ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum - Joint Meeting: GAC and ALAC
Wednesday, March 11, 2020 – 12:15 to 13:00 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Hello everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is Gultan Tepe from ICANN GAC support team. Welcome to the ICANN67 virtual meeting. This is the GAC meeting with ALAC. This is the GAC meeting with ALAC session being held on Wednesday, 11th of March, 2020 at 1400 UTC -- I'm sorry at 17:15 UTC. The zoom room audio is in English. In order to access the French or Spanish audio please join the streaming links that has been shared on the main ICANN67 website. GAC agenda page under each session as well as on the calendar invites sent to you. We will not be doing a roll call today for the sake of time, but GAC member attendance will be noted. And available in the annex of the ICANN67 GAC communique and the GAC minutes. Recognizing that these are public sessions, and that other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance GAC leadership and staff encourage all of you who are GAC representatives and observers to update your participant name in the zoom room by adding GAC into parentheses after your name. You may take the way I type my name as an example. This will help us to identify GAC session attendees, keep accurate GAC attendance records and facilitate the queue for participant comments and questions during the session. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment in English French or Spanish please type in it in the chant by starting and ending your

sentence with question or comment and please keep them short if possible. French or Spanish questions will be translated into English, and read-out loud. Staff will put periodic reminders of this process in the zoom room chat. If you're in the zoom room and wish to speak you may also raise your hand and we will manage the queue. A kind reminder to please state your names when you speak, not only for the transcription purposes but also for the interpreters to identify you on the audio streaming. Please also speak clearly, and at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation finally this session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. I will put a link in the chat to those standards for your reference. So with that, I will would like to hand the floor to GAC chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. And welcome to the GAC ALAC meeting. The meeting is scheduled for 45 minutes. And we have an interesting agenda already posted on the screen, but before we get started allow me furs to pass the chair to Maureen if you have any independent deduct, introductory remarks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Manal. I hope you can hear me well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, loud and clear.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Manal. Thank you for this invitation, and the ALAC and at large community appreciate the opportunity to share the contributions and normal contribution to your meetings that at large participants but their contribution that they're making to PDPs that are related to ICANN issues of concern to both the GAC and the ALAC. I enjoy being able to participate the subsequent procedures an hour or so ago and happy to have with me Justine Chew to give our update and subsequent procedures and YRJO and Allen to give their report. That will do for now so back to you Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Maureen and without any further ado maybe we can hand over to Justine and Luisa, I'm not sure who will start our discussions on subsequent procedures.   So shall I hand over to Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you this is. Justine Chew for the record. I had a couple of slides that I shared with Luisa and GAC leadership earlier today, I was hoping that we could put that up on the screen, and while that happens I'm -- it's you know my pleasure to be here representing the ALAC and also as the lead for the at large consolidated policy

working group small team that is working on the ALAC and at large version of the scorecards for subsequent procedures. What you see on the screen is possibly not unfamiliar to some people, but in -- for the benefit of UFO(sic), the many participants that we have today, this is a -- the chart that shows the high level process and timelines that at large and ALAC are following in terms of producing scorecards which ultimately would form positions of at large and ALAC in terms of responding to the final report of subsequent procedures. So you can see there in step number 3 there is a co-operation that we are looking into, or we are actually started in terms of inter-sessional work with GAC focus group. So yes if I can -- we can just go onto the in next slide please. Yes, so we -- in terms of this GAC ALAC inter-sessional co-operation, we had a leadership team call in 18th of February -- on 18th of February and there after we've had an exchange of draft scorecards between the GAC focus group and the at large consolidated policy working group subsequent procedures small working group team which I lead and we expect to the practice will continue as and when each of the advisory committees builds up consensus on different topics. I've also had the pleasure of observing all the GAC sessions on subsequent procedures so I am pleased to say that you know, noting that at large is also taking the same sort of approach in terms of building consensus within at large for certain topics of -- which we deem of high priority except that of course our perspective would be from the end users' point of view as opposed to the government's perspective for GAC. We've also noted that there was time needed to be put forward for capacity building needs on both sides, and I think that will continue to happen, and in terms of

