

---

ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General - Joint Session: GAC and ALAC  
Wednesday, October 21, 2020 - 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

GULTEN TEPE:

Welcome (audio in and out) my name is Gulden Tepe with the GAC support team. Recognizing these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance. GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC representatives and delegates to type names and affiliations in the chat pod to keep accurate attendance as well as for comments and questions to be read out loud. If you would like to ask a question or make comment, please type in chat and start sentence as noted in the chat.

Interpretations will include all six UN languages and Portuguese and conducted using Zoom and the Congress Rental network. If you wish to speak, once the session facilitator calls your name, please unmute and take the floor. Remember state your name and the language if other than English. When speaking, make sure to mute all other devices, including the CRN application.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of a disruption, the support team will have to mute all microphones.

---

***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.***

---

Both recording and transcript will be available on the ICANN69 page. Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the GAC meeting with the ALAC. Our meeting today is scheduled for 60 minutes. We have a short agenda but we have very dense topics so I will keep it brief but before we get started with our agenda, allow me first to hand it over to Maureen, would you like to make opening remarks?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Manal, for your very warm welcome. Always very appreciative of the opportunity to share with GAC key issues and we have also appreciated the very productive [indiscernible] meetings we have had as well. And we've got three teams per usual and members on the team pretty much familiar with the GAC presentations but I know they're looking forward to some interesting discussions so we might as well start. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maureen, and thank you all for joining the GAC today. So we have the agenda as it stands on the screen. Again with the thanks to topic leads from both sides and to Yrio, the ALAC liaison to the GAC for compiling this agenda of interest to both committees. So Yrio, would you like to kick start the discussion?

YRJO LANSIPRO: Well, thank you Manal. Everyone welcomes everybody to this meeting. I think we could first have the EPDP Phase 2, and Alan, would you like to start?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, would be glad to. We're at an interesting point with the EPDP. The GNSO as we all know has adopted all of the recommendations that came out of the EPDP Phase 2 including some that did not have consensus support within the EPDP, and it is now up to the board to decide what to do with it. It's not a position that I envy them, but I think it's our responsibility to the main advisory committees to think carefully about what kind of advice we give to the board. We're between the proverbial rock and a hard place, that is we don't like the position we're in right now in terms of accessing the redacted WHOIS data, and we are not very satisfied that the SSAD that was specified in the PDP will

---

end up with is place we really want to be. So how we go forward is not really clear, but the board will have to make some decisions and lay out a path going forward, and I think we have an obligation to advise them as best we can.

In terms of the ongoing EPDP, the GNSO will be meeting in a few hours, and one of their decisions I believe, at least according to their agenda will be to reconvene the EPDP. They're determined not to call it a Phase 3. I believe it's called a Phase 2 A and talking about reconvening as early as November 15th, about three and a half weeks from now, during which time we're expected to either reconfirm or select new teams to represent us on the new EPDP, and going forward they're looking at a few months in which to see whether there is any progress going to be made.

So I think all of the players but certainly our two groups are going to have an obligation to put forward a proposal for legal natural that we think is viable and to try to chart a path with anonymized email addresses that we think we can sell to the contracted parties. I think in both cases we have a pretty good understanding of how we want to get there but it's something I think we will have to do our homework and do it well before the start of the EPDP. They are looking at trying to find a new chair Phase 2 A and also saying if they don't, they will use the liaison

---

from the GNSO, since the current chair rafik is leaving the GNSO, I presume they will have to name a new and who that is will be known.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Alan for sharing ALAC thoughts but also potential results of the GNSO, all looking forward to the council's meeting today. Hadia, please.

HADIA EL-MINIAWI: Alan provided a comprehensive position, so apparent next steps, as Alan mentioned is of course in relation to the distinct between legal the data of the natural and legal persons and the feasibility of any contacts to have [indiscernible] other work expected to happen in the relation to the scoping [indiscernible] to consider accuracy and the accuracy reporting system in order to determine next steps in this regard.

And general concerns, if I may, I will just state them quickly. First is the ability of the system to evolve or improve as we know more about its operation and as more legal guidance and clarity becomes available and maybe even more specific regulations in relation to the registration data comes out. Our concerns in relation to the financial aspects of the SSAD, concerns in relation to the ability of the current system to provide necessary data for

---

requestors with legitimate interest and lawful basis in a timely manner, and that would be priority level.

