ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum  - Joint Meeting: ALAC and GAC
Thursday, June 17, 2021 - 9:00 to 10:00 CEST

DEVAN REED:  Welcome to this ICANN71 GAC session, Meeting with ALAC, on Thursday the 17th of June at 7:00 UTC.

Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance, GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC representatives to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod to keep accurate attendance records.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat, the feature located on the bottom of your Zoom window, by starting and ending your sentence with <question> or <comment>, as indicated, in the chat.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six U.N. languages and Portuguese.  Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon located on the Zoom toolbar.  If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor.  Remember to state your name and the language

you will speak; in case you will be speaking a language other than English.  Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.  Please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.

Finally, this session, like all ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected Standards of Behavior.  In the case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants.  This session is being recorded and all materials will be available on the ICANN71 meetings page.

With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you very much, Devan, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, welcome to the ALAC bilateral with GAC.  Our session is scheduled for an hour, and I would like to start by welcoming Maureen and all the members in the Zoom room and to thank Yjro Lansipuro, ALAC liaison to the GAC, and Shi Young Chang, a representative of Korea, for their collaboration and work to compile the agenda.

As you can see, at this time we would like to run it a bit differently, but before the tackling the slide on the screen, I would like to hand over the floor to Maureen for any opening remarks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Manal, and to the GAC community for allowing to us join you today. I think we have, as Manal said, we're sort of experimenting a bit, and I think this is going to be really good for us to as we move forward working together. I'm really looking forward to seeing how this turns out today, and I hope you enjoy and participate as much as you can. Thank you, Manal.

And I think [indiscernible] one of the things we thought about, we thought the meetings were a little bit too one way and we wanted to know how the community felt, not only the At-Large community who we get feedback from all the time, but really how the GAC community also felt about some of the discussions that we were having, so we're actually going to be exploring different ways of working with these topics; some of them policy topics but also like Internet governance, more on DNS abuse, and the ATRT3, something else coming up on the horizon, and all these topics affect both of our communities so we want to look at ways to work together. We have a lot of common interests and we know if we can work together and support each other, it's going

to be good for our communities to also understand and to connect with the GAC community as well.

So what we have arranged is that there's going to be some formal sessions on the subsequent procedures and on administration data services, formal sessions that we will have, and there will just be brief introductions from those, and we would like you if you've got any questions, the ALAC and GAC teams will be presenting on each of these.  So Manal, if you would like it take it before we pass it over to Yjro.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you very much, Maureen, and indeed, we would like to expand our discussion beyond the deeply involved topic leads; we want more participation from both of our advisory committees.  So you will see that we have prepared differently for this session, stepping back from the highly detailed process steps, despite tackling the same topics of importance as Maureen mentioned, but also trying to ask some general questions.  You don't have to really have background information or be deeply involved to get engaged in the discussion.

So I really hope to see some wider participation, and indeed, Maureen, we have so many in common and aligned views, so I hope we will see broader discussion during this session.  With

that, I think we can move to the following slide and I can now hands it over to Yjro.

YJRO LANSIPURO:     Thank you very much, Manal.  This is Yrjo Lansipuro speaking. Subsequent rounds for new gTLDs.  This topic has been with us actually the whole time we have had joint meetings.  We have achieved to my mind an amazing degree of policy cooperation and now we have arrived at a stage where it's good to take a short review of where we are and what both committees are doing at the moment.  So first, I give the floor to Justine Chew, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:      Thank you, this is Justine Chew for the ALAC, for the record, and speaking on Subsequent Procedures as the topic lead for At Large for this topic for Subsequent Procedures.  I did have two slides, was wondering whether the -- yes, thank you very much.  Very briefly, by way of recap -- and I will just limit it to what has happened in 2021, no point going back any further than this year. So in February we saw that the GNSO Council adopted a resolution with respect to outputs of the Subsequent Procedures policy development process final report, and outputs is defined at the affirmations, recommendations, and implementation guidance deemed to have received either full consensus or consensus designation, and this resolution obviously was

followed by the transmission of those outputs to the ICANN Board for the Board consideration and implementation.

