JOHANNESBURG – GAC Underserved Regions Working Group Session
Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 09:00 to 09:45 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

PUA HUNTER:

Hello, good morning, everyone. Welcome to the session for the Underserved Regions Working Group. My name is Pua Hunter, co-chair for the Underserved Regions Working Group. And here with me on my left is Alice Munyua, also co-chair for the Underserved Regions Working Group. And we have Julia on my right, our support staff.

Our agenda for this morning, we'll start with an update on our capacity development effort, both completed and planned. And next is an update on the FAQ document on the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs. Then we will have Rapid from Cambodia to introduce some work that he's been working on related to a newcomer's toolkit. And finally a call for volunteers to assist with our work.

At this point of time I will hand over to Alice to provide an update on the capacity development. Or maybe I can start. In Copenhagen we gave an update on the workshop that was held in Nairobi and informed you of our next planned workshops. So the second capacity development workshop for GAC members was held for the Pacific in Fiji on the 28th and the 29th of April.

And we had support from the various departments within ICANN. And this was laid by the global engagement team. Out of the 17 GAC members for Oceana, 16 governments were represented at this workshop, which is a good turnout. It was an interactive and productive workshop, and I think Alice can talk to that on the specifics of it. Alice, thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Pua. Good morning, everyone. We've had a series of very successful capacity development workshops that have been ongoing since the beginning of the year. The first one was in Nairobi, Kenya, and we reported about that in Copenhagen. The second one took place immediately after Copenhagen in Fiji for the Pacific Island nations. Again, a very successful one. As Pua said, there were 16 member states. And we had a very -- very interesting discussions. But during Fiji we only had a two-day capacity building for government -- GAC members, not for law enforcement. And the topics ranged from a tutorial on the Domain Name System and Internet identifiers, understanding the Internet governance ecosystem and specifically the ICANN ecosystem and how to participate in that. We also looked at the -- we had the addressing supporting organization and the regional -- regional Internet registry, the APNIC that presented the work they do and how that relates to the GAC and ICANN generally.

The role of the GAC and there was a call -- you know, a lot of outreach regarding -- you know, in terms of encouraging member states from the Pacific to be more active and to participate in GAC work.

We also discussed quite a great deal on the current policy issues that the GAC is considering and on the policy development at ICANN. And the issue of the lack of participation as well as key GAC working groups and how they can contribute specifically the more active ones, geographic names, human rights, underserved regions, the Public Safety Working Group.

One issue that was discussed at length, and I think we'll continue to discuss it here at the GAC, was on -- not -- on the issue of the two- and three-letter codes at the second level domain and as well as protection of geographic names as -- and DNS abuse. And I think that several Pacific Island member states here who might be able to speak to that because a lot of concerns were also expressed that are similar to the concerns that have been expressed here previously. The issue of understanding ccTLD management and redelegation was one that was noted as important, and to that effect we recall that the Underserved Regions Working Group has been mandated by the GAC to work on assisting Underserved Regions Working Group GAC members in understanding how to address issues to do with ccTLD delegation and redelegation and management.

There was sharing of best practice for effective participation in security stability, and resiliency from the ICANN SSR team. And also a tutorial in the use of ICANN online conferencing, taking into consideration how difficult it is for all Pacific Island nations to participate in all, you know, GAC meetings.

Quite a number of challenges and constraints were shared. Some of them was finding the time to read the amount of emails received through the GAC mailing list. Understandably this is an issue that has -- that resonates with several GAC members from underserved regions. And the minimal understanding of some of their discussions that are ongoing and some of the work streams and how those relate to the broader GAC work and broader ICANN work.

So information overload and understanding the responsibility of the GAC and especially for national -- those who are GAC representatives and how they can take back information at the national level. There was a call for assistance in understanding issues much more deeply and linking that and being able to contextualize that to national issues, rather than having them as a stand-alone. There was a call for need for technical training on -- around DNS security and national -- and how that affects national development. And the feedback to the GAC in general was that in addition to Oceana mailing list we establish a platform for better collaboration between GAC representatives --

representatives from underserved regions. And there was one suggestion that instead of ICANN spending so much money for travel, because it's not -- it's never really going to be sufficient to bring all underserved region GAC members, that we may need to consider having regional -- intersessional regional meetings that consider GAC issues that are then fed to the three face-to-face meetings that we have every year. So, for example, during that -- we had the Fiji meeting during a governmental meeting that was ongoing, so we can take advantage of that in underserved regions to discuss some of the upcoming -- some of the issues that are being discussed currently at the GAC level and feed that to the GAC rather than, you know, considering more travel support. So that's a new way of engaging with GAC issues.