moving forward, we, we take the opportunity now to propose a number of subsequent procedure topics for further discussion in terms of moving the inter-sessional co-operation forward. These are merely suggestions obviously. And we would love to have the perspective or the inputs from GAC on these topics especially if there has been consensus reached or will be reached in future on these topics from the GAC side. So if I could just briefly mention a couple. In terms of these -- the consumer protections the consumer trust and consumer choice recommendation review teams whether those serve as a prerequisite to the next round. Whether it's we are going to approach it from the perspective of selected recommendations, are from from the RT report or whether we need to look at if from a totality point of view, also public interest commitments and what is now called registry voluntary commitments. Used to be mandatory PICs and voluntary PICs and these have an element of public interest goals which GAC has actually raised before are in the earlier 2012 rounds so we would like to pursue discussions on those as well as GAC advice and GAC early warning which connects to the next topic of objections. And appeals is all together a new framework that subsequent procedures is looking into. Closed generics TLD is something that has sparked quite a bit of discussion within the subsequent procedures working group and we are looking at how to come up if possible with some guard-rails to allow for closed generics and in what context should those be allowed. Then one of the topics that at large holds very high in their agenda would be DNS abuse mitigation, and a small connection to that would be possible changes to the base registry agreement and contractual compliance. Also

African support, and community-based applications which is related to community priority evaluation mechanism of last resort for string contention resolution which is the auctions process and lastly geographic names as top-level domain. And in terms of next steps we would love to have an indication or perhaps some discussions as to what concrete next steps we could put forward to further the GAC ALAC inter-sessional work. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Justine. This is very informative and thank you for sharing your priority issues with the GAC. We had very interesting discussions during this meeting and prioritizing the topic for this GAC meeting. Despite the many priority issues to the GAC on this we have prioritized the 5 topics or the 5 issues that are being discussed and concluded at the PDP subsequent procedures working group so namely the closed generics TLDs, public interest commitments, GAC early warnings and GAC advice, applicant support program and underserved regions, and community-based applications, so we decided to follow the steps of the subsequent procedures working group for this meeting, and we had an excellent capacity building workshop at the beginning of this meeting focussing solidly on subsequent procedures as well. So I'm not sure whether Luisa, would you like -- or to weigh in, or -- Jorge or -- yes, Luisa, please go. Luisa, we cannot hear you.

LUISA PAEZ: Luisa Paez of the Canadian government. Can you hear me well?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I can hear you now.

LUISA PAEZ: Okay, I'll try.

GULTEN TEPE: We can hear you now, Luisa, please proceed. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Hello.

LUISA PAEZ: Hello, Manal, can you hear me? Luisa Paez.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes we can hear you now Luisa. Go ahead. Luisa, we can hear you. Can you hear us? Can you hear me?

GULTEN TEPE: Luisa, we can hear you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: She got disconnected. She said in the chat she got disconnected, and she will connect again.

GULTEN TEPE: Jorge, would you like to take the floor?

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, you can hear me okay?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Jorge, we can hear you well.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, and sorry, because I'm multi-tasking with some other urgent issue for the GAC communique, so on subsequent procedures I hope that the sessions in the GAC, and also the interventions of GAC members and the subsequent procedures have been useful for you, and also the GAC documentation which we shared with you before the meeting. And I at least for myself -- and I cannot speak for Luisa -- we very much look forward to co-operating with you, with ALAC on this issue, and to exchange our scorecards and align them as much as

