
ICANN81 | AGM – GAC Communique Review
Monday, November 11, 2024 – 16:30 to 17:30 TRT

DAN GLUCK:

Hello and welcome to the GAC Communiqué Review on Monday the 11th of November at 13:30 UTC. My name is Dan Gluck from the ICANN Policy Development GAC Support Team. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. Please state your name and the language you will speak if other than English and remember to speak at a reasonable pace. As a kind reminder, tables with microphones are reserved for GAC members and observers. I will now hand the floor over to Nico Caballero.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Daniel. Welcome back, everyone. As you can see this is the most popular session of the day. So, thank you for being here. Thank you for the enthusiasm and the energy to be able to at least-- I'm hoping we'll have enough time to review the different sections and see if there's consensus or maybe there's already some text provided for any of the sections in the draft Communiqué. The idea

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.

is to identify the topics, the issues and for the benefit of the new GAC members to get familiar with the way the Communiqué drafting actually takes place. So, for that, we'll have the invaluable help of my good friend Fabien Betremieux. Fabien, over to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Nico. In anything, GAC Communiqué drafting it's also a team effort. And so, Benedetta and the team in the back are always helping so it's really not just a one-person effort for sure.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: No, of course. I just wanted to say that you would be walking us through the different-- Of course, we have Julius Havelain over there, we have Daniel Gluck, we have Benedetta, we have the fabulous five team and Rob Hoggarth, of course. I didn't mean to--

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: No, for sure, but I just want to make sure everybody understands that it does take a team. So on the screen we have the slide you may recall from the opening session. I don't think it's necessary unless there are questions on the process to go through the explanation again, but we wanted to make sure that it's there and there is an opportunity for anybody to ask any clarification on the process if that's needed. So, we are at that-- Did we? Yes, we are that Monday, sorry I'm losing track of time here. So, we are at the Monday Day 3 of the meeting and we are in this first session regarding the Communiqué which is the Communiqué Review.

So, it's not necessarily an opportunity to start drafting but it's really an opportunity to make sure that we take a look at the Communiqué, we remind ourselves of what goes where in the Communiqué, and as you said Nico, to identify whether there are current consideration of topics to be discussed in the Communiqué and by whom so that that can facilitate ongoing or future discussions with a view to be ready as much as possible when we get to drafting to have text that's already been discussed between various members that are interested in the topic so that the Communiqué drafting process is as smooth as possible and we ultimately succeed in drafting the Communiqué in the allocated time we have. Because we do not have more than what's on the schedules contrary to practice a long time ago where there was sort of an open-ended deadline for drafting the Communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Which is not the case anymore, thank God. So, this is a very important thing. Please take a look at the graphics on the screen. So, as you can see, there's this continuous consideration of Communiqué issues or topics at the end of each session. As a matter of fact, all the way from Saturday, Sunday, Monday, today we're basically kind of halfway through the sessions and the same-- We'll go on with the with the-- Is it going to be a Google Docs document that we'll share with the full GAC or? As we usually do, right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

It is, yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, it's going to be up until Wednesday more or less depending on how it goes. Hopefully, if we can finish earlier. The sooner the better everybody will be happy, equally happy if we can do it before Thursday. I have my doubts but let's see how it goes. Then at some point, we will need to stop basically the contributions and do all the editing only through GAC staff in order to make sure that there are no mistakes or misunderstandings or anything like that. So, that's just like an overview for you to remember how the process will go. If you have any kind of question or comment or suggestion at this point more than welcome. If not, I'll handle the floor over to Fabien again. Fabien, all yours.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Before we get to the actual document of the Communiqué and start looking at it, I wanted to maybe take the opportunity to show you very quickly a document that we shared with respect to the way the Communiqué is drafted. So, I'll just share my screen here very quickly. And so, this is the art of the GAC Communiqué. So, it's a document that we shared with the committee and-- Sorry, yeah. Okay, it's here.