Other concerns in relation to the enforceability of the policy, so those are all concerns that I think the ALAC and the GAC share. Those are not per se within the next steps but maybe those are issues that we need to think about together. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Hadia. And indeed, we have a lot of concerns in common and happy to think about next steps together. I see also Alan in the chat flagging another issue, which is the [indiscernible] WHOIS, and indeed, Alan, thank you for adding this point. Any comments from our topic leads from the GAC side? Yes, Chris please.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thank you, Hadia and Alan, for those comments. As you well know, we have had many discussions especially around the natural and legal [indiscernible] and the anonymized email contact, and certainly something that we have discussed in our session yesterday with the GAC around moving forward and next steps. So I think is that whenever the next phase, whether 2a or 3, we will certainly look forward to working together on

---

proposing a way forward for the whole EPDP. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris. And I think, subject to the outcome of today's council meeting, we will need to start either like Alan said either confirming or current representatives on the EPDP Phase 2 A or select new representatives but also be ready to contribute to the work of the accuracy track as well as they will look to us to provide substantial input, I would say, even to trigger the work of this separate track, Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One quick comment you just hit on it. There is EPDP 2 A, the scoping work that is going to go on in terms of accuracy, the WHOIS work going on, and there were a few other related things to WHOIS. We're going to have a manpower, a person power problem. The number of people that we're going to need to focus on all these just a larger than the number that we have had before. There's no way the same few people can do it all, and I think all of us will have a real challenge finding people to devote the time with the necessary skill and knowledge to address all of these issues in parallel, just a thought.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Good point, Alan. And we need to start thinking as well in order to be ready as soon as things are clear, we definitely don't want to delay the continuation of the discussions, and as you mentioned, also Alan it's just a few months and the teams have to prove progress in order to be allowed more time if needed or to conclude hopefully. So with that said, we agreed to have a call between the topic leads, so maybe we can do this after ICANN69 and agree on concrete steps forward or even start working on material jointly that would feed into the coming tracks.

I'm just reading Alan in the chat. Unfortunately the recommendations do not seem to allow ICANN to fully fund it. Obviously I missed a couple of chats. So India: Funding of the SSAD has to be fully done by ICANN, and this was in response, and thank you, Alan for confirming the suggested plan. Any other comments on the EPDP? So seeing no further requests for the floor, if everyone is okay we can maybe move on -- Yrjo, with your permission, to subsequent procedures?

YRJO LANSIPRO: Thank you. I'm happy to organize [indiscernible] a call between [indiscernible] after the ICANN69.



---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Yrio. So I think Justine could get us started.

JUSTINE CHEW: Very pleased to be here to speak with colleagues from the GAC. We are slightly ahead of the process that Alan described for EPDP on GDPR. We're at the point where we are looking -- when I say we, I should be referring to the subsequent procedures EPDP working group -- at the point of reviewing the comments received from the public comment proceedings on the draft final report that concluded on the 30th of September. And that is still proceeding and that is supposed to -- well, expected to proceed until the end of the year by which time a final report is expected to be completed and submitted to the GNSO Council.

Now in the last ALAC GAC leadership meeting, in terms of this particular topic of subsequent procedures, I sort of promised to come up with a comparative analysis summary or comparative analysis of the some of the comments that have been coming through from the public comment proceeding, and we have prepared a very short slide deck just to highlight some of the key comments that maybe deserve our attention today on selected topics. Now of course I'm advised there have been about 50 comments that were received and we will just focus on the comments for four parties today, and I was hoping -- sorry, I hear

---

background noise. Okay. And I was hoping that because our GAC colleagues have been discussing subsequent procedures with the PDP working group co-chairs as well as with the board yesterday on at least one, at least one sub topic anyway, that GAC colleagues could enlighten us on insights they feel ALAC should take note on.

So moving on to the second slide, I will cherry pick the key issues that I want to highlight, that we wanted to highlight today, and if I could just have a few minutes to get through the whole slide deck and then perhaps invite my GAC colleagues to then comment or even comments from the participants today. So in terms of the registry commitments topic which also includes the area of impossibility and when talking about I am possibility, we are pointing to what is both contractual compliance and the dispute resolution procedures.

