

---

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**ICANN69 Virtual Annual General Meeting, 19-22 October 2020**

---

<b>MEETING ATTENDANCE &amp; MEMBERSHIP</b>	<b>2</b>
Opening Plenary Session	2
<b>PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES</b>	<b>3</b>
Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	3
DNS Abuse	4
Access to gTLD Registration Data	5
<b>GAC WORKING GROUPS</b>	<b>6</b>
GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	6
<b>CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>6</b>
Meeting with the ICANN Board	6
Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	10
<b>INTERNAL GAC MATTERS</b>	<b>11</b>
GAC Elections	11
WS2 Accountability - GAC Plans to Implement Recommendations	11
GAC Travel Support Rules	11
GAC Priorities (GAC Wrap-Up Session Discussion)	12
Future of ICANN and GAC Public Meetings (GAC Wrap-Up Session discussion)	14
<b>Attachment 1 - ICANN69 Virtual Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Attachment 2 - ICANN69 Action Points Compilation</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

Sixty-six (67) GAC Members and five (5) Observers attended the meeting remotely.

GAC membership currently stands at 178 Member States and Territories, and 38 Observer Organizations. A list of ICANN69 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in [Attachment 1](#).

The ICANN69 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website at:  
<https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann69-gac-communication>.

Presentations used by speakers during the meeting and supporting briefing prepared for the GAC can be accessed from the GAC website: <https://gac.icann.org/agendas/icann69-virtual-meeting-agenda>.

Full transcripts for each session are to be made available from the ICANN69 Public Meeting website, via the relevant agenda items on the GAC's website agenda page listed above.

### 1.1. Opening Plenary Session

The GAC Chair formally opened the GAC ICANN69 meeting. She explained the logistics for the meeting week and allowed GAC Support to explain technical information about meeting resources on the GAC web site and use of the Zoom Room and Congress Rental Network interpretation application.

The GAC Chair reviewed specific aspects of the meeting week agenda - particularly noting the opportunities to participate in the ICANN cross community plenary sessions. She noted the plan to offer daily 30-minute "catch-up" updates for GAC Members who may not be able to fully participate in the virtual meeting due to time zone challenges or other reasons.

The GAC Chair reviewed the GAC work efforts conducted inter-sessionally since ICANN68. She specifically noted progress on the top GAC priorities including new gTLD Subsequent Rounds, DNS Abuse Mitigation and Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection issues – especially the GNSO EPDP Phase 2 effort. She also reviewed the GAC's public comment participation (see <https://gac.icann.org/activity/gac-public-comment-opportunities>) and notable correspondence (see <https://gac.icann.org/advice/correspondence/>) since the last meeting.

The GAC Chair also described a number of recent operational requests made to GAC including a GAC Opportunity to Participate in Community Representative Group to help select the new IRP Standing Panel, an ICANN Survey for GAC Input on Future ICANN Public Meetings, a proposal to consider a new Operational Design Phase relating to the implementation of approved gTLD policies, and outreach from the Registry Stakeholder VPIC Working Group regarding recent efforts to explore a mechanism to modify, enhance or add voluntary public interest commitments ("VPICs") to their existing ICANN Registry Agreements.

The GAC Chair also summarized recent SO/AC leadership meetings held prior to the ICANN69 meeting. She explained that recent community leaders' deliberations with ICANN org have included discussions regarding: future "virtual" public meeting criteria; the proposed new operational design phase before consideration by the ICANN Board of GNSO policy recommendations; and further developments and

issues regarding the status and management of ICANN organizational and structural reviews - particularly implementation of Work Stream 2 Accountability recommendations.

The GAC Representative from France delivered a message from the French Ambassador for Digital Affairs, praising ICANN for being one of the most authentically multi-stakeholder organisations on Internet governance, but also noting the challenges and growing complexity of recent ICANN policy development efforts. The message therefore expressed concern about the ability of ICANN Community members to fully engage in these efforts and urged GAC members to closely follow developments.

The GAC Chair reminded session attendees of the Communiqué remote drafting process, previously used at ICANN68, that would again be used for this meeting. Noting that a decision to produce a reporting Communiqué or a more substantive document would likely develop organically over the course of the week, the Chair asked that Members share any proposals for Communiqué language as early as possible with the GAC list to allow for more efficient remote discussion of the Communiqué. It was noted that regardless of the ultimately agreed Communiqué format and substance, that additional time would be made available at the end of the meeting so that all GAC Members would have the opportunity to review the Communiqué in their own time zone before publication.

