ICANN | GAC

Governmental Advisory Committee

Istanbul, Türkiye, 18 November 2024

GAC Communiqué – Istanbul, Türkiye[1]

The Istanbul Communiqué was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting, during the ICANN81 Annual General Meeting, with some GAC participants in Istanbul, Türkiye, and others remotely. The GAC's discussions during this public meeting are reflected in the GAC Meeting Minutes and the transcripts of all sessions, available at https://gac.icann.org/meetings-records/. The Communiqué was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC Members and Observers to consider it before publication, bearing in mind the special circumstances of a hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication.

I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Istanbul, Türkiye, in a hybrid setting including remote participation, from 9 to 14 November 2024.

Sixty-nine (69) GAC Members and six (6) Observers attended the meeting.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN81 Annual General Meeting. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

---

[1] To access previous GAC Advice, whether on the same or other topics, past GAC communiqués are available at: https://gac.icann.org/

II. Inter-Constituency Activities and Community Engagement

Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed:
- Next Round of New gTLDs
- Policy Development Transparency, including the Draft ICANN Code of Ethics and GNSO Statements of Interest
- Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Domain Name Registration Data
- Global Digital Compact and WSIS+20
- Priorities of the Incoming CEO

Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed:
- WSIS+20: Reflections and Future Directions
- DNS Abuse: Addressing the Challenges

Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed:
- State of Cooperation between the GAC and GNSO Council
- ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on Statements of Interests and General Ethics Policy
- Registration Data issues, including Accuracy, Urgent Requests, and Privacy/Proxy Services
- New gTLD Program Next Round, including:
  - Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort/Private Resolution of Contention Sets
  - Applicant Support Program
- Latin Script Diacritics

The GAC expresses its appreciation to the outgoing GNSO Council liaison to the GAC, Jeff Neuman, and welcomes Sebastien Ducos in this role.

Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH) of the GNSO

The GAC met with representatives of the CPH and discussed:
- Registration Data Accuracy
- New gTLD Program Next Round
- ICANN's Community Participant Code of Conduct on SOIs and General Ethics Policy

Meeting with the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

The GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed:
- Policy and procedural gaps in IANA policies pertaining to ccTLDs
- WSIS+20: securing ICANN's multi-stakeholder model
- DNS Abuse Standing Committee Survey results

Meeting with the Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

The GAC met with members of the ASO and discussed:
- The Internet Coordination Policy ICP-2 Criteria for Establishment of New Regional Internet Registries

Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed:
- SSAC's Five Steady-State Topics
- DNS Abuse and Artificial Intelligence
- Blockchain and the DNS
- SSAC and the GAC

Meeting with the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC)

The GAC met with the RSSAC Leadership and discussed:
- Introduction to the RSSAC
- The DNS Root Server System

Cross Community Discussions

GAC Members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN81, including *Shifting Paradigms: Multistakeholderism, Geopolitics, and Emerging Internet Infrastructure*s which explored the challenges and opportunities presented by emerging technologies and their implications for the multistakeholder approach in terms of its adaptability, flexibility, and evolution.

III. Internal Matters

1. GAC Membership

There are currently 183 GAC Member States and Territories and 39 Observer Organizations.

2. GAC Elections

The GAC elected as Vice-Chairs for the term starting after ICANN82 (March 2025) and ending at the close of ICANN85 (March 2026):

Ian Sheldon (Australia)
Thiago Dal-Toe (Colombia)
Marco Hogewoning (Netherlands)
Christine Arida (Egypt)
Jorge Cancio (Switzerland)

3. GAC Working Groups

- **GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)**

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data.

In the week prior to ICANN81, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest. During ICANN81, the PSWG invited INTERPOL, Europol, FBI and Contracted Parties' representatives to discuss potential means of law enforcement identity authentication with ICANN technical staff.

The PSWG participated in briefing the GAC during the session on WHOIS and Data Protection Policy developments, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work: engagement on "Urgent Requests" for registration data; participation in the Standing Committee tasked with reviewing data generated by the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), including input to improve the utility and awareness of the RDRS, and participation in the Privacy/Proxy Accreditation Issues Implementation Review Team, including highlighting the relevance of this work to the RDRS and successor systems.

The PSWG appreciated the perspectives provided by Türkiye's .TR ccTLD during the GAC briefing session on DNS Abuse, which highlighted regional experiences in the shared global fight against DNS abuse.

- **GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group (GOPE WG)**

The GOPE WG Co-Chairs updated the GAC on recent activities carried out by the Working Group. The GOPE WG continues its revision of the GAC Operating Principles while receiving a proposal presented from the GAC Chair to revise the tenure of leadership positions. The GAC conducted a preliminary discussion of this proposal at ICANN81, and GAC members are invited to participate in further full GAC discussions. The Working Group will resume its meetings post ICANN81 and continue its discussion on matters in relation to updating the GAC Operating Principles.

4. GAC Strategic Planning

Following the endorsement of the GAC's Strategic Plan 2024-2028 and Annual Plan 2024/2025[2], GAC Leadership has worked to facilitate the delivery of the expected outcomes related to each of the 9 GAC Strategic Objectives, in coordination with relevant GAC Topic Leads, Working Group Chairs and interested GAC Members. GAC Members are invited to consider the progress report shared during ICANN81 and to engage further in areas of interest on the implementation of the Annual Plan.

5. GAC Capacity Development

The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) held three (3) capacity development sessions at ICANN81 which focused on topics of interest to GAC members.

These sessions included discussions on the new gTLD Program and opportunities for the Middle East region; updates to the Africa region on Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2) issues and the recent Africa Internet Summit; and language breakouts on how these topics could be linked to GAC Strategic Objectives 2 (Effectiveness of the GAC) and 3 (Future Rounds of New gTLDs).

Based on the feedback received at ICANN81, the USRWG will assess the framework and substance of the capacity building approach for future ICANN Meetings, including the potential participation of SSAC Members to cover topics of interest to the GAC such as the impact of emerging technologies on DNS Abuse and the DNS in general.

6. Continuous Improvement Program Framework

GAC members welcomed a status update from the GAC representatives participating in the work of the Continuous Improvement Program Community Coordination Group (CIP-CCG). GAC members were invited to consider providing inputs as part of the ongoing Public Comment proceeding for the Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) Framework, a key output of the CIP-CCG.

---

[2] https://gac.icann.org/activity/gac-strategic-planning

1. Next Round of New gTLDs

a. Applicant Support Program: Outreach, Engagement and Communications

The GAC welcomes ICANN org's outreach, engagement and communications in under-represented and underserved regions relating to the Applicant Support Program (ASP) with activities undertaken in "target countries". With a view to having effective targeting and ensuring that the ASP achieves the key objective of facilitating global diversification of the new gTLD application program, the GAC recommends that ICANN org consults and engages fully with GAC members to:

1. Identify target countries, in keeping with the regional approach for selection in the next phase of the outreach, engagement and communications activities, which are expected to commence in January 2025;
2. Obtain support and guidance on how best to navigate and engage within the selected countries including the public sector.

Additionally, the GAC welcomes the recent announcement that the ASP applicant readiness materials will be published in the six UN languages, and strongly recommends that all materials developed for the ASP be translated and published into the working languages of the GAC (six UN languages plus Portuguese).

The GAC welcomes the invitation extended by ICANN org to interested GAC Members to provide additional assistance on the awareness and promotion of the ASP in the relevant regions or jurisdictions.

b. Applicant Support Program: Application and Evaluation Fees

The GAC takes note of the announcement[3] of the application and evaluation fee for the next round of new gTLD applications expected to be USD $227,000 subject to formal approval by the ICANN Board upon the adoption of the Applicant Guidebook.

