ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GAC: ICANN68 Communique Review Point
Tuesday, June 23, 2020 – 10:00 to 11:00 MYT

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone this is Julia Charvolen from the ICANN GAC support team. Welcome to the ICANN68 virtual meeting with our first session of the day with the GAC ICANN68 GAC communique review point on Tuesday, 23 June, 2020 at 2:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call for the sake of time but GAC members' attendance will be noted and available in the annex of the GAC communique and in the GAC minutes of the ICANN68 meeting. Due to unfortunate Zoom bombing circumstances which occurred on the first date of the meeting, ICANN68's community sessions will be switching to Zoom webinar rooms and not regular ones for the remainder of the meetings. In a Zoom webinar in order for a GAC member to speak he or she needs to be identified as a panelist.. In order for Zoom to do this automatically GAC members need to either log into Zoom room with the GAC mail in list or join the Zoom room with an individual link that was sent to them via email. In case a GAC member does not have the ability to raise a hand or see the names of other panelists he or she may need to leave the room and join again using the individual link sent by email. When recognized as panelists in the Zoom room GAC members will experience much of the information and functionality they have seen in a regular Zoom room with the ability to rename themselves for attendance by entering their participant name,

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.

surname, country or delegation. If you've used a different email address you will not be promoted and will not be able to speak. The Zoom room is equipped with a Q&A pod in the chat feature. A box is found at the bottom of the Zoom window.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type it in the Q&A pod by starting and ending the sentence with question or comment to allow all participants to see your request and please make it as short if possible. Interpretation for GAC which will include 6 U.N. languages and Portuguese and conducted using simultaneous remote interpretation operated byCongress Rental Network application. Attendees are encouraged to download from the link in the Zoom chat or if the meeting details document on the GAC website page. Your microphone will be muted unless you get into the queue to speak. If you wish to speak, raise your hand in the Zoom room. The tech support will unmute you as soon as you have been given the floor by the session lead. When speaking be sure to mute all your other devices Including in the application.

And finally, this session like all other ICANN sessions is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. You will find the link in the chat for your reference. It is now my pleasure to give the floor to the GAC chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Julia, I was not able to switch on the video but it's okay. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone and welcome. As Julia mentioned, this session is scheduled for an hour and this is the first discussion we have on our communique. During this first review point we need to confirm or plan for the communique drafting, identify topics that are potential for the communique that we would like to reflect in the communique and then ultimately start or discussion on what we need to convey under each topic and also assign pen holders.

As usual, support staff will be helping with non-advice parts or parts that has nothing to do with the substance, whether advice or not. And I hope that GAC members and observers will be providing the communique language for other parts of the communique, namely the GAC consensus GAC advice with any topics of importance to the GAC and the third section is the follow up on GAC advice to the board. So that said, let me first confirm our plan for the communique drafting and whether we can agree on how long do we want the communique to be circulated before it's been adopted and posted online. As ICANN67, over are I think we gave it 24 hours after circling on the communique, again, it was asked that we give a little bit more time at ICANN68, so wondering how long GAC colleagues would like to have before adopting the GAC communique.

PLEASE STAND BY...

Judging by priorities, I think we have subsequent procedures, DNS abuse, and EPDP as the topics that are of priority to the GAC. So those are potential of course to be effective in the communique. And thank you, Fabien for displaying the Google Doc where colleagues can start inserting text if any but also displaying the process we will follow in compiling the communique. So meanwhile waiting for any hands to be raised? Let me go through the process. So GAC members and GAC - -

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Sorry for interrupting. I see Kavouss has his hand up.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, thank you Julia for letting me know, I'm sorry I was on the wrong tab, on attendees instead of panelists. So go ahead Kavouss and sorry to overlook you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me now?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning good afternoon and good evening to everybody just I hope I have not interrupted you because you raised a question that how long we need to give to colleagues to react on the draft communique the part, sorry, I think we are limited by the number of days that we are available to us. I suggest that if in the absence of any opposition we maintain the 24 hours because time differences would fit within that 24 hours that the people have an opportunity to consult their colleagues, the departments and get any answers. I suggest that in the absence of any opposition to that, and because of the time limit that we have, and because we have to release the communique almost a day before the end if possible, we maintain the 24 hours deadline for reaction on the communique.