possible. But if you have any specific questions or issues that you want me to react, I'm really happy to do so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I think the question -- because Justine already shared the priority issues from the ALAC side, and I was just mentioning that we already shared the same priorities and we have identified 5 topics in specific for this meeting. Again following what's being discussed within the PDP on subsequent procedures. And Justine was asking whether there are any GAC consensus on any of those issues, anything we've reached any results, Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much, Manal, for clarifying. Jorge Cancio again for the record. As you will have seen, the -- or maybe not -- but clearly in the discussions in if the GAC have been -- have gone to the substance of public interest commitment on GAC early warning applicant support programs and closed generics. We also have covered the next step, but basically the task of finding possible new consensus positions on the specifics of the of the recommendations being owe lap elaborated by the PDP working group is something we will endeavor to achieve inter-sessionally. It's, of course, very complicated complex task with so many governments, and not having face-to-face meetings, but as you may have seen for -- from the GAC scorecard we are basing our discussions on a lot of prior consensus positions from the GAC which stem from -- date back to 2007 with the GAC principles on new gTLDs,

and also have different milestones in input from the GAC to the subsequent procedures working group since 2017. So actually we are not starting from scratch but of course as the work from are the PDP working group is really a moving target because only last week we only saw the paper with your... positions on issues as important as... GAC advice applicant support, etcetera community-based applications, of course the GAC is not able, and I would say no advice... and no supporting organization is able to go in that level of detail and have a consensus position in a matter of days. But as said, I think we have a good bases, and good documentation, and also plan for the months to come.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And now we have Luisa back, so Luisa, please go ahead.

LUISA PAEZ: Hello, Manal. This is Luisa Paez. Can you hear me now?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect, and apologies that my zoom got disconnected. And so I -- it's really a pleasure to have these exchanges with the GAC, and I also

wanted to note, though I'm honored to be categorized as the chair of the focal group I just wanted to highlight that its been really a GAC leadership effort as long as with GAC support staff to try to come up with a comprehensive draft GAC scorecard identifying topics of priority to the GAC as well as the GAC support staff has been working very closely with GNSO support staff on the PDP SubPro in order to ensure we are up to speed on the ongoing discussions of priority topics to the GAC that are taking place in the PDP working group, but as well as both Manal and Jorge mentioned it -- even though this discussions in the PDP have been going on for many years now, we have sometimes new GAC members that come in or GAC member representation changes so I mean for governments this is a challenge to I guess to, to work at the speed that we would like to and be as nimble as we would like to. We always have to consult internally our positions. Consult with our stakeholders so we are trying our best but yeah, but all to say that there's still -- as Jorge mentioned we are in a good place, but there's obviously a lot of items and considerations that need to be reviewed and discussed by GAC members and it's encouraging to see that ALAC has a dedicated group that's looking into their priority issues. We have -- we are aligned in a few items as well so that's also encouraging, and for this particular first ever GAC ICANN virtual meeting we did ensure not to schedule our GAC sessions at the same time as the SubPro PDP working group sessions and this was really to give GAC members an opportunity to participate and to experience for some -- maybe for the first time -- for more seasoned GAC members not for the first time but to really experience that the bottom um, multistakeholder policy development policy process to

keep strengthening it so that also presents that opportunity and, of course, to ensure that government public policy considerations are taken into account into the future rounds so to say that we, we are in a group effort with the GAC leadership and hopefully as well with some interested GAC members we will be continuing our inter-sessional discussions, and if there is potential GAC input that we would like to present to the upcoming PDP -- sorry, the draft … regions expected in July 2020 or if there is consensus for anything before that and so finally of course open to have further GAC and ALAC inter-sessional calls. It is helpful for us to get a sense again of where the ALAC is moving, and that those exchanges help also even build our capacity as well. Much thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa, and as Luisa mentioned we would be happy to compare notes again inter-sessionally.   We did some significant progress during this meeting but we're not there yet so we will keep you posted on further progress. And would be happy to exchange and compare notes inter-sessionally, if possible. So if there is nothing more on subsequent procedures, maybe we can now move to EPDP. I can see Justine in the chat thanking everybody so we, we are good to move onto the EPDP and I'm handing over to Hadia and Alan? Yes, Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA EL-MINIAWI: Thank you, Justine, and thank you, Manal. So those are the possible topics of mutual interest, and first I will be talking about the of course complying with the GDPR and the relevant data protection laws and then standardized system for access disclosure. Automation. Urgent standardized system for access and disclosure requests, and accuracy of the data and the distinction between natural and legal ... if we could have the next slide please. So it is very important to continue working to balance the low data retention requirements and the protection of the personal information of the data subjects with the legitimate interests of third parties seeking access to nonpublic registration data. However, I should note here that we are already over complying with the requirements of GDPR. GDPR as an example of that GDPR provides protection to the personal information of natural persons, and not legal persons, however current already we are ... to the personal information of legal precedence as well. Thus we are not following what the GDPR says which could later prove to be problematic. There are also other examples for overcomplying. Anyway, to achieve this balance, we need to have a standardized system for access and disclosure, and this is not only to achieve the balance but to suppress the... of the registration data access that apparently exists. And also to meet the public interest. So it is necessary to have a standardized system, and as much as possible centralized. And I would refer here to a recently published by ICANN org in relation to its meeting with the Belgian data protection authority. The blog mentions that the data protection authority representative said a centralized model is worth exploring, and seems to be a better common sense option with regard to the security and