The GAC further notes that the maximum fee waiver percentage (85%) will result in an approximate application fee of USD $34,050 for ASP supported applicants. Consistent with previous GAC Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and the ICANN77 Washington D.C. Communiqué urging the reduction or waiving of fees to the maximum extent possible, this figure may still be too prohibitive for many prospective applicants from underserved regions, particularly when combined with additional costs and fees. Accordingly, this may constitute a major challenge for applicants from these regions, thereby threatening the ASP's objective of facilitating global diversification and inclusion within the new gTLD Program.

To mitigate this, the GAC urges ICANN org to:

---

[3] ICANN Sets Expected Evaluation Fee for New gTLD Applications in the Next Round (25 September 2024)

1. Build awareness of the new gTLD Program and the ASP among traditional financial institutions and the investment community in all targeted countries.
2. Engage with development financing agencies (e.g. the World Bank and Regional Development Banks), donor/grant funding organizations, and similar entities, to promote awareness of the benefits of the New gTLD Program.
3. Facilitate "matchmaking" between financing or funding entities and potential applicants with a view to providing financial assistance for ASP supported applicants.

c. Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort/Private Resolution of Contention Sets

The GAC greatly appreciates the constructive dialogue with the Board following the Advice issued on this topic in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué and ICANN77 Washington D.C.Communiqué, and especially the community dialogue held by the Board at the request of the GAC since the Kigali Meeting.

The GAC further appreciates the decision to prohibit the private resolution of contention sets, including private auctions. As envisioned in the GAC Chair letter to the ICANN Board[4], the GAC has held discussions at ICANN81 on the proposed path forward set forth by the ICANN Board[5].

The GAC generally welcomes the Board's proposal including to provide applicants with an opportunity to apply for an alternative string in case of string contention, and intends to submit a formal communication to the Board to this effect. The GAC will seek further dialogue with and guidance from ICANN org as it relates to implementation details of this proposal.

d. Latin Script Diacritics

The GAC engaged in discussions regarding the Policy Development Process (PDP) on Latin Diacritics during the GAC/GNSO bilateral meeting. The GAC notes the recent GNSO decision to initiate the Latin Diacritics PDP. The GAC expresses its support for this initiative, particularly in light of the strong community response during the public comment period, which garnered wide support favoring the initiation of this PDP. The GAC looks forward to the progress of this significant initiative as it seeks to foster a more inclusive and multilingual Internet.

2. General Ethics Policy and Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest

The GAC has addressed the matter of transparency and Statements of Interest (SOI) in prior Communiqués and correspondence, notably in its ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué, and recalls that ICANN Bylaws require ICANN and its constituent bodies to "operate to the maximum extent

---

[4] GAC Response to Board-GAC Consultation regarding ICANN77 GAC Advice Item 4.a.i (28 October 2024)

[5] ICANN Board Follow-up on 3 September 2024 Board-GAC Consultation regarding ICANN77 GAC Advice Item 4.a (3 October 2024)

feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness."

The GAC firmly supports transparency within ICANN, and considers it inconsistent with the Bylaws if ICANN participants are permitted to decline disclosing who they represent. Therefore, the GAC welcomes the publication of the proposed draft ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest, and the approach to a General Ethics Policy that includes this Code.

The GAC intends to continue reviewing the proposal, and engaging with the community on the matter, and looks forward to making a submission under the public comment process.

3. DNS Abuse

The GAC welcomes the constructive discussions on the topic of DNS Abuse with different ICANN communities at ICANN81. In particular, the GAC appreciates: a) the updates regarding the work carried out by SSAC on the impact of Artificial Intelligence on DNS Abuse, b) the invitation from ALAC for discussions on possible further policy work regarding DNS Abuse, including based on the conclusions of the recently released INFERMAL report[6], and c) the information on the work carried out by the ccNSO through their DNS Abuse Standing Committee survey. The GAC is interested in pursuing these conversations further.

The GAC values the preliminary feedback received from ICANN Compliance and various parts of the ICANN community (Registries, Registrars and SSAC) on the impact of the DNS Abuse contract amendments in their first six months of implementation (April-October 2024). In particular, the GAC notes that the volume of abuse reports has increased in this period compared to the same period before the amendments entered into force, possibly due to increased filing by those who submit abuse reports. The GAC also notes ICANN Compliance is keeping track of data regarding mitigation and disruption actions taken as results of DNS Abuse reports and welcomes ICANN Compliance's actions to enforce the contractual amendments. The GAC highlights the importance of regular reporting from ICANN Compliance, including on statistics about the ratio between the number of reports and actions undertaken, and more specific information about the types of disruption or mitigation actions taken. The GAC would also welcome information about practices stemming from the interpretation of the Advisory guidance[7], for example in relation to "actionable evidence."
The GAC intends to continue reviewing measurements and analysis of the effectiveness of the DNS Abuse amendments.

The GAC welcomes the shared understanding, as expressed by ICANN org and other parts of the ICANN community, that the contract amendments are a significant first step when it comes to initiatives aimed at addressing DNS Abuse. The GAC looks forward to further engaging with the community to identify priorities which could be considered for further policy and other types of work to address DNS Abuse. The GAC recalls some topics previously identified (such as guidance on

---

[6] https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/inferential-analysis-maliciously-registered-domains-08nov24-en.pdf
[7] https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/advisory-compliance-dns-abuse-obligations-raa-ra-2024-02-05-en

key terms or capacity building to disseminate best practices), as well as discussions on possible targeted, narrowly scoped PDPs to further address DNS Abuse. The GAC also looks forward to reviewing and analysing further evidence and data on DNS Abuse provided by ICANN org, particularly through the INFERMAL report and the Domain Metrica project[8] from the ICANN Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), and data and analysis from appropriate third parties.

Finally, the GAC notes its interest in maintaining awareness not only of the efforts within the ICANN community related to addressing DNS Abuse, but also of the efforts within the broader ecosystem to address abusive activities.

4. Domain Name Registration Data

a. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)

The GAC notes with interest the completion of the first year of the two-year RDRS pilot period and looks forward to the second year of the pilot. The GAC has observed the value of the RDRS and believes it should continue. The GAC remains supportive of efforts by ICANN and the RDRS Standing Committee to promote awareness and usage of the RDRS. In particular, the GAC supports efforts to identify and implement improvements to the RDRS interface to boost users' ability to navigate and submit requests via the RDRS, and regularly provide usage metrics that will help inform work toward an eventual Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD). The GAC reiterates its encouragement to include information about the RDRS and a link to it within the WHOIS lookup/Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) with a view to provide timely and relevant information to increase its visibility. The GAC will continue its engagement with the RDRS Standing Committee to support the Standing Committee's work toward constructive outcomes.