And having said that I think although every GAC communique would be good if you have any advice but it is not a necessity if you don't have any subject newly arised on which we have not reacted before we don't need to initiate a topic so we should start with the topic of any possible advice then we take normal course of action. Last thing that we may in the GAC ICANN67 was when invited the Board we raised the questions and now our questions are quite clear, and we

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

expect them to give some very very short reply at the meeting in a more formal manner because our question. I don't think it is good that we say that we have the meeting for the Board. The following questions were raised and full stop. So we have to say what was at these very brief summary of the answers in particular areas that we asked them, would it be possible that for instance maybe yes we will take necessary action, in time and so on, so these are the things I wanted to raise.

I'm sorry at the beginning of your discussion I thought it's better to raise that so every meeting with any constituency after saying that we had met them or we have met them we should say that what was the main topic that we have discussed and what is the outcome of that discussion? This reflected the communique but not saying that we met them or raised the point of interest. So what? Thank you, thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Kavouss and thank you for triggering the discussion and breaking the ice. So, let's take them point by point so on your first point regarding the time that we can give for everyone to review the communique in their time zone, I agree if there is no objection you would follow what you suggested and what we already followed at ICANN67 which is 24 hours after circulating the final communique, which should be almost agreed, so if there are any final comments, and I think what we did last time was close of business of

Friday at any time zone, so if there are no other suggestions, we can proceed with this, but I see Vincent's hand up so Vincent please.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Yes hello, Manal. Can you hear me?

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

VINCENT GOUILLART: Can you hear me okay?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Vincent can you hear me?

VINCENT GOUILLART: Yes. Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

VINCENT GOUILLART: My mistake. Well, first of all, hello and good morning good day and good evening to everyone, and I'm very happy to be with you all today, and given that we have the pleasure of having live translation in all our usual languages, I think I'm going be speaking in French. (Interpreter speaking) I would like to say something about what Kavouss just said in terms of the time line that we would have to validate the communique. I think it would be unfortunate to use only 24 hours where really we could use a little bit more time, I think that this would enable better participation for some of us. I think that 48 hours is a minimum. I would like to go back to what Jorge said in the chat in his comments, and I think that we could even consider 72 hours but at least 48 hours would be a good compromise. We are in a difficult situation and I think that we could all use a little bit more time. The procedure is mostly oral, and the written procedures are used by many organizations, they are very useful to help participants who have a hard time joining the oral procedure.

Right now we are all faced with a challenging situation with the pandemic that creates difficulties for all of us and I think that the written procedure being longer would help all of us and facilitate the process. That's why I would like to confirm what Jorge said, and I would like to propose a 48 hour validation time line. I think it would be useful and a good compromise. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, very much, Vincent. So we have a proposal from Vincent to have 48 hours... is this okay with everyone? I see agreement from Jorge in the chat as well. And also Egypt supporting and Betty wants to have more time. So I think we can confirm the 48 hours but Kavouss, I see your hand is up, please go ahead first.

IRAN: (No audio)

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, Kavouss, I cannot hear you.

IRAN: Now? Okay. I think you have to work it out backward. What is the time that the communique should be published, issued formally? And then count on the last edit that we have to make, a day and then count backward to today. If we have 48 hours available, I have no problem. But the problem is that the more time than the less time available for drafting the communique and for negotiating, we should be understood that. Virtual meetings are more difficult to negotiate because there is no face-to-face, no [indiscernible] discussions and there are time limits because of the time zones and so on, so forth. Like me, we're starting from 4:00 in the morning and so on and then we have some other objectives as well. I have meeting with a start of 12:00 Geneva time so I cannot stay more time on the ICANN because I

have another important meeting outside of ICANN.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, Kavouss, if I may interrupt. I think there is a misunderstanding here. We will finalize the communique by Thursday as we normally do. So we will not leaving meeting until we finish the communique draft. This grace period is being provided to those who were challenged by the time zone and could not participate at the communique drafting session if they need to have a final look at the overall communique before it's being adopted and released. So in terms of drafting, we will finish the communique and finalize it hopefully of course by Thursday. Sorry to interrupt you. Back to you, Kavouss, I just felt there was a little bit of a misunderstanding.

