ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum - GAC Preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board, GNSO and ALAC
Monday, June 14, 2021 - 10:30 to 12:00 CEST

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to this ICANN71 GAC session, Preparation for Meetings with the ICANN Board, GNSO, and ALAC, on Monday 14th of June at 8:30 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 is located on the bottom of your Zoom window, by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment, as indicated in the chat.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all 6 U.N. language and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon located on the Zoom tool bar. If you wish to speak raise your hand. Once the facilitator calls upon you 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

---

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.

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. Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulten, and welcome back, everyone. We will use the coming 90 minutes to prepare for our bilateral meetings with the Board, GNSO, and ALAC. So I see we already have slides. If we can go to the following slide where we have good topics to discuss. As I mentioned, we will be hopefully preparing also for other bilaterals in addition to the Board. We normally use this session to prepare for our meeting with the Board, but it would be a good opportunity to also prepare for the bilaterals with the GNSO and the ALAC, and thanks to our points of contact for the ALAC and Jorge Cancio for the GNSO, they have been coordinating with GNSO and ALAC regarding our meeting. So if we can go to the following slide.

So I think for the sake of time maybe we can go directly to the topics that we need to discuss. I'm not sure whether it's slide 5 or

6. So 5 is a list of our bilaterals, and then 6. Okay. So we have identified discussion topics or topic areas. First is the subsequent rounds of gTLD, and second is the registration data WHOIS GDPR matters, DNS abuse, CCT and SSR 2 recommendations and ICANN return to in person meetings. We need to confirm what exactly we would like to discuss with the Board under each of these areas and then make sure we, like Kavouss reminded us in the previous session, need to be mindful of any replies, previous replies or responses we received from the Board in formulating our follow-up or new questions. So do we have further details on the topics? I'm not familiar with the slides so if someone can please guide me whether -- can we go to slide 7, please.

So under subsequent procedures, this is more of an informational discussion point, so I intend along with topic leads to introduce the topic and provide an overview of our general comments, but we were also asked by ICANN CEO to have a couple of minutes at the beginning to also provide a few comments from the ICANN CEO side. So it's more of a general discussion on the topic, and Jorge, please correct me if I'm wrong, anything else that needs to be discussed under this theme with the Board? And if others also have any comments regarding any specific questions that need to be flagged in that context. I see Rob's hand up, please go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much. I wanted to remind folks about the ICANN70 preparations with the Board meeting, things a little bit different based on feedback and adjustments for this meeting. Many will recall that for ICANN70 you had a laundry list to start of about 16 questions, and those were substantially reduced during the prep session. The different approach you all took this time was to identify topics and most of the feedback on the email list was to keep things quite general and high level. So don't be nervous if you see just the fact that these reflect topics, but this is an opportunity to flag any particular issues that either the topic leads or the members might want to mention during the meeting. As I have explained to a number of you through the emails and follow-up conversations that we haven't shared specific questions beyond what is directly on the slides this time. So again, the intention is a higher level of discussions, but this is an opportunity to flag any specifics.

After this session is over, I'll be sharing with the Board an updated slide deck based upon these slides to sort of guide the discussions, and then Manal, you and the topic leads for any particular topic can sort of play that by area in terms of the feedback and conversation that takes place. I hope that is helpful. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Very much, indeed. Thank you very much, Rob. So any specifics under subsequent rounds of new gTLD that need to be flagged during our exchange with the Board? If not, then it's going to be more of sharing the general comments we have on the topic and I will be working on this with Jorge and Luisa. So can we move to the following slide. This is the registration data, WHOIS GDPR matters. And again, an introduction to the topic, and there are three topics identified as maybe possible or potential points for discussion with the Board. First is the SSAD implementation. GAC members could ask go about the status of the SSAD ODP in light of the 25 March Board discussion on the matter and measures to address issues identified in the EPDP Phase 2 final report by the GAC in the ICANN70 communique. And it has been noted that it might be useful to wait for the GAC's further asking of the Board's scorecard on ICANN70 advice, as this may lead GAC members to ask more pertinent and focused questions. We have already received the scorecard, it's a substantial one, and there is a thorough annex on the topic attached to the scorecard. I'm sure everyone has already gone through the scorecard and the annex. So I'm just wondering whether there are specifics that needs to be flagged under the EPDP Phase 2 topic. And third is the distinction between legal and natural persons in gTLD registration data, EPDP Phase 2a but also the accuracy of gTLD registration data and expected scoping team.