There was a call to enhance outreach efforts in technical training, as mentioned earlier. And working with the ASO, for example, APNIC to run, for example, IPv6 training and among others. And to that effect the APNIC committed to working together with the GAC underserved regions and ICANN department, especially the government engagement, to come up with a capacity development workshop perhaps around April -- February, during the APRICOT meeting in Nepal.

A lot of suggestions for better collaboration. The Pacific GAC representatives agreed to identify a champion similar to what the Africa region has in terms of the African Union Commission,

an intergovernmental organization that might help coordinate work at that regional level. So essentially adopting the African Union Commission model in the way the AUC works with African member states.

There was a great deal of sharing of both good practice and challenges. I think that is it in terms of the Fiji workshop. The most important issue was the idea of finding ways of intersessionally doing GAC work at the sub -- at the regional level that the GAC may want to consider during its deliberation in this meeting. Thank you, Pua.

PUA HUNTER:        Thank you, Alice. I also want to inform of planned workshops for this year and for next year. We have Pakistan in August, Peru in September, somewhere in the Middle East, no venue yet --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        ( Off microphone ).

PUA HUNTER:        Okay, I've just been corrected here. Thank you. Peru in November. And somewhere in the Middle East in October. And for 2018, as Alice mentioned, Nepal in February during the APRICOT session, and somewhere in the Caribbean in July or

August.  We don't have confirmed dates and venues, but we'll work with the countries who registered their interest to have both venue and date firmed up so that ICANN can plan for resourcing arrangements.

I want to hand you back to Alice for an update on the capacity development workshop that was held here, the second one for Africa.  Thank you, Alice.  Before I hand over to Alice, sorry, are there any questions from the floor regarding the workshop we had in Fiji?  Or any additional comments?  Ashwin.

ASHWIN SASONGKO:    Thank you, Pua.  Unfortunately, I cannot join your workshop in Fiji.  Should be very interesting.  But I just look at from the, you know, this correspondence and information on the web.  But correct me if I'm wrong, my view is that the problem with the underserved region is more on the telecommunication infrastructures rather than the Internet access.  Now correct me if I'm wrong, because as we know, there will be no Internet without communication -- telecommunication access.  Now, without telecommunication access you don't have Internet. Because if it is telecommunication access problem, this is a separate issue than the Internet access problem.  Once you have the telecommunications, then you can have Internet access. And if we have a -- we can also have problem with Internet

access because of the IP address is not so many and so on and so on. But Internet connection will be poor if the telecommunication is poor. So correct me if I'm wrong but my -- my understanding is that it is more in the telecommunication access with this -- the problem in the underserved region. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Ashwin. No, you're right. We did acknowledge that as an issue and that has to be dealt with at the national level. Thank you. Ashwin.

ASHWIN SASONGKO: Yeah, just more. As far as I'm aware -- I'm sorry if I'm wrong -- I'm not aware that in ITU council we have this type of problem discussed. Perhaps in the next ITU council we can also do some sort of -- sorry. I know it is ICANN meeting but because it's telecommunications in the ITU council meeting we can make some sort of contributions from several underserved regions, contribution for the council meeting that this has to be taken into account or looked in ITU program consideration. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Ashwin. I note that. Okay, if no other comments or questions, I'll hand over to Alice.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Pua. The underserved regions in the Public Safety Working Group had a second workshop for African law enforcement agencies that took place on the 23rd and 24th of June. This is on Friday and Saturday. We had 57 participants. Mostly law enforcement agencies from the southern Africa region. We had South African police from all of the South African provinces, intergovernmental organizations, industry representatives, and all the Internet registries, all the five were represented. Discussions were around the DNS abuse and the current issues to do with WHOIS and we also had a roundtable with industry representatives regarding ideas around collaboration. So we had Facebook and others discussing -- Facebook and regional Internet registries discussing how to collaborate on issues to do with law enforcement.

So some of the recommendations that came through from that meeting was that the level of technical was too high, that we need to bring it down a notch lower, so that it can be contextualized, so this still needs to be understood within the various contexts -- for example, the African context -- and how

the DNS abuse affects and how law enforcement agencies would deal with that.