And following that in April, the ALAC, At Large Advisory Committee, issued advice on Subsequent Procedures to the ICANN Board ahead of the -- and this happened ahead of Board's call for public comments to which proceedings concluded on the first of June and looking forward. And as you can see from slide number 2, the resolution from the GNSO Council has a number of limits, so from these we can expect -- and this is from the At Large's perspective and in addition to the GNSO resolution, we are expecting the Board to respond so the ALAC advice, obviously, something that we anticipate will happen, we just don't know the timeline as yet at this point in time. And from the GNSO resolution we can also anticipate the Board to initiate an Operational Design Phase on Subsequent Procedures following the recent practice of what the Board did with the SSAC.

And while understanding the purposes of the design phase, or the ODP, is for the Board to obtain more information on complexities and costs for implementing those outputs coming from the Subsequent Procedures PDP and by way of the GNSO Council resolution, we will anticipate that ICANN org would convene an implementation review team or IRT to implement the outputs -- if and when the Board approves those outputs, of course.

Now moving ahead, this is what I foresee At Large would be doing, and there would be ample room for both committees to collaborate on aspects of this foresight. So I would expect the At-Large to be trying better to connect the dots across the policy development processes to determine what we consider as prerequisites and dependencies for the next round. So what do I mean by this? Well, for practical purposes, the approach for EPDP is to limit its scope to its charter. While this is operationally necessary, one of the consequences of this approach, we tend to look at each PDP independent to others. And in order to see the whole big picture, we need to connect the dots on what we deem as prerequisites and dependencies we want to see put in place before the next round happens.

And by way of this too, we need to monitor the status ensuring continuing end user input with respect to those identified prerequisites and independencies related to other [indiscernible] and Subsequent Procedures especially in areas where the Subsequent Procedures outputs have not adequately or effectively addressed this, what we deem as prerequisites and dependencies. An example of this, I would put to you, would be the possibility of public interest commitments, the way that the registry voluntary commitments are going to be formulated and possibility of those as well, more details on the applicant support program, community wide effort for DNS abuse mitigation,

**EN**

internationalized domain names or IDNs, and we know there is an EPDP coming up for in that as well as metrics to evaluate the whole new gTLDs program and other areas within the program itself.

We would hope to maintain also dialogue with the Board to follow up on its response to the ALAC advice as well as their action on the competition -- consumer choice and trust review team recommendations, those are the ones we have endorsed and there is the deliberations on areas not adequately and effectively addressed by the outputs, so more examples of this was closed generics top level domains, revise to name collisions, how to handle name collisions, as well as permissibility of private auctions.

Those are the three major things that I can think of that we have scoped to speak to the Board about. And along the way we need to find -- highlight common goals and support shared propositions. In this respect the GAC has been a very strong partner to the ALAC, and we certainly hope to strengthen this collaboration and yesterday's plenary on the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, I think I heard renewed expressions of commitment to work together for the common good and benefit of end users, so that will be interesting to follow up on.

**ICANN|71**
**VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM**

**EN**

The last thing is to obviously identify avenues for At Large to strategically draw end users to the design phase as well as Subsequent Procedures. So I will stop there and open the floor to colleagues on both sides of the committee to make comments. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you very much, Justine. Jorge, please.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you. Thank you, Yjro and Justine. And I wonder if Luisa is in the room. If she is, she can complement what I have to say on SubPro. I will be very brief -- do you hear me okay?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, we can hear you, Jorge.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, I heard some noise. As we have informed you recently in our bilateral between the ALAC and the GAC leadership, we find a comment on the final recommendations as were transmitted by the GNSO to the ICANN Board to the public comment period that the Board opened, we have drawn their attention to our comments both in writing and during the bilateral we had -- I think it was yesterday or the day before -- and we had a discussion

**ICANN|71**
**VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM**

especially on the overarching comments which pertain a series of more general issues which have to do with what we see probably as preconditions or as steps we have to take before a new round is launched.

So I hope that we will continue with that conversation and not only with the Board but also with you, as you will have seen in our comments we filed to the Board, there are many issues where we have supported the ALAC advice, so many thanks for doing that work beforehand. And now we are expected to participate actively in the operational design phase and monitor that also together with you. And during this time it is still open for the GAC to decide whether we wish to file GAC consensus advice to the Board on discreet issues. So I will leave it there at the moment, new faces here, new voices, and I think you have heard me enough during this week. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:    Yjro.