In its bilateral meeting with the ccNSO at ICANN81, the GAC asked if any ccTLD managers might be interested in exploring potential voluntary participation in the RDRS. The ccNSO expressed certain concerns regarding the technical feasibility of such participation and the challenges posed by diverse national policies and regulations that may affect ccTLD operators. The GAC takes note of these concerns. However, given significant interest from requestors in having an ability to submit requests to ccTLDs, the GAC would welcome further discussion and input, on possible interest from ccTLD managers in RDRS participation on a voluntary basis, and how any related challenges might be overcome.

b. Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation

The GAC appreciates the efforts of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT) to explore whether and if so how the original PPSAI recommendations may still be implemented, in whole or in part. The GAC continues to encourage registrars and requesters to participate in the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and reiterates its encouragement for registrars using an affiliated proxy service provider to consider making disclosure decisions in response to RDRS requests for domain name registration data on

---

[8] https://www.icann.org/octo-ssr/metrica-en

behalf of their affiliated proxy service provider, where applicable. These steps will enhance the ability of the RDRS to generate useful data to inform next steps, including regarding Privacy and Proxy services.

c. Accuracy of Domain Name Registration Data

The GAC remains interested in providing input on work at ICANN related to the accuracy of domain name registration data. The GAC welcomes the shared acknowledgment of the importance of accuracy as expressed during its bilateral meetings with the GNSO Council and the Contracted Parties House during ICANN81. Especially, the GAC appreciates efforts from the Contracted Parties to keep the registration data of their domain names under management accurate, including by accepting reports on inaccuracy and suspending domains with inaccurate registration data or taking other appropriate actions, and further encourages Contracted Parties to increase these efforts. In this light, the GAC appreciates continued engagement with relevant stakeholders on this topic, including to inform GAC discussions on this issue and possible paths forward.

The GAC stresses the importance of resuming work on accuracy as soon as possible, particularly in light of the GNSO's recent decision to further extend a pause on the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team. The GAC also notes that during its bilateral meeting with the GNSO Council, the Council stated it will request input from community members, including the GAC, on questions related to domain name registration data accuracy, to inform possible ways forward. The GAC looks forward to considering these questions and to potentially providing a response. The GAC expects that, as soon as feedback is collected on the GNSO's questions, the community will resume efforts towards scoping policy work on accuracy of domain name registration data.

In addition, the GAC welcomes ICANN's proposed Data Processing Specification (DPS) for gTLD Registries and Accredited Registrars and looks forward to receiving the final text once the feedback from the public consultation period is processed[9]. The GAC also takes note of ICANN's remark that the DPS does not require Contracted Parties to provide ICANN with access to domain name registration data beyond the terms of the Registry Agreement (RA) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)[10] and, hence, different alternatives need to be explored.

d. Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data

The GAC reiterates that the issue of Urgent Requests for domain name registration data remains a high priority. The GAC expects that the process to address this issue will be prompt and effective. The GAC appreciates the constructive discussion with the ICANN Board at ICANN81 and that while action is still pending on the GAC's Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and the Follow-Up on Previous Advice in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué, the Board has provided preliminary feedback on certain outstanding issues. In particular, the GAC would welcome further confirmation on the Board's tentative support for the GAC proposal to pursue two tracks of work in parallel: one on determining the appropriate response time to authenticated Urgent Requests, and another in

---

[9] See "Section 4: Next Steps" in ICANN's Public Comment Summary Report (14 October 2024)

[10] See ICANN's Public Comment Summary Report (14 October 2024) and ICANN Board Comments on the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué (17 June 2024)

which community members work together with the GAC and the Public Safety Working Group to develop a scalable authentication process for Urgent Requests[11].

The GAC also expresses satisfaction with the Board's tentative feedback that a Policy Development Process (PDP) will not be needed and that the Board will explore efficient ways to move forward together with the GNSO Council. The GAC looks forward to having further trilateral discussions soon after ICANN81 to work out the details.

The GAC appreciates the support expressed at ICANN81 by the ICANN Board and ICANN org technical staff for collaboration with the PSWG to discuss means of law enforcement identity authentication, which could pave the way to address broader challenges with authenticating requestors seeking access to non-public domain name registration data. The work within the PSWG on authentication solutions is off to a good start and the GAC would greatly appreciate the continued support and collaboration of ICANN technical staff, and input from other appropriate stakeholders, possibly via creation of a study group or a similar expert group dedicated to the issue.

5. Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2)

The GAC was updated on the Number Resource Organization (NRO) and Address Supporting Organization (ASO) process to update the Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2) and the publication of a set of proposed principles that should inform the drafting of this update.

GAC members are encouraged to review the proposed principles and develop any possible feedback, which may be submitted either through ICANN's Public Comment process or through the NRO website, where the same questionnaire is available. The African GAC members agreed to submit a collective input to the public comment process and also to work with other regional organizations within the ecosystem to fast track the process.

The GAC also noted with concern the absence of African representatives on the ASO Address Council (AC). In that respect, the GAC encourages the African community to explore all avenues to quickly appoint community members to the vacant African seats of the ASO AC.

The GAC welcomes the ICP-2 update process as a means to strengthen the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and looks forward to an outcome that supports the important role of the Regional Internet Registries in upholding a single, global Internet.

---

[11] See GAC Follow-Up on Urgent Requests - GAC Response to Board Clarifying Question and Additional Considerations (15 October 2024), where the GAC noted that "*the re-commencement of Urgent Request policy work is not dependent upon the completion of authentication mechanisms. In the interest of moving forward in an expeditious manner, in parallel with the PSWG's work on authentication mechanisms, Urgent Request policy discussions can assume that urgent requests received by registrars have been authenticated, but the form of that authentication is not a prerequisite for such discussions*".

V. Next Meeting

The GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN82 Community Forum in Seattle, United States, on 8-13 March 2025.

EN

DAN GLUCK: Hello and welcome to the GAC joint meeting with the ICANN Board on Tuesday, the 12th of November at 10:15 UTC. My name is Dan Gluck from the ICANN Policy Development GAC Support Team. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read if submitted in the chat pod.

Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. Please state your name and the language you will speak if other than English and remember to speak at a reasonable pace. As a kind reminder, cables with microphones are reserved for GAC members and observers and for this session invited guests from the ICANN Board.

All right, I will now hand the floor over to Nico Caballero, GAC Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch and the fantastic Turkish food and Turkish coffee and tea and so on. Let me welcome the Board. We have the pleasure of having Sally Costerton, ICANN CEO, Tripti Sinha, Chair of the Board. We have Becky

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.

Burr, Danko, Alan, Edmon, and my distinguished vice chair, Nigel Hickson, from the UK, as well as Zeina Bou Harb from Lebanon.

Welcome, everyone. This session will be running for 75 minutes. That is still 2:30 PM. And we have some interesting reviews and as well as GAC topics and questions that were shared in advance of the meeting with the Board. But basically, we have four main issues, four main topics to discuss today. The next round of gTLDs, as you may have guessed at this point.

Some issues regarding Policy Development Transparency, like the ICANN Code of Ethics and SOIs. And we'll have a deep dive in that regard very soon. And then we'll also discuss urgent requests for disclosure of domain name registration. And finally, some overviews about global discussions taking place at the time regarding the GDC and WSIS+20.

So, without further ado, let me welcome again the Board. At this point, I will hand the floor to Tripti Sinha, Chair of the Board. Over to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Nico. And on behalf of the Board, let me reciprocate our appreciation for this joint meeting. We've had some very good meetings of note. Our intersessional meetings in the last couple of months have yielded some very good solutions and we appreciate the back and forth. And so, we're looking forward to this discussion. Thank you for your questions. And I'm going to turn it right back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:	Absolutely, thank you so much. If we can move on to the next slide, please. So, we have topic number one. I'll very quickly read what the whole thing is about. The GAC appreciates the Board and ICANN staff's responsiveness to recent GAC Advice regarding implementation of the ASP. And GAC members, we basically intend to share our reactions with the Board to presentations earlier in the week regarding progress and plans to initiate the ASP. And so, at this point, let me open the floor for discussions. Comments, questions, anything you would like to mention at this point from the floor or online? Well, we're talking about the ASP, the Applicant Support Program. Comments, questions, thoughts? And I have the UPU.
TRACY HACKSHAW:	Please go ahead. Thank you, Nico, Tracy, Hackshaw, UPU. So, I'd just like to reiterate our appreciation for the discussions we had intersessionally with the Board on resolving, I believe resolving the issues we had regarding ICANN80 advice and the board's proposals, which we believe were a good compromise in dealing with that. And I think we are on a good path forward with regards to the ASP and trying to ensure that we have regular reporting, monthly reporting as we agreed with what's possible, course corrections, if there's anything that comes up in that reporting, as well as the Gates of 20 applications, at which point we will take a look again at whether or not you would have to any further work on the diversity aspects of this.