## **2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

### **2.1. Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs**

The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs, following the publication of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG (Subpro PDP WG) Initial Final Report. The GAC engaged in discussions with the Subpro PDP WG Co-Chairs on recent developments in the PDP WG, their initial reactions on the GAC consensus comment filed on 29 September 2020, and letters submitted by the ICANN Board and ICANN Org to the PDP WG. The GAC thanked the Subpro PDP Co-Chairs for their engagement and cooperation with the GAC throughout the course of the finalization of the draft final report, and recognized the tremendous efforts of all the ICANN community members participating in the Subpro PDP WG. The GAC noted general alignment between various ICANN Board comments to the PDP WG and GAC consensus input to the PDP WG Draft Final Report on topics such as predictability, closed generics, community applications, applicant support and auctions of last resort. Some GAC members highlighted specific items of importance to the Subpro PDP WG Co-Chairs, including a discussion on the predictability framework (SPIRT), and recalled the view that the “strong presumption” language regarding GAC Consensus Advice should be retained in the Applicant Guidebook. GAC members stressed the importance of addressing DNS Abuse Mitigation measures.

The Subpro PDP Co-Chairs reviewed the updated Work Plan confirming that the PDP is expected to deliver the Final Report to the GNSO Council by the end of December 2020, with the assumption that the Final Report could be delivered to the ICANN Board in Q1 of 2021. The PDP WG is presently in an initial stage of the review process for the 50+ comments received during the public comment period. The Subpro PDP Co-Chairs asked the GAC for specific examples regarding the need for further implementation of category 1 safeguards highlighted in the GAC input on the Subpro PDP Draft Final Report. GAC Topic Leads invited GAC Members and Observers to join in the GAC efforts regarding Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs in the coming months, and identified the various forthcoming opportunities for potential GAC input to the PDP WG, to the GNSO Council or to the Board as soon as the Working Group Final Report is submitted to it.

### **Action Points:**

- **GAC Members/Observers** encouraged to contribute and join the GAC efforts regarding Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs by contacting GAC topic leads. In particular, GAC members and Observers are invited to share examples regarding the need for further implementation of category 1 safeguards highlighted in the GAC input on the Subpro PDP Draft Final Report.
- **GAC Topic Leads and Support Staff** to continue monitoring completion of Subpro PDP Final Report, expected December 2020 and updating GAC Scorecard and/or other relevant documentation accordingly.

## **2.2. DNS Abuse**

As reported by the GAC's Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) during ICANN69, many stakeholders agree that DNS Abuse and threats to the DNS will not cease to exist and will continue to evolve. PSWG experts shared with the GAC a sense of the continued levels of threats, in particular phishing and malware, as well as the magnitude of harm such threats cause. Beyond debates of trends, statistics and share of abusive registrations in specific gTLDs, GAC participants pointed to devastating real world consequences, noting recent cyber attacks on hospitals in particular.

Given the threat landscape and magnitude of harm, PSWG and like-minded ICANN stakeholders believe that ICANN's work should focus on: the speed of response by responsible parties where applicable; accuracy of registration information; clear and enforceable contract provisions with consequences; and continued communications and coordination with relevant parties.

A particular area of shared concerns among many ICANN stakeholder groups is the enforceability of key contract provisions directly related to DNS Abuse and the so-called Public Interest Commitments (PICs). In this area, there is agreement among stakeholders that concrete proposals for changes in contractual provisions may help constructively influence future agreements (for future New gTLDs, and renewals or renegotiations of current Registry and Registrar Agreements). PSWG leaders recommend engaging ICANN Contractual Compliance and affected stakeholders to come up with concrete proposals addressing gaps and lack of clarity in current contracts.

Another development of shared concern is the decision of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure PDP Working Group to exclude DNS Abuse from its upcoming policy recommendations. This is leading to questions and uncertainty as to where and how policy on this matter will be considered. In the meantime, PSWG topic leads pointed to planned ICANN Board action during ICANN69 on the recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Review Team (CCT RT), on which the GAC advised the ICANN Board in the Montréal Communiqué. GAC participants referenced the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs (SADAG) Report which was commissioned by this review, and serves as a point of reference in engagement between the PSWG and ICANN's Office of the CTO to improve Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR).

