
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GAC Discussion: Preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AMS

GULTEN TEPE: Hello and welcome to the ICANN74 GAC preparation for meeting with the ICANN Board. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviour. During this session questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read out loud if you put it in proper form.

If you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute you're Zoom microphone. For those of in the main room raise your hand in Zoom and when called upon unmute your table microphone. For the benefit of our other participants please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in Zoom tool bar.

With that I will hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.
Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, and good morning and good afternoon and good evening, everyone in the GAC room and on Zoom. Welcome to the GAC session to prepare for our bilateral meeting with

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ICANN Board, and this session is scheduled for an hour, and this is where we get to review the questions we have already submitted to the Board, and fine tune anything for before we finally meet with the Board on Wednesday.

So if we can go to the following slide, please. So first we will -- I will provide a quick background on our bilateral meetings for the benefit of new GAC colleagues, and then we will start reviewing and confirming the topics and questions that we will be conveying to the Board.

If we go to the next slide, please. So basically, GAC bilateral meetings with other parts of the community are an important and regular feature of the ICANN public meetings, and during the past years these bilaterals have remained important regular interaction point to preserve and expand useful GAC connections with the Board, and as I said, other parts of the community, other supporting organizations and advisory committees.

They can also provide useful venues to highlight and emphasize areas that are likely to be in the GAC Communique, so it's more of a heads up on what is on our thinking, and issues of importance to the GAC, and what may materialize as something important in the Communique, whether issues or advice.

Recently, the GAC has employed a targeted topical or Q and A agenda approach for these meetings, so yeah, previously we used to have a sort of an unprepared discussion, but thanks to our liaisons, and points of contacts to other parts of the community, we found out that having a prepared agenda more a Q and A or specific topics so that everyone comes prepared, and participates actively to the discussion.

So, this session is an opportunity to confirm the topics, as I said in questions previously shared with the ICANN Board in preparation for our meeting on Wednesday. Next slide, please.

Yeah, so as said, the meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, and basically this is the agenda of the meeting. We do the normal introductions and then we have our list of discussion topics, and questions. Basically, around three areas, the SSAD Light, and I'll expand this when we go to the following slide -- accuracy and follow up on the global public interest, then discussion of future GAC information opportunities and then we will look if there is any other business.

Next slide, please. Yeah, so SSAD, three major topic areas that were identified by GAC colleagues for discussion with the Board. First, the SSAD Light and SSAD stands standardized system to access and disclosure so there was a discussion on this -- on

having such a system in place, and then it was more now directed towards having a lighter version, so this is what is referred to as light here.

So, the light version of the Standardized System on Access and Disclosure, and access and disclosure of registration data of course. And also community-driven solutions being built, and this is because a couple of initiatives were brought to our attention, so this is also something we were -- we wanted to raise with the Board.

Second is the accuracy of registration data. I hope this is self-explanatory, and the third area is follow up regarding Global Public Interest Framework, and this is a framework created by the Board, and offered to the community if they wish to benefit from it.

And we have a few questions to the Board, and we started a discussion on inclusiveness, and we felt some interest from the GAC and the Board to pursue this discussion. So, if we go to the following slide, please. So first is the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure, the SSAD Light prioritization and the community-driven solutions being built, and the first question reads, how can the ICANN Board ensure that an evaluation of a SSAD Light concept is completed in a timely manner?

And the second question reads, is the ICANN Board aware, and if so, what are its views, on community-driven proposals for implementations of GDPR compliant registration data disclosure systems?

So, I'm going to pause here to see if there are any comments, remarks, any fine tuning? Are we good with the questions? Okay. I'm sorry, just checking on-line as well, and seeing no -- yeah, there is a request from the floor. Pär please go ahead.

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: It's a question for later.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Noted, so I think we are good to confirm these two questions. Can we go to -- Nigel, please go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, sorry, good morning, Manal and colleagues. Nigel Hickson, U.K., on the questions -- and nothing wrong with the questions at all -- I just -- I thought we ought to get a sense out of the ICANN Board about their, about their thinking about how the sequencing of SSAD Light is going to be sort of accommodated within the actual SSAD itself, so I -- perhaps I'm not expressing

myself very well but I think the concern is -- certainly the concern of the U.K. is that while we totally appreciate that a SSAD Light might be an interesting way forward, and you know having some sort of evaluation study in the next 6 weeks of the -- of its attributes and how it might help us is all beneficial.