There was a great deal of appreciation expressed about the capacity-building sessions, and calling for more, because they're important in terms of information sharing.  A lot of the law enforcement agencies actually mentioned that they'd never really understood how to deal with DNS abuse and how -- and who to go to when it came to that, and also didn't understand what ICANN as an organization's mandate and role was, so it was an eye-opener for them.

There was a lot of discussion around the issue of trust and collaboration, in terms of trusting the work that ICANN does in other organizations and who to direct some of their questions to.

That is taking into consideration that several -- I mean, most of African law enforcement are not really engaged at that level.

But having had nearly 50 law enforcement agencies, we are hoping that some of them are going to be joining the public safety working group and perhaps in a couple of months actively participating after they've understood some of the areas of work that we are engaging on.

Most of them understood issues to do with child online protection, so that was quite an important and common thread and theme that was understood.

The issue of collaboration was again reiterated by nearly all of them, and the roundtable especially was noted was something that must continue to feature in a lot of the capacity development sessions, especially with law enforcement, taking into consideration that issues to do with cybercrime go beyond just the ICANN remit, but we have to deal with not just names but also numbers.

I think for now, that is all that I have.

And we also had a very, very good session on data protection and privacy, and we had, from the African Union Commission and -- on the Malabo Convention, which is the African Union -- the Convention on Cybercrime -- Cybersecurity and Personal Data Protection, and also the European Commission and the E.U. data protection provisions, very good discussions around that, and a call for a better understanding of how that affects the work of law enforcement and their collaboration with industry in terms of data protection.

So generally the meeting and workshop, was deemed as very useful and called for, once again, more regional sessions that are tailored to the various regions and also at the national level.

So rather than the global sessions, to make them tailored at the regional level and more specific and more thematic to the regions.

Thank you, Pua. Any questions?

PUA HUNTER:     Thank you, Alice. Any comments or questions from the floor?

Okay. We'll move on because we're running out of time.

Next on our agenda is the FAQ document, but we have some technical problems here so we will skip that for the time being and move straight to Rapid Sun. He will give an update on the work he's been doing that responds to a task in our work plan, which is the development of a newcomers toolkit or an induction pack.

Rapid is right at the back. Rapid? Thank you.

RAPID SUN:     Thank you, Pua. Rapid speaking, for the record. And for the community onboarding pilot program, it's a collaboration between the ICANN organization and ICANN's community to more effectively integrate new community members into their volunteer role.

**EN**

The program aims to create a structured onboarding process tailored by and for each community group.

The program consists of three main pillars.

One, welcome -- timely welcome of new GAC members.

Two, onboarding structure costs, materials, and tools for newcomers to learn about GAC and how to participate.

Three, mentoring. Individualized peer mentoring for newcomers.

So Tracy and I are working to develop the GAC briefing so far, and the GAC briefing is a revamp of the existing interaction on the current GAC Web site, and it has been reviewed and finalized by the GAC secretariat and also got approval from the GAC chair.

So the briefing will be developed into an infographic and video by the communication department of ICANN, and also, it can be used for the new GAC Web site.

And from after this meeting, we also will convert the GAC briefing into the ICANN Learn -- on the ICANN Learn Web site. Yes. That's all.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you very much, Rapid, and we really appreciate the work you and Tracy have been doing because, like I said earlier, it

responds to one of the tasks in our work plan and it's something that we've been working with in the past for -- to assist our newcomers. Thank you.

Any comments from the floor?

Okay. We'll move on. Now the technical problems have been sorted with the FAQ document on the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.

We had a lot of support and assistance from the ccNSO and PTI in putting this draft document together to assist GAC members with any issues they had at the national level to do with delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.

I will hand over to Julia to go through the questions that has been put together. Thank you.


JULIA CHARVOLEN:     Hi, everyone.

So I'm not going to read everything. The link to the document is on the underserved regions working group page right here, so if you want to click and take a look at it, that's -- please do so.

I was thinking that maybe I could read the questions and maybe you would have additional questions to add to this document, knowing that we did say at the last ICANN meeting that this

**EN**

document would hopefully be endorsed by the GAC by the end of ICANN 59.

So Pua already explained the purpose of the document.

We have several questions, so first:

What is a ccTLD?

Who is the manager of a ccTLD?

What is a delegation of a ccTLD?

What is a transfer?

This term has been changed. We originally put "redelegation." This was a term, I think, changed by the ccNSO, if I'm correct. I can see that we have a member of PTI in the room so please correct me if I'm wrong.

What is the process of delegation and transfer of a ccTLD?

