
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GAC: DNS Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs (2/3)
Tuesday, March 23, 2021 – 11:00 to 12:00 EST

GULTEN TEPE:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to this ICANN70 GAC session on Tuesday, 23rd of March. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance, the GAC leadership encourage all of you GAC representatives to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod to keep accurate attendance records. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type in the chat, the feature is located at the bottom of your Zoom window, by starting and ending your sentence with a <QUESTION> or <COMMENT> as indicated in the chat.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all 6 U.N. languages and Portuguese. Participants may select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon located on the Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your language you will speak, in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when speaking.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the

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.

ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. In the case of a disruption during the session, our Technical Support Team will mute all participants. The session is being recorded, and all materials will be available on the ICANN70 meetings page. With that, I would like to turn it over to the GAC chair, Manal Ismail. Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, and with my sincere apologies to our subsequent procedures topic leads, I will hand over apologies for the four minute delay. Please, over to you. So who will be starting, Luisa or Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Hello, this is Jorge Cancio, but Luisa, I thought perhaps you had technical issues. But please take the floor.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: No problem. I just want to make sure you can hear me well. You can? Okay. Wonderful. I'm just going to... perfect. This is the second session on subsequent procedures within the GAC. And so yesterday we had really a good exchange with regards to two priority topics. We discussed clarity and predictability with the application process and had discussions in regards to the public interest commitment, PICS and global public interest, in particular the importance of the PICS

enforceability. Today we will focus hopefully, time permitting, on three topics, the applicant support program, underserved regions, and closed generics and finally, if time, on GAC early warnings and GAC advice.

If we could go to the slide on applicant support. Wonderful. So in regards to the applicant support program, there was really good improvement from the last 2012 round regards recommendations, so I will just highlight a few of those to provide bit of background. First, extending the scope of the program beyond only economies classified by United Nations as least developed and also to consider quote unquote struggling regions [reading] [refer to slide]. Second, expanding the scope of financial support such as supporting costs, attorney fees, writing fees related to the application process. Third, ICANN org to continue facilitating non-financial assistance, including the provision of pro bono assistance where applicable and finally, the importance of outreach and awareness should be delivered well in advance to help promote more widespread knowledge about the program.

That said, the final report does not include a recommendation for the applicant support program for the reduction or elimination of fees for candidates and also to note at a certain point there was a proposal in the subsequent procedures Working Group put forward that ICANN should cover registry fees for a limited period of time; however, the Working Group did not come to any agreement on this proposal.

Next slide, please. On this slide, I will highlight GAC positions to date on this topic. GAC has asked for how [reading] [refer to slide] and the GAC support as meaningful evaluation with good metrics in order to assess the success of the applicant support program. Next slide, please. In regards to a proposed next steps for the GAC to consider, we have a few questions here. The first one is do GAC members in particular the underserved regions Working Group consider the final recommendations meet GAC expectation and the actual needs of prospective applicants in these regions until the pore program.

Do GAC members foresee the need to recommend or potentially advise the ICANN Board to consider including the reduction or elimination of ongoing registry fees at least in part to expand financial support available to eligible applicants? In this context the GAC may wish to recommend the ICANN Board as mentioned in the previous slide that perhaps the ICANN should cover registry fees for a limited period of time and perhaps suggest a specific time frame for this purpose. ICANN org has previously expressed that it is still exploring all possible funding opportunities within ICANN's current remit and bylaws. So I will ask Jorge or Manal to help with any questions or comments.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Luisa. Any questions or comments?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: And we will probably prioritize first the GAC members and obviously also welcome -- I see [indiscernible] and Nigel, not sure who came first -- Kavouss, yes, thank you.