I'll go to the structure of the document. So, it's a fairly long document for which we shared the link with the GAC. And our goal with that document was to try to capture and in writing the general practice for developing the Communiqué. The principles and the practice we've been using because there's no specific rules documented in the operating principles apart from very high-level rules actually. But there's been a tremendous amount of practice that's been accumulated

over the years. And so, in the spirit of ensuring that the Communiqué drafting is done in a consistent, repeatable, predictable and stable manner we've tried to assemble all that knowledge in the document.

And so, you if you are interested, you will find in the table of content here a number of principles that we've derived from practice. We've documented the structure of the Communiqué, what goes in what part of the Communiqué. We've tried to describe what are the responsibilities of the various participants to Communiqué drafting, from the GAC chair and vice chairs to the topic leads, working group chairs, and GAC members as well as support staff. And we've tried to document the actual Communiqué production process from the initiation, the preparation before the meeting to the drafting during the meeting and the various review stages after the meeting.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Let me ask one question and this is for the floor. How many new GAC representatives are present in the room? Could you please raise your hands? This is just in order to identify the way-- So, we have one, two, three, four, five. Okay, that's good. So, the rest of the session might be redundant or repetitive maybe for the ones who have been here for a while, but we just want to make sure that, as Fabien mentioned before, that there is consistency and accuracy in terms of producing, I would like to say, a well-presented Communiqué which is a very important document and will stay there forever. 10 years from now, people are going to say oh, yeah. But during ICANN81 in Istanbul, you said this, this

and this and the rationale was this, this and this so we really need to be consistent with that.

Another thing is, and this is more like a procedural thing, we want to avoid at the end of the of the input period, so to say, somebody coming up with an idea out of the blue, out of nowhere saying oh, we should mention that the best shoes in the world are made in Japan or in Paraguay or in Antarctica, those kinds of things. So, back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So, you have a link to that document in the emails that were sent by Nico in the past two weeks, so please feel free to peruse the document and make comments or ask questions if you have any. This is a living document. We're still working on it. We've been working on it for a while and it's meant to help the committee understand the process and help us evolve the process as necessary as well. So, I just wanted to--

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

So, in short, this is like the business intelligence of the GAC in terms of Communiqué drafting and that's the whole idea about the art of the GAC Communiqué. Once again, if anybody has a better idea on how to deal with this, with a Communiqué drafting, more than welcome to share it with us. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So, we're moving on to the actual Communiqué document. And so, here, Nico, what we can do maybe is to just scroll down the Communiqué so that we review each of the sections and their purpose. And then once we get to the actual substantive parts of the Communiqué, issues of importance, GAC advice, then we can stop and ask or at least share the committee's understanding of what's being considered already at this point in terms of topics for input in the Communiqué.

So here, what you're seeing is the heading of the Communiqué. If you just scroll up a little bit, so you have the logo, the introduction. Then in the introduction, we usually report on the location of the meeting, on the participation. So, you'll see here that the date of the Communiqué will be confirmed, but it is usually the first day after the end of the review period when we do publish a Communiqué, that's the date we use.

In the introduction, so if you scroll down a little bit, we report on the number of attendees to the meeting. And so, this is a number that we will provide at the end once we have a confirm the count. So, if we scroll down, the next section is the inter-constituency activities and community engagement. So, this is where we report on the meetings that the GAC has had during the ICANN meeting.

And we generally only report on the topics that were discussed with each of those groups, those community groups, noting that we have the minutes of the meeting, which contain a summary of the discussion. So, this is why we do not go farther than mentioning the topics for reference

here in this section. So, you'll see the list of meetings that GAC has had or has scheduled with the other groups, the Board, ALAC, GNSO, the CPH, the ASO, the SSAC, and RSSAC as far as ICANN 81 is concerned. Then we have a subheading here for the cross-community discussions that we still need to fill out. Those are the various community sessions that the GAC has had an interest in.

The next section of the Communiqué is internal matters. This is where the GAC reports on the evolution of its membership, results of the elections or scheduled of the elections, changes in the GAC leadership, reports of the GAC working groups. So, you have a list here of the various working groups, but it doesn't necessarily mean, this is part of the template, so it doesn't necessarily mean that all the groups, the working groups will report, but those that do will provide text here.