Who is involved in the process?

What documentation do I need to proceed to a delegation or transfer of a ccTLD?

Why are ccTLDs important for governments?

This has been added from a member of the working group, the underserved regions working group.

What is the role of governments in management of a ccTLD?

Who decides how a ccTLD is managed?

What is the role of other stakeholders in ccTLDs?

What should governments do if they would like to get involved in the management of their ccTLD?

Who do I need to contact if I have questions?

What happens if a government, a local Internet community wants to transfer a ccTLD and not all parties consent?

What is common and best fit model for selecting a new operator, ccTLD manager, for the ccTLD to be redelegated?

Are there any documents required to describe how existing ccTLD operations will be transferred to the proposed new operator in the case of a redelegation?

And we have a few other questions but they're -- and I will leave them on the screen.

So if you have any additional questions, maybe, that you would add -- like to ask, please do so, so we can add them to the document. If not -- if you don't have any, well, would that mean that it's final and we can ask for the GAC to endorse it?

That's my question to the working group members. Yeah. Ashwin?

ASHWIN SASONGKO: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Pua.

Just one small question. Where -- do you discuss in the workshop about the ccTLD that is sold or offered to be used by companies around the world? In Indonesia, for example, there are many companies using not .ID but also not gTLD but other ccTLD.

Now, some countries do not want to use -- do not sell that -- do you offer their ccTLD for businesses outside their country but I know that some countries also offer their ccTLD to be used by other businesses in other countries.

The problem is, of course, how they can check or recheck to make sure that the company or the person who use that ccTLD can be identified correctly.

Now, I just want to know whether you discuss that in the workshop in Fiji or whether it will be another topic in the next workshop. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Ashwin.

Yes, that was discussed in our workshop. Like Alice mentioned, it was a hot topic where the ccTLD is used at the second level. We did not go into the specifics, but if there's a requirement from the countries to go into the specifics of how their ccTLD should be used, then we can provide that assistance to them.

But it is part of the topics in our capacity development workshops. Thank you.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Pua, Julia, and Alice, for your efforts on putting this together.

A few remarks first.

It would be useful to have the questions numbered, for ease of reference.

And I also -- I note that "redelegation" is now "transfer to" -- became "transfer" rather than "redelegation," but we have already many community members using "redelegation," so I think it would be useful to have some footnote or something stating that this change took place, so that people know what we are referring to.

Having said that, I already had a few comments on the final set of questions, which I'm not sure whether they were addressed or not, but for example, there was a question saying, "What is the common and best fit model for the ccTLD to be redelegated?"

And we don't have numbers, but... yeah. I think -- yeah, yeah. The one before the last here. "What is the common."

So -- and I was just -- I don't see my comments here, so I'm not sure if this is the final version, but my comment was I don't see a link between the model itself and the redelegation, but I stand to be corrected, of course.

JULIA CHARVOLEN:    I see -- I added a comment that you sent to us on the -- not on the Google Doc, but on the Word document by email. That's why you can see that I added "Comment from Manal Ismail." But maybe you added -- okay -- additional ones.

MANAL ISMAIL:    Yes. I commented on the Word Doc, and I saw you referring to my comments in the Google Doc, and thank you for this, but I made further comments on the Google Doc, on the final set of questions.

But, anyway, yeah, I can just -- first of all, as I said, I don't see a link between the model and the redelegation. So I have a problem with this question as it stands.

I also think we need to be consistent either referring to "redelegation" or "transfer" or both because sometimes we refer to "transfer" and sometimes "redelegation" and sometimes both. And then the footnote as I mentioned earlier.

I have a problem understanding -- I'm not sure I understand this question, "From which government office ministry in a country, point of contact who has a say in the redelegation." I mean... yeah, this one, yes.

Yeah, so, yeah. Now I can see my comments. So maybe I don't have to go through them again. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Manal. You're right, the questions should be numbered and we will work on that. And also a footnote for the redelegation, the transfer to refer to as a redelegation, which is a common term that's been used throughout.

We can't remember who -- so, Pakistan actually provided that question for the document. So I'm not sure if Pakistan is here to respond to your question.

If the member from PTI can respond to that question, that would be appreciated.  Kim?

KIM DAVIES:              Hello.  Sorry.  Can you restate the question?

JULIA CHARVOLEN:        I know that you had comments on the previous one.  Maybe we can go back to this one first, which was -- do you remember, Manal?  Because I did not --

MANAL ISMAIL:           Yes, the last one on the screen.  Okay, now the one before the last.  Stop scrolling, please.