Another issue that I think we raised and has come up a bit since this discussion is the fee, the 227K. And one thing that we did want to note |

is that as you would recall from the ICANN80, ICANN79, ICANN77 advice, the gap did indicate that they would have liked to see the application fees for the ASP reduced to the greatest extent possible.

We do know that we have settled on, based on GGP, the guidance there, 75 to 85%. However, having noted the new fee of 227k, we believe that the 34,000, which is the approximate maximum fee that you would pay on the 85% level if you get the maximum waiver is quite high for several of the underserved regions that we are speaking to in terms of how they get financing and so on. So, what we are proposing, or would like to propose is that, and I had a discussion with Org on this earlier, if there's a way that ICANN could sort of provide awareness to when they go out into communications to not just the applicants, but also the financing institutions in those countries and potential funding agencies.

So, include them in your targets so they understand what this program is all about, what the DNS industry is all about. So, when the applicants approach for financing for the 34K or more, that it will be something that will be known to these institutions. So, perhaps some sort of material that will be able to be shared with the banks and credit unions and funding agencies, et cetera, in those underserved regions countries. So, that's a little bit of a nuance of what we would like to suggest going forward. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, UPU. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON:	Thank you very much, Tracy, UPU. Yes, excellent suggestion. Thank you very much for your comments, first of all, and thank you very much to the whole GAC from behalf of my staff team for your tremendous partnership in this. It's been remarkable and it's incredibly valued. There will be monthly reporting that will be shared with the IRT. You will be able to see it. And I know some of you were at the meeting with my team earlier this week when you saw it. So, I wanted everybody to be aware of that.

To this question specifically, it is something that's on our radar. This is, I'm talking about making funding agencies aware of this round and what potential applicants might, so they're not coming in cold is what you're saying, isn't it? Yes. So, for example, development banks are on this. One of the things that we need to work through with you and anybody in this position in the GAC that wants to work with this, hopefully we're already talking to you and also with the At-Large group.

When we're in specific target countries and regions, making sure we've got the right development bank contacts on our outreach database so that we're talking directly to the right people, recognizing that some of the more high-profile global funding agencies are often not in the relevant countries where those applicants might live. So, we need to be smart about, not that we shouldn't talk to them as part of the global outreach campaign, but we shouldn't assume that just because we have, that somehow, we've ticked that box. Thank you for the question and comment.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Sally. I have Alan Barrett next.

ALAN BARRETT: Yeah, thank you. This is Alan Barrett. I think Sally said a lot of what I was going to cover, but yeah, let me emphasize that the Board very much wants to find or support deserving applicants from all over the world. And to that end, the Org has developed a communications plan, which has been shared with the GAC.

They will have outreach in specific countries and collaborate with GAC members in those countries to identify the appropriate fora or organizations to target in the countries. And the materials related to the Applicant Support Program, I think have already been translated into a few languages. And the org is interested in collaborating with anybody in countries that use languages that are not yet supported to allow the materials to be translated into even more languages, as time and capacity allows.

We're also aware that the funding is limited. And if there are too many applicants, then the Board has committed to looking for additional funding. We can't sign a blank check. We can't say that regardless of how many applicants we'll be able to support them all because we don't know how many there might be, but we have committed to looking for additional funding if that becomes necessary. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Alan. Any further comments or questions from the GAC at this point regarding the ASP program? Please go ahead.

VINCENT MUSEMINALI: Thank you very much, Chair. This is a Vincent Museminali from Rwanda for Liquid. So, I want to ask some questions related to Applicant Support Program. We're told that it is intended to make applying for a new gTLD or operating registry more accessible to applicants who would be otherwise unable to access due to financial resource concern. The ASP is for gTLD applicant seeking financial and non-financial support.

If I go away, it has been said that the financial support is for NGOs, MSMEs, and indigenous categories. So, I'd like to inquire if ICANN can think about financial support for registries in these developed countries to seek for financial support to apply for generic top-level domain because some government and organization run their own ccTLDs and may wish to run the new generic top-level domain. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Rwanda.

ALAN BARRETT: Sure. Thank you very much for those comments. I think the Applicant Support Program is intended specifically to address those applicants that you're talking about, the countries which already have their own ccTLDs and who may be interested in expanding to new gTLDs or possibly using IDNs.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thanks. Thank you, Alan. Thoughts, questions, comments regarding the ASP? If not, we'll move on to the next subtopic, which is Contention Sets. So, as you can read on the screen, throughout the meeting week, the GAC will seek to absorb ICANN81 discussions and reactions to the board's October follow-up regarding the effort to achieve a mutually acceptable solution as per the ICANN bylaws to the resolution of contention sets and then discuss GAC member thoughts with the Board. But at this point, again, let me open the floor for comments, questions, or for a discussion. Any comments or questions for the Board in this regard? And I have Switzerland and the UK. Switzerland, you go first.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. I guess Nigel can then recap the discussion as topic leader as well. So, first of all, on this question, I wanted to comment the process we have been having. I think the Board has been quite responsive to our Washington and then to our Kigali consensus advice on the matter. I'm here, Becky. So, I think the reaction of launching the community consultations, as we asked you for in the Kigali communiqué, is really a way of showing your goodwill and your good faith in this discussion.

I appreciate that personally quite a lot. I think we understand that time is of the essence because this is really an issue that has to be clarified before we launch the next round and have the AGB ready, et cetera. So, as to the substance, I think we had some conversations with the GNSO council. We had conversations also internally in the GAC. We of course

absolutely agree with the prohibition of private resolutions, including private auctions. That is very welcome.

Maybe we are still looking into the use of alternate strings, replacement strings, as ICANN Org is calling them in their presentations. But it seems to be a useful instrument at least and, of course, on ICANN auctions of last resort. We also had a good conversation yesterday with the GNSO council, understanding that after all, this is part of their recommendation and having or taking into account that apparently there's no other better solution under Californian law.

I at least personally would defer to your judgment. After all, it's your fiduciary duty to do the best in the global public interest. But yeah, I think these are the comments I wanted to share with you, but maybe Nigel can add to that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Switzerland. So, if I understand correct, thank you for the comments, right? But you don't have a specific question to the Board at this point, right? Okay, thank you. I have the UK next.

HICKSON NIGEL: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon to all here physically anyway. And it's a pleasure to be able to discuss these issues with the Board as has been mentioned. We were talking earlier in the week about what has gone on since Kigali. And we mentioned the extensive dialogue that has taken place in relation to bylaws consultations, in relation to the GAC Advice on ASP and contention sets.

So, we thought we'd have lots more advice this time because we had such fun. That was a joke, Becky, really. No, I mean, sincerely, it was a very productive dialogue. And as my distinguished colleague from the UPU has said, the way forward on applicant support program is very encouraging. We had excellent discussions with the ICANN Org earlier this week, and there's work to do. We all know that, but we see a way forward.