This is also the section under operational matters where we report on various operational developments. We have added two sections recently, the GAC strategic planning and capacity development where we report on those matters. And this takes us to Section 4 of the Communiqué, Issues of Importance and Section 5, GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board. You are certainly aware of the difference in how those two sections are considered by the ICANN Board. GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board is defined in the bylaws. And there is a number of provisions that relate to how the Board must consider GAC advice.

In practice, GAC advice is subject to a specific process. Once the Communiqué is issued, the Board considers the advice and may ask

clarification question or clarifying questions to the GAC on that advice to ensure that the advice is properly understood. An element that was added in the past few years is the rationale of the advice. You'll see in the art of the Communiqué document that there's been a history which we've tried to document. And in a longer while back, the Communiqué wasn't as structured and advice was not necessarily clearly identified. And so, that created difficulties of interpretation for the ICANN Board.

So, this is why the advice now belongs in this section. It does have systematically a rationale that helps with the interpretation of the advice. And so, this is what helps the ICANN Board to process the advice, ask clarifying questions if necessary. That leads to a clarification call that's held between the GAC and the Board after the meeting, which eventually lead to the Board taking action on the advice and reporting on that advice in their documentation, which gets shared with the GAC.

As far, if we go back one section to the Issues of Importance, the Issues of Importance are not subject to such a formal process. This section is also the fruit of an evolution in how the GAC notes of issues that matters to the committee. It's recently evolved into a section where the GAC may signal its interest in the consideration of potential future advice. And so, you may want to see the Issues of Importance as a potential precursor for further and future consideration of advice.

And so, this section of the Communiqué is also processed by the ICANN Board and subject to a less formal conversation, which occurs in the framework of what is called the Board-GAC interaction group calls,

BGIG. And so, this is sort of a parallel process to that of consideration of the advice of the GAC. And that is subject to its own scorecard of the Board where the Board makes comments on the Issues of Importance. So, that way that sorts of serves a dialogue that has some level of formality, but not the same as advice. It's not defining the ICANN bylaws. It is more of an established practice now between the GAC and the ICANN Board. So, that is the difference between Issues of Importance and GAC Consensus Advice.

And so, if we scroll down, there's one more section, Section 6, which is the follow-up on previous advice. And this is where the GAC regularly may come back and follow up on previous advice issue to the ICANN Board. And this is where the GAC seeks further conversations with the ICANN Board and consideration by the ICANN Board of existing advice. And one challenge with this section is to ensure that a follow-up on a previous advice does not introduce opportunity for confusion or-- Sorry, I'm trying to find the appropriate words, but the challenge is that in following on previous advice, there may be a risk of adding new considerations that might complicate the interpretation and processing of the advice. So, this is a consideration to keep in mind.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Yeah, or repeating ourselves, right? I mean, the idea is to avoid giving advice or issues of importance or anything about a topic or about an issue that has already been covered before, correct? So, that would be part of the follow-up on previous advice, correct?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Right. And it is formally processed similarly to GAC advice subject to the same scorecard on GAC advice and resolution by the ICANN Board. So, this is why there's also a particular attention to making sure that the text in this section is quite clear and consistent with the previous advice that it may refer to. And I believe this need to follow up on previous advice is also the product of experience. And the fact that the GAC has needed to come back on a given piece of advice because it's processing or interpretation or implementation was not to its satisfaction. So, this is why this section of the Communiqué exists.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Well, not satisfactory or too slow or ignored, maybe. Hopefully not. I mean, I'm not saying that that's always the case, but we need to be aware of the possibilities. So extremely slow, so to say, or directly ignored or needs follow-up. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And with that, this takes us to the end of the Communiqué, which is a reference to the next meeting, which we'll obviously here update. And that completes our review of the document. And so, I don't know if there are any questions maybe on this overview, and then we can move on to identifying current topics under consideration.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Fabien. So let me open the floor for questions, especially for the newer GAC members. If there's anything we didn't cover, if there's anything you don't understand at this point, or maybe

you have a good idea, which we would love to hear. I have the UPU. Go ahead, please, Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Nico. I did want to ask a question about that last point you raised about follow-up advice. So, there's a particular issue that on the ASP side we would like to raise that was advice, but now that it was, I won't say it was ignored, but the advice-- I'll just be frank. So, the fee that was proposed is now available, and the weaved aspects of it, as much as 85%, is a certain figure, right? The GAC had advised previously that they wanted to go as far as no fee, right? So currently we have some text on that to go to Issues of Importance, but would you say that is instead follow-up advice?