Looking ahead, many stakeholders are looking forward to the publication of an anticipated report by the SSAC Working Party on DNS Abuse, in which a PSWG member represented the experience and expertise of Law Enforcement. It is expected that this work will advance the conversation in the ICANN Community by proposing concrete and effective actions. It was noted that governmental education material on cybercrime would support ongoing ICANN community initiatives to inform end-users of

threats and mitigation measures. PSWG co-chairs confirmed the Working Group's plan to continue consideration of challenges caused by DNS over HTTPS on DNS Abuse mitigation.

**Action Points:**

- **GAC PSWG** to consider developing a concrete proposal regarding DNS Abuse Mitigation steps to prepare GAC for further discussions at ICANN70 (per GAC Wrap up Session discussion).

**2.3. Access to gTLD Registration Data**

Representatives of the GAC Small Group on GDPR/EPDP provided an overview of the status of policy development, and discussed in particular the conclusion of Phase 2 of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data. Recommendation of the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report for a System for Standardized Access and Disclosure (SSAD), adopted by the GNSO Council (24 September 2020) for consideration by the ICANN Board, were reviewed. It was noted that consensus has been reached on matters of accreditation, purposes and centralization of requests, while no consensus could be achieved on the centralization and automation of disclosures of registration data.

GAC concerns with these recommendations were recorded in the GAC Minority Statement (24 August 2020) and shared in part or in full by the ALAC, SSAC, Intellectual Property and Business Constituencies of the GNSO. GAC participants discussed the concern that non-consensus recommendations were adopted by the GNSO Council and recommended to the ICANN Board. It was noted that while the GNSO did not violate its operating rules in doing so, this has raised questions about how the ICANN Board could or should consider these recommendations.

Looking forward, GAC attention and contributions are expected in the near future at several stages: as the ICANN Board is expected to engage in a consultation with the GNSO and in analysis of cost and benefit of its recommendations; when the ICANN Board eventually considers the GNSO recommendations formally; as part of a proposed Operation Design Phase prior to ICANN Board action; and in new additional policy development planned concurrently to address the issues of legal vs. natural persons, feasibility of unique anonymized contacts and data accuracy.

GAC participants discussed the above concerns and expectations from the SSAD as well as a continued role for governments to support ICANN's work in bringing WHOIS in compliance with data protection legislation around the world.

In its update to the GAC the Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) reported on its discussions with ICANN stakeholders who share an interest in establishing an effective access model that provides timely and effective access for properly formed and legally justified requests. There are doubts among several stakeholder groups as to the Cost/Benefits balance in the proposed SSAD policy recommendations, in addition to particular concerns that non-consensus GNSO recommendations were being referred to the ICANN Board. Going forward, several stakeholders share with the PSWG the expectation that an effective and non-conflicted individual would chair future policy work (next phase of EPDP in particular), while concerns remain around Accuracy of Registration Data and the continued suspension of ICANN's Accuracy Reporting System. A particular interest was expressed by some stakeholders in Denmark's Domain Name Act requiring mandatory publication of .DK Registration Data, as well as the .DK identity verification policy, as possible models applicable to gTLDs.

### 3. GAC WORKING GROUPS

#### 3.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)

During ICANN69, Chris-Lewis-Evans (UK NCA) was confirmed as a new PSWG Co-chair. The PSWG reported to the GAC on its discussions with ICANN's OCTO, SSR and Contractual Compliance teams, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups (Ry/RrSG), and the Intellectual Property, Business and Internet Service Providers Constituencies of the GNSO (IPC, BC and IPC). These discussions focused on the two priority policy areas of the PSWG Work Plan: DNS Abuse and RDS/WHOIS. See above in section "Public Policy and Substantive Issues" for a substantive report of these discussions.

Leaders of the Public Safety Working Group renewed their call for GAC Members to consider encouraging their relevant public safety agencies to join the work of the PSWG.

##### **Action Points:**

- **GAC Members** to consider encouraging their relevant public safety agencies to join the work of the PSWG.

### 4. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

#### 4.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed:

- Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, including Public Interest Commitments (PICs) in New gTLD Contracts and Follow-Up on GAC Montreal CCT Review Advice;
- Domain Name Registration Data/WHOIS Matters, particularly related to the GNSO EPDP Phase 2 effort and follow-up;
- ATRT3 Final Report Recommendation Applicable to the GAC; and
- An ICANN org proposal for a new Operational Design Phase relating to the implementation of approved gTLD policies.