IRAN: I think you have put some question here, do GAC members and so on, so forth report, second bullet, you mentioned no recommendation for reduction of fees and so on, so forth but now if we provide an advice, if and only if, that there should be a reduction, how would you see that? Because the community did not agree during the process to have any recommendation. Do you see any problem or way how we proceed with that advice? Or if this is not the case, we should not do that? Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: And it's a very important question, and that is why I made the important point that we should always keep in mind ICANN's org's current remit and bylaws and they are exploring possible funding opportunities. But I think it will always depends on the way if potential GAC advice is framed in a constructive or actionable way, I think it is still worth considering. That being said, there is currently already some financial support that has been included in the recommendations but

at least we did want to give GAC members an opportunity as this was part of the previous GAC positions and at a certain point within the Working Group, there was a proposal to have some of the ICANN registry fees partially reduced with a limited time. But yes, there was no consensus on it. But wondering if there are any further thoughts on this topic, we welcome those. And thank you, Kavouss, for your question. Nigel.

NIGEL CASSMIRE:

I was wondering if we were -- in the initial report. This is something that could be quite important for a proposal for smaller markets like the Caribbean. Just wondering if there was any information as to why it was removed. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Nigel, that is a really good question, and I do know Jeff, one of the previous co-chairs, could perhaps provide some further clarification on this important point. Jeff, if you could quickly respond to Nigel's question. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I was one of the co-chairs of the SubPro Working Group, and I think you are correct that was in the initial report. I think after comments came in and more discussions, the Working Group was concerned -- or at least

enough members of the Working Group were concerned -- that a registry that was not able to pay its minimal ongoing fees would not be a financially stable entity and therefore may pose a security and stability threat to the domain name system. So for that reason, we could not get agreement to pay those fees.

I would offer that if the GAC could find a way to recommend that that financial -- that those entities do get financial help to make those payments but also in a way that would assure the community that the registry is a stable entity and doesn't threaten the security and stability of the Internet, I'm sure that would be seen as very positive. Thanks.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jeff, appreciate your clarification, and we are taking note of all comments and questions. In the interest of time, Nigel from the UK, if you could be brief. And [indiscernible] you are part of the queue as well. But perhaps if you don't mind asking your question in the chat, that would be greatly appreciated in the interest of time. Go ahead, Nigel.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much. Good afternoon, Nigel Hickson, UK GAC. Just to note first of all that this is a very important part of the SubPro report. As we saw in the last gTLD round, it is very difficult indeed to encourage a global response in this area in terms of gTLD applications, and I think

it is important that we move forward with discussions between the GAC and the GNSO and the ICANN org, the Board, takes place to see what can be done to address this issue to try and increase the number of applications from regions where in the past those applications haven't come from. And if we look at previous reviews, we recognize this is a holistic problem; the problems don't rely on just one party, and I think all of us have an interest in ensuring that we work together to try and do our best in this area. And as Jeff said, it doesn't have to be the registry that pays or comes up with the subsidy, it can be other parties. But I think we need to work on this prior to the next round. Thank you very much.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Nigel, very much, and Kavouss, we have taken note of your comment as well in the chat. Perhaps the recommendation of the Working Group whether auction proceeds be used -- Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, I just put into the chat, my experience from the prior business discussion about subsidies is that the fees we are talking about are a very, very small portion of the total cost of operation. So what actually happens, I think, is that in a developing country if somebody wants to apply for these funds, the real money is sitting somewhere else, so you have a sort of colonialization and the benefit goes back to the external funder, doesn't do much in terms of making it

available in a country for these less well endowed, less well funded organizations. I am basically covering the same thing that Jeff Neuman says but from a different perspective.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Steve. This is important. This provides further clarification and further thinking within the GAC. So I do appreciate the comment. Nigel, I believe that is an old hand and if so, we will go to the next topic which has to do with closed generics. So first focusing on what the subsequent procedures Working Group recommendations developed. The Working Group was not able to agree on how to treat closed generics applications in future rounds. So the final report reflects this status. The Working Group of course had numerous discussions and received extensive comments from the community; however, the Working Group was not able to come to an agreement. The Working Group members recognized the ICANN Board's resolution after the 2012 round noting that the PDP Working Group should attempt to draft recommendations. To highlight some of the key challenges discussed numerous times within this topic was about the defining of closed generics, defining public interest, public interest goals, whether the public interest may be served or harmed by an application and diverging opinions on the perceived benefits and harms of closed generics.