And the potential discussion -- so the GAC may follow up with the Board on these matters once the outcome of ongoing deliberations in EPDP Phase 2a regarding legal versus natural and in the GNSO Council regarding scoping the accuracy issues are clearer. And this is what we shared earlier like a month ago with the Board. So as things become clearer, maybe we can be also more clear on what needs to be discussed under this topic. So I understand regarding accuracy, we will be seeking or at least noting our concern that this has not been launched yet, and we're interested to see this Work Track launched and also interested to participate to this efforts. I saw a hand up and down. I'm sorry I didn't catch the name. But again, any comments on any of the three potential discussion areas? Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. Thank you very much. Useful information. I just have one comment regarding first the point three or bullet 3. We said once the outcome of our deliberations in Phase 2a are clearer. So perhaps I request you whether we are at that stage or we are not yet at that stage and therefore we should wait, if I am not mistaken. So the question for bullet 3, while it is a valid question, distinction between this, this is a very sensitive, very difficult questions, very difficult subjects. Even there are no, I would say, universally, internationally agreed distinctions, it is a pressure from GAC members always between these two. Sometimes, dear

Chair, questions are valid, but answers might not be easy. So we have to find a way. So my comment is that are we ready to raise this question? Because we said once the outcome is clearer -- is the outcome now clearer? This is a comment on bullet 3.

On bullet 1, timeline for SSAD implementation, it's a simple question. I think we have already get some answers, may have more. I don't think it is difficult and Board members may easily say it's available. On the second one, I have some doubt that we have to raise this question because you just said this scorecard is available. After the availability, is the question more clear or not? Sorry I raise this question this early stage, but you asked for comments and I replied. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and for breaking the ice. So we're asking about updates and status on the SSAD ODP, on the second one. I'm not clear what will be raised under this potential topic, so unless we hear from our topic leads or GAC colleagues, I think we may be deleting the bullet. On the third bullet, I understand -- and I stand to be corrected -- that the report is also finalized. So but of course our topic leads may correct me if I'm wrong. So again, on the accuracy issue, I know we're not clear on what is going on and why the Work Track is not yet launched. So there is something to ask about here, though it's a GNSO matter but

again, we can flag the issue. But again, I'm just waiting for more clear points that needs to be flagged or concerns that needs to be discussed with the Board under bullet 2 and 3 from our topic leads.

I see no hands. And thank you, Rob, for offering to make live edits which I can see you are already doing on the slides. Just reading Nigel in the chat: Agree that I think we need clarification here regarding public consultation. Sorry, Nigel, do you mean on...

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, good morning, Manal. I do apologize. I should learn to write English. Nigel Hickson, UK. On the accuracy issue that was raised and -- I mean, clearly it might not be the time, as Kavouss has said, to intervene, but it would be nice to have the factual situation so we can have a discussion within the GAC on this issue. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. So again, if no further comments, I think for now we can mark the second bullet for deletion?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Manal, sorry, my hand is up.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: I think certainly the second point, we would be careful to not repeat things we're saying and maybe wait on further clarification once the ODP has been released, I think would be better on the second point, so I agree with removing that for this session. And on the third one, I think maybe the ask needs to be clearer. And we can work with the other topic leads on that in making the ask a bit clearer, but certainly there are points on accuracy with the updates we have had with the GNSO Council that we may want to look at. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris, and sorry to overlook the hands; I scrolled down and forgot to scroll up again, so very sorry. So I hope you can provide us with the specifics under the third bullet, along with other topic leads as well, hopefully by the end of the session. We still have like an hour or so. So it will be very much appreciated so we can share with the Board after the session. Kavouss, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, thank you, Manal and Chris. First of all, thanks to Rob that mentioned that we now are more precise and clearer that limiting the number of the questions to the minimum absolutely necessary, and that is good because the time available is very short. Distinguished Chair, may I suggest the following: After review of this points, the question that we raised or the information that we shared with the Board for the reply would be divided into two categories. Category 1, question that we will raise; category 2, we call them issues currently being discussed in GAC and ask the Board whether they wish to comment on that. That means there are potential questions subject to further clarifications. So we reduce the number of the issues which is serious that we need answers from the Board, and the issues that are still among ourselves and could be considered as a potential question subject to clarification, I just submit that for your consideration. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you very much, Kavouss. This is very helpful and makes a lot of sense to me. So we can indeed see if there are any specific questions or those are issues currently being discussed and offer the Board an opportunity to share views and comment. So again, I reiterate my earlier comment that we need to please finalize any specifics under those potential