##### New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

The GAC Chair explained that subsequent procedures for new gTLDs remain a high priority for the GAC and highlighted (some of) the public policy matters discussed in the recent GAC comments on the Sub Pro PDP WG Draft Final Report. GAC Members noted that in a recent correspondence to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, the ICANN Board had expressed concerns about ICANN's ability to *"enter and enforce any content-related issue regarding PICs or Registry Voluntary Commitments"* due to limitations of ICANN's mission in the Bylaws and asked if the Board could further explain those concerns.

Noting that any comments during this session should not be construed to replace any formal written Board feedback, the Board explained that several themes around the definition of ICANN's mission were an important part of the community's work during earlier discussions involving the IANA transition. It was explained that this resulted in a Bylaws provision specifically excluding the current

form of ICANN Registry Agreements from challenge on grounds that they exceeded ICANN’s mission. In considering these recommendations in terms of future registry agreements, the Board explained that the language of the Bylaws specifically limits ICANN’s negotiating and contracting power to PICs that are “in service of its Mission.” It was noted that the Board has raised this not to push the PDP toward a particular solution, but to ask questions and to flag potential issues for the community.

In response to follow-up GAC concerns regarding the need to achieve some legal certainty regarding existing and future PICs, Board members explained that in round 1 of the new gTLDs, there were two forms of PICs – “standard” and “voluntary”. With respect to standard PICs, it was explained that it is hard to argue they are not within ICANN’s remit or ICANN’s “mission”. Regarding voluntary PICs, it was explained that there were reasonable discussions to be held about the scope and relative degree of preservation of those commitments.

Regarding the impact of previous GAC advice in the Montreal Communiqué – particularly regarding the recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT), the Board explained that it has already reviewed and adopted certain CCT-RT recommendations and that by the end of the ICANN69 meeting week the bulk of the CCT-RT recommendations will have been adopted by the Board. It was noted that a very small handful of recommendations will require some additional work by the ICANN org for the Board to understand the implications.

#### Registration Data and WHOIS

GAC Members noted that the GNSO Council has resolved to forward to the ICANN Board several policy recommendations that did not achieve consensus in the EPDP team and asked Board members how they would weigh the lack of consensus on certain recommendations in their consideration of whether adoption of such recommendations would be in the interest of the ICANN Community. On a related matter, the GAC also noted the GNSO Council’s desire for consultation with the Board regarding a cost-benefit analysis of the EPDP Phase 2 Policy recommendations and asked when such an analysis might be initiated and what potential funding might be made available to establish the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD). In conjunction with a related proposal to consider initiating a new Operational Design Phase for the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendation, GAC Members were also interested to know what impact such a process would have on the timeline to deliver an SSAD.

Board members noted that the ICANN Bylaws require the Board to consider whether proposed policies will be in the best interests of ICANN and the ICANN community, such that a specific threshold of Board votes is required to be met or exceeded in the event that the Board determines that this is not the case. It was explained that the Board has a responsibility to ensure that all community feedback is considered, including during the mandatory Public Comment period prior to Board action. The Board noted that the GNSO Council voted with a supermajority to approve all the recommendations in question, although some did not attain consensus (as defined by the GNSO’s procedures) among the Working Group. This was noted to also be the case for a few Phase 1 recommendations. The Board also noted that the three participating Advisory Committees filed Minority Statements on the Final Report and that, during the GNSO Council discussion of the Final Report, many GNSO stakeholder groups took the opportunity to make further statements.

It was recognized that the EPDP Team and the GNSO Council have acknowledged that implementation of the SSAD is likely to be complex and resource intensive. Board members explained that prior to the EPDP Team’s finalization of its recommendations, ICANN org provided the EPDP Team with a general

estimate as to possible costs and timing that building and implementing an accreditation mechanism and centralized gateway will entail. The ICANN CEO explained that the estimate would need to be revisited as part of any cost-benefit analysis and that the recently proposed Operational Design Phase under consideration could help to inform the Board's discussion about the EPDP Phase 2 report. Board members said they look forward to receiving the GNSO Council's report and to clarifying the scope and timing of a possible consultation.

Now that EPDP Phase 2 policy development has been completed, GAC members were also interested to hear whether there are any remaining obstacles to resume implementation of the Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation policy recommendations. It was explained by Board members that the ICANN org is currently reviewing the impact of the EPDP recommendations on existing policies and procedures, including the PPSAI recommendations, to help determine next steps. It was noted that the Phase 1 EPDP Team recognized that its recommendations would impact other existing policies and procedures, and Phase 1 Rec 27 anticipated policy updates to relevant areas. This is the process ICANN org is using to share the analysis and support the discussion on next steps regarding proxy/privacy and EPDP.