So, it's not advice as yet. It's sort of noting what has happened and providing some-- I know the text is not in front of you, but there's some text that is trying to highlight what's happened and providing that guidance. But I guess I can leave that for the staff to categorize, but right now this is of importance for us.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for the comment. You're right, but it's for us to decide, if we want to put it under Issues of Importance or as follow-up. If it's already being issued, I would say it should go under follow-up. But again, I don't have any strong feelings unless you tell me otherwise, unless you tell me there's a specific reason why. Yeah, go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Yeah, the reason why, and I asked staff about this earlier. So given the challenge we had with advice previously and strong advice being issued, being subject to rejection, then putting it in advice or follow-up advice may also be subject to rejection and the whole process that goes along with that. And given the timeframe which we're trying to operate in, it may not be strategic or tactical to put it in advice.

So, I'm just trying to understand, given what Fabien has just kind of given clear categorizations about how it's processed, I'm just wondering how it might work in a situation where if we issue advice based on previous advice, but you don't want it to be rejected, should we put it in Issues of Importance or follow-up advice?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that again, Tracy. But wouldn't it be good if it's rejected first so that we can deal with the problem and trigger the-- So, it depends, it depends on how you see things. And this is my personal opinion. If we have a rejection or some, or depending on the case, obviously, but that's an opportunity to trigger the mechanism for reaching a mutual-- What's the word? What's the phrase? Mutually agreeable solution, something like that with the Board. So, it depends on how you see things. I'm equally happy either way. It's for us to decide. And again, thank you for the idea, Tracy. We were more like identifying the structure of the document before we enter into the details but thank you anyways for the comment. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

We put in focus here the footnote to the section on consensus advice, which is a quote from the bylaws, which refers to the process and the sort of provisions applicable for the ICANN Board's processing of GAC advice. And it is what you've explained in terms of process. I think when you said you would want an advice to-- If an advice needs to be rejected, it should be done ideally as fast as possible.

You may have referred to the identification or the communication by the Board of the fact that it may decide to reject and then trigger this process of finding a mutually acceptable solution, which may not be a fast process, but at least I suppose you've meant that the GAC would know that it wouldn't have to enter that process as soon as possible. Is that what you meant?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Not exactly, because it doesn't need to be a slow process. According to my experience, at least during the last six or let's say seven months discussion about all the topics, things happen actually very quickly, which is a very good thing. Instead of dragging on some quick answers. But again, it depends, it depends on how we see things and it depends on what we decide. I was going to mention something else. Sorry, I have the UK in the meantime. UK, please go ahead. Only one thing I will ask you, Nigel, please speak close to the microphone so that I can hear you. Thank you so much.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry, Nico, I'm not very good at this technology. Yes, I think there's a fine balance here. The application B has been discussed through the IRT process. We're talking about the 200-- And so, for the Applicant Support Program, the 85%, which was agreed in the GGE process, which the GAC were part of, it means that we have a fee of \$30,000 for applicants that make it through the ASP process. I think what we discussed yesterday was very useful in what Tracy brought up in that when you translate this into other currencies, and \$30,000 for some countries is not an awful lot, but for others it's more. So, I think this fits into issues of concern. Absolutely.

I mean, I think it is an issue of concern or issue of importance, and it should be noted. I think advice on this will be quite difficult, but it's also, of course, subject to what the will of the GAC is, but if we give advice that the application fee should be 127 rather than 227, then obviously that is not going to work because 227 hasn't been plucked out of the air. It's a figure that's been negotiated, and it's a figure that is based on a certain number of applications to give the overall balancing of the costs and expenditures with the income expected through about 1,500 applications.