topics by the end of the session, so I would very much appreciate if topic leads can come back to us with specifics before we conclude. And meanwhile, we can move to the following topic, it is DNS abuse. And the text we shared already with the Board says: The GAC is expected to seek clarity from the ICANN Board on the next steps it expects are needed to address the issues in this area. So again, it's a very open question but again, it provides Board members to provide us with any expectations or clarity from their side on next steps regarding DNS abuse. So any comments or remarks on this? Or shall we move on? Nigel please, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, Manal. On this topic, clearly, we have had exchanges with the Board in the past and of course over several GAC meetings. And since ICANN70 meeting, the Board came back with the scorecard, sort of gave welcome information concerning the status of some of these recommendations. So I do feel we're probably in a position to get down to a greater level of detail with the Board in saying well, of the -- and we can actually sort of identify perhaps those recommendations which are still outstanding rather than just talk about all the recommendations, we can identify a handful of recommendations which either are down for GNSO action or some other action and discuss those with the Board. Because I think we're all conscious that we don't want to waste the Board's time on this but on the other hand the

GAC advises that these recommendations should be adopted before the next gTLD round. And clearly, I think we owe it to everyone to be very specific about which recommendations we're talking about here so we're quite clear about this conversation. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Nigel. But let me ask, this is the CCT recommendations that are pending, right? Because we have another topic labeled CCT --

UNITED KINGDOM: I'm sorry, I thought it was all the same topics.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's -- I understand.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, I'm not suggesting there aren't other issues on the DNS abuse; I was just addressing the CCT angle. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. So this is in the broader sense of DNS abuse, we will get to the CCT recommendations to follow and maybe we can check the order, if the discussion is going to be

repetitive, maybe we can have them discussed following each other. But let's check the order later. Kavouss, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, thank you, Manal. We should distinguish within the CCT recommendation adoption, approval and the general issue of the DNS abuse if there are not connected, we have to raise them separately. Because issue of approval or adoption of the recommendation is something that we have discussed with many years and some answers has been given so we may ask further action on that. But the general issue of the DNS abuse, perhaps our question would be not asking clarity but asking further development from the Board side on the issue of the DNS abuse. Maybe we formulate our question in that sense, further development. If there is anything they should add. But I suggest that we distinguish between the recommendations, approval, and the general issue of the DNS abuse. They are connected but they should be raised separately. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Noted, and we will raise them separately. So if we can go back to the slide on DNS abuse, please. So already taken care of. So we will be asking on next steps or further developments expected. Then moving to remaining topics, I think we have the CCT recommendations, if we can go to

the following slide. So the text we shared with the Board reads, the GAC will seek an update from the Board on the development of a tracker document to report or assess follow-up on relevant CCT review recommendations as references in the GAC communique from ICANN70. And I have received an email from [indiscernible] on behalf of Göran, providing us with efforts to date on updating the community on the CCT review recommendations. So I'm not sure whether this obsoletes the question or whether it still stands and how concerned still to the GAC leads. So it would be helpful to review the question in light of the email we have just received a couple of days ago. Any comments? Jorge, please, and then Kavouss.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Hello. Again, this is Jorge Cancio speaking. I hope you hear me okay; I had some connectivity issues. On this issue I wanted to make a comment and if it's possible, go back to the point on DNS abuse to make a connection with the subsequent procedures overarching comments. So on CCT and the tracking document, I think that the email you were referring to, Manal, is a good collection of some more or less static or let's say photo finish sort of information pieces on where the implementation was at certain moments of time, but I'm not sure whether it's periodically updated tracking tool in the sense we were thinking of. And as I think Jeff mentioned in the chat, and I'm trying to