What we would be concerned about, I suppose, is that, is that after that process that we are able to have a discussion on whether we got the head wind of SSAD Light in terms of further scoping it etcetera, etcetera or, you know, we as a GAC want to, want to ESHAW the more comprehensive model and I suppose I'm just not sure about the sequencing of the decision-making process in that.

And, I think it is of concern because so much work has been put into this area, and we need to ensure that the -- at the end of the day that we do get the access that GAC countries, countries around this table, are able to -- their law enforcement agencies and other agencies are able to secure that necessary access to the data. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. So, would you like to add a third question, or follow up verbally during the session? And thank you

for also reminding me to explain how the session itself goes, again for the benefit of new GAC colleagues.

So I normally go through question by question. We receive the answer from the Board, and then I pause to see if there are any follow up comments from GAC colleagues, so we normally can accommodate one or two comments depending on the time, or follow up on the Board response, for example, and again depending on the time, but normally its one or two comments or follow-ups.

So, Nigel, would you like to follow up on this verbally during the session, or add a third question that we should add to the slide deck?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, Manal. I think depending on what is said during the session perhaps a brief verbal. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Nigel. Noted. So I note your interest to follow up during the session on this this question, and please feel free to you don't have to mention it now if you feel like following up on any of the questions please feel free to do so during the session,

but again, depending on the time we can take two or more depending on the time.

So anything else on SSAD Light? Brazil, please go ahead.

BRAZIL:

A little bit along the lines of our friend from the U.K. and going back to what I had raised yesterday, I understand of course that our -- there are questions about the extension and the education of the is SAG system and that is why I understand this proof of concept is being proposed. I wonder if the question here is more to do the timing of this process, or this scope and the nature of the process in let's say if wouldn't be appropriate to ask ICANN Board how it sees the usefulness or the... of the exercise and the scope of the exercise because again I had understood that this proof of concept is something with a very limited objective of testing if the regional assumptions were right or not but then as a result of this exercise we come to the conclusion well they were not and then what the alternatives are?

And so, I don't know if we should perhaps go a little bit further than that in asking more than the timing of the process and more about how the Board sees the usefulness of this -- how it sees the scope and the usefulness of this proof of concept exercise? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Noted. So Rob, were you able to grasp the essence of the question on Board views on the usefulness and scope of the system?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I will make an attempt to do so, Manal, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. And I see a hand from Julia, please go ahead.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Yes. Thank you, Manal. We have a comment in the chat from Gemma, EC who states would it be to be clarify the second question B, are we asking about the other initiatives outside of SSAD preparation? Are we aware of any? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Julia, and thank you for the head up, and thank you Gemma for the question. So I understand there is a couple of community initiatives, but again, to colleagues who drafted the question, I stand to be corrected.

One of the initiatives was brought to the attention of the GAC, and they asked for a bilateral with the GAC. It was a very short notice,

and we couldn't accommodate a slot on the GAC schedule, and we thought it -- maybe later we can do this over a conference call or so, but I think this is more of a general question to the Board.

I don't think we will be getting into deep details, but at least I understand there is a couple of community initiatives. Any -- and I see nodding from Laureen so thank you, Laureen.

Does this answer your question, Gemma, I hope? Please, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Gemma, thank you I am ... but let me briefly say I think this is a really good question but I wanted to understand the context because I was not part of the preparation. And I was wondering so I this is new to me that there are other initiatives, and if this is the case that's very good news and it's indeed important to get to know whether the Board is aware, and whether this initiatives could serve the purpose that the SSAD is also trying to fulfill.

But, now, reflecting on this and with no aim to change the question, but I was wondering whether as part of this exercise of having initiatives, so something which is not I understand implemented already -- to have a look at the good practices that exist already for GDPR compliant disclosure systems. I mean, in

reality I think in European Union we have quite a number of examples about that.

The colleagues from the member states are better placed to inform about them, but this is also very good step so to look at what is already available in terms of solutions, although I must say these in general this type of solutions implemented already they tend to be focussed on initiatives from the registries and the registrars so we are not talking about any centralized system as the one that the... could derive out of the SSAD.

So a small note. Thanks for the clarification on the question. Perhaps for the future it would be good to reflect on how it's possible to inform on existing implementation practices. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gemma. Well noted. Any further requests for the floor? Yes, please go ahead.