So, if we give advice that that should be halved, then I think our credibility would be on the line. If we give advice that the 85% should be increased to 95%, then again, I think it would be very difficult for the Board to agree. Yes, they would come back to us and we'd have a discussion, and then there'd have to be a bylaws consultation. But given that the applicant support guidance is supposed to go out next week, is it? No. It's supposed to go out next week, which has the 85%

in it. This would cause delay to the actual start of the program. So, I think on both those grounds, to give advice might be counterproductive, but yeah, thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that, UK. So UPU, please don't get me wrong. I'm not trying to preclude by any means whatever opinion you might have about, including that issue under as advice. I might agree or not agree in that regard as per what Nigel has already mentioned, but again, you might have your own opinion about that under issues of importance or follow-up.

TRACY HACKSHAW: I said any question would have been, is it with Fabien with the follow-up advice guidance? So, we are referring to previous advice in the issues of importance that we gave previous advice on this, and therefore we recommend the following, which is not advice, it's sort of a light touch thing. But in fact, we are referring to previous advice. I'm just wondering if that's going to break the format that you're using.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: The way I think of it is, what matters is how the Board will consider it, how the Board will read the Communiqué. Because the text will be in Issues of Importance, the Board will take it as sort of a discussion item, and they may make comments, but it will not trigger the process of a piece of advice or a follow-up on advice, which can lead to a disagreement, and therefore the need to find a mutually agreeable

solution. So, your recommendation in Issues of Importance may not be followed, and that would not have any process consequences. So, that's the main difference there. Right. And so, Benita just reminds me that this will be discussed in the BGIG call setting, and the Board will issue a document, a scorecard, in which it does comment on each of the Issues of Importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

As a matter of fact, thank you for that, Benita and Fabien. As a matter of fact, Tracy, I think that's a very good point to include for that-- When's that meeting happening, tomorrow? Oh, the bilateral, sorry. Yeah, for the bilateral. So, keep in mind. So, thank you for that, UPU. UK, is that an all hand? Okay. So, any other comment or question in this regard? Are we okay with the structure? Everybody understands what the process is, the timeline.

So again, we want to avoid having like a last-minute suggestion to include as GAC advice, like the day before, or the morning or the night before the addition was closed, because in that case, we won't be able to include it just because we didn't have the chance to actually have a discussion on the issue. That's the procedure we have been following so far. Yeah. I see no hands. So back to you, Fabien, please be the shepherd.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you, Nico. So, we do have three issues of importance that are identified in the document. Applicant Support Program. And so, I

suppose this is coming from the GAC topic leads on the subjects, and we've inserted, right, as it's written in the comment. Thanks, Benedetta. So, we did put that one in on behalf of the topic leads. Contention sets and auctions, which was proposed by the UK, and ethics SOI proposed by the UK as well. No? Yes? Okay, as a placeholder. Do you want to speak to your two suggestions there or?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, very briefly. This is the first session. Under issues of importance, I think probably we need a main heading saying New gTLD Program or something, and then we could break it down into Applicant Support Program, contention sets and auctions, which I think we should reflect on the conversations. And then another item would be SOI ethics, and then others might have other items, but that's only an idea.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Okay. Thank you for that, UK. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio from Switzerland for the record. I'm not entirely sure if this is the right moment, but as we are already touching on substance, I just wanted to support Nigel or the UK or whoever proposed these topics on New gTLD, contention sets, auctions. Maybe some wording could be produced on the basis of the discussions we had in the New gTLD meetings. Of course, I think we are in the hands of our topic lead and our support staff as we used to do traditionally. And on

ethics and SOIs, I just wanted to share that some members are already looking into text and it will come forward quite soon, I guess.