In regard to previous GAC positions -- I think if you could all mute,

please, there is background noise. So with regards to previous GAC positions, the GAC encouraged always further discussions to identify criteria as to how to assess the public interest within closed generics. The GAC did review three individual proposals that were submitted by different individuals from the PDP Working Group and so it is important to note that of these three proposals, the GAC did not support one of them which is the case for delegating closed generics, so again, allowing all closed generics to be delegated. However, the GAC encouraged the continued consideration of the other two proposals, the proposal for public interest closed generics which includes a new -- which would include a new category of new TLD [refer to slide] directly in response to previous GAC advice in Beijing along with the third proposal, the closed generics proposal.

I won't go into much more detail, the proposals are more explained in the GAC scorecard and obviously if there are any questions, we can provide a bit more details. Next slide, please. So in regards to proposed next steps for the GAC, so here we have some questions for GAC members. Do GAC members wish to submit potential advice to the ICANN Board recalling GAC advice that closed generics should serve a public interest goal, noting areas of agreement within the two proposals submitted just mentioned, by the individual Working Group members and to try to seek alignment with previous GAC advice?

Also the GAC may consider that due to no agreement on closed generics in the absence of recommendation to perhaps consider aligning with

the at-large, the ALAC statement, which quote unquote says there should be a suspension of any processing or acceptance of any applications for closed generics until such a time recommendations in how to address applications for closed generics which serve a global public interest are developed by the GNSO and/or ICANN Board.

So as I mentioned, the GAC may wish to further advise the ICANN Board to provide continued consideration in particular to the two proposals that were considered within the Working Group, the first a proposal for public interest closed generics gTLDs and the second the closed generics proposal. So I will just stop there and see if there are any questions or comments and perhaps if you need a little bit more clarification on the two individual proposals that perhaps the GAC could further -- potentially ask the Board to further consider, let us know. So I will stop and see if there are any questions or hands raised. So I do see Kavouss' hand. Please go ahead, Kavouss.

IRAN:

Yes, thank you very much. I think we have been working for many, many years to find out what is really -- what does it really mean public interest. There is no universal, international or common agreement on what is public interest. The public interest has been used by ICANN Board, sometimes they want to decide on something and think it is not in the public interest. But it is difficult to base ourselves that yes, this closed generics is in the public interest when the definition of public

interest and the scope of public interest and the area that public interest applies is not clear, so it may further confuse the people or not help at all. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and indeed, I think this was discussed at length within the Working Group, and also that said, the two proposals in particular, the one that includes the potential creation of a new category of gTLDs, the so-called public interest closed generics string, so similar to for example the community status of applications, and there is that could operate within this public interest framework. And so the proposal also includes a public interest closed generics review panel, so a group or a committee could be established to evaluate whether each application meets the unique aspects or requirements.

But we agree this continues to be a challenging word to clarify and discuss. I do note both Jorge and Olivier have a hand up, I just want to note comments in the chat. Kavouss, you mentioned your comment, and we have Finn from Denmark supporting perhaps GAC aligning itself with the ALAC suggestion on closed generics. But I will have Jorge, if you can take the floor, and then Olivier. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you so much, Luisa, and I will be speaking more in my national capacities on this issue but also bearing in mind my role as topic lead, in the sense that we tend to turn back to the Beijing advice which is important and which still stands, but I think it's important to draw the attention from the community and Board to the consensus input the GAC made to the public consultation on the draft final report last September, because there are important aspects there that put more meat on the bones of the Beijing advice.

So amongst other things, I would like to highlight that we said in that consensus input that we want to support the retention of the Beijing advice and that adequate means and processes are defined to ensure that public interest goals are met is important, that the burden demonstrating the benefit of a closed generics string be [indiscernible] to the applicant, comments in a review process and we supported continued discussion on two of the proposals that had been circulated in the Working Group.

Finally, I think it's also worth highlighting that we said as GAC that regarding the closed generics proposal from Jeff Neuman, we find value in the notion of creating a framework for evaluating closed generics applications to determine whether those applications serve a legitimate public interest goal. So just to recap, I think it's important to bear in mind this input because it goes further than just the Beijing advice, and it may help also the Board to understand the GAC position. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, and we take note of that in terms of making sure we are looking at the previous GAC input and beyond the GAC advice of Beijing. I would like to give Olivier the floor.