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

the protection of the data subject. However, the agreed-upon hybrid model in which the central gateway manager would be -- would possibly automate the disclosure of a couple of requests, while the other request would be directed to the relevant contracted party to make the decision and maybe disclose the data is a good start. If we could have the next slide please so automation is definitely very important it would lead to a quicker consistent and stable process especially where a large number of requests are being analyzed. We have almost agreed on the automation of two used cases one with regard to the uniform domain name resolution policy and the other with regard to uniform rapid and uniform rapid suspension and the others with regard to low enforcement request from from the same jurisdiction, and again I would refer here to what the Belgian DPI mentioned so they noted that GDPR would not prohibit the automation of various functions in an access model. And they also say it is not how the disclosure decision is made that makes -- that matters but to be able to demonstrate that any algorithm automating decision making considers the criteria required by GDPR. So frankly we have almost agreed on only two cases however it is the ALAC sees that it is very important to start with some automated use cases, and also it is equally important that the central gateway manager and the contracted parties learn from their requests and responses and based on this, more use cases could be automated in the future, and this is what we call the involvement of this system. If we could have the next slide please. So requests for which evidence is provided that shows an immediate need for disclosure should have an immediate response. And currently -- and this is yet -- is put forth to comment on. We

haven't yet concluded the ... however I would note here that urgent SSAD requests are defined as circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure whether on-line or off line, or ... [inaudible] so we definitely see if the data is required for one of these cases then the response should be immediate, and again the response doesn't have to be yes. The response can be a yes or a no depending on the evaluation however it should be immediate. If we could have the next slide please. Accuracy, and this is a topic that we have been discussing, the importance of the accuracy of the data, and definitely accuracy of the data is important for -- right for the data subjects but also but also accuracy should -- the data should fulfill the processing purposes and if you -- for example, you need to contact the registrant for an important issue relating to the abuse of the domain or security, then you should be able to -- so we continue to secrecy as an important topic that needs to be pursued. If we could have the next slide please. And then finally the distinction between natural and legal persons, and I would say again the concerns present now include some practical implementation. Some concerns about the legal [inaudible] registrants [inaudible] not identifying themselves however again the GDPR does not protect the personal information of legal persons, and by redacting this it could be -- it could prove to be problematic later. Also such a distinction will significantly reduce unnecessary load from the standardized system of access and disclosure. So this was a brief presentation about the topics that the ALAC considers topics of mutual interest, and I spoke here, and hand over the floor to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Hadia. I'm just wondering whether we have any of our GAC EPDP small group members who may like to comment at this stage? Yes, Giorgio, please go ahead.