IRAN: I know. I understand you, but I think you have a time limit will say also for preparations and so on, so forth and then you are talking of Thursday and -- please don't forget in many countries Thursday and Friday are off, they don't work. So we have to take all of this into account. I don't understand this 48 hours. We are here, have been authorized to attend the meeting and 48 hours is the time limit because of the time zone differences. One side is far east and the other American continent and the differences not more than eight or nine hours, so 24 hours is sufficient but if we want that then we will take the issue we have Thursday and Friday off, and the 48 hours, 72 hours and so on, so forth. Do we want to do that? I don't understand

this situation. So did 24 hours cause any problems to anyone? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think what I heard is that people may need some more time to review the communique and if they are willing to work over the weekend, then it's up to them. Kavouss please, go ahead.

IRAN: Manal, excuse me, we're misunderstood.   Which we finish the communique and then come back, who will do the changes, who will negotiate the changes? Somebody may bring something which has not been discussed. Usually we should not give anything, this eight hours which is within the 24 hours just because of the time difference because it's virtual. It depends on the type of the changes. If 48 hours people coming and making major changes, then we have to renegotiate that we are not there anymore and we don't want to bother you again. So how do we do that? So that is the situation. So let us start first on the type of the advice and then we have sufficient time for discussion and 24 hours is the last -- after the end of the thing but not the starting at the beginning of the meeting that we have 476 members and we have this -- these are the very simple things, we leave it at the end and for that you can give instead of 24 hours, 48 hours or 72 hours -- but let's concentrate as soon as possible on the type of advice we have and then I think 24 hours is sufficient but if

everybody agrees with the 48 hours, I have no problem. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss for your flexibility and allowing to us move on and also for the excellent point that this period is not given for colleagues to start rediscussing points that we already closed or proposing brand topics that were not flagged during the session or discussed during the drafting. So indeed, this is not the purpose of this period, it's just for those who were not at the session to have a final read of the communique and normally we don't expect any comments after we finalize the communique unless we have overlooked something that. That said, let's move on to the topics and let me ask what are the topics expected to be reflected in the communique, given the discussions we started and given the discussions remaining for tomorrow. But also note what Kavouss mentioned at the beginning because I didn't touch on this, which is reflecting board answers to our questions in the communique as well. So this is also a point that need to be confirmed by everyone so we can act accordingly and also let the board know we will be putting short answers to their questions in the communique.

So with this, let me open the floor again for suggestions or the topics that need to be reflected in the communique. And my understanding is that we don't have something for advice. As far as we have discussed. But again, please raise your hand and let me know if there are certain topics that need to be reflected in the advice part.

Otherwise let's discuss the topics that need to be reflected in the communique in general.

And thank you, Fabien, for displaying the process to insert text in the Google Doc so this is to make sure everyone is familiar with how to use this Google Doc and how to insert text under the relevant section, making sure you are inserting text in suggestion mode so that you don't delete or mess with the text of others and also propose your text under the appropriate section. Make sure the author is properly identified so that we know who inserted what and finally, don't for forget to hit reply so that your edits are shown and identified. So is subsequent procedures something we would like to reflect in our communique? Reading Jorge in the chat, subsequent procedures as in ICANN67? So I think this is an agreement, Jorge; short summary of discussions. Noted. Next would be DNS abuse but first let me give Kavouss the floor, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I think we are discusses something which is not related to the GAC advice, just what appeared in the communique. So it's not GAC advice. Am I right? We are not talking of GAC advice, ad advice to the board. I think the issues are quite clear. Most of the topics are those we have raised with the board. These are the topics of interest so any of that could appear in the communique, I have no problem but the issue that what we would like to put in the communique. What are the texts so subsequent round, what to do