On this particular issue of contention sets, thank you very much for the dialogue in the bylaws' consultation on this. As our colleague from Switzerland, Jorge, of course, has already mentioned, the resolution regarding private auctions and private ways of going forward was very welcoming. We see the resort to auctions of last resort as a consequence of that. And the alternative string way forward is something that we have discussed.

Hopefully, well, we will be responding to the Board and the consultation that you launched on the way forward on Contention Sets. We also note that having an alternative string may well help smaller enterprises and Non-Commercial Enterprises, one of the issues of our previous concern. So, that's encouraging.

I had one other point, but I can't think of it, but that's enough. So, I had no question either. Well, yeah, sorry. The question was really in your interactions with the community this week, it'd be good to know what other groups and bodies have been reacting to your most constructive proposals. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

Okay, thank you. This is Alan Barrett. I'll try to respond to that. We have, I think, had a very constructive dialogue between the Board and the GAC over the past few months regarding resolution of contention sets. And as the GAC recommended, private resolution will not be allowed. We do hope that the option of applicants providing an alternative string or a second choice in case their first string is in contention will have the result of reducing the number of contention sets.

And we think that's positive. We plan to, that auctions, what used to be called auctions of large resorts, and I think we're still calling them that, will use the ascending clock second price method, the same as was done in the 2012 round. And yeah, I think we've had constructive dialogue and we hope that the Board will soon receive confirmation from the GAC that that dialogue has indeed arrived at a mutually acceptable compromise. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Alan. Still on the point of contention sets, I have the European Commission and then Chinese Taipei. Please go ahead.

MARTINA BARBERO:

Thank you very much, Chair. This is Martina Barbero, European Commission for the Records. And I'll also start by appreciating the very constructive dialogue. I think it was very helpful to have these exchanges over summer. I think our question, which is also something

we put to ICANN Org yesterday, because we have been thinking about this alternate string, but what is a bit unclear to us, and I know you've put a lot of thoughts in that, because the applications are linked to one string with one business plan, I guess that for alternate string, they would have expected to have a separate or different business plan for the alternate string. But I don't know exactly if you have, and we got feedback from ICANN Org that this will be possible through the procedure for applying to put different input according to the string.

We were just wondering if you had further consideration in terms of, do you think that the applicants will go for two business plans? Do you think they will be more likely to have one string with a business plan that is also partially adoptable to the second alternate string? Just trying to understand a bit, how do you see this question? We might be asked by applicants how to proceed in this respect. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. So, we've intentionally left this as open as possible. Applicants could provide two entirely distinct and unrelated strings, which may or may not require different business plans, or they could apply for alternative strings for the same business plan. It really, I think is going to vary from applicant to applicant. I personally expect that it's more likely to be a single business plan and alternate strings that fit, but that is just my wild guess. But what we've tried to do is impose as few constraints as possible so that we provide as much flexibility and so that the alternative string option can provide as much flexibility as possible.

It is interesting. Once we came up with this concept of the alternative string, we began to identify other issues that are partially addressed through it. So, we're quite sure that this is going to provide some really interesting options and alternatives for applicants.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that, Becky. I have Chinese Taipei next.

KEN-YING TSENG: Thank you, Chair. My question is about the term private resolution. We have been seeing the letter saying that the first condition is, there will be no private resolution when there is any string contention. I just want to get more clarity and understanding on the scope of the so-called private resolution. For example, if the two parties, they can reach a settlement arrangement and the one party can withdraw the application and allowing the second party to obtain the registration, would that be allowable or not? That's my question. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT: Yes, thank you. This is Alan Barrett again. In the scenario that you postulate, I think that would be classified as private resolution. And the plan is to prohibit communication between the parties. So, they would not be allowed to discuss such things. And they would, therefore, being unable to discuss, they'd be unable to reach a settlement where one withdraws and the other one remains. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Yes, just to add to that, when we looked at what happened in the private auctions, which I think we all agreed was not desirable and something that should be prevented this year, we did reach out to experts to get advice on this. And we got very strong advice from the experts that if you actually wanted to avoid private financial auctions and the use of these arrangements, sorry, there's a cat up here, that the post-application joint venture could be easily used to disguise what would otherwise be a private auction.

So, we looked at lots of alternatives, lots of ways to control things so that the joint ventures that were produced as a result, because the advice that we originally got from the community was that we should allow post-application joint ventures. But we found that we had no way of actually enforcing that we would have lots of disputes about whether the joint venture was bona fide, whether it was just a sham for an auction or a payout. And so, we ultimately decided that that was not a good option.

The alternate string is intended to address that in part so that in fact, if you get applications that would otherwise be in contention, both of the parties can get a gTLD and move forward and proceed and nobody gets knocked out. So, the goal is to actually allow both parties to move forward, one with an alternate string.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Becky, for the explanation. Please don't be scared by the cat. That's the official GAC's pet. His name is Tom. So, don't worry about that. I don't see any other hand up regarding a

Contention Set. So, for the sake of time, let's move on to the next topic, which is topic number two. This is SOI Statements of Interest. And in general, the ICANN Code of Ethics, as you all know, this continues to be an important priority area for governments in ICANN. And we welcome the release of the draft Code of Ethics.

We appreciate the timely reaction of ICANN Org to develop the current proposal. We're studying the draft carefully and we hope that this matter can be resolved quickly. I'm not going to read the whole thing. You can see it on the screen. So, the questions are basically, the first one is we are interested in Board member reactions to the ICANN Org draft document currently out for Public Comment. That's the first. And I'll stop here in order to see if we have any reaction. Is that an old hand, Chinese Taipei? Are you requesting the floor right now? Oh, okay, okay. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. So, Tripti, please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, first, thank you for the question. And as you know, transparency is very important to the Board and we appreciate the GAC's continued interest in the topic. So, in terms of our reaction, the board's reaction, we are supportive of the draft code of conduct that's out for Public Comment at the moment. And as of November, the 7th, we heard three submissions have come in. And by the way, all these submissions are in support of the draft.

In terms of next steps, after ICANN81, ICANN Org will coordinate all the public comments that have come in and they will also put together a community-based panel so that there could be a discussion in the

community with regard to the draft proposal as well as the comments that have come in. And then the Board will look at that and adjust it accordingly and look to see when we would ratify this and put this.

Our plan right now is to implement it in the first quarter of 2025. And so, that's where we are. Those are our anticipated next steps. And back to you, Nico. And my colleague, Chris, would you like to comment further on this?

CHRIS CHAPMAN: Thank you, Chair. Simply to add that the need for the Board to set a community-wide expectation on statements of interest is entirely appropriate. And it's entirely consistent with what the Board is doing in other elements of ethics, whether it's conflicts of interest in the Board, transparency, you name it.

I think there is a new found intent, desire, recognition by the Board that things that have been drifting need to be addressed. Having said that, ICANN can't of itself enforce these statements of interest engagements. It is a collective responsibility of all the ICANN community. And we would encourage the relevant community to be proactive and positive in that regard. And that when it bubbles up to Board level as well, you will find a reaffirmation of these new principles. I just wanted to in effect, add to and double down on our intent.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Chris and Tripti. I don't think I need to read the second question because they can have already answered

them, unless my distinguished GAC colleagues have a different kind of question. But at this point, let me open the floor again for comments, questions, or any thoughts you would like to share with the Board at this point. And I have Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. Yes, I guess it comes as no surprise that I take the floor because it's a matter that has interested us quite a lot in the last meetings. So, maybe, again, as a bit of a broken record, but thanks again. I think the Board has been very responsive, very timely in its reaction, especially to the Kigali communiqué. And we are looking into the code, into the text.