It says, What is common and best model for selecting a new operator, ccTLD manager, for the ccTLD to be redelegated?  And my question was why are we linking the model itself with the redelegation?  In other words, would a certain model be more easier in the redelegation other than other models?  Thank you.

KIM DAVIES:             Thank you.  I will start by saying I think this question was proposed by one of the editors, and this is not guidance that PTI has given.  With that in mind, the criteria for delegation, redelegation, or transfer essentially touches on a few points that

don't relate specifically to what model is used but rather things like fair and equitable treatment, accountability, and so forth.

So we don't prescribe a particular model. So I can't speak further to that question beyond that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. I recall those questions were proposed by our colleague from Pakistan, as you rightly mentioned. So I'm not sure if we can resolve this now since we don't have him in the room. So maybe we can take this set of questions -- I'm trying to make a constructive suggestion just to -- not to get stuck here. So maybe we can adopt the first part and then continue discussions on the last part of the questions or this set that was proposed later in the process. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Manal. I agree with you. Thank you.

Any other questions or comments from the floor? Lance.

LANCE HINDS: Hi. Good morning, all. Just -- I got that they -- in the first question was the definition of a ccTLD. It might be helpful to have simpler language just for the -- you know, in the interest of

**EN**

clarity, not everybody -- I don't know what that simple language is, certainly when I look at it at a first glance.  Just a comment.

JULIA CHARVOLEN:      Do you mean the question of ccTLD to just...

LANCE HINDS:      Yeah.

JULIA CHARVOLEN:      Okay, the acronym.

PUA HUNTER:      Thank you, Lance.

Any other questions or comment?

Nigel.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:      Yes, thank you.  Nigel Cassimire, CTU.  The objective is to get it endorsed by the GAC by the end of this meeting over the next couple days.  Maybe you can give an idea of what the process would be towards achieving that after this meeting is finished in a couple of minutes.

PUA HUNTER:    Thank you, Nigel.  We will recirculate this to the GAC because the idea is to have this endorsed by the end of this meeting, ICANN59.   So any comment -- additional comments and questions you have, we can add that to the document.

I also believe that ccNSO have a session with us this afternoon, and maybe they have an update on this FAQ document as well.  But the comments that we have received so far, we will incorporate those in a document and recirculate.  Thank you, Nigel.

Any other -- Jamaica.

JAMAICA:    Good morning.  With respect to question 2, Who is a manager of ccTLD, I believe the first sentence speaks to -- first sentence seems to be answering the question what does a manager do.  And then the second question speaks to who he is.  So we may want to consider flipping the sentences around based on the question that is asked.  So who is the manager?  The first thing we start off by saying is what he does rather than who he is.

PUA HUNTER:    Thank you, Jamaica.

Niue.

NIUE:                          There is a third word for "redelegation" called "revocation."  So maybe it should be in there, too.  It appears in the FOI as an alternative word for "redelegation."

PUA HUNTER:                    Thank you, Niue.

                               Kim?

KIM DAVIES:                    Thank you.  Just a clarification, revocation is the act of removing a TLD, not redelegating.

PUA HUNTER:                    Thank you for that clarification, Kim.

                               We have someone at the back.  State your name, please.

PAKISTAN:                      Raza Shah from Pakistan.  Actually, if we can go back to the question raised earlier that you mentioned was from Pakistan and maybe I can help explain.

PUA HUNTER:                    Thank you.

PAKISTAN: If you don't mind reading it through, please.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: That's the one highlighted in yellow, correct, Manal? Okay.

What is common and best-fit model for selecting a new operator, ccTLD manager, for the ccTLD to be redelegated? That was the first question.

PAKISTAN: Okay. I guess our understanding is that there are different models, may not be the right word for it, but different ways of achieving it. And the actors involved in this whole process are -- could be, you know, broader community stakeholders or purely government. Or to our knowledge, there is some, in fact, issues related to having a law of the land where it's required that ccTLD operator maybe should operate from within the country or should be from the government for that matter. So we're not clear what exactly is the requirement in achieving this and what is the right model then. So I guess that's why we're using the word "model" here.

I guess let me put it this way, that -- is there any clear-cut said of guidelines that one follow and successfully achieve what they're trying to achieve?

JULIA CHARVOLEN:          Go ahead.  Yeah, Kim.

KIM DAVIES:               Thank you for the question.