NIGERIA: Good morning. This is... from Nigeria. I'm going to take us back to the A question. How can the ICANN before assure an evolution in regards of the time-line? I think what we should look at is the time-line. Then review very well let's -- that's not what the GAC...

and identify rather than just asking the Board straight away how can they ensure because if there is a time-line we need too lack at what is to be done at any particular point in time. Then identify the GAC. I might be wrong but just clarification. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Mistura. There is no clear time-line and that's why we are trying to follow up and this and I see nodding from the pen holders as well so I mean, there is no clear time-line so that is the reason for the question, and I see you nodding so I hope I'm answering your question. Thank you, and thank you, Rob, for the quick addition of the third question, which now reads, given efforts on the SSAD developments to date, has the Board developed any general perspectives on the general usefulness and/or scope of the system concept?

And Brazil, I see nodding as well so thank you very much Rob. Anything else on SSAD before we move on? Okay.

Can we go to the following slide, please? So this is under accuracy of registration data -- one more trial. This is under accuracy of registration data, and the question reads, has ICANN org requested and/or received legal advice on the issue of whether there is a legal basis for ICANN org to access registration data for purposes of accuracy verifications?

And this is in connection with ICANN's planned outreach to the data protection authorities for guidance. Any comments? Any questions? I see a hand up from Nigel. Is this an old hand or -- I see. Thank you. Old hand. Seeing no requests from the floor I think we are good to confirm this question and can we go to the following slide, please?

And this is a follow-up regarding the Global Public Interest Framework, and as I mentioned earlier it's a framework created by the Board that -- and this is how they do their sort of evaluation. It's a list of questions that they ask to themselves to make sure they are serving the global public interest in their decisions, and they offered this framework to the community, to the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, in case they find it helpful to guide their discussions as well.

So, by way of providing background, the GAC conducted several discussions at ICANN73, and there was a community plenary on the topic. We had internal discussions on this, and we had bilateral discussions with the Board, and other groups. Subsequently, the GAC recognized the importance of incorporating global public interest considerations into policy development, and decision making at ICANN.

The GAC also continued internal discussions regarding the concept of inclusiveness during that time, and the global public interest was an issue of importance in GAC ICANN73 Communique, including -- and we're quoting here from the Communique -- the requirement of inclusiveness established in the articles of incorporation should be explicitly enshrined in the Global Public Interest Framework. This particular Communique language prompted interest from Board members who suggested that it would be useful to clarify what the GAC meant by the term.

Can we -- I see a hand up from Pär, please go ahead.

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: Yeah, this is partly to do with global interest, of course, but lately due to some -- I've been in contact a lot with the ICANN Board and ICANN org†--

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, Pär.

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: You can't hear me?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, if you can speak closer to the microphone.

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: All right, all right, all right, I'll take my mask off. There is one thing that has never been clarified really. It is in the Bylaws. And that is the phrase that I've heard several times now from ICANN that national law supersedes ICANN Bylaws.

And that is if you read the Bylaws, both the Bylaws and the article of incorporation to Internet and incorporation for the assignment of ICANN is very clear that local law supersedes the Bylaws in hand with the public interest, though I've never seen this in writing. It's very vague. The so I would like to ask a question to the Board about why they don't spell it out.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Pär. Noted. So, would you like to make this as a follow-up verbal follow up?

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: Follow up, yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, noted then. When we have -- when we get to discuss this during the Board please feel free to seek the floor. I'm going to pause after the questions, and the answers we received and then

GAC colleagues can follow up on -- so feel free to follow up on this topic obviously. It's of interest to Niue. Thank you.

PÄR BRUMARK, VICE CHAIR: Yup, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So we are still on the background. If we can go to the following slide, please. I'm sorry, I see further hands up.

Yeah, Kavouss, I'm sorry. Please go ahead.

IRAN: Manal, no problem. I know you are busy. I am also busy. I have 2 computer one ... for listening to GAC. I have third computer listening something else. Distinguished Manal, you hear me, please?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, loud and clear, Kavouss.

IRAN: Yes, thank you very much. Manal, I am a simple person, believe me. I don't understand why we put in question the inclusiveness. Inclusiveness is a quality of including many different type of

people and treating them all fairly and equally. Why we get into that discussion what is inclusiveness? We are talking of connecting everyone.

You are talking to including everybody, and as somebody mentioned in the article of incorporation this inclusiveness is the keyboard. Why we put in question and why the Board ask us what we mean by inclusiveness, inclusiveness, inclusiveness. Everyone have the same right and everybody should be treated fairly and equally. I think it the time consuming if you agree. If you don't agree, I don't know.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and this was by way of background to everyone so that we are on the same page. We don't necessarily have to go word by word with the Board. We have two complete questions at the end, so definitely we shouldn't be reading all this with the Board. We can produce if there is no interest to get deeper in the discussion, but my recollection is there was interest from the GAC and from the Board to pursue this further.