We are also listening to the community, I think both in meetings, as yesterday with the GNSO Council, as of course in the corridors with the coffee time to see. And at least personally, I see that the reactions are very positive, very supportive. So, that's a very good sign. I think that we are still looking into the diverse reactions before we take a complete position. And as far as I'm aware, there's a communiqué language in the making that will probably go in this direction. So, just wanted to share that with you and to thank you again for the timeliness and the responsiveness and also for the clarity, if I may, of the text, because it avoids too much icon-ese or lawyer-ish language, which we all sometimes tend to abuse. So, thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Switzerland. Any reaction on behalf of the Board or we can move on? It's up to you. It's up to you.

TRIPTI SINHA: No, thank you very much for your words of support. And we look forward to getting more public comments and moving this forward. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So, seeing no other hand in the room or online, let's move on to the next topic, which is urgent requests. And just to give a quick background, the GAC notes that since March 2024, the ICANN Board has deferred action on the GAC's Advice in the San Juan communiqué to act expeditiously to establish a clear process in a timeline for the delivery of a policy and urgent requests. And I'll stop there and I'll go straight to the question.

So, the first question is that, the GAC appreciates the recent, for November 2024, trilateral call on this topic between GAC members, the Board and the GNSO council. Any comment or question regarding that call or anything you would like to share at this point with the Board? Let me open the floor at this point. Okay. I see no comments, so I'll go right to the next one. Considering that the Board has deferred action on the GAC's Advice in the San Juan communiqué and follow up to the advice in the Kigali communiqué to act again expeditiously and so on and so forth, when can the GAC expect to receive feedback from the Board on

the GAC Advice and the GAC's latest proposal? That's a question for the Board.

BECKY BURR:

So, thank you for the question and thank you for participating in the trilateral call. We also found it to be very useful and we have been talking with members of the community and the GNSO council in particular about the ways forward with respect to policy development. At this point, I can't give you an exact timeline, but I can tell you that we have been socializing the idea of having a couple more trilateral calls to make sure we've nailed down all of the questions that need to get addressed in that.

We've also been talking with the GNSO council about what the proper vehicle for policy development would be. We actually tentatively believe that we can think of this as a continuation of the EPDP phase 1 Policy Development so that we wouldn't have to necessarily open up a whole new policy process to address it. We're interested in the work that the PSWG is doing on the authentication issues and I understand that there was a useful meeting on that and there's progress being made on that.

So, to the extent we can support that work. We want to make ourselves available to do that. So, I think we need to nail down a couple more issues before we go into the actual policy development and we will probably speak with you more about that to gauge your interest and willingness to participate in a couple more trilateral discussions to get there as quickly as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Becky. The floor is open for questions or comments. In the meantime, can I ask you, roughly speaking, are we talking about a three-year, six-month, two-year PDP process? Roughly speaking, can you give us, in your opinion, how long more or less it would take?

BECKY BURR: I never want to bet on the length of a Policy Development Process. One of the reasons that I would very much like to make sure we get that scope nailed down is because if we get the scope nailed down, we could probably move more quickly on it. I personally don't think that this is a three-year process. I'm not sure I would bet my firstborn son on that, but I will certainly do everything in my power to make sure that's not the case.

I think just in terms of starting the next couple of discussions that enable us to move expeditiously to identify the policy issues that need to be resolved, there's a simple way of dealing with this, which is to say, pick a number of-- pick some period of time that says within X period after authenticating that the request is actually from law enforcement, you'll get a response. It appears to be a simple question, but I think there's a feeling in the community that we need to round out the pieces of this.

I just want to make sure we all have all of our expectations on the table and we identify whether there are any other pieces of policy that need to fit into it. We would certainly want to have policy well before the implementation of whatever the authentication system is done.

ANNUAL
GENERAL
MEETING

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Becky. I have the European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission for the Records. First of all, let me thank Becky from the Board for the answer. I think the question from Nico, I mean, the follow-up question on the question you see on screen is that because in the GAC there has been a discussion throughout this time and there has been a sort of growing sense of frustration because the GAC felt that two consecutive advice, I mean, advice and follow-up advice were ignored or according to the GAC not adequately taken into account, in particular because the GAC was not asking for a solution but for a path towards a solution.

                     So, the GAC thought we had taken all the reasonable steps to have a constructive dialogue with the Board and with the GNSO on this matter. I also think we had the call on the 4th of November which was called with zero notice period, Friday to Monday, and there was a very big participation from the GAC colleagues. I think this is yet another signal of great openness from the GAC into a constructive dialogue with the Board and with the GNSO. And same for the work of the PSWG because in all honesty this is not a simple matter, the one on authentication, and this is a track where we already see significant progress thanks to the effort of the colleagues from the PSWG.

                     Having said that, but I think this was a necessary premise because we had a number of discussions with the colleagues in the GAC. I seem to understand that the Board is open to consider the path forward that the

ANNUAL
GENERAL
MEETING

GAC has proposed in its letter from 15th of October, which means that we might have two separate tracks, one on timeline and one on authentication of law enforcement.

Considering that the second one has somehow already kicked off, it would be really good that indeed we have very soon a trilateral meeting with the GNSO to nail down the details. I would just like to reiterate the view that the policy part which accompanies the authentication part should be restricted to the timeline which was the open matter at the end of the implementation review team effort. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: If I could just add, I don't think there's any suggestion of expanding the policy issue beyond the timeline. The only question is sort of what are all the pieces that need to fit into the timeline. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, European Commission, thank you Becky for the answer. Any further comments or questions? I have the U.S. next. Please, go ahead Owen.

OWEN FLETCHER: Hi, this is Owen Fletcher for the United States, thank you. I appreciate the update on this and the responsiveness to the GAC letter of October 15th, thank you for that and that's good to hear about tentatively seeing an extension of the IRT as a way forward on this. I think we would welcome more discussions be they bilateral or trilateral as needed. I

agree to identify any questions on an appropriate scope for the work or just to make sure that we all understand what sets of questions need to be answered to implement this possible approach. We also support the PSWG continuing its efforts to explore authentication solutions for law enforcement requesters. So, we hope to see if there's an appropriate mechanism for that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, The U.S. Becky, is there anything you would like to add?

BECKY BURR: Thank you for that. I just want to clarify. It's not clear to me that the IRT is necessarily the right way but what I was saying is we don't think we need a new policy development process so you know it's not a whole new chartering process or anything like that. So, we're looking for efficient mechanisms but I wouldn't want you to walk out of here and think that it's clear that the IRT is the right way to do it. It may be that we just reconvene the already existing policy work.

OWEN FLETCHER: Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Becky. The floor is still open. Any further questions, comments? I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see any hand online. Let's move on to the next topic which is topic number four. UN Level Global Discussions like GDC and WSIS+20. I'll go straight to the

questions. Can Board members share their reactions to the latest multilateral UN outcome regarding the GDC in particular, how it addresses internet governance issues relevant to ICANN and the multi-stakeholder processes? That's the first question. Should I go to Tripti? Please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA: As you know, ICANN's been very engaged in the proceedings with regard to the Global Digital Compact in the United Nations and the current version which was ratified recently, we're very pleased with where they ended because the original versions of the GDC had left out the technical community and the last version now recognizes the technical community as a separate stakeholder. That was indeed a good place where the GDC ended. Also, it recognizes that Internet Governance is global in nature and it's diverse and multi-stakeholder. That also was very pleasing to us.