OLIVIER BRINGER: Thank you, European Commission, for the record. I wanted to ask a simple question. What does it mean, what is the consequence of the fact of no consensus on the recommendations on closed generics? What does it mean exactly in terms of organizing the next round? Does it mean that we revert to the old applicant guidelines of 2012? I think that is important to be able to reply to your question on whether we want to follow the ALAC suggestion. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Olivier, and that is an important process question, and perhaps I could provide a little bit of context and then also ask Jorge and even Jeff, as part of the GAC [indiscernible] with the GNSO. But it is important to clarify that the GNSO approved all of the recommendations in the final report, were approved by the GNSO Council; however, there were three exceptions, and one was the closed generics because there was no agreement.

So I read here from the GNSO Council report, it says: While the Working Group agreed by full consensus that there was no agreement on this topic, the GNSO Council believes no agreement is functionally equivalent to the designation of divergence as detailed in the GNSO guidelines. [reading] that said, it is true it begs the question in terms of practical terms what will this entail when a future potential round in 2023 happens? So I think that is exactly where we are now. I think trying to see what is going to happen procedurally, so I think there is still not too much clarity on that. But of course if others could provide a bit of clarity. I know Jeff just quickly here in the chat mentions: I think you gave the answer I would have given; I cannot add anything other than what the GNSO sent.

So all to say that that is a very good question, Olivier. I have Jorge and afterwards Kavouss, and then mindful on time, perhaps we can then go to the next topic. Thank you. Go ahead, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Yes. Thank you, Luisa. And just to give my view -- this is not an official view as topic view, this is my personal national view. There has been disagreement in the Working Group itself on what would be the fall-back position. So with no recommendation coming from the GNSO, which is something which is in the GNSO report to the Board, because there is divergence on this issue, really the question is, well, what is the fall-back?

And there were basically I think two schools of thought. There were those who said okay, the situation would be the one we had in the 2012 round which is basically according to the GAC advice, the Board put a halt on such strings, and there was the other school of thought which said there is nothing in the Applicant Guidebook and there is absolutely nothing in the policies of the prior round. So really, either closed generics would be possible or the Board has to intervene. So it's really a bit of an unclear situation, and that is why I think ALAC, who have been following this with very much attention and have very expert people working on this issue, are coming with this proposal. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And Kavouss, if you can take the floor, and then we will go to the next topic. Thank you.

IRAN: Yes (audio distortion) yes, perhaps the problem gets back to --

GULTEN TEPE: Kavouss, sorry --

IRAN: Can you hear me?

GULTEN TEPE: Not really, we cannot hear you, Kavouss.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Very choppy, your line, Kavouss, unfortunately.

GULTEN TEPE: Kavouss, we can dial out to you, because your line is currently very choppy, currently.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: I think that would be a good idea. Gulden, if you can dial Kavouss, and we will make sure to give you the floor --

IRAN: Is it okay now?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Yes, go ahead please.

IRAN:

I think we, GAC, in April 2013 we tried to associate this closed generics with public interest without knowing that it was public interest, and it has been referred to several times during the policy development process that this is coming from the GAC saying if it is in line with the public interest, you could allow it but we cannot revert back to this one. However, if there is and only if there is anything for closed generics, we should have a very clear, precise and concise criteria [indiscernible] to be applied clearly without giving any kind of abuse to that. Because DNS is similar to those things that belong to everybody. When you make it closed, that means you do not allow that for other people to have access to that, more or less. So we should be very careful, this equitable access to DNS. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Absolutely. Thank you, Kavouss, thank you for highlighting that and being very clear. We have taken note of everyone's interventions as well as everyone's comments in the chat and in particular just seeing from the ALAC, who was one of the ALAC representatives in the subsequent procedures Working Group highlighting and clarifying ALAC's position. And in the coming days if GAC members believe there is some support to align with ALAC's statement, to let us know. And in the interest of time, I will pass it on to Jorge Cancio to review the final topic for this session, and I do thank you, everyone, for this fruitful exchange and for all the questions. We appreciate it. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you so much, Luisa. So what we have in our platter today as the third priority issue is GAC early warnings and GAC advice. So if you could move to that slide, please. Thank you so much. And I would like to draw the attention, of the GAC membership to the GAC scorecard. Because there you have an overview of how this issue and all the other issues have evolved, it is included in your briefing for this session, and this specific topic is in pages 17 and 18 of that briefing under the scorecard.