about round subsequent round. DNS abuse, what to talk about DNS abuse. EPDP, what do we want to talk about the EPDP that we have not talked already. So if we have a topic yes and then after the topics we really should have a clear-cut idea which have not yet been addressed or if has been addressed we need to refer to them as a follow-up actions. That is my suggestion without opposing any point but our points are those we have raised in our questions to the board. Any of those could be in the communique and then what should be apart on what I have already mentioned. We have mentioned about subsequent advice more than ten times. What is new? We have talked about the abuse of DNS. What is new? So we have to be quite careful. No problem with the topics but the issue is what we have to say? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And indeed, this aligns with my thinking as well. Those are the three potential topics as they are the GAC priorities for this meeting. So I see the three topics you mentioned as potential to be reflected in our communique, subsequent procedures, EPDP, and DNS abuse. And that said, I was going to ask that topic leads help us in drafting the relevant parts, but it could be a good idea to flag the points under each topic so we get a green light on continuing the draft the rest of the text. Although part of it would still be clear when we finish our discussions tomorrow. But again, I think since this is not advice to the board, it's going to be merely a summary of what already factually happened during our

discussion. So I hope it's not going to be controversial. But again, if topic leads already have some key messages in mind, please share them with the wider GAC membership to make sure we're all on the same page and facilitate our review of the communique later on Wednesday and Thursday. So I think for subsequent procedures, I hope Jorge and Luisa will help accept to help drafting this part, and Fabien I see your hand.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I didn't mean to interrupt your flow, but I'm aware the representative from the GAC small group on the EPDP are discussing possible text for the communique and they will be discussing that in the GAC session on [indiscernible] right after this, so I just wanted to flag that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Fabien. This is very timely. So members of the small group will be presenting to ask -- I mean later today and will be flagging communique text as well which would be helpful and an early heads up to everyone. Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Yes, thanks, Fabien for his very hard work. I know he's known as an EPDP man in ICANN, GAC, he's very hardworking on that. But I would like to repeat what I said before. Anything about the EPDP shouldn't be considered that we are on one hand part of the EPDP with the small

team on the other hand we challenge the discussions being finalized there and come back and take again our points. So we should avoid to have any insistence. We should work within the community and with consensus building. So I think the small group respectfully not to raise the point [indiscernible] as EPDP because that does not make any effect. We raise it in the communique but the people read that they say that the EPDP group did not agree to that so what we can do? So we have to be careful, something not in contradiction of what was discussed because we are members there, plus three, six people, although not compared with the noncommercial that there are more than that, but in any case, we should be quite careful. So I draw the attention of distinguished colleagues, Fabien and the team to be quite careful of what they're raising, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And indeed, GAC colleagues already from the small group are already participating to the EPDP process, and I think whenever there is a valid argument at the EPDP side we should not keep reiterating the same positions but if we're still not convinced and it's a pressing need, we can still reiterate previous positions, and this is up to the GAC and the text will be presented to the entire GAC and subject to GAC approval of course. But thanks to the EPDP small group members. So now we have Jorge, Luisa and Benedetta will be helping with the text under subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, small group members with Fabien on EPDP, and I hope we can also rely on the PSWG working group with your help on DNS

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

abuse.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Absolutely, Manal. I will convey the request and I assume that's an [indiscernible] understanding.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Fabien for the confirmation. So anything else under other parts of the communique or any other issues of important? So two more things, Kavouss, please go.

IRAN: We have heard 40 percent inaccurate information, data accuracy. Was discussed yesterday and people raised questions that what we do with those -- so comes under the DNS abuse or not? The issue of accuracy.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. And I think it comes under DNS abuse but also under EPDP as well. I think accuracy was one of the topics that our pending resolution or agreement by the EPDP and it is one of the topics that are being followed since they don't seem to be -- it doesn't seem that they will be resolved during Phase 2. But again, I'm sure accuracy would appear, if not under both, then EPDP the but again, Fabien, if you can convey Kavouss' knowledge our pen holders, please. Kavouss, go ahead.