So the thing to note here is I believe -- well a couple of things. First is, GAC very wisely commented that we should be looking at the adoption of category 2 safeguards for TLDs in highly regulated sectors as well, something probably the EPDP working group hasn't addressed specifically. And also interestingly the ICANN board came back with a comment or at least a query on the enforcement of PICS and RVCs, public interest commitments and registry voluntary commitments. Now the board is

---

concerned about enforceability of both PICS and rvc's in light of the bylaws stated on the screen which limits the board's mandate to mission of the ICANN within the bylaws itself, specifically the judgment on content is clearly excluded from the mission.

So the board is concerned about usage of PICS and rvc's and how to frame the public interest concept in the context of PIC and the dispute resolution procedures to ensure that when they come through the next round are in fact impossible(?) in the context of ICANN's mission. And ICANN had a very interesting question as well in terms of category 1 safeguard that the PDP working group has recommended to adopt, which is how do we address community disagreement over safeguards, in particular the category 1 safeguard in the context of specifications 113 A obligations.

Moving on to the DNS abuse mitigation, not going to direct too much on this topic, it has been spoken of and discussed community wide and we had a very good session, follow-up session on DNS abuse yesterday, a plenary session. So the only interesting thing -- well the interesting thing to note on this slide is GAC did say it expects swift action from GNSO Council in triggering such holistic efforts for PDP in terms of DNS abuse

---

mitigation. So we will have to see how we want to approach that moving forward.

Next up is applicant support and the outreach of applicant support. ALAC still has concerns over some of the draft final recommendations, in particular the source of fund that goes through the (audio breaking up) and so we are looking details on auction bid credit that is to benefit applicant support -- applicants who qualify for applicant support, given a bid credit if they have to participate in auction of last resort. Still scanty in details of how that will work and ICANN org also has questions about the implementation of the auction bid credit mechanism.

And also we find that this particular lack of details in how to prevent gaming goes fundamental change in terms of one of the recommendations EPDP has recommended is that any applications that are judged not to qualify for applicant support may still participate or may proceed in the application process by transferring to a standard application. So in the earlier round of 2012 any applications that do not qualify for applicant support automatically terminated or disqualified so that is a fundamental change for the next round, and we see that as opening opportunities for gaming, so we need to look at how to address the possibility.

---

And in terms of the ICANN board, their concern about expanding financial support to applicant support qualifiers beyond application fees, something that would raise fiduciary concerns for the board in terms of would they be forced -- give certain advantages to certain applicants as opposed to others?

Moving on to community applications and community [indiscernible] evaluation. The area of community priority evaluations is a topic that we at large at ALAC have worked very hard on and I believe it was necessary because if you note the ICANN board's comment, I basically read that as saying that the draft recommendations that come through from the PDP working group don't particularly have any details that point to any major reforms being done to [indiscernible] in particular. So in that respect they're saying if that's the case should we still use CPE as a last resort of resolution contention and the CPE has one aspect where there are certain restrictions on registry in terms of community obligations they need to meet. So again, the board is worried that that might cause problems in terms of creeping out of the mission of ICANN.

And in terms of where we are at and where GAC is at, I believe that both advisory committees are saying similar things in their comments in terms of like for example -- well ALAC has pushed for major reforms to the CPE process guidelines in terms of

---

[indiscernible] participation in the CPE provided engagement and also pushed for changes to the actual CPE process and CPE criteria. For example including more grass root participation either the evaluation panels or access to expertise in community in the evaluation panels. And also absolutely to avoid the bias toward economic driven groupings that occurred in the last round, to balance the consideration for marginalized groups as well as civil society advocacy groups and definitely to rebalance the scoring of the CPE criteria to eliminate possible penalization against -- and to lower pressure to prevail. And ICANN has many questions regarding the implementation guidance for CPE.

And moving on -- next slide. We are still proposing a ban on private actions and to adopt the traditional [indiscernible] as mechanism of last resort when comes to auction and this is kind of reflected in the ICANN board comment which asks why should auctions not be done in a way that net proceeds would benefit the global Internet community? So in that respect it is asking why are we considering allowing private auctions as opposed to ICANN conducted auctions. As we know from the last round ICANN conducted auctions, the proceeds were held in trust for the benefit of the Internet community. But proceeds from any private auctions actually go back to the applicant participating in the auctions itself.