So if you have a look at that in addition to the summary in the slides, you will see that there are a number of recommendations coming from the SubPro Working Group which relate to two important intervention instruments that the 2012 Applicant Guidebook let's say created for the GAC in relation to applications. And those were the GAC early warning and the GAC consensus advice on applications. This is dealt with under recommendation 30, and it is different sub part of the final report so please have a look at that. It has evolved somewhat during the last months as a reaction, amongst other things, to the GAC consensus input we issued during the public comment period last September.

So if we look at the different recommendations, we would like to highlight that there is first a recommendation suggesting, advising, recommending that GAC advice should be related to the interaction

between ICANN's policies and various laws and international agreements but where they may affect public policy issues, and with this the Working Group in comments to the GAC is sticking to how the GAC advice is characterized in the ICANN bylaws. So in that aspect this is recommendation 30.3. We see no divergence existing.

The second is when this advice, be it on categories of TLDs or on individual strings, should be issued. And here the PDP working group has softened somewhat in the course of the months its recommendations because initially it had somewhat hard language requiring that GAC advice should in any case be issued before the Applicant Guidebook is published. And now this is still more or less a recommendation, but it is limited to establishing sort of an incentive to issue that advice before the publication of the Applicant Guidebook. Because it is after -- if the GAC consensus advice comes after, it is recommended that the ICANN Board should take into account the circumstances resulting from such timing and the possible detrimental effect on the applicant or the potential applicants. So that is recommendation 30.2 which remains a bit problematic, we could say.

Then there is also recommendation 30.6 where it is mentioned that if there is GAC early warning, the GAC should also clarify in that early warning how the applicant can address the GAC members' concerns, and here the GAC had proposed some common ground language because not always those concerns may be addressed by the applicant, and we had proposed a tweak in the language in the sense that the

applicant could potentially address the GAC members' concerns to the extent feasible. So that was another issue which drew our attention.

And finally, we have consideration of all the weight of GAC consensus advice which, if we recall, the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, whenever the GAC issued GAC consensus advice against the passing of an application, according to the Applicant Guidebook, this would create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application shouldn't be approved. So this language is considered very important by some GAC members, and this has been stressed in the different inputs we have been making. But the Working Group has considered that this language should be deleted.

So I have been trying to sum up the slides in the interest of time. If we go to the next slide, we see the GAC positions to date, which I have been summarizing. And in the subsequent slide, please... we see possible proposed suggested next steps for the GAC. So there could be -- it's the previous slide, please. Please go back. The last slide on early warnings and GAC consensus advice, please. Thank you. This is the right one. Okay. So the proposed next steps, this is a menu of what we could say or what we could communicate or advise the Board, be it in this meeting or in an inter-sessional input or probably also at ICANN 71. So we could insist on -- some GAC members could insist on this strong presumption language. We could reaffirm or position or our concerns to these provisions in recommendation 30.2 which try to [indiscernible] the GAC consensus advice after the Applicant Guidebook has been

published. We could reaffirm the compromised language as mentioned regarding recommendation 30.6, and regarding all the recommendations or implications of the text that emanate from the subsequent procedures Working Group that has to do with how the ICANN Board takes into account GAC consensus advice, maybe a dialogue within our Board GAC interactive group, BGIG, could make sense to clarify expectations and how we understand the provisions.

So I will take a look at the chat. I hope that we are sticking to the issue we are discussing. I see mentions from Nigel regarding to closed generics which I think we are taking into account. And I see that Benedetta has pasted the language we had proposed on recommendation 30.6. And I will check also the possible interventions, and --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt, I saw a hand up from the US, Susan. Were you seeking the floor? Okay. If not -- yes, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Manal, and Jorge. Just to note that under the first bullet point that some GAC members strongly support the retention, we would just like to add that other GAC members do believe that the text in the Applicant Guidebook must be consistent with the bylaws. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you so much, Susan, point taken. I think that is something to take into account, if anyone is going to propose language for the communique, be it communique language or advice language. Is there any other comment or question? I don't see any. I don't know if Luisa, do you want to chime in or whether we want to use the remaining eight minutes for discussing other issues?