### ICANN Operational Design Phase Proposal

Further acknowledging the recently proposed Operational Design Phase to be incorporated into implementation of certain new gTLD policy initiatives, GAC members noted that the proposed "new" phase would seem to call for an expansion (in certain cases) of the ICANN policy development life cycle. They expressed concern that operational/implementation considerations should be a fundamental part of the standard PDP effort.

The initial concern to GAC members is the potential impact on community resources and it was asked whether community resources are ample enough to address an additional phase (or parallel effort) in the ICANN policy development life cycle. Also it was asked, if there is a real need and added value of such a mechanism, especially with the envisaged Design Feedback Group.

Board Members explained that ICANN Org is currently facing a number of complex and challenging issues – particularly the cost of implementing complex policy and operational matters and that the proposed new phase would help the organization better plan for those implementations. Several examples of these complex matters include GDPR implementation of SSAD, subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and management of new gTLD auction proceeds. Rather than just having the ICANN org interacting with the Board, the thought has been that those discussions should also be open to the community so that the ICANN org has an ability to check with the community members to see if it properly understands the policy and intentions of the community.

The ICANN CEO explained that in many cases it is the Org's job to implement approved policy recommendations and this proposed concept was not intended to create an opportunity to re-open prior decisions by the GNSO. Rather, he viewed it as simply making an existing process more transparent, as these discussions already take place. He noted that implementation considerations and ICANN Org information sharing with the Board have always been a part of the Board decision making process and that the recent SSAD proposal by the GNSO is an example where those operational and implementation discussion are very important due to a large number of unknowns (e.g., international data transfers) that need to be investigated and considered. He said he thinks this concept of a new transparent process would be very helpful.

GAC members reiterated that these types of preparations are a very important part of policy development - part of policy making itself – and there is concern about potentially adding a new layer to the PDP system that would stretch volunteer capabilities even more than they currently are needed. GAC Members asked that this idea be approached with great care, otherwise community participation will not likely be feasible.

#### ATRT3 Final Report Suggestions Impacting the Board and the GAC

The GAC Chair noted that this matter was briefly discussed during a recent Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting during which both a number of Board and GAC Members recognized the valuable relationship that has been forged between the Board and the GAC. It was agreed that sharing recent improvements with the rest of the community was a good suggestion by the ATRT3 as well as exploring additional ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of collaborative exchanges between the Board and the GAC.

Board Members noted that efforts to improve the processing and tracking of GAC advice have been a fundamental focus of the Board and the GAC for some time and they were happy to have recently worked on a process for acknowledging and discussing Issues of importance to the GAC when they are raised.

#### Enhancements to the ICANN Multistakeholder Model (Board topic)

The GAC Chair noted that the committee was pleased to provide comments on the June 2020 paper entitled Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model – Next Steps (hereinafter “the Next Steps Paper”) and she observed that this was an area of work that the GAC was following closely.

She reiterated the GAC views that the Next Steps Paper prepared by ICANN org staff thoroughly identifies existing work efforts that are consistent with the MSM evolution. It is appropriate to recognize that relevant parts of the community will continue to engage in their current work efforts “which holistically lend themselves to addressing each of the priorities.”

The GAC Chair noted that the committee agrees with the ICANN Board assessment that by limiting Immediate “next steps” to three priority work areas and leveraging existing work efforts, a necessary workload balance can be achieved that will result in incremental evolutionary enhancements and improved efficiencies to the MSM, which will benefit everyone’s future work. The GAC agrees that the actions proposed in the Next Steps Paper should not unduly burden the community and could have a materially positive impact on evolving the MSM. She noted that the GAC has independently embarked on developing its own implementation plan for Work Stream 2 Accountability recommendations and ATRT3 Final Report suggestions that impact its operations.

Board members welcomed the GAC comments and shared that efforts regarding the first three priority work areas are moving into the implementation phase. It was noted that although the three priority areas have been selected, all six improvement areas suggested by the community will be dealt with over the next five (5) years. The GAC was asked to be prepared for future input opportunities that may be requested by the Board.

### Closing Remarks:

The GAC Chair and ICANN Board Chair shared their mutual thanks to all for holding the meeting. The Board Chair noted the Board's appreciation for the GAC's focus on so many operational matters and thanked GAC Members for continuing to raise issues and topics of interest with the Board. A complete transcript of the session was appended to the GAC ICANN69 Communiqué.