---

And in terms of transparency there has been major push back in the depth of the transparency mechanisms we're asking for. To the extent that we don't think it goes far enough to disincentivize gaming and what the board rightly asks why should private resolutions only partially be brought into the program? Because they're saying some resolutions should be under the purview of ICANN and some left to the devices of the parties involved in the auctions itself and certainly the concept of good faith [indiscernible] raises many, many questions in terms of the objective, any objective criteria, [indiscernible] and also penalties involved.

And the last topic is on closed generics, otherwise known as exclusive generics. And in terms allowing closed generics if at all would be if they served some sort of public interest. Nothing finalized yet, and the ALAC has also proposed a number of principles that could be adopted in moving this forward, if at all. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Justine. Thank you for this extremely useful and very well thought out comparative analysis. And thank you for your efforts and for sharing those efforts to the benefit of everyone. I understand you reduced a bit because of the time, so if other topics are also ready to be shared, I think it

---

would be very useful for everyone to benefit from your excellent work.

So I'm looking at the floor for any requests for the floor. I see Luisa's hand up. Before giving you the floor, I see a comment from Jeff Neuman in the chat: Just a note that during the public comment period the GNSO SubPro working group held a number of sessions on the number of the points raised about CPE, so the concerns of ALAC which were made known to the working group just prior to the public comment period are being addressed. Just wanted to provide full information. Thank you, Jeff. I have Luisa and then Jorge next.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

(No audio) good morning, Manal.

Can you hear me well?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Perfect. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone, this is Luisa Paez with the government of Canada, current GAC vice chair and GAC



---

topic lead on subsequent procedures along with my GAC colleague Jorge Cancio, current vice chair as well.

So first of all, we wanted to recognize the tremendous effort that Justine along with the other ALAC participants to the subsequent procedures working group have been doing in the past years, having attended a few of the subsequent procedures working group, there is tremendous expertise that ALAC brings to the table, and so we first wanted to recognize the tremendous efforts and also we truly appreciate the inter-sessional work we have been doing in the last few months and years.

It has been really great, again, learning from ALAC, from your expertise as you can all attest, always wonderful, prepared comprehensive slides and materials, and so we first wanted to recognize the tremendous effort and the great collaboration inter-sessionally and look forward to continuing this work with regards subsequent procedures and also wanted to note that during the GAC and ICANN board session in regards to subsequent procedures, the GAC raised two important items which I know are also of importance to the ALAC as a presentation of today which is the following up with Montreal GAC advice, in particular in regard to implementing CCT review recommendations and the particular focus on addressing DNS abuse. So that was raised with the ICANN board as well as the

---

public the question of enforceability with the public interest commitments.

So again, wanted to raise that there is a lot of commonality in terms of the ALAC and GAC views and we look forward to continuing to engage and collaborate and welcome any questions that GAC members might have to Justine, again, a lot of expertise within the ALAC group. So again, a big thank you, and we look forward to continuing the collaboration. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Luisa. Jorge, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Hello everyone. I hope you hear me okay. I'm a bit in a noisy environment so I hope it's not going to interfere with my short intervention. I'm Jorge Cancio from Switzerland, for the record. As Luisa said, I happen to be one of the GAC vice chairs and also one of the topic leads on subsequent procedures. I would like to join to what Luisa said in the thanks to ALAC and especially also to Justine and the dedicated team on subsequent procedures from ALAC as we have seen and in the slides presented by Justine, there is a lot of commonalities between the positions of ALAC and the GAC.

---

There has of course been exchange during the last months between us, and just to give an overview or a sense to also ALAC members or at large members in this session, I would draw your attention to the fact that the GAC has been evolving its thinking as also the subsequent procedures were crystallized in draft recommendations. We have gone from a compilation of about 20 GAC individual members which we organized in April May and which is I think available to anyone interested over to GAC consensus input regarding the draft final report which we filed during the deadline of September 30th. So I hope this is also easily available online and if anyone from and beyond the GAC has interest, of course please reach out to us because we would be happy to share that document which reflects what the consensus positions are from the GAC at this stage and which builds on prior GAC advice and submissions to the PDP and working group.