have a look at the chat in parallel, there might be a shared interest in the whole community to benefit from a tracking tool of that sort, not only on CCT review but other reviews so we don't get lost in a flurry of different PDFs and information that's not always completely up to date. So that's my comment on the CCT. I don't know if you would allow me to go back to the DNS abuse piece.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure, please. Can -- yeah, I see it on the screen.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Okay. That's great. Thank you so much for your flexibility. While we were discussing this and apart from my connectivity issues, I was thinking that we have raised DNS abuse also under the overarching comments, we have included in our input to the Board regarding the new rounds of gTLD, subsequent procedures final outputs. So maybe under this topic of DNS abuse, we could make the link and say something like as we discussed before and as you have seen, we have included the reference to DNS abuse in our inputs to subsequent procedures, and we have mentioned that we continue to have serious concerns regarding the absence of policy recommendations. This we would say before on the subsequent procedures, and here we could go a little bit more into depth with the Board and reminding them that we are expecting swift action from the GNSO Council in figuring a holistic

effort regarding DNS abuse, we can of course make reference to the language we included in ICANN70 on DNS abuse, and maybe what we can also do is raise the SSAC 115 as specific new development --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, Jorge, you are breaking. Is it only me?

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Is it better now?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes. I think it's better now, sorry to interrupt you. Go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: I'm so sorry. I will wrap up, try to conclude. So first, make this connection with the overarching comments we have made on the SubPro regarding DNS abuse. Perhaps we can summarize things a little bit, and if we want to put more and new elements on the table, we could also ask the Board on its reaction regarding SSAC 115 and especially the new entity which is called [indiscernible] which is sort of a response facility which would be common to the whole community and whether the Board sees itself triggering such an effort. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, well noted. We will do the link, mention this on the subsequent procedures, and then link with the DNS abuse. I see Nigel's hand up.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes. Thank you, Manal. Just apologies for getting the order wrong before. But I completely agree with what has been said. I think the email you mentioned from ICANN org was very helpful. And there is a enable there. Clearly, we ought to thank the Board for references that document from the PDP sort of tracker page. But as before I said, I think what this tracks some of the recommendations and what we ought to do with the Board is just be a bit more specific on which of the recommendations are still outstanding in this matter. But I will stop there. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. And just reading Rob in the chat. Rob has already recorded Jorge's suggestions in slide decks (no audio).

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Manal, I think you're muted. Sorry.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you for the heads up, Chris. We lost Manal --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Very sorry. So I was reading Rob in the chat recording Jorge's suggestions, thank you, Rob, and Susan from the US agreeing with Jorge and Chris that the Board's reaction to SSAC 115 would be useful to add to the agenda. Noted, Susan, thank you. And yeah, it's good to know which points, because I will kick start the discussion and there is always the opportunity to GAC members to follow up with further points they would like to make. So please let me know if colleagues would like to speak or elaborate on certain topics.

Just reading Jorge on SSAC 115: We could specifically ask the Board about its general reaction on whether they intend to take a lead in fostering community effort and what opinion they have of the proposed common abuse response facilitator. So this is a good specific point. Rob, if we can capture this, please, it would be very much appreciated. I see a hand up. Kavouss, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. So far, I don't know whether the text on the screen is the text you want to raise, so I suggest that we do not refer clarity,

we refer to the follow-up actions from the ICANN Board on next steps because when we say clarity, that means that what they have already told is not clear and we don't want to say that, so seek follow-up action from the Board on the next -- if you want to maintain the same text. But if you change it, I have no problem. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. We can say clarity/next steps or -- I think the steps are already something very concrete. We were trying to be a little bit flexible with the Board. But again, if everyone feels it's better to replace clarity with next steps, we can -- it's clarity from the ICANN Board on the next steps or further developments. So we want further developments maybe instead of clarity? To seek further developments from ICANN Board on next steps.

IRAN: Yes, I think that's a good way.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So if we can replace clarity with further developments and then delete further developments. So the GAC is expected to -- we need something here, it doesn't read well. But anyway, point noted. And thank you, Luisa, for confirming points shared on the

SSAC 115. So if nothing else under DNS abuse, we can move to the following slide, please. Under CCT review recommendations, I noted that we will be acknowledging receipt of the email thanking the Board for the email and also for the information provided, useful information but as I heard from everyone, it is more of static information reporting on the status quo but does not provide the dynamic tracking we were looking for, and noting also that there might be interest within the community for this tracking tool being a one stop for all reviews and to follow up on recommendations of the different reviews.