### **4.2. Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**

The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed:

- **EPDP Phase 2**  
The two committees identified several points of common interest regarding the EPDP effort including, (1) the distinction between natural and legal persons, (2) uniform anonymized email address, (3) financial aspect of the SSAD, etc. Both groups agreed to further work together on matters of common interest on this topic.
- **New gTLD Subsequent Procedures**  
The ALAC presented selected topics with comparative analysis among the ALAC, ICANN Board, ICANN Org and the GAC (PICs, DNS Abuse Mitigation, Applicant Support and Outreach, Community Applications and Community Priority Evaluation, Auctions and Private Resolutions of Contention Sets, and closed generics). GAC Topic Leads recognized the efforts done by ALAC, and look forward to a continued collaboration.
- **Educating end-users about DNS Abuse**  
The ALAC is currently looking for resources to help educate end-users in DNS Abuse and better protect themselves. Subsequently, the ALAC wishes to create a repository and extend the effort to regional webinars. The GAC notified the ALAC of its ongoing internal discussions on creating capacity building efforts on DNS Abuse.

#### **Action Points:**

- **GAC and ALAC** to schedule a call to agree on concrete next steps and joint material related to EPDP issues.

## 5. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS

### 5.1. GAC Elections

The GAC elected Manal Ismail (Egypt) as Chair for the term starting after ICANN70 (March 2021) and ending at the close of ICANN76 (March 2023).

The GAC elected as GAC Vice-Chairs for the term starting after ICANN70 (March 2021) and ending at the close of ICANN73 (March 2022):

- Rodrigue Guiguemde (Burkina Faso)
- Pua Hunter (Cook Islands)
- Pär Brumark (Niue)
- Jorge Cancio (Switzerland)

### 5.2. WS2 Accountability - GAC Plans to Implement Recommendations

The GAC explored options for implementation of the Work Stream 2 - Accountability recommendations applicable to the committee. Co-Chairs of the Human Rights and International Law Working Group (HRIL WG) and GAC Support shared information on the progress toward completing an inventory tool that will enable GAC members to confirm and assess over 40 specific recommendations, assign accountability for establishing plans to develop recommendations for GAC review, and track the status of the implementation efforts. The HRIL WG co-chairs explained that the WG plans to proceed with a preliminary specific focus on the GAC's implementation of the new ICANN Human Rights Core Value along with the consideration of WS2 diversity recommendations.

#### Action Points:

- **GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs** to share with the GAC the GAC Tracking Tool on implementation of WS2 Recommendations.
- **GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs** to reiterate the call for GAC volunteers to contribute to the assessment and implementation of the Human Rights Core Value, Diversity recommendations, and/or any other relevant recommendations.
- **GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs** to discuss future involvement of GAC Operating Principles Working Group (GOPE WG) and Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG).
- **GAC Leadership** to discuss options for appropriate GAC implementation management and oversight.

### 5.3. GAC Travel Support Rules

The Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) reviewed the 2017 GAC Travel Support Rules ensuring that they were consistent with the new ICANN Travel Guidelines, and taking into account the feedback received from GAC members. The new 2020 GAC Travel Support Rules are now proposed for endorsement by the GAC.

#### Action Points:

- **GAC USRWG Co-Chairs** to circulate the proposed new rules as a final opportunity for GAC review and intersessional adoption before ICANN70.

#### **5.4. GAC Priorities (GAC Wrap-Up Session Discussion)**

The GAC Chair reviewed a number of topics and issues that arose during ICANN69 and which the GAC will be tracking for the next several months into calendar year 2021 including:

##### **a. New gTLD Subsequent Procedures/Rounds (topic leads Jorge Cancio, Switzerland and Luisa Paez, Canada)**

The topic leads confirmed there will be significant follow-up in this area.

##### **b. Registration and Data Protection Matters (e.g., GDPR Implementation)**

There will be significant follow-up work in this area regarding all three “phases” of the GNSO EPDP efforts.

##### **c. DNS Abuse Mitigation**

The GAC Chair revealed that an ICANN community-wide survey is expected in this area. Also, the GNSO is developing a framework to identify and explain the different mechanisms that could be used to address this range of topics. GNSO has indicated they cannot proceed with this effort until the report from the SSAC is published.

##### **d. GNSO Work on IGO Protections**

The GAC Chair reported that Board action is expected in this area before the end of ICANN69 - regarding Red Cross protections (partial acceptance and partial rejection of GAC advice) and this will trigger a Board-GAC consultation shortly after ICANN69. Additional work is expected to start in the new year in GNSO.