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

IRAN:

Please unmute me, it's okay now? Yes. I think it's no problem notice two places but in one place will be just raised and refer to the second place. See detail and then we go in that place. So maybe better to raise it at the EPDP saying that the EPDP team discussed that and said this is not as part of their job specifically and so on, so forth but we put all the discussion on the DNS abuse but we raise it at the EPDP but cross referencing in the part of Part 2. So no problem. We should say EPDP full discussions importance of the accuracy and so on, so forth addressed in section 2 of the DNS, [indiscernible] arrangements. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. And we will try to avoid redundancy unless it's being tackled from different perspectives, but otherwise we will surely try to avoid repetition of the same text. And by the way, I think as a panelist, you can unmute yourself now, Kavouss. So whenever given the floor, I believe you can unmute yourself.

So I think we're good on issues of importance to the GAC. If there are any key messages or initial thoughts under any of the topics, please make sure to share them as early as possible. And on the board questions, if we can please, Rob, convey to them that we will be inserting short answers to the questions, it would be good for them to know and also to make it clear in their answers if there is a short answer to the question, that this be made clear so that we can easily

capture in the communique and finally on the time thing, but I see Kavouss' hand up, go ahead first.

IRAN: Yes, depending on our discussion with the board, there may be other point that either connected to the DNS or EPDP or subsequent or any other thing, we may either put them in this [indiscernible] or add to them somebody. But the point I wanted to raise, some time ago there was a document, thank you very much for that document from the board that referring to all the advice that being followed up, some under consideration.   If there is anything that we believe that sufficient attention has not been paid, maybe you kindly give it to someone to have a look to all those in a follow-up action, whether there is any area that we need to put some request that we would like to accelerate [indiscernible] and so on. I don't have anything in mind but I think that would be another thing, maybe one of your colleagues, vice chair could look at those advice to see whether there is any need to refer to the follow-up action not as GAC advice but in a normal convey of views from the GAC to the board. [indiscernible] we see not sufficient nothing progress has been made and we need to accelerate them. I don't know for instance the issue of IGO, whether now with this arrangement of the GNSO, whether we need to defer saying we hope this group would continue or with the start -- just refreshing our mind on something that we need to emphasize that action need to be followed or actions being followed need to be to be accelerated. Thank you.

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, you might be on mute.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Actually, it looks like Manal is not connected anymore.

PLEASE STAND BY...

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Fabien, should we continue or do you want to wait for Manal?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: [indiscernible] in the chat suggesting we wait a few minutes as she's connecting. So please stand by. Thank you.

PLEASE STAND BY...

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is a reminder that we are waiting for Manal to reconnect. So please stand by and we will be resuming the session in a few minutes.

IRAN: I wanted to propose the same thing. In the absence of the chair, sometimes it might be good that that a vice chair temporarily take it up, not a complex issue, considerations of the previous GAC advice and identifying any issue that requires follow-up action or requires to be -- the process to be accelerated. That's all. So I think one of the vice chairs can take that one and when Manal comes back she can agree with that or might have a different view but at least this is a situation where we may have this several times of the connections. It happened for me in some other areas and one of the vice chairs took up the duty until the chair reconnected. So the issue I raised was as simple as I suggested. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Kavouss. And as you may have noted, we scrolled to the section -- Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm very sorry, I was disconnected and was not able to reconnect so they dialed out to me. Can you hear me?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear. We have section session six, follow up on GAC advice. And that's where we are right now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. I think it's a good suggestion even if we're not able to or ready to do it this time, at least we keep it in mind since we have this action request register, the ARR that Kavouss refers to, we can follow up on issues from the log in mechanism whenever needed under this section.

That said, and please note that I'm not in Zoom, so I will not be able to identify hand up so if someone can help me with any requests for the floor. Meanwhile, I think the only pending issue before we conclude in the remaining ten minutes is to confirm the 48 hours. I sense a lot of support for the 48 hours and thank you, Kavouss for indicating flexibility if this is the request of the majority. So maybe we can confirm the 48 hours, noting that this would end sometime on Saturday, and being a weekend, I'm not sure that support staff would be able to post the communique online during the weekend or we may need to have it on Monday morning. With that said, I think we should be aware that the 48 hours may end by -- (no audio).