Earlier in the discussions, there was concern about the internet governance forum. They were questioning whether that should stay or go and there is now an acknowledgement of that as well. All in all, we are very pleased with where the GDC ended. Edmon, would you like to add further comments to this?

EDMON CHUNG: Sure. Well, I guess building on what Tripti mentioned, I remember very clearly actually Jorge asking me the question at an ICANN open forum at the IGF a couple of years ago. What's the Board doing with the GDC?

I hope you see that actually Feni's team and the government engagement team has been working very hard and also updating the Board periodically and having interactions and input from the Board to work on the GDC. I guess the next question is even more important. How do we take some of the positive elements coming out of the GDC and reinforce them in the WSIS+20 process?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Edmon. But let's go step by step. Jack the ripper digs it. So, regarding the GDC, any further comments or questions? I don't see any hand in the room, so thank you for that, Edmon. Let's go to the second topic, which is WSIS+20. Tripti, would you like to talk about that?

TRIPTI SINHA: Sure. In terms of what will happen at WSIS+20, it's not clear. It's too early to say what the conclusion will be because this is a process that will take place at the United Nations General Assembly. We're hoping that the co-facilitators of the WSIS+20 review, who will likely be two permanent representatives of the UN, will find a way to include entities like ICANN in their deliberations. We're hoping that the review would result, amongst many other things, in continuing to uphold the IGF so that we can continue to meet there and there'll be a convening forum for us, and the reaffirmation of this model, the multi-stakeholder model of Internet Governance, and of course, support for the technical community as a separate stakeholder. So, those are our hopes and

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, just to add to what Tripti said, yes, we do have the WSIS+20 outreach network and also very recently the WSIS+20 discussion group that is actually a small discussion group with the SO AC representatives. So, these are some of the things that the Board through the staff team has been working forward, and that's a community effort. I think right now going forward into the WSIS+20, it really needs, in fact, this is the community, the GAC community is the community that needs to take some of those positive elements into the WSIS+20 process itself.

So, the small discussion group that is happening is useful, and I note that some of the members actually are also part of the community efforts on the technical community for the coalition on multi-stakeholderism that is also taking those notes and amplifying it through the community. But I guess what I would just like to add is maybe turning the question around, what does the GAC members feel about these efforts and how you can help us take those positive elements coming out from the GDC to reinforce them in the WSIS+20 process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: That's a very good question, Edmon. Thank you so much for the question. So, the floor is open. Thoughts? Comments? And I have the Netherlands and Switzerland and the UK. You go first, Netherlands, please.

EN

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues. For the record, this is Marco speaking for the Netherlands. And then thank you, Edmond, and the Board. Of course, duly noted the ICANN engagement in GDC and much welcomed. Also, behind the scenes, all your expertise in capacity building.

Looking at WSIS+20, also very much acknowledge the effort you are doing in bringing in and mobilizing the community. And of course, we share your hopes that with the co-facilitators, we find a way to include ICANN and other non-state stakeholders in this process and provide them a seat at the table when this is discussed. I was part of the reason why this question now appears on the slide. And let me elaborate a bit outside, of course, the community input into the WSIS+20.

I was also wondering whether the Board has already taught simply from an operational perspective. WSIS+20 also recognizes the role of ICANN as one of the relevant organizations in managing part of the internet. And that makes the review also important for, as it were, the ICANN Org business case. And I wonder if the Board already has had any thoughts or deliberations on the potential impact or how to ensure that ICANN as an organization can keep doing what they do now in light of the upcoming review.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, in terms of what we're doing, our fidelity towards IANA functions and other technical components of what ICANN does continues to operate at a high level of efficiency. But in addition to that, we are

working very closely with other technical partners in the ecosystem. So, the RIR community, ISOC, and other ISTAR organizations.

Indeed, Sally can add to this, but those meetings have commenced, recommenced. There was a while when they were not meeting as often because of COVID and so forth, but those engagements have reconvened again. So, the best we can do is do what we do, do it well, and tell a better story of how the internet actually works, how the underpinnings occur, because oftentimes it's a mystery as to how all of this is happening. And I believe we're not telling a story as well as we should do, tell the story. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just a couple of points. Of course, it's very important to make the point about the technical community, to make sure that that is recognized. At the same time. I think many of us are part of the wider internet governance community in different fields that depends on the stakeholder. I think going back to Edmon, it's very important that ICANN continues to act as a platform, as a facilitator of this community-wide dialogue where it helps us to keep on the conversation and to form our coalitions, our alliances, our networks, and to bring in positions.

Along this week, I don't know how many conversations, both formal and informal, we've already had on these topics. So, that shows that

ANNUAL
GENERAL
MEETING

ICANN community is as such a platform for these conversations. So, I would invite you once again, I know you are doing a lot, but invite you once again to be as proactive as possible, to engage in these conversations, because it really affects us all, all the different stakeholder groups. ICANN and ICANN Org especially can act as a catalyzer of these conversations, of this awareness raising, of this building of positions, developing of opinions. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Switzerland. And I just wanted to respond to your request, especially to the organization. Just for the benefit of the broader GAC members, as well as the discussion group that was referred to by Edmon, and the mailing list, which have been very active. We have, I think, 540 members of our mailing list now from 85 countries. And I think probably quite a lot of people in this room may be on that list.

The discussion group has just got started. It's had two calls and it will meet as often as it decides that it wants to meet. And ICANN is participating in that as well as facilitating it, which is a little bit referring, I think, to what you're saying about not just the action of the discussion, but the substance of the discussion and sharing understanding of different positions, as you said earlier.

The other thing I just wanted to mention is that we, as many of you know, and I think all of you know, the organization has engagement teams all over the world, and we have had for many years. And those teams, some of whom are in the room with us now, are very close to you

ANNUAL
GENERAL
MEETING

in many cases and work very closely with you in the relevant regions through our regional offices.

And it continues to be a priority for us, both as staff, but also with our community partners, whether that's GAC members or RIRs or other technical community partners, like ISOC, all these groups that Tripti is also referring to, to make sure that as we engage in regional outreach activities and regional meetings, as you rightly say, well beyond our, this is not just about our ICANN community, this is about our much wider global internet community, as you say, about the topic and how important it is to protect what we do and why we do it, and to prove all the time to show the world what this model achieves.

So, there's kind of a transverse activity, if you like, through the regions and through the world, as well as through these specific initiatives that are at the global level inside the Org. So, if anybody at any point wants to talk to me more about it, understand more, or for me to put them in touch with the colleagues in their region, just let me know separately. Thank you very much for the question.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And thank you, Sally, for the answer. I have UK next.

HICKSON NIGEL: Can I defer to Anna and I'll go last?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Sure, of course. I have Portugal and then the UK. Anna, please go ahead.

ANA NEVES: Well, I think that we need some Portuguese here today. So, let's go for Portuguese. I will speak in Portuguese. Despite a short comment, I think it is important to say in this meeting that ICANN will have a fundamental role in the WSIS+20 Review. At this moment, and having discussed the Global Digital Compact, I think we are fully aware that continuing discussions at the intergovernmental level at this stage will be a bit counterproductive because those who are against multi-stakeholderism will not change their mind. So, what we have to do is to be in bottom-up movements.