##### **e. ICANN org Operational Design Phase Proposal**

The GAC Chair reminded delegates of the concept paper circulated to the GAC and asked that interested members review the document and share feedback so that GAC Leadership can represent GAC views accurately. A fuller community consultation is anticipated on this matter. GAC members reinforced their concerns about the impacts of a new process on community workloads and noted the need to further make the points that financial and other implementation matters be considered during the PDP process itself.

##### **f. Community Representative Group for Independent Review Panel**

The GAC Chair asked GAC Members to consider if they had any interest in serving on the upcoming Community representatives Group which will be established to select members of the Independent Review Standing Panel.

##### **g. WS2 Accountability Implementation**

The GAC Chair reminded GAC Members of the opportunity to review the management tool developed by the HRIL WG and the GAC Support to inventory and manage the effort to implement the WS2 recommendations.

#### **h. Voluntary Public Interest Commitments Framework**

The GAC Chair alerted GAC Members to a proposed framework shared by a working group in the Registry Stakeholder Group of the GNSO that is proposing changes to voluntary public interest commitments (VPICs) in Registry agreements. The working group has asked the GAC to identify any “red flags” in the proposal. The GAC Chair is hoping that this review can be resolved by the GAC by the end of the calendar year and welcomes volunteers to share their views when the documents are circulated.

#### **i. GAC Points of Contact**

The GAC Chair explained that positions were open for volunteers to take on “point of contact” roles with the ALAC, ccNSO and the GNSO.

#### **j. Other priorities anticipated by GAC Members?**

GAC members were offered the opportunity to identify other priorities that the GAC should identify and work to resolve. It was mentioned that the GAC should expect a more concrete and detailed agenda from ICANN on DNS Abuse. It was asked if the PSWG could consider developing some ideas in this area, using the recent SSAC Report to develop some specific next steps to share with GAC with the goal of further GAC discussions on this topic at ICANN70. Noting that this general matter was already on the PSWG work plan, the PSWG leadership accepted the suggestion and committed the PSWG to take the matter as an action item for the ICANN70.

The GAC Chair and Vice Chairs noted that GAC Member availability and Interest in topic Leadership was critical to assure GAC attention and substantive contributions in these various areas and noted that the GAC Support would be reminding the committee about those opportunities in post-ICANN69 communications.

#### **Action Points:**

- **GAC Support** to share follow-up email to GAC post-ICANN69 reminding GAC of opportunities to serve/volunteer for a variety of GAC priorities noted during this session.
- **GAC Support** to share proposals of Registry Stakeholder Group VPIC WG with GAC.

### **5.5. Future of ICANN and GAC Public Meetings (GAC Wrap-Up Session discussion)**

#### **a. “Future of ICANN Meetings” Feedback Opportunities**

The GAC Chair led session participants on a question-by-question review of a current ICANN org survey regarding the future of ICANN public Meetings. A wide variety of GAC views were expressed including:

- Favorable comments about continuing to hold three public meetings per year; but also giving consideration to the fact that more substantive GAC work now seems to take place

outside the face-to-face meetings. It was noted that this more recent work style may need to be reflected in how ICANN (or the GAC) now conducts its business - including the goals for meeting and, if so, how often the community needs to meet face-to-face or virtually.;

- A need to confirm community expectations for public meetings - recognizing there may be different goals for different communities;
- Focused one week of meeting should be sufficient;
- There is appreciation for unconflicted session time that enables GAC members to attend sessions conducted by other communities;
- The virtual meeting format has important shortcomings re consensus-building, networking, and spontaneous meet-ups and presents special challenges for on-boarding newcomers;
- It is unfortunate that a single time-zone approach is not possible for all community participants, but staff should make efforts to identify common times that present reasonable accommodations for as many as possible - even if that means shorter meeting days.

#### **b. GAC Feedback on GAC Meetings**

The GAC Chair asked GAC delegates about their views of future GAC meetings during these challenging times and the impact virtual meetings could have regarding development of GAC consensus advice for the Board. Among the many thoughts shared were the following views:

- One GAC working week of around 4 hours of sessions a day should be enough to conduct GAC work;
- The GAC has recently enjoyed a good work environment - there were no emergencies at ICANN68 or 69, but the GAC may need to consider creating new rules in the future regarding the remote development of GAC consensus advice on main community work streams like new gTLD Subsequent procedures;
- While the “door” is open to GAC consensus advice during virtual meetings, these meetings bring challenges. The committee should be cautious on drafting GAC consensus advice in advance (i.e time pressure, extra intersessional work, longer meetings, etc).
- Perhaps, in certain cases, GAC consensus advice discussions could start before an ICANN meeting (e.g., circulating pre-warnings to the whole GAC and sharing any advice proposals a certain number of days prior to a GAC session). Some topics may even require this consideration at ICANN70.