Another point I wanted to make, which is not really issues of importance, but I just wanted to put it on the record is that as a point of contact with the GNSO, I feel it's important that when we talk about the bilateral, we thank Jeff Neuman for his service. Because it's been not only a service to the GNSO Council, of course, but also to our good cooperation, and that we welcome Sébastien Ducos to his new role as GNSO liaison to the GAC. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Switzerland. Well noted. Any other comment or question? And I have Canada. Please go ahead.

RIDA TAHIR:

Thank you, Nico. Rida Tahir here with Canada. I just wanted to express support for Nigel's suggestion to have a broad New gTLD topic and then go into the specific subjects that we covered, including the items listed up there and perhaps also singular/plurals, which we can talk about with support staff on the side.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Canada. Well noted. Okay. So, there we go. Thank you for that, Canada. Any other? I have Egypt.

-
- MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Chair. I think we would also like to have a placeholder for now on the ICP-2 discussions we're having with address supporting organization. Just a placeholder until we come up with the exact language. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. Well noted as well. And I have Netherlands. Please go ahead, Marco.
- MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you. I support Egypt on that I do think it warrants a place already put a comment in on ICP-2 and ASO bilateral. I would like to put a small reservation on whether this is an issue of importance or whether we should recognize this somewhere else based on how the bilateral tomorrow is going. I find it a bit too premature to already declare this isn't an issue of importance.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Netherlands. Good point. Noted as well. And there it is. This is where we are. Any other comment? Any other suggestion? Anything you might be considering for GAC advice at this point? It would be good to identify. Do we have anything in that regard so far? You don't need to provide specific text or anything. Just to identify the topic potentially. So, if that is the case, this is a good moment to present it. Okay, I see the European Commission. Please go ahead.

-
- GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you very much, Nico. Just to say that as mentioned earlier in the previous section, we would wait to see the Board before deciding whether we need another follow-up advice on the previous follow-up on urgent request. Hopefully that's not the case. We believe the bilateral will be important. We hope so, but let's wait for tomorrow. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, European Commission. Would you like to add a placeholder just in case, or we'll wait?
- GEMMA CAROLILLO: Let's be schematic. Let's say we won't need follow-up advice as we were going to get some replies tomorrow. We wait. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, European Commission. Let's be positive. Thank you for that. I have Papua New Guinea.
- RUSSELL WORUBA: Thank you, Nico. Russell Woruba from Papua New Guinea. This is more a comment on how best we progress the Application Support Program for, shall I say, underserved regions. There is a need, based on the conversations we've had for a pack for government that we as GAC representatives can take back to our governments to easily persuade and to educate our respective governments on the benefits and the perils of committing to it or omitting. So, I'm not sure where that will fit

in this as an advice, but I just want to bring it up at this stage. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that. Not sure about including that as advice, maybe under issues of importance, perhaps, or just noting the availability of the whole pack. I think it's called a toolkit or something, right? I forgot the name, but they had a special name for that. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I understand it's like ASP Toolkit or Champion Toolkit. All right, all right. So maybe we can include that under issues of importance if you all agree. No problem whatsoever. Thank you so much for that, Papua New Guinea. Any other comment or question?

One thing I would like to show you, is there any way you can show the blog schedule on the screen? Do you have it there available? Just to get us in. And one more thing, Daniel, this screen is not working. The second from right to left, for whatever reason, this screen is not working. So, thank you for that, Dan. So, do we have the blog schedule on the screen?

Okay. So just to make sure everybody understands that at this point, we're just identifying the different sections and potential topics and placeholders to include. We'll have six sessions. We'll have one tomorrow. That is, yeah, Tuesday the 12th. At the very end of the day, we'll have the first actual Communiqué drafting session, and then five more. Hopefully, nothing precludes. nothing stops us from finishing before. We don't need to use the six sessions whatsoever. If we finish by, let's say, Wednesday at 2:30 pm, the next sessions can be used for,

or not used at all, unless we decide to do otherwise. So again, it's up to us to decide. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

A quick comment on the scheduling of the Communiqué drafting session, which I tried to mention in the opening plenary, but I want to take this opportunity to mention it again. The reason why we've distributed all these sessions throughout the week, and including this Communiqué review session, which is quite early in the meeting, that's meant to facilitate your coordination with capitals, potentially, coordination between members in writing texts or reviewing texts.