I hope this is accurate reflection of our discussion. If not, please raise your hand and let me know of any additions or changes. And if not, we're now at -- have we missed anything on the previous slide? I'm sorry, can we go to the previous slide. Okay. So under the other topic here is SSR 2 recommendations, and we will be asking for an update from the Board on how the SSR 2 recommendations are being considered or might be addressed going forward. Then any comments on this one? Kavouss, please. Go ahead.

IRAN: Yes. I have a problem with that. But I seek here some clarification. Because always the SSR 2 is one of the active members is Laureen, among   others.   Do   we   need   to   refer   to   a   specific

recommendations that we are much more interested at least to know about it? Or just general questions? I remember sometimes Laureen raised a question about a specific recommendation and [indiscernible] replied to some of those so do we have specific recommendation or recommendations that we want to seek clarification or follow-up action or is it general? That is my question. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And if there are specific recommendations to ask about, please clarify. Otherwise, we will be posing the question generally. So it would be more of what is the Board's plan regarding the SSR 2 recommendations; how are they going to approach this? But if there are any specifics, as Kavouss asked, please let us know. If not, then we can move to -- I think it's the meeting, the planning, moving to the in-person meetings. So ICANN return to in-person meetings, and the text we shared already with the Board reads: Discuss ideas and efforts to ensure diverse and active participation at ICANN public meetings as the organization returns to physical meetings. And this is an ongoing discussion within the community, how to return to in-person meetings and passing by a phase that they call a hybrid meeting where some people are able to meet physically, and others are connected remotely. And also a question would be what is the critical mass that could be satisfactory for ICANN

and the community to kick start a return to in-person meetings, of course in addition to other factors related to the pandemic. But if everyone is not able to travel, how many would compose the critical mass and whether we need certain geographic distribution maintained within this critical mass, and how to deal with the challenge of the time zone if some people are on-site while others are connecting remotely. So this is the essence of the discussion ongoing within the community. And by the time we will have the meeting with the Board, we will have had our discussion as well regarding the future of GAC meetings which is scheduled for tomorrow morning. So I think we will have more food for thought to discuss with the Board, but I see your hand is up, Kavouss.

IRAN: Yes, with respect to this issue. First of all, it's very difficult to answer. It depends on the venue of the meeting, if there is in person meeting and which area of the world. Some areas of the world the situation is slightly improving, and some others still very difficult. However, my recollection, of the UN family, almost up to the end of the year, there would be no physical meeting. Because if the meeting is more than 50 person in a place, it would be more difficult to manage some countries now allow short meetings with the maximum 50 persons in a space but in some other areas, having one and a half between them -- can we just

say the reply could be given at the future ICANN meeting when we have a clearer idea? Because I don't think that the next meeting will be physical, in person, it's very improbable. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And this is I think good views to be shared with the Board at the time of the meeting. So we will have a GAC-specific discussion on the topic earlier in the morning so we might have some views to share with the Board. I'm sure the Board also will have views to share. So not a concrete question, per se, but more of a discussion around the topic. Also noting that the Board needs to take a position on ICANN72 by mid-July. So by mid-July, they will have to decide whether the meeting will be totally virtual or hybrid, meaning part on-site and part remote. So it's a timely discussion, as the Board needs to decide on this in mid-July. And again, I hope with our internal GAC discussion in the morning we will have a lot to say by the time we meet the Board.

Any other comments on this? I see active chat. The UN postal union is planning on organizing a hybrid meeting this August, and IGF is going hybrid as well in December, thanks to Jorge and Nigel. And earlier comments on I think this was Laureen saying [indiscernible] if we can capture those from the chat, would be very helpful to support staff. And thanks, Laureen, for weighing

in, and thank you for joining and thanks to everyone who is joining from a difficult time zone. These are CCT recommendations, not SSR 2. Okay, noted. Thank you, Laureen, apologies.