This week we have had the chance to exchange both internally in the GAC with the valuable presence of Cheryl and Jeff Neuman, co-chairs of the PDP working group as Luisa mentioned, and there were some of the issues of the GAC consensus input which were raised again, for instance the new predictability framework, the SPIRT, what roll the GAC would play in that framework, whether the GAC would be able to raise issues directly with the SPIRT or whether we would need to be

---

forced, let's say, to go through ICANN board or directly to the GNSO Council, that is a point that was raised during our discussion, also the status of GAC advice, GAC consensus advice, within the application process for strings in the future applicant guidebook. And of course as Luisa mentioned, the questions related to the implementation of cc -- recommendations and DNS abuse. This will probably all be reflected in the GAC communique, so I also suggest you to keep an eye on that and read it because in the end everything which is on the GAC communique is a consensus product of our committee, and interestingly we had a conversation with the board yesterday whereas Luisa mentioned, we raised again the Montreal advice of the GAC regarding full implementation of the most important recommendations of the cc rtc, and especially DNS abuse and also entered into the first exchange regarding the question that the board proposed to the subsequent procedures working group concerning the impact or the interaction between the new ICANN bylaws language on mission and [indiscernible] regulation and public interest commitments from 2016.

I think that it was very a very useful first exchange Avri Doria elaborated on the board's concerns and highlighted that they are just looking for more clarity, not prejudging any outcome or conclusion but presenting the PDP working group with relevant questions, and we on our side highlighted or very good that of

---

course the mission language in the bylaws from 2016 is a very nuanced one which has different elements which have to be looked at holistically. So I think it is important now that we keep on cooperating in the coming months. There is still a stretch to go until the financial report is really final and then it goes to the GNSO Council and then to the board.

And of course I think it's also important that the PDP working group is aware that there is a lot of synergy and alignment between the comments from ALAC and the GAC, and this is of course something that has to be taken very seriously. We also have in any case later on the possibility of issuing GAC advice or ALAC advice to the board. So I hope that our comments are well considered in the PDP working group so that we can minimize these kinds of interventions in the end with good alignment and coordination between the committees would be important. So I leave it at that, and thank you very much for the presentation for the good cooperation.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And I have two really thank Jorge and Luisa as the GAC topic leads for leading us through this exercise, keeping the GAC informed of course with the help of Benedetta from support staff, and helping compile GAC input to this important process. And of course as always, the availability

---

of the SubPro PDP co-chairs and their willingness to engage and listen. So as is obvious, we have a lot in common, and I think we can potentially also agree on maybe if needed, a call between the topic leads to agree on next steps and how we can align our next steps together, but I will leave this up to topic leads from both sides.

So any other comments or requests for the floor? Or Maureen if you would like to say anything before we move to the third agenda item?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Manal. I guess I might mention that would like to thank GAC and the teams that actually shared and discussed on the common issues -- not putting my video on -- and I really appreciate what was said about our topic leads. We and at large also recognize the amazing effort gone to the EPDP and subsequent procedures issues by our topic leads. But just wanted to recognize too the contribution of other members of our consolidated policy -- and they meet weekly at least -- assured of the backing of the at-large team and discussions they have. And I think that that has been a really important part in the success of our team, when they have gone to enter discussions. But just wanted to make that point.

---

But (audio breaking up) and I don't know that Jonathan still has something else to talk about but I guess in regards to the discussions we just had, I think it's great that we have devised next steps with the ALAC and GAC can work together, there have been really positive productive outcomes from this meeting for both of us and certainly looking forward to the future and collaborative efforts that we can present to our members, but I would like Jonathan to be able to do his presentation on some future work, which I would really like to see that we can work together on [indiscernible] education. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry. And I will turn on the camera. How is that? Yeah. So I just -- Yrion asked me to speak briefly about a project we have just gotten off the ground recently. During ICANN67, if I recall, we gave a kind of introduction to DNS abuse presentation and made a commitment on behalf of the at-large community to take two pronged approach to combating DNS abuse, and the first was continue to go pursue improvements to DNS abuse mitigation policies inside of ICANN, whether changes to contracts or changes to contract compliance practices, et cetera, in order to combat abuse. But the other prong of our commitment was to launch a campaign to educate individual users about DNS abuse such that they could protect themselves from it, better recognize

---

phishing scams when they appear, for example. So the idea there being is to sort of address this from two different sides.