And so, we're trying to create as many opportunities as we can throughout the week to spread these efforts and allow you that possibility of coordination among members as well as coordination with your capitals as necessary, taking into account time difference and those types of challenges. So, this is why we've spread the effort. And you may feel this is a bit early to be talking about the Communiqué, but we hope that this actually helps facilitating those discussions that are unnecessary before getting to actual text that can be considered as Communiqué text and discussed as such, and again, towards hopefully completing drafting as soon as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Also taking into account, I remember I sent two emails, one two weeks before the meeting and one week-- Correct me if I'm wrong, Fabien, but so just to remind everybody that this is not something new or an idea

that we came up with on the spot by no means. So again, as Fabien mentioned, if you have any outstanding issue you would like to include, this is kind of like an early warning so that you can communicate with your capitals, and you can reach an agreement on the kind of text you would propose. Obviously, that text will be discussed with a full GAC. And if there's consensus and we decide where to include it under Issues of Importance or under direct GAC advice or as follow-up, again. As I always say, it's for us to decide.

So, I hope that gives a glimpse, an overview of the week ahead in terms of Communiqué drafting. If there's any question at this point, regarding the internal mechanics or the procedures, this is a good time to ask. Is everyone okay with the procedures? Everybody understands the mechanics? I see no hand up. There are no hands online.

So, before we wrap up the session, and again, we don't need to artificially extend the whole session, I have three housekeeping remarks. One is the GAC elections, please do vote. It is my understanding that there's still 28 hours. Rob, correct me if I'm wrong, please. 30 hours to go for the vice chair election. 28, more or less, yeah. We still have like a day and six hours or something like that. Please do vote for your regional representatives or whoever you decide to vote for. That's not my business, of course, but I just wanted to remind you.

There's going to be a photo session. This is the second housekeeping detail I wanted to share with you. I don't know exactly where and when, but I swear to God, I will let by tomorrow. Sorry, Daniel, go ahead.

DAN GLUCK:

Hey, Nico. It looks like we have confirmation that'll be here in the room at the front near where you are right after the ALAC session, between the ALAC session and the GAC discussion on DNS views. So around 10:00 am local time, there'll be the photo in this room by the front of the house.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Daniel. So, that means tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock am, is that correct? Right after the session with the ALAC. So please dress up for tomorrow. No, I'm joking. We have the photo session tomorrow morning. That's the second housekeeping detail. And then for the ones who were planning to be there with me for the tree planting activity, unfortunately that will not be happening this time because there were some permissions required by the Istanbul municipality authorities and some complicated things.

We could have done it during lunchtime, but given the fact that none of us has time during lunchtime, we won't be able to plant any trees in Istanbul this time. The tree planting activity meant to be a way to show love and affection to the city and country we're visiting. But again, unfortunately that will not be happening. So, thank you for the ones who volunteered to be there with me to plant the trees. We'll plant something for Seattle for sure. I have no more housekeeping. I'm sorry to bother you with these things, but given the fact that we have some extra time, I just wanted to take advantage and tell you about this housekeeping details.

Fabien, I don't know if there's any other thing to cover. Benedetta? Nigel, anything you would like to add at this point? Any of the vice chairs? If that is not the case, let's wrap up the session and enjoy the fantastic Turkish coffee and the beautiful city of Istanbul. So, we'll reconvene tomorrow for the meeting with the ALAC at 9:00 o'clock am. Enjoy your coffee and your dinner and your views of the Bosphorus. Thank you so much. Have a good-- Sorry?

The reception. I'm sorry. Yeah, yeah, but I took it for granted that everybody knows already about the reception and the concert. The concert is tonight as far as I understand, right? The Istanbul Philharmonic Orchestra and there's going to be a cocktail and an official reception. And please remember to bring your badges for the reception and for the concert, I assume. So, that's all for today. Thank you so much. Enjoy.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]