YRJO LANSIPURO:    Thank you very much, Jorge, and on the screen, we have some follow-up questions for the discussion, and I see Kavouss Arasteh has raised his hand, please.

IRAN:                          Hello, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, it is long time that ALAC and GAC are very close with each other in the facts. We are sure about that and don't need to more talk about this collaboration because we are in full collaboration with each other.  My question to ALAC, you have seen the concerns of GAC with respect to these issues which were on the slide.  Did you raise or would you raise some of these issues in common interest with GAC with the Board when you are talking with them in order to enforce or reinforce the issues the GAC is raising?

YRJO LANSIPURO:                Thank you Kavouss.  Anybody from the ALAC side that wants to answer?

MAUREEN HILYARD:              I can, actually.

YRJO LANSIPURO:                Yes, please, Maureen.  You're muted.

MAUREEN HILYARD:              Sorry, I was trying to use the phone bridge and it wasn't quite working.  I hope you're not getting an echo, but I just wanted to reassure, we're very keen to collaborate in a way where there is

common ground, and we certainly do.  In fact, it gives us a lot more sort of support of our own views to be able to say that we share these views with the GAC, and I believe that the Board is very keen to sort of see that there's commonality between the advisory committees, so if there is anything that we agree on, you can be sure that we will be mentioning it.

YRJO LANSIPURO:     Thank you, Maureen.  And anybody else who wants to take the floor on the follow-up questions we have on the screen?  It's interesting, of course, to ask what are the fundamental goals of both committees on this question?  What are the governments', end users', what is the most important thing when it comes to the new rounds of new gTLDs applications?  Yes, Hadia, please.

HADIA EL-MINIAWI:     Thank you.  So I think when thinking about what end users would like to have and what customers would like to have when accessing the Internet, it's definitely that you need to be both secure and safe.  So security, definitely we are talking about privacy laws, talking about the security of the service they are accessing, and safety also goes down to -- goes down as well to the security of the transaction and goes down to what we do with DNS abuse.  And bringing up DNS abuse into the picture, if we are talking about a new round for gTLDs, we need to be sure that we

have a way forward to DNS abuse mitigation and we know exactly how we are going to be able to to face the challenges that might arise from a new round.

Another thing of course that users -- and I would talk especially about, like, local communities for example, and I would talk about small businesses like farmers and producers, all these communities will definitely want to protect their identity online. They do not want to lose their identity through [indiscernible] or globalization, so I think this is also another issue, how do we protect our local communities online?  So maybe those are the two broad elements, security, safety, and protecting identity online.  Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:          Thank you very much, Hadia, for bringing these two issues into discussion.  Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you very much, and just to break the ice from the GAC side, I think growing and extending the DNS market to reach underserved regions or regions that are not represented but also extending the market to include more IDNs to cater for needs by all end users irrespective of their native languages.  I will stop here and hand it back to you, thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:          Thank you, Manal.  Kavouss, please.

IRAN:                    I put the answer in the chat, please read the chat.  What is most important?  It is difficult to say (audio distortion) these are the important things that we need some resolution if not totally resolved.  Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:          Thank you.  Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:           I'm trying to hold back because we're trying to get more input from folks, and I think that is one of the challenges we both face as organizations is making sure we're hearing a broad enough spectrum of voices for sure.  As far as the questions here for the At-Large community in terms of end user expectations or via new round, I think there is a problem with the question itself in a way in that predominantly end users are not looking for a new round of gTLD applications, it's not on their radar, not consumer demand for it, it's something that's driven completely by business interests inside the ICANN.  Doesn't make it a bad thing but it comes down to with the At-Large, I think is twofold, one to avoid mistakes from previous rounds where we talk about issues

related to DNS abuse and perhaps auctions and things like that where we're just trying to have a better outcome than before.

And then the other is that we're trying to figure out if there were things that -- trying to think of the right word -- things like applicant support where they didn't seem to have the desired outcomes of bringing new players into the field the way we hoped. so I think those are things we're focused on as well and extrapolating in some instances what those instances are of more localized resources that didn't come out of the previous round in the way we hoped, so I think that has been another area of focus for us.