So, we have to reinforce everything that is action and entities that demonstrate that the bottom-up approach works and that the internet and the digital should continue to work. I think ICANN's work in this area is very good. I think we can reinforce it. And in the GAC, I think we have a very important role because we, representing the governments of our countries, and having here the various trends of the various countries in what concerns the governance of the internet and the digital, it seems to me that our point 8 of the GAC strategy on Internet Governance is very important so that several countries can be committed to this Internet Governance topic so that they can better explain at home and in their ministries what the bottom-up approach is about, and what it means to collaborate and be together to make decisions, and how everything is much more engaged and everyone is

much more committed. This is absurd that I'm speaking Portuguese with words in English, but okay.   Thank you.

TRPITI SINHA: Thank you very much, Portugal. I couldn't agree with you more that the world would need help of the members of the GAC to reinforce this message of collaboration and partnership in working together and to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice at our table. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Portugal. I have the UK and then the European commission. Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. I'll be brief. Nigel Hickson, UK. First of all, I really wanted to echo what Edmon had said here, and he took the words that I was going to mention to thank, in particular, the work that's already taken place in this regard. I think here we can link the GDC and the WSIS. The input that ICANN gave in some of the open consultation processes on the GDC and, indeed, the involvement of Tripti, the Board Chair in this process was incredibly encouraging. I think the evidence that ICANN presented was important.

Secondly, the linkages. We also think in our government, and I think many of us here when we discussed it in the GAC think important, that the GDC has laid a sort of bedrock, if you like, for the discussions of the

WSIS+20 review. But the WSIS+20 review is far more than just the governance of the internet. It's also capacity building, it's digital divide, it's development. And so, we need to reflect on those issues. It's not just a case of defending certain paragraphs in the WSIS agenda. It's more about that. But what it is about, of course, is the endorsement of the UN IGF.

We're delighted to understand and to appreciate the resources that ICANN, the organisation and the Board are putting into the UN IGF in Saudi Arabia next month. This is incredibly welcome to make the broader internet community aware of what goes on at ICANN and the criticality of the work it does. So, this is important. So, all kudos to the government engagement team and to Veni and his colleagues.

And finally, of course, we look forward to the UN GA discussions next year. It certainly ends in the General Assembly. But before that, there's critical processes. And let me just highlight three very briefly. Ana Neves spoke earlier. She performs an incredibly important role as chair of the UN CSTD.

The CSTD is the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development. And they will meet in plenary session in the spring next year to adopt a detailed report on the progress of the WSIS process and also a resolution that will form perhaps the bedrock of the UN GA discussions that will take place later in the year.

Secondly, there's an event at UNESCO. UNESCO played a very important role in the creation of the WSIS process and are responsible for many of the WSIS action lines. And thirdly, there's the WSIS High

Level Forum, which is taking place in July next year. And that will, if you like, be the last set piece event for many of us or for many stakeholders before the actual General Assembly discussion.

So, I think it's very important that ICANN continue, alongside other members of the technical community, their participation and promotion of these events. So, thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, UK. Any reactions from the Board before I give the floor to the European Commission? If not, European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. And I will really be brief. I understand we have another topic possibly even on the agenda. So, I'm trying not to repeat what the colleagues said. I would like to emphasize one thing in relation to WSIS+20. And this is that, of course, a key topic for discussion is the model. And we all feel very much about bringing forward the multistakeholder model. So, this is one objective per se, perhaps. But at the same time, it would be important that in these conversations about the future of the Internet, it's not only about the governance as a model per se.

So, multistakeholder because it's good, but also because institutions like organizations like ICANN in its community can show authoritative leadership on what are the challenges and the opportunities ahead. So,

take a clear position as regards the evolution of the Internet and why there needs to be a continued multistakeholder model supporting it. And at the same time, also a reflection of how these organizations and their communities can evolve to support the new challenges. I think this is a sort of reflection that ICANN started somehow. But at some point, when we go closer to the end of the WSIS+20 process, it would be good to have perhaps even some sort of position because this would help a lot in the discussions. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much for that input. And we will keep that in mind. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much again, European Commission. UK, is that an old hand? All right. So, for the sake of time, let's move to the next topic. Next and final topic, as a matter of fact, which are the board's questions to the GAC. I'm not going to read the whole thing again. But what are the top three priorities and briefly explain why. And the answers are right there. ICANN's role in the preservation of ICANN's multistakeholder model. We were talking about that just a moment ago and GDC and WSIS+20. No surprises there. Effective and successful implementation of the next round. That goes without saying. And the third one is. And we also talked about this before. Urgent requests, as you may have guessed. I don't know if any of the distinguished GAC members in the room would like to elaborate a little bit more in this regard. So, the floor is open at this point.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:	We still have a good five minute, you know, time frame for this discussion. I don't see any hands in the room. I don't see any hands online. I do see Lebanon. Please go ahead.
ZEINA BOU HARB:	Yes, thank you, Nico. Just to say that we are not listing these priorities by order of priority. Because the third item on the urgent request is very, very important to the GAC. And we believe this should not be delayed anymore.
BECKY BURR:	Thank you very much. And as I said, we have expressed openness to the approach that the GAC has presented. And we are endeavoring to nail down the issues that need to be resolved. And that will be working with you, with the GAC and with the GNSO council to do that as quickly as possible.
NICOLAS CABALLERO:	Thank you very much for that, Becky. I don't see any other hand. Oh, CTU, please go ahead.
NIGEL CASSIMIRE:	Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. You're talking about the CEO's priorities. I have no quarrel with what's on the Board. But I would just like to suggest that maybe outreach be high on his agenda and especially to what I would call the underserved areas. So, we're making some

provisions right now for more applications from underserved areas in the next round. But I think enhancing the value of what ICANN does, enhancing the value of Internet governance. Because even in the small territories, the value of digital transformation has been made clear with the pandemic and so on. And a lot of us are challenged to move effectively towards developing digital economies and so on.

So, I think in the Caribbean's case, it has been maybe 10 years since we've had an ICANN CEO in the region. We have had a virtual participation from an ICANN chair during the COVID time at one of our ministers' meetings. But I think we need to see a little more hands on, a little more presence. Certainly, in the Caribbean, and I would make the case as well for the so-called underserved areas. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that, CTU. I can certainly volunteer to go to the Caribbean anytime. So, count me in by all means. So, we're running short of time. I have the U.S. next.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Laureen Kapin. And this is a quick question for Becky. Just following up on the discussion we had with urgent requests. You had made a statement about you wouldn't want us to walk out thinking that the IRT was necessarily the place where ongoing follow-up would take place, the phase one IRT. And I was just wondering what other places you think in policy mechanisms that are still alive could be there in addition to that?

BECKY BURR:	I'm not certain. I am talking with the GNSO Council to figure that out. We definitely want to use an existing mechanism. We don't want to create something new. So, I think we're fully on board with that. But we just haven't nailed down exactly what the right place is. And the IRT is just a little bit awkward because it's really not supposed to be developing policy. It's supposed to be implementing. But we'll figure it out.
NICOLAS CABALLERO:	Thank you for that, USA. That's all we have time for. Thank you so very much. We need to wrap up the session. So, let's give a big round of applause to our distinguished Board members. Thank you so much. Tripti, any final words, anything you would like to say?
TRIPTI SINHA:	Oh, thank you. We really enjoyed the exchange of ideas and input that we've received. We've had great intersessional conversations, as was this. So, thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO:	Thank you so much. So, the meeting is adjourned. Please be back at 3 p.m. for the session with the ASO. Thank you so much. Enjoy your delicious Turkish coffee.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]