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this is Fabien speaking. I just would like to confirm whether you are thinking of 48 hours exactly from the moment we conclude the drafting of the communique or as previously was done during ICANN67, that is end of day that day. So for instance will be Saturday end of day or would it be Saturday at 800 UTC?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Fabien, this is Julia just to inform that Manal disconnected again. We're trying to dial back.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, we will come back to that question when she rejoins. Kavouss, I see your hand up.

IRAN: Thank you very much, Fabien. You are right. You could not say with 48 hours. We should say [indiscernible] so I agree that we say Saturday, the date and then say 1800 hours UTC. That would be good for those countries that Saturday is the first day of working, still they have time to reflect and also for other people. So I think I don't see Manialit object to go that because that is quite reasonable. We could not start end of day saying 48 hours, what you said is absolutely right, 1800 hours on Saturday [indiscernible] thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Kavouss, so you are suggesting Saturday, [indiscernible]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm very sorry, I was disconnected again from the mobile. Very sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I was acting for practical confirmation whether we were targeting for a strict 48 hours or a more supple deadline by Saturday, the 27th of June, whether in [indiscernible] time zone as we had adopted for ICANN67 or at a precise time. Kavouss suggested while you were disconnected that it could be Saturday 27th of June at 18 UTC at a specific time, so I believe we are trying to agree on that at the moment.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Fabien. I'm hearing an echo. I think this is the only pending issue. Have we agreed on a firm date and time for now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I believe there is an agreement that by Saturday the 17th of June, every GAC member would need to have reviewed the final communique and express concerns, if any, but we are -- as support staff trying to confirm precisely when on Saturday the 27th this period, this review period should end. During ICANN67 we had agreed on end of day in all time zones. And I understand Kavouss in the discussion was suggesting a specific time such as 1800 UTC on Saturday the 27th.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So any objections to having this certain time or do GAC members wish to have it by the end of -- we cannot call it close the business, it's not -- it's a weekend.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: In the chat, Manal, Jorge and Luisa were suggesting close of business -- maybe they were flexible to accept your suggestion to call it end of day instead of close of business since it may not necessarily be a business day.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm thinking since we mentioned 48 hours, it could be calculated from the [indiscernible] because again, it takes a little bit more time than whenever we close the meeting. Sometimes it's two or three hours later that we circulate the communique. I'm not sure what happened exactly at ICANN67, but again, I think [indiscernible] suggestion would cover anything. It would never be later than 1800 UTC, and this also covers close of business as suggested by Luisa and Jorge.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So we had a hand raised, went down so not sure whether Kavouss wants to speak. Kavouss, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, Fabien, we have this in other areas outside the ICANN. 1800 hours is one option, the other would be 23:59 of the 27th of June. These are the other two. Keep these two for the time being and depending on the essence of the communique at the end we select a day. Either 1800 hours or 23:59 hours at the end of that day in standard [indiscernible] so either of the two. But always we prefer to use UTC because something everybody could calculate. So for the time being 1800 hours and then if necessary we could change it to 23:59, that means midnight. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Kavouss, we have recorded your suggestions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: [indiscernible] noting the two times and maybe GAC leadership can come back with a firm time after we finalize our discussion. So anything else before we close? I think we have one minute remaining. So if Fabien cannot see any hands raised --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: No comments in the chat and no hands raised.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you --

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, sorry to interrupt you. We do have a hand up. Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, I am asking Jorge if I'm unmuted. Do we need to refer so the IGO or not yet? Because of the working group being established and so on. Even to Jorge to look at that one. Jorge very seriously following this issue, whether there's a need to also add a paragraph or two on that matter. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you, Kavouss thank you for flagging this. Not sure if Jorge wants to [indiscernible] we can definitely discuss with Jorge and also with [indiscernible] who will lead the session on IGO tomorrow. Thank you for flagging that, Kavouss. So with this, I thank everyone for the engagement, and this concludes the communique review points. We need have a 30 minute break, and we will see you back in the GAC room for our next session on WHOIS and data protection policies at 1:30 Kuala Lumpur time, 3:30 UTC. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]