I see a comment from India. the PDP's recommendation to remove the provision of the strong presumption language shouldn't be included as it could result in undermining GAC advice on sensitive issues. This is of course noted, India. As you realize, this is not a full consensus position in the GAC, in fact there are different opinions, so please also consider the comment made before by Susan if you would like to propose language for the communique.

And I see also the comment by Nigel Hickson -- as we have two Nigels in the GAC. I specify that the UK supports the language proposed by the GAC for recommendations 30.6 as it may not be possible always for an applicant to address a specific concern. Yes, indeed, that is why we had proposed it. And I think I see Kavouss' hand up, so I would pass the floor to Kavouss. Please proceed.

IRAN:

Yes. As I mentioned during the PDP, yes, as Susan mentioned, everything should be in compliance or consistent with the bylaws, but not paraphrasing bylaw, not adding something to the bylaw or interpreting the bylaw, should be a quotation, in italics and so on, so forth. So we do not agree that taking something, paraphrasing, adding words, adjectives, and verbs, so on, so forth, is consistent with bylaws. I have mentioned it three times during the working group, and I am among the first category that the [indistinct] presumption be removed [indiscernible] we don't agree with that. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss, we take note of that. I think there has been some progress in the final recommendations if we compare them with the draft final recommendations but feel of course there might be aspects that are still not streamlined with the bylaws. And I see Taylor Bentley from Canada mentioning that he doesn't believe that the presumption text is used in the bylaws. So it is the 2012 Applicant Guidebook that interprets or paraphrases the bylaws. And I can confirm that, at least in my national capacities, as I witnessed or was proud of the discussions that ended with the 2012 guidebook and that language, the strong presumption was a result of very long discussions between the Board, ICANN org, the community, and the GAC. So this is coming from that period.

Okay. I see there is some discussion ongoing on this. I wonder whether

there is any other colleague seeking the floor. I see [indiscernible] from Morocco with a question: Is there a specific period during which the GAC could provide an early warning advice? Yes, there is. This is provided for in the recommendations, and this would be I think detailed in the Applicant Guidebook that would be issued based on those recommendations. But I will read the rest of the question: That said, early warning advice require the establishment of discussions within the GAC in accordance with GAC principles which require a quorum and that this is only possible during meetings scheduled on the sidelines of ICANN meetings, for this purpose it is possible to bring the GAC outside of the ICANN meetings to arrive as an early consent or opinion.

In this regard, as Jeff mentions we have to distinguish, there is the instrument of the GAC early warning which might be broad during the specific phase for GAC early warning by an individual government or group of governments, so there is no requirement of having a GAC consensus on that, it is just one government or a group of governments raising concerns regarding an individual application. And the other instrument is the GAC consensus advice which at least in the 2012 round used to come afterwards during the process and where if the whole of the GAC agrees on specific advice regarding an application or group of application, of course it requires GAC consensus in the sense of our operating principles and the bylaws.

So I see there is some discussion on that, but we have come to the top of the hours. So I will benefit from the last seconds before I pass to

Manal to remind you all, GAC colleagues, that if you wish to see GAC consensus advice or GAC communicate language on these matters, you have to propose it. So please get together and come up with good language, we will all benefit from it, and I will pass the floor to Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, Luisa and everyone. Before concluding, let me also read Denmark in the chat. Denmark also is of the view that we should stick to the provision of the bylaws.

So thank you again for a very well-structured presentation and discussion, and many thanks to everyone for the engagement and active participation. We still have one more session on this very broad topic tomorrow. For now, it is time for a 30 minute break. please be back in the GAC room at 12:30 Cancun time, 1730 UTC, for two back to back sessions, 30 minutes on communicate predrafting review, and one hour for our meeting with the Board. Enjoy your breaks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]