So anything else for our meeting with the Board? If not, we can move to our agenda for the bilateral with the GNSO? And the meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, and the confirmed agenda, again, thanks to Jorge and Jeff, they worked together to fine tune this confirmed agenda, first is follow-up to ICANN70 discussions on EPDP and SSAD, Phase 2a and also accuracy and DNS abuse, and another point on CCT review and the GNSO take on pending recommendations, especially those passed by the Board to the GNSO and potential common asks to the Board regarding common tracking tool of review team recommendations. So two points here, first following up with the GNSO on the pending recommendations, and then just trying to make sure that we are on the same page and they share our interests regarding a tracking tool on the review team recommendations. Finally, the SubPro or issues coming out of the GNSO Council in addition to any other business. So any comments? Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Yes, thank you, Manal. This is Jorge Cancio again, for the record, this time as point of contact with the GNSO. As you said,

we have put together this agenda with the GAC leadership and the GNSO Council's consent of course, and it may be worth stressing that we shared already some points we want to raise with GNSO liaison with Jeff and as far as I know, he has shared them on his site with the GNSO Council. They tried to get into a bit of more detail of the points that are on the slide, and finally, under any other business, if we have enough time, we were discussing the opportunity that Jeff or somebody else from the GNSO Council could share some words on the importance of the IDN EPDP which is going to start, which is starting as we are talking. So that is from my side. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And I'm sorry I didn't know we already have slides on the substance as well. So -- but I see Kavouss' hand up. So Kavouss and then we will get into the details of the agenda.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. I think if Brian is with us, he may complement what I am saying that we need to talk to the GNSO in general concern being the actions or alternatives or options which is on the way to be provided by the Work Track of IGO. And asking further, I would say, relaxations of the recommendations from the GNSO, in particular recommendations that [indiscernible] into

the Work Track. So we are taking that perhaps we should have some alternative approach and that we should ask the GNSO to further collaborate in releasing this difficulty of IGO which is on the table many years and also perhaps yourself maybe expressing the appreciations to Chris Disspain. We found that very active and useful information and good guidance and competence, and we express our satisfaction in the way he runs the meetings. If you wish, you can also express that, that would be an encouragement to Chris to further discuss the matter.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And I think we already heard from Chris, and thank you, Jeff, for confirming that he will be attending the session on IGOs on Wednesday, I think it's on Wednesday. But he will be joining, and he expressed willingness to answer any questions or share any updates if need be. So -- and your point is noted, and we can -- this is going to take place after our meeting with the GNSO. So if you would like, we can flag this during the GNSO, but also, we will have more substantial discussions on the topic later with the presence of Chris as well.

So just for the sake of time, going through under EPDP and SSAD, regarding the SSAD, the GAC awaits progress update from ICANN org on the operational design phase, and already will be asked to the Board and regarding the implementation of the policy

recommendation adopted by the GNSO in Phase 1 of the EPDP, the GAC is interested in the resumption of implementation of the privacy proxy accreditation policy recommendation, this is consistent with GAC advice in the ICANN64 Kobe communique, and subsequent follow-up on that in the ICANN 65 Marrakech and ICANN 66 Montreal communique. So those are two things to flag. Phase 2a have raised several process observations following the recent publication of the initial report. And those points include timeline constraints, have not been helpful in supporting the EPDP's work. There were too many substantive changing at the end of the drafting process of the initial report and not enough time for the EPDP team to review the proposed edits, brand new questions and changes with short turnaround times before publication, as low as 24 hours, should be allowed. And then a document management system, the third point, should be adopted to avoid too many documents created too frequently. The number of documents should be reduced and their access centralized, this is deemed to directly affect the effectiveness of the EPDP's team's work.

So again, with thanks to Jorge and Jeff for the compiled details, if we can go to the following slide. I see no hand up. Under accuracy, scoping efforts, two points, first, it should be noted that GAC concerns with accuracy of domain name information referred to the registration information itself and how it

corresponds to the registrant of the domain name and with that accuracy of that information for the purposes of which it is processed. In that context, the focus of further studies on this matter should concentrate on the accuracy of the domain name information. And finally, under DNS abuse, on the slide, I mean, the GAC would welcome an update from the GNSO about what community work it envisions to conduct on these issues in light of the recent SSAC 115 report and SSR-2 review team recommendations. So anything specific? I'm just reading Brian in the chat: Just a note to follow on Kavouss' good intervention, communique advice on IGOs is being drafted in consultation with GAC leadership. So another point to note. Thanks, Brian. If we can go to the following slide.