GEORGIOS TSELENTSIS: Yes, thank you very much and thank you both Alan and Hadia. We have, I think, a quite good collaboration in the EPDP. Very briefly I would like to agree that those are points of mutual interest that says Hadia, not only of interest but I think in most of those points we are, we are practically aligned to our stance what we believe the way forward would be on those. Particularly I would say in issues that until -- to the -- how this model will be addressing the needs also from our side that pertain to public interest, so I just very briefly want to say that I agree with the points raised by the -- in the presentation, and that more or less, we have, we have a quite common position there. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Georgios. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and I agree with Georgios. I think we have been working together, and we are very much aligned on many of the issues

if not all. I guess my one concern is, I'm pleased that the SSAD model that we are talking about now will have some initial cases will be fully automated, but they're going to be a relatively small number, and I have real concerns about how we are going to move forward, and improve that once the system is deployed. I really don't so although we talk about saying well we'll learn from experience, I'm not sure I see the actual met methodology that will be used to move forward in this area and I think it's something that the EPDP has it think about more carefully and more pragmatic because it's not going to be practical if every decision has to be handled manually and I certainly believe there are more that we can safely and without high risk do in an automated fashion, but I'm not quite sure how we go there and that's one of my largest single concern there right now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Alan. I had Laureen asking to comment as well in this the chat room, and then Kavouss and Chris. So Laureen, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Manal. And also a big thanks to our ALAC colleagues who we closely collaborate with, and almost always are in alignment. I did want to underscore the importance of this distinction between legal and natural natural and back up a point Hadia made, because the GDPR didn't protect the in information of natural entities unless its personal information, even trying to push for a policy that did not result in this over compliance would actually make the system a lot

more efficient a because it would reduce the into he had to make requests for nonpublic data so I think there's area that's absolutely ripe for further pursuit. And then as to Alan's last point about practically speaking how we're going to improve the system as it goes along, I think that that is also a real concern, and there is an opportunity for the GAC to actually provide input and comments on this, and I will note to my GAC colleagues that in the draft comments that we've circulated, those areas are blank because we really haven't had a chance to collaborate with the GAC about how it sees the best way forward here, and because Alan has so eloquently raised this topic I did want to highlight that this would be a great opportunity for the GAC to really consider thoughts on how to, how to implement in a practical way some sort of system steering group or mechanism to make sure that this system which handles which important responsibilities can actually adapt and improve over time in a way that is nimble, not in a way that requires us a 3 year policy making process every time a change is justified.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Laureen. Kavouss, go ahead, please.

IRAN: Yes, thank you for the presence of the ALAC, and always a very close collaboration with GAC, we really enjoying this source of collaborations and we are grateful to you sharing your knowledge with us. I think on this specific issue we discussing now, legal versus

natural and so on and so forth as I mentioned yesterday, among the participants or group or stakeholder group or SO-AC and others there is one group that strongly oppose to address this issue saying that it's outside the mandate of the ... this is something that for the time being we don't have, and that was the timing they have been succeeded to push for their positions and so on and so forth. This is one thing that you have to really careful either we want that distinction we made or we want that -- we should accept that non-distinction because of the strong position of that group which the number of participants of that group its double compared with the participants of our groups. They have 6 members. Other they have 3 or 2 but they have 6 members and always some of these 6 take the floor and opposed to the situation. And 2 or 3 very strongly opposed to that. And this is ... the other point is still 2 of the group participating did not allow to work on the full automation and put the -- this hybrid and the released or responses will be through manual but in the automatic. Don't go to that one. That they -- succeed today do that but I would like to ask those people like Hadia and Alan and others participating in if the PDP to what extent, up to what time this nonautomatic or hybrid will go? Is the object why why I have go to the full automatic or not, and what is a time-frame for that? These are the -- and 2 and the third issue I raised yesterday. If the requester comply with all criteria, whatever criteria is. Is there any possibility that was non-technical and none -- and just for political issue that request or or that request or will be ignored in one way or another to be accepted by the gateway receiving the request and ignored to be replied by the registry and the registrar. Is that possibility exist? Does the OFAC operation come there and

deprive some requestors to make a -- I would say justify the request, or that does not exist? Unfortunately, this is the bitter experience that we have are our area restriction thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss. We are right at the hour. I would like to give a chance to those who have hands up but please keep it brief and short so that we are able to conclude quickly so Georgios, please.