YRJO LANSIPURO:        Thank you Jonathan. We have time for one more intervention during the allocated time we have. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you very much. I will be brief. This is really a multi-faceted issue. And I think it becomes very much an issue of what are the individual aspects where, as Jonathan said, maybe it didn't work as well last time or more specifically, where we're not getting our way. There will be for these kinds of subjects' differences between the GAC and ALAC at times and that is fine, but where we focus specifically is where it's not working and you have to work

together.  And in the case of a subject like this which is so complex and interwoven, it really means a matter of looking at the subjects on the table today and decide is there a benefit to working together or not.  Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:         Thank you, Alan, and I think those were the last words on this subject and I give it back to Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you very much, Yrjo and everyone.  And if we can move to the following topic.  Maureen, of course if it's okay with you we can go to the next slide.  And I will hand it over to Shi Young.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:        Thank you, Manal, I'm Shi Young Chang (audio interference) let's go to the second issue, the registration data services.  So what are the latest developments and what is each committee doing about the issue at the moment?  So could each committee talk about the recent developments about the issue and each side's action and what are the actions?  So let me give you the floor from the other side.  If Alan or Hadia could answer the question?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you, and again, I will be relatively brief on this one.  The subjects we have discussed in these meetings almost ad infinitum of what the areas were, looking at consumer affairs.  Cyber security, the things that ultimately make sure the end users can safely use the better net.  And the reason why we have had had WHOIS or [indiscernible] to begin with, we have had thought for years that the GAC and the ALAC should work together.  And usually the only time that the issue came up is when we met together and said we should work together, but rarely did it happen.

In Phase 1 of the EPDP, we tended to meet for dinner prior to to face-to-face meetings, and I will give credit to the business constituency and sometimes the IPC for having led those efforts.  But there was not a lot of actual day-to-day cooperation.  Phase 2, that changed somewhat, and the interaction were far stronger and there was a lot more coordination between what we were doing.

In Phase 2a, we have gone all the way through where it's not just a matter of comparing notes, but we have tended to meet in teleconference prior to every single EPDP meeting.  So we have met almost as much as a subgroup deciding how to proceeded forward, what are the important things, almost as many hours as

there have been meetings of the EPDPs. So it has evolved from let's talk about talking to each other to doing it, so much so that we tend to talk to our colleagues almost more than we talk to our own members within the EPDP. I don't think I have talked to Hadia nearly as much as both of us talk to our various colleagues, and that goes for the GAC, IPC, BC, and the SSAC. So again, what things are important is really easy in this case. And we have worked cooperatively, about as closely as I can imagine, going forward in this one, and I hope that is a model that will be used in the future. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:  Thank you. And let's hear from the GAC side. Maybe [indiscernible] or Chris? Anyone from the GAC side to talk about their points? I don't see any hands. Oh, I see the chat from Chris that he has audio issues. Yes, thank you, Hadia.

HADIA EL-MINIAWI:  Thank you so much. So I think Alan actually summarized what we would like to say. I would just like to maybe answer one of the questions there: What is the strongest interest of Internet users', protection of personal data or ability to battle bad actors? And I would say it's both, not either-or. Definitely users are looking for the protection of their data in addition to battling bad actors. And I think therein lies the problem. We always think those two

elements do not go together; however, they do, and this is certainly what end users are looking for.

For example if we look into a little bit more detail, for example, for an end user trying to acquire products online or using some services online, so if the end user could actually verify the legitimacy of such a website, that gives them a kind of security and safety online, and I would say here that GDPR, the general data protection regulation, allows for that because the protection of legal vs natural is not protected under GDPR but according to our policies this is not happening. So this is just a small example of how actually small things could affect the lives of end users' daily online activities. And I would stop here because I would not like to go into the details, but I would just assure that end users need both, and both can happen together. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:     Thank you, Hadia, for the importance for the end users. So now let's hear from GAC.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:     Thank you very much, Chris Lewis-Evans. Sorry for the delay, I was having issues. So maybe just to build on what Hadia said there a little bit, GAC and the GAC small group have really seen the importance of RDS for a number of users and the [indistinct] a

large part of that, and whether that's educational in how they can protect themselves or utilize the Internet in a safe and secure manner or whether it's through services that use RDS to provide a second stable Internet for them to use and secure, I think we do have many points that we work well together.