And this is on CCT review: While the GAC found the feedback from the GNSO interesting and in places constructive, it is not that clear how it takes us forward with respect to key concerns in the GAC communique from ICANN70, in particular on the issue of the CCT review and subsequent rounds of new gTLD, the GNSO seemed to reiterate previous GNSO Council positions and did not address the substantive issues clearly identified by the GAC's advice in terms of the adoption of relevant CCT review recommendations ahead of the next round of the new gTLDs. And first given the decisions not to address certain relevant issues in the SubPro work, does the GNSO intend to opine on those

recommendations that might require PDP processes, especially given the duration of such?

And the second question, the GAC asked the Board in its ICANN70 communique for a tracking tool that identifies the status of recommendations in terms of who is taking it forward, how it will be implemented and when it is expected to be completed, particularly in regard to recommendations attributed to the organizations and ICANN community in addition to the Board, would the GNSO Council agree on such a tool being made available by ICANN org on CCT review recommendations and possibly other review team recommendations. And this aligns with our discussion earlier regarding our ask to the Board and whether views of other parts of the community also aligns with us regarding this tracking tool.

So thanks, Jorge and Chris and Jeff, for taking this point into consideration in our joint agenda. Anything else? I think we still have one more slide. Okay this is subsequent procedures. As a point of information, GAC would like to draw the attention of the GNSO Council to the input the GAC has filed in the recently finalized public comment period opened by the Board. So this is just to flag our collective GAC input submitted during the public comments opened by the Board. I'm sorry, I see Kavouss' hand up. Kavouss?

IRAN: Yes, just a simple question. Yes, without we draw the attention of the GNSO to what we find. What do we expect from the GNSO? Drawing the attention is sort of your invitation. Okay. Thank you very much. You drew our attention. Do we have something [indiscernible] it would be good if we have, to raise them. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I don't think there are concrete expectations at this point in time apart from bringing it to the attention. I think the matter is now in the hands of the Board so nothing from the GNSO side, but I stand to be corrected. And seeing no objections, I assume this is the case and confirmed by Jorge in the class so thanks, Jorge, and thanks, Kavouss. Let's move on. And as Jorge mentioned, under any other business, the upcoming EPDP on IDNs might be raised, particularly that we are asked to name I think maybe three GAC representatives. So please be ready to volunteer, and rest assured that we will provide the necessary information with the webinar we're scheduling.

On ALAC GAC meeting agenda -- and again, thanks goes to [indiscernible] from the ALAC side, they're coordinating together. So first we have an introduction by the chairs, then the

subsequent rounds, then registration data services. And if time allows, we may tackle a few other topics, namely Internet governance, DNS abuse, and ATRT3. I believe we have more slides. First on subsequent rounds, what are the latest developments and what is each community doing about the issues at this moment? So this is a question that will be posed, once to the GAC and once to the ALAC. I hope we will be ready to engage in this discussion. So for GAC members to discuss, the first point describe at the fundamental level what are two owe three fundamental goals that the GAC is trying to achieve regarding the next round of gTLDs? And second, how do governments believe the next round will or could impact their citizens? As for the ALAC questions, they read: What are end users looking for regarding a new round of gTLD applications? And how can those expectations be met by ICANN? If I recall correctly -- anyway, of course we will have our topic leads speaking to this but of course the wider GAC membership is invited to share their views as well. And yeah, thank you, Jorge, we are hoping such questions trigger a widening debate of course.

And I'm assuming everyone is okay because I see no hand up, so moving to the registration data services, again, with another 20 minutes allocated for this topic, what are the latest developments, and what is each committee doing about the issues at the moment? And the questions posed to GAC members

will include: Describe at the fundamental level what are two or three fundamental goals that the GAC is currently trying to achieve regarding ICANN implementation of the GDPR? Second, how do governments believe that implementation of new privacy laws will impact the use of the Internet by their citizens? And third, how can those protections be applied across borders?