So, again, I'm (intervening audio) I'm sorry, someone needs to mute. And so, let's go through the rest of the slides on the same

topic and I think we can then agree how we want to finalize this part.

Rob, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. Literally, in the room as well as in the Zoom room, thank you. I wanted to offer a little bit more context to this. A number of the GAC members may recall some e-mail exchanges earlier this period since ICANN73. And if I recall correctly it was something that did come out after Board discussion when they were reviewing the ICANN73 GAC Communique.

And the critical aspect of that was that although there was no consensus advice from the GAC in that Communique, the Board still very meticulously looks through the document. GPI was identified as an issue of importance, and you quoted the language earlier, Manal, about inclusiveness that the GAC used, and I think that's what prompted the question. A number of GAC members have offered perspectives from a topic lead perspective about this issue.

A number of people commented on the e-mail list, which was greatly appreciated, and there have been some additional internal conversations about what approach the committee

wants to take on the concept of inclusiveness and whether you want to clarify that or not to the Board.

The next couple of slides reflect some of that input, those drafting efforts and the discussions. You can choose to review that today and have that be a part of your conversations tomorrow, or it can be something that takes place more broadly between now and ICANN75.

From my perspective, I offered it in the slides to give you all the opportunity to talk about it today, but it's not a requirement. I think we've got 2 or 3 slides about that that some of the contributors are welcome to speak to, but if they're not interested in doing that at this meeting we can go directly to the questions. I leave it in your hands. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob, for the clarification, and the context.

So, I suggest we go quickly through the remaining couple of slides on the issue and then read the questions, and pause to seek the views of the GAC colleagues. So I hope this is okay with you, Kavouss, as well, so can we go to the following slide, please.

So GAC members believe it is crucial to the legitimacy of ICANN that the organization allows all stakeholders to participate meaningfully in its processes, and to express their needs and interests. Only by taking them into account can ICANN claim to act in the global public interest.

And again, I hope this is useful to GAC colleagues who were not there during the discussion. The concept of inclusive policy making is multifaceted and includes notions of diversity, openness, meaningful participation, and responsiveness to different interests. Definitely inclusiveness is much more than just an open door, ie; PDPs that are open to volunteer participation.

It should mean that all interested stakeholders are able to participate, actually to participate -- I'm sorry -- it should mean that all interested stakeholders are able to participate, actually do participate thanks to an enabling environment, and have a fair to say and impact on the results of the process and there is a reference to an OECD relevant source.

Within the specific parameters of the Global Public Interest of ICANN the concept of inclusiveness should be taken down to a series -- should be broken down to a series of aspects. And there is a reference to previous bullets, that can be measured in some

way or another. This should be included explicitly in the GPI framework as part of the elements against which a PDP or other outcomes is measured up in order to ascertain whether it is in the Global Public Interest.

So this is basically further explanation and further elaboration on what the GAC meant by inclusiveness and that it is not only an open door for everyone to participate, but also to make sure it's a meaningful participation and being considered.

If we go to the next ... so the June 2020 ICANN discussion paper titled delivering a public interest framework, presents a proposed framework and a long list of Bylaws, considerations, fashioned as question to potentially be applied in the context of existing policies that might be developed.

Among those 18 questions, three critical questions stand out that specifically apply to the policy development process of such great interest to the GAC. So out of the 18 questions, question 8, 9 and 10 are of particular interest. Question 8 reads, will or did the policy development process employ open, transparent and bottom up multistakeholder policy development processes that are led by the private sector including business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community, academia and end users, while

duly taking into account the public policy advice of governments and public authorities?

These processes shall, A, seek input from the public for whose benefit ICANN in all events shall act, B, promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and C, ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

And we're quoting here from the framework so the framework is comprised of a set of questions, as mentioned earlier, and those three are of special interest to the GAC. Sorry.

Question 9 reads will or did the policy development process seek and support broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development, and decision making to ensure that the bottom up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the Global Public Interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent.

And finally, the third question, which is question number 10, will or did the policy development process strive to achieve a reasonable balance between the interests of different stakeholders, while also avoiding capture?

So if we go to the following slide, and I think yeah, so yeah, more background. Think this is the last one on the background of the topic. The discussion paper itself in the footnote -- in footnote number 4 addresses the term inclusion by stating -- I'm