And as Alan said, I think we have done more talking between different groups than we have to each other at times, and I think that's the real benefit of the multi-stakeholder model. I know I have had numerous conversations with the registry and registrar stakeholder group as well as on how we can move some of this forward. And I think it's been a very difficult process but through the communications that we have had, I think we are taking steps. I think they're small steps but hopefully we can build on this going forward. And obviously noting the upcoming part on accuracy, I think that could have a real impact on the data available not only to end users but to everyone as well. Thank you very much.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:    Thank you so much, Chris. Yes, and I would add collaboration is important for the multi-stakeholder model. So as we have follow-up, anybody who would like to ask a question of each committee, please raise your hand. If there's anyone for either of the committees it's okay, so if there is anyone who has questions, please raise your hand. I don't see a hand from the floor.

So let me ask briefly about -- what are the goals from each side about these specific topics? What are either from GAC, Chris or Hadia, answer on your views from the committee? Anyone from the GAC or anyone from the committee about the fundamental goals for the EPDP issues? I think I don't see any hands from either side. I think because of the --

HADIA EL-MINIAWI: If I may, this is Hadia El-Miniawi for the record. So I'm not sure actually what your question is. You are asking about the fundamental goals of the EPDP, correct? And I think we all entered into this knowing the goals of the program, and so that's why I think we have difficulty in answering it, because we think it is obvious. You know, when we entered the EPDP we were -- the EPDP for gTLD registration data, we were looking to come up with an RDS that would replace the non-compliant WHOIS and that would definitely comply with the GDPR as well as all the other relevant legislation and laws respecting definitely privacy and the registrant's data, rights to protect their data, while at the same time allowing for those who need this data for many reasons, whether to protect their online users or to protect the Internet ecosystem or to allow the Internet to function in a secure and safe manner, so for a variety of reasons to actually have access to this data.

So I think this question is hard to answer because I don't think that any of us does not have a clear understand being what the goal was or is. The problem lies in how actually are we able to achieve this goal and to what extent are we able to achieve this goal? And there we stumble. But I think both parties, whether the contracted parties, whether it is the ALAC, the GAC, we agree on the fundamental principles. I will stop here, thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you, Hadia, for mentioning about the questions. And let me ask the final question in the specific sentence. So from the GAC side, how do governments believe the implementation of these new privacy rules will impact the citizens or end users? So are there any answers for this question from the GAC side? Thank you, Chris.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thank you. And Chris Lewis-Evans, for the record. So I think, as we have seen with the impact of the work that has been going on with the EPDP, that what the laws are striving to do is to protect people's personal data, and obviously the European Commission's GDPR was one of the first and probably the highest bar that we have seen so far and for organizations and groups to understand how to implement those laws and how they affect how they operate.

And I think one of the big tasks within the EPDP and I think going forward with any new laws is how to balance that level of data protection while enabling proper access to data to enable systems to work effectively and to maintain security and everything else. So I think there will be new laws around data privacy. As we speak there's more and more coming out, and I think it's just the job will be for us as a multi-stakeholder community is to ensure that we maintain that right balance between data protection and enabling services to work efficiently and correctly. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you, Chris. I think I saw a hand from Alan. So could you talk briefly, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I will be -- again, I will try to be very brief. The privacy laws that we have reacted to have been adopted by contracted parties essentially in the extreme because there are huge penalties for not adopting them and they have absolutely wanted to minimize their risks. So yes, the GAC and ALAC and lots of others are interested in protecting the privacy of individuals, both regular Internet users and registrants.

But the largest focus from our perspective is to try to meld into that a requirement for the other things that Chris also talked about, essentially, we're acting as the balance -- I hate to say this because it sounds negative -- but we're acting as a balance against the privacy laws to make sure other things are considered as well when these things are implemented, so it's an interesting balancing act. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:      Thank you, Alan. As we have limited time, let's finish this topic and move on to the next section. Could Maureen take the floor?