#### **c. Further Follow-Up**

Finally, noting the final wrap-up session was running long, the GAC Chair suggested that a GAC-wide call will be considered in the future for GAC members to discuss further GAC-wide feedback on ICANN Meetings and to discuss potential future High Level Governmental Meeting planning.

## Attachment 1 - ICANN69 Virtual Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST

GAC Members (67) participating remotely		
Argentina	Hong Kong, China	Senegal
Australia	Hungary	Serbia
Bangladesh	India	Singapore
Barbados	Israel	Spain
Belgium	Italy	Sweden
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Jamaica	Switzerland
Botswana	Japan	Chinese Taipei
Brunei Darussalam	Kenya	Thailand
Burkina Faso	Korea	Trinidad and Tobago
Burundi	Lithuania	Tunisia
Canada	Luxembourg	Uganda
China	Madagascar	Ukraine
Congo, Democratic Republic of	Malaysia	United Kingdom
Congo, Republic of	Morocco	United States of America
Cook Islands	Republic of the Union of Myanmar	Zimbabwe
Croatia	Nepal	
Czech Republic	Netherlands	
Denmark	Niger	
Egypt	Nigeria	
Eswatini	Norway	
European Commission	Pakistan	
Finland	Poland	
France	Qatar	
Georgia	Russia	
Germany	Saint Kitts and Nevis	
Holy See - Vatican City State	São Tomé and Príncipe	

<b>GAC Observers (5) participating remotely</b>	
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
League of Arab States	World Broadcasting Union (WBU)
Organization of American States (OAS)	

## Attachment 2 - ICANN69 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
1	Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	<b>GAC Members/Observers</b> encouraged to join GAC efforts regarding Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs and to contact GAC topic leads accordingly. In particular, GAC members and Observers are invited to share examples regarding the need for further implementation of category 1 safeguards highlighted in the GAC input on the Subpro PDP Draft Final Report.
2	Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	<b>GAC Topic Leads and Support Staff</b> to continue monitoring completion of Subpro PDP Final Report, expected December 2020 and updating GAC Scorecard and/or other relevant documentation accordingly.
3	DNS Abuse	<b>GAC PSWG</b> to consider developing a concrete proposal regarding DNS Abuse Mitigation steps to prepare GAC for further discussions at ICANN70 (per GAC Wrap up Session discussion).
4	GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	<b>GAC Members</b> to consider encouraging their relevant public safety agencies to join the work of the PSWG.
5	GAC Meeting with the ALAC	<b>GAC</b> and <b>ALAC</b> to schedule a call to agree on concrete next steps and joint material related to EPDP issues.
6	WorkStream 2 Accountability - GAC Plans for Implementation	<b>GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs</b> to share with the GAC the GAC Tracking Tool on implementation of WS2 Recommendations.
7	WorkStream 2 Accountability - GAC Plans for Implementation	<b>GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs</b> to reiterate the call for GAC volunteers to contribute to the assessment and implementation of the Human Rights Core Value, Diversity recommendations, and/or any other relevant recommendations.
8	WorkStream 2 Accountability - GAC Plans for Implementation	<b>GAC HRILWG Co-Chairs</b> to discuss future involvement of GAC Operating Principles Working Group (GOPE WG) and Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG).
9	WorkStream 2 Accountability - GAC Plans for Implementation	<b>GAC Leadership</b> to discuss options for appropriate GAC implementation management and oversight.
10	GAC Travel Support Rules	<b>GAC USRWG Co-Chairs</b> to circulate the proposed new rules as a final opportunity for GAC review and intersessional adoption before ICANN70.
11	GAC Priorities (Wrap-Up Session)	<b>GAC Support</b> to share follow-up email to GAC post-ICANN69 reminding GAC of opportunities to serve/volunteer for a variety of GAC priorities noted during this session.
12	GAC Priorities (Wrap-Up Session)	<b>GAC Support</b> to share proposals of Registry Stakeholder Group VPIC WG with GAC.