So in this meeting -- ICANN69, we had very early brainstorming session about what such a campaign might look like. I think what the at-large brings most to the table is a fairly deep network that includes the [indistinct] and the at-large structures each of which are members organizations so we have the capacity to reach out to the member community in a pretty significant way, and one of the things we identified as a requirement was trying to find resources that we might use to educate individual users. Lauren Kapin of the public safety working group pointed us to some videos that had been produced by the ftc and said we could make use of those any way we wanted, including rebranding them as at-large, so we are looking at trying to find what kind of resources are available around the world and in which languages and that we might create a central repository of those things as well as maybe develop a kind of webinar that we could train all of our als' to deliver in their local regions to try and begin this kind of user education campaign that we promised back six months ago.

So that is really where we are on it, we're now at the sort of resource identification phase of just seeing what is already out there, don't need to reinvent the wheel, but if there are good



---

explainer videos but if we take a video from the ftc only in English and Spanish and translate to other languages. So that's the concept.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jonathan, for sharing the update, and it's a very interesting initiative and we look forward to the outcome and happy to know that Laureen was helpful in that aspect. Thanks to her -- due to the time zone difference she's not on this call, but great to know and happy to offer any help or alignment on this very interesting initiative.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I guess we would ask if there are GAC members aware of resources that have been created in other countries that are effective animations or how to videos, like how to spot a scam or a phishing attack, et cetera, we would be interested to know about them so that we can compile an inventory of what is available out there and come up with the best set of videos and infographics and maybe translate them so we have a standardized set that we then try to push out into the individual user community. But I don't know how to go about asking for that but if there is a way to ask GAC members for those resources or contacts, that would be useful.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Excellent idea, Jonathan. And we have been talking --think it's in our previous communiques as well, talking about capacity building for DNS abuse. So very timely and very relevant, and again, I echo what you have just said to all GAC members if they have any relevant material that they do share it.

And I think this is a good point also to remind GAC colleagues that ever since the GAC representative from Portugal, ever since she left we have not assigned a point of contact from the GAC to ALAC so a good opportunity to, again, seek volunteers. We need someone to be our point of contact and to align efforts with Yrio and the excellent job he's doing and maybe also be our focal point, Jonathan, to collect material that is available. And I see Jorge in the chat [indiscernible] Switzerland.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And maybe we don't even use DNS abuse when teaching this, we might just be talking about phishing or pharming or specific types of scams that happen rather than getting them thinking about the DNS's or ICANN or anything like that but just help them be protected. So that's it for me.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jonathan, and thanks everyone. So any last requests for the floor? We have four minutes. Maureen, anything before we close?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Not really, just want to thank you very much again for allowing us this opportunity to share with the GAC. But also putting really strong capacity building also a really big part, telling my people this now too, capacity building will be so important for the plan next year and if we can get people from the GAC helping us with that effort, that would be really great. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maureen, Yrio, Alan, Hadia, Justine -- and all ALAC members who joined us.

GULTEN TEPE: So sorry to interrupt, but we have Alan in the queue.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry to miss your hand. Please go ahead.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Just wanted to make a quick comment. I have been involved in ICANN now for about 14 years, and I am just amazed and pleased at how involved the GAC is now in the actual work of ICANN and helping to go forward in the right ways as opposed to almost in the past sitting back and critiquing things but not actively being involved and just how dynamic the GAC is right now compared to a dozen years ago. So my hat off to you, if I was wearing a hat.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Alan, and goes both ways. Thank you also for lending a hand and happy to engage with all the community of course. So with this, I think we can conclude, again, by thanking everyone from ALAC -- Maureen, Yrio, Alan, Hadia, Justine, Jonathan, and all ALAC members, but also due thanks to our topic leads as well, Chris, Georgios, Luisa, [indiscernible] and Jorge and (no audio)

[end of session]

**[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]**