MAUREEN HILYARD:      Thank you. I just wanted to...

GULTEN TEPE:      We can hear you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:      I'm getting an echo. Are you?

GULTEN TEPE:      No, we don't hear any echo, but I will ask our tech team to resolve that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. What I wanted to say -- thank you very much, Shi Young, for taking over that section. But what it demonstrates, sometimes the topics that we discuss with everyone are probably a little bit -- they don't have the full understanding of the topic to be able to ask the questions they want to ask. So what we wanted to do was sort of bring into the conversation some other topics which we think are more user based so that we can look at things like Internet governance.

And we have someone who is very interested in Internet governance, and I'm sure he will enthuse you to be involved and if we can work together and get more people engaged. So could I have Olivier Crepin-Leblond -- and Nigel Hickson, of course, too from your side might have something to say as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen, and I will be brief about the joint session. Yes, I will be quite brief about the session we had earlier this week which brought participants from around the community but also from outside the community, so it was great to see James Bidel from the State -- Jorge Cancio from the GAC, [indiscernible] Internet Society, [indiscernible] from the commercial stakeholder group [reading] ALAC and registry stakeholder group, a great panel.

And first we touched on the multi-stakeholder model inside ICANN, and we looked at the current resilience of the model as it currently is, and why do stakeholders participate in ICANN the way they do?  And each stakeholder group has a different view. How do we overcome difficulties?  What can we do better to work better?  And there were concerns expressed about the efficiency of the model when we now are seeing privacy development processes that are going on and on, but it was understood that of course with COVID we are going through a very special time, and it is hoped that things will get better.

We then had [indiscernible] speaking to us from another angle, and that is of course from the outside world, what is ICANN multi-stakeholder model, how is it perceived outside the ICANN walls, what role should the ICANN community lead, what role should the Board, and should the ICANN org lead in the outside world in wider matters of Internet governance?  And we did see the expression that ICANN needed to be a component part of the outside world Internet governance landscape, if only because it should promote the model it runs to run its own things --

GULTEN TEPE:          Olivier, sorry to interrupt -- more slowly, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I always think I've been speaking too slowly but because I have had coffee, slow is fast. So just saying the model itself in ICANN should be showcased to the outside world. At the end of the day, the proof came with the pandemic, with the increased reliance on the Internet to keep the world connected and to keep the world running, and it ran very well. And certainly the DNS and the component parts which ICANN produces policy for worked extraordinarily well. So it really shows that there is -- the model itself doesn't have that weakness which some would like to say and would like to replace as a result with a different model.

So of course there are adjustments necessary, but altogether, ICANN should be more involved with the international space and should showcase its model more clearly. Nigel Hickson, UK GAC representative, did take some notes about the session, so I will just hand the floor over to him to outline a few points which came out of the session.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier, and to everyone, it's always a pleasure to be in a GAC ALAC session and speaking on this. Nigel Hickson, UK GAC. Olivier, you gave me 30 seconds before; this time I might take 45. But you have summed it up very well and thank you to the contributors we have had to this session. Four

things came out, if I may. Firstly the linkage, and our colleagues at ALAC have a lot to do with this, especially having a multi-stakeholder model that works collectively and collaboratively together in a wider ecosystem, because if ICANN is one of the proponents of a multi-stakeholder model works in itself, it has a problem.

As Olivier said, there was a lively discussion and I think [indiscernible] summed it up well by saying, how close do you get to the sun? How close should ICANN get to the sun in terms of how hot should they get politically into the Internet eco-space? And that is always a judgment call, and in fact we heard the facts that ICANN does make contributions on many different sectors, [indiscernible] U.N., in terms of updating the delegates and ensuring people understand the DNS and certain terms and resolution, so there to a large extent.