So three questions to the GAC to trigger the discussion and also three other questions to the ALAC: What are end users hoping to see as a result of new registration, and will data privacy protections as they are assessed and implemented by ICANN? What is the stronger interest for end users, protections of personal data or the act to battle bad actors? And third, are those goals necessarily exclusive? So good questions, looking forward to the discussion. And again, as discussed between the GAC and ALAC leadership, we are really looking forward to the wider engagement of GAC and ALAC beyond the topic leads. So hoping to hear from everyone from the GAC, as time allows.

Last slide, I believe. If we can go to the potential topics, time permitting, first is the Internet governance. Summaries of issues spotting derived from the community Internet governance discussion at ICANN71. So there is already a plenary 2, as we mentioned earlier today, on ICANN multi-stakeholder model and its effectiveness internally but also externally within the wider

Internet governance ecosystem. And we already have Jorge on this panel, and Jorge and Nigel expressed interest in leading our discussion with the ALAC on Internet governance if our time allows to reach the potential topics. The second is the abuse, and the idea of committee collaboration on DNS abuse education content, info production, potential reaction from GAC topic leads. So this is an invitation from the ALAC side to collaborate on material on DNS abuse awareness, any educational content or awareness material that is being used at the national level if this could be collaborated and shared with ALAC.

And just reading Nigel in the chat: Yes, regarding ALAC and IG will be good to discuss outcome from the plenary as well as topical issues. Thank you, Nigel. And last the ATRT3, updated on attention to review recommendations, potential reaction from GAC Chair. So they have brought to our attention before that the holistic approach to the -- I'm sorry -- to the organizational reviews. There is -- we have never had organizational reviews, those are normally done by other parts of the community, and for the GAC, our review of how we work is normally done through the ATRT3 recommendations addressed to the GAC and to the Board, and we work on this together through the BGIG. Would this holistic approach -- this may need to change, so ALAC, seeking our views on this as a potential reaction from my side. We haven't had the discussion yet, but it is high on our priorities, and for

everyone's information, we're -- the GAC leadership is scheduling leadership call specifically dedicated to operational and administrative issues shortly after ICANN71. So we hope to pick up on the operational issues as we have been concentrating more on substance, but we hope to get back to you with some highlights for discussion under this topic.

So anything else or any comments while I'm picking up with the chat? So Laureen: PSWG discussed working with ALAC on educational material for public to avoid DNS abuse. And thank you Laureen, for bringing this to the attention, and it would be good to raise it during the session as well. And thank you for confirming. And Chris, thanks for sharing changes to the slides as discussed earlier. So I'm reading Chris this the chat: The GAC has noted initial report of the EPDP Phase 2a [indiscernible] no changes to the policy, the GAC will follow-up on any changes with comments with a view to balance to public protection and other policy interests within ICANN. With regards to accuracy, the GAC has offered to support the GNSO Council in its opening of the PDP. Thank you for sharing, Chris and Rob. I would very much appreciate if we can capture this text from the chat and inert it in the document, please, on the slides. That would be very helpful.

So any final comments? Questions? Remarks? On any of our bilaterals during the week? We have the Board, the GNSO, and

🔍

the ALAC. Any comments in the remaining nine minutes? I see a hand up. Brian, please, go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Yes, thank you, Manal. I have on my screen a direct email to the GAC list, just received an email on the council list, an email from ICANN org was just received in terms of potential dependencies and implementation of PPS AI, I think that has been a long-standing topic of issue for the GAC and rights holders. Although not raised specifically in this session, it relates to topics that were covered so I thought that might be timely to flag to the colleagues' attention.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brian, for flagging. Anything else? Okay. Seeing no further requests for the floor, I think we can conclude early and give you back around seven minutes or so. So thanks, everyone, for this discussion and for the active preparation for our bilateral meetings, and thanks to our points of contacts. We have a break. And after the break, I invite you to [indiscernible] ICANN policy topics, and it would be great if you can share any national regulations that may touch on DNS. They look for governments' contribution during the session, so this would be a good opportunity to share any national regulations related to DNS.

After the plenary there is another 30-minute break, and then we will reconvene to start our GAC plenaries, again, and the next session will be on abuse.

So please be back in the GAC room at 1430 Hague time, 1230 UTC, to reconvene our meetings.

The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]