GEORGIOS TSELENTSIS: Yes, thank you. I will be brief. To Alan's point with ... I think I will be more optimist and the reason is that automation is also something which is very useful for both the access seekers but also for the ones making the disclosure, so at the end of the day with a good automated system I think every party has a win/win. However, I would like to say that automation needs first to address some very, very core issues regarding the responsibility and the controller ship that we need to address in the very another future, and also it has to deal with some issues that we have not touched so far in the EPDP with, with data crossing jurisdictional borders from different countries. So that, that would be for me the most important challenges that we would face in the upcoming weeks. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Giorgio and I invite everyone to read Chris's comments in the chat. Joanna, please go ahead.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Joanna Kulesza, for the record. I just wanted to grab the opportunity to briefly speak at the any other business section and in terms of aligning our policies and finding common ground for further collaboration please let me know the session we have advertised to the GAC before and the ICANN67 meeting on one world one Internet cybersecurity and geopolitics is taking place. I will paste a link no the chat backs. Everyone is invites today participate. We are looking forward to this opportunity as another chance for us to build consensus and build bridges between the 2 communities. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Joanna. And Hadia, I will give you the floor and I have Kavouss in the chat asking whether Alan or Hadia can respond to his third question, so Hadia I appreciate if you can tackle this as well thank you.

HADIA EL-MINIAWI: Thank you. That's why I raised the hand, because I wanted to tackle Kavouss last question and this is one with regard to can concern requestors their request be ignored? Requestors and the answer to

that is I think no according to the policy we have put but we should remember that all requestors are accredited requestors so no one can actual already I submit a request to the -- submit for disclosure unless he is an accredited user. And so first the request needs to be accredited and then submit -- and then the requestor would submit a request to the central gateway. And, and then the request would be automatically reviewed and all the reviewed, no, not in in -- not content wise but syntax wise and also making sure that all the requirements required elements are provided and this could be down automatically and then a response would automatically also be sent to the requester if some of the elements are missing so that the requester can actually complete the missing elements. So all of this is actually automated and then after a complete and valid request is [inaudible] that part is -- could be fully automated. The central gateway manager will look at the request and if it it's one of the cases that are to be automatically responded for it will do so. If not, it will actually ask contacting party to respond [inaudible] if it is not a used case that actually could be responded to automatically then it is sent to the contact party to make the decision and the contacted party at this point should make a decision whether a yes or a no, and this is actually monitored by service level agreement, and, and for that the contact party should actually provide a response, so I think that the -- system as we have said right now does not allow for ignoring requests. And I leave the floor to Alan, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Hadia and since we called upon Alan as well. I will give him the floor before I go I have it back to Maureen to conclude so, Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you very much. As Hadia said, once you're an accredited and assuming you haven't doing something to lose your accreditation there should be no issue of a request being ignored by the SSAD. What the contracted party does, if it goes to them, is another issue that we will be monitoring. The only challenge I see is the whole system of accreditation has to be set up. And making sure that any one who is eligible for accreditation actually can be accredited you know given a whole issue of range from, from language and jurisdictions and things like that is going to be a challenge that we are going to have to work on. But that's not an issue of the SSAD refusing a request it's making sure that any one who has a valid reason to be accredited can do so in a timely manner. So that's one of the things we are going to have to watch. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Manal, this is Maureen. I just wanted to say thank you very much for the session today. Really interesting, and interesting discussions today. Best we've had I think and I look forward to our inter-sessionals as well as our next meeting. Thank you so much.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Maureen. Thank you for joining the session that. The transcripts and recordings will be posted and the relevant GAC and website pages. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very much. Have a great rest of the day everyone.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So to GAC colleagues we are supposed to have a 15 minute break so we were supposed to be back at quarter past, I propose that we reconvene at half past also giving some more time for maybe on-line coordinations or discussions on the communique. So if this is okay with everybody if you can click the green check button.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020