And finally, if I may, the threats on the horizon -- and a couple were mentioned -- the discussions as we go forward on new IP, whether they're taking place in the ITU or [indiscernible] or other bodies and of course the whole legitimacy of the [indiscernible] in 2005 will be renegotiated starting 2023-24 at the U.N., and that of course is very important for the multi-stakeholder model. So thank you very much, those who contributed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much to both of you. Really good to get that feedback on that really interesting session that was held. But Olivier, I just wondered if you might want to introduce your Internet governance engagement group. We have people here we can possibly engage in that group, because Internet governance is something that is universal, so it is something I think a lot of our GAC members could become very much engaged in and the capacity building that could go with it as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. There is indeed an engagement group on Internet governance in existence, it has its own mailing list, and we coordinate some of the discussions. We have ICANN staff that also feed the group with information regarding external events, those taking place at -- well, in Geneva, Brussels, New York -- you can guess what organizations are being followed there. If you are interested in joining, you can probably reach out to staff or ask GAC support staff, and they will get in touch to have you added onto the mailing list, and it's free.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Of course. And as Donna says, not just GAC members say -- I'm sure Olivier would love more than the two or three people he's gathering for the meeting at the moment. I think it's an important

Working Group, and it has changed from a Working Group to an engagement group. But we knew that this would probably sort of extend that we would be over planning with our sessions and like with the DNS abuse and ATRT3 subjects as well. But what we also wanted to find out was, we really would like some feedback as to what do At Large members want to know about the GAC community, and what do they want to know about the ALAC so we can work together a little bit more meaningfully in these sessions as well as inter-sessionally?

We have been having amazing meetings from the PSWG, and the discussions, it's really good to sort of be able to have those talks, just as Alan was saying before, about how important this is to actually be talking together and getting down to the nitty-gritty about what is important to us as advisory committee members within the ICANN ecosystem.

So I see we're at the top of the hour. I'm going to have to pass it over to Manal. We've just sort of taken over your meeting, and haven't finished the agenda, Manal. But I think we've had a really good discussion, and it's the start of something, the start of something new, I think. And I'll leave it to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maureen and everyone. Just quickly on ATRT3, because I know Sebastien is very keen about it, and thank you for flagging this and continuing to follow up with this. We haven't really -- we don't have any substantial developments on this discussion within the GAC yet, so I'm just flagging that your keen follow-up is noted. We will prioritize some operational matters during the coming period and as soon as we have notable feedback, we will get back to you. And if it is okay with everyone, if I can give Sebastien a minute and maybe Jonathan also, I know he has a very short thing on DNS abuse so maybe a couple of minutes.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Not to take too much time, just to say that I'm sure that my colleague from the ATRT3 shepherd team like [indiscernible] Danielle, and of course Cheryl and [indiscernible] and myself, we are ready to come to any meetings you need us to come to, explain where we are, what are the main topics. And I understand why it's not possible here, I did prepare a presentation, but I feel it's better not to take that now but just to tell you, the four of us are ready to come when you need us. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:   Thank you very much, and we count on your offer.  So Jonathan, if it is one minute, please?  Or 30 seconds?

JONATHAN ZUCK:   On DNS abuse?

[ Laughter ]

Sure, I felt the contracted party house session with the DNS abuse Working Group was a good one and working in a lot of different areas that I think would be helpful and they have committed to working with us on the education front, which we have talked about working together with members of the GAC and the Public Safety Working Group on, so I feel good about that, having their participation in that effort.

So I think it is one of those issues that has a lot of different threads that need to be going on at the same time, and it feels as though there's a lot of folks working on those things, so I come away from that meeting feeling good about some things that are happening. So I think we just need to stay on it and find a way to be cooperative.  It turned confrontational and I think that was never the intention, so I'm glad for the collaboration we're beginning to have with the contracted parties house on DNS abuse and look

forward to it -- and we have some of those folks on this call, so I will repeat that.  Thank you so much for the work you're doing, and we look forward to working together to address this issue and make so many improvements to the environment.  Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:    Thank you very much, Jonathan, and see, you did it in one minute.  So thank you very much and to Maureen, Shi Young, and to everyone from the advisory committee, so thank you everyone for your attention.  Always great to discuss our common priorities, compare notes, and agree on a common way forward.

So with this, I thank everyone.  And to GAC colleagues, we will reconvene again at 1430 The Hague time, 1230 UTC, please, for our wrap-up session.  Thank you very much, Maureen and everyone.  The meeting is adjourned.

**[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]**