We do not prescribe a particular best-fit model.  Every country is different and has a different set of trade-offs.  I think -- if this question was teased out into more detail, it would look at different kinds of models and where the challenges lie and where the benefits are.

We're often asked to recommend a model; and in order to be independent, we simply can't.  So I understand why it's a FAQ question because it is a common question that we receive. Unfortunately, we can't give a -- I don't think there's a simple, pithy, prescriptive answer to be given.  I think it's just that each country needs to analyze the situation, what they're trying to achieve, learn from other countries, which models have worked for them, if there are parallels, things like that.

PAKISTAN: Just a follow-up. So it's better if there are some use cases that could be describing the different models, again -- sorry to use the word "model" over and over again. But maybe use cases that can describe different scenarios and how it was done and it was achieved. That would probably be more helpful.

PUA HUNTER: We have another question from Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So maybe -- maybe we can -- if it is a question that we need to put here, then maybe the answer could start as Kim mentioned, that there is no specific model and that this varies from one country to another and then maybe provide whatever examples our colleague from Pakistan sees that this could be useful as an answer.

But the key thing is that we start that there is no single model that would facilitate the redelegation and that this varies from one country to another. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Manal.

We are running out of time. And we've got one more person at the back. But after that, I will close the queue because the

document is available online. And if you have any comment, we welcome you to add those to the document. Thank you.

RWANDA: Yeah, thank you. Justin Rugondihene from Rwanda. I have a general question with regards to the manager of ccTLDs. Is there -- it's just a general question. Is there any legislation or ICANN guidelines or document that prohibits governments or a public institution to be a custodian manager of a ccTLD as long as it is done in the interest of Internet community or Internet users? Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Justin. I don't have an answer to your question.

Kim, would you have an answer to that question? Thank you.

KIM DAVIES: Certainly. There is no prohibition that governments cannot manage a ccTLD. In fact, that happens in many countries.

If terms of the process, there is an expectation that the manager does have some day-to-day operational responsibility. Obviously different models have different levels of involvement. There's technical outsourcing and such. But the expectation is

the ccTLD manager does have some direct day-to-day involvement.

Beyond that, it's certainly fine if it's a government entity that operates a ccTLD.

PUA HUNTER:          Thank you very much, Kim.

We're at the last topic on our agenda, so I'll hand over to Alice.

Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:       Thank you, Pua, and thank you for all those who submitted additional comments and questions for the FAQ as we try to work with the PTI and the ccNSO to complete it for GAC endorsement later during this meeting.

In terms of way forward, I think as mentioned by Pua, we're going to try to finish the document for discussion at the GAC level to see whether we can get endorsement. And if not, to see about perhaps explaining it further or working on it further. And it can be endorsed intersessionally before the next meeting if there's more work that needs to be done.

Regarding way forward, we're going to be working with the Government Engagement Team, ICANN, and also the GSE and

others to come back to the GAC regarding the next sessions and series of capacity development that are still remaining, I think three or four for the regions. And then we'll probably start exploring subregional an national capacity-development sessions.

We'll have the report for the Johannesburg law enforcement meeting -- second law enforcement meeting ready towards the end of this meeting, hopefully, and share with you all the recommendations that are coming from that.

In terms of anything that will require the GAC to endorse, I think it's just the FAQ document, and perhaps timelines for the next capacity development sessions. And one of the things that we want to again really request is your continued participation from GAC and subregions governments in terms of just GAC work at the GAC level and also with other PDPs that the GAC is engaged with. So we'll continue encouraging that.

We'll share the work plan with all of you and the GAC in terms of way forward between now and the next meeting.

So I think that's -- that's all we have for now in terms of way forward.

And we also want to thank -- really thank the ICANN departments -- government engagement, GSE, MSSI, and all the

others -- and the department Ergys' development that is actually helping us development the framework, especially the capacity development sessions, to see whether there's any impact we're having or where we need to address -- any challenges that we may encounter and how we need to address those.  So we should have that framework ready, and we'll share with the GAC for any comments or questions.

So I'll hand over the microphone to Pua to close.

Thank you.


PUA HUNTER:        Thank you, Alice.

Last on our agenda was the call for volunteers.  We're very overwhelmed with the work we've been doing, and we would like our -- the members in our working group, even members here in GAC, to support us, assist us with our work.

And thank you, everyone, for your engagement, for your comments, for your input.  And we'll keep you updated with the FAQ document.

Thank you very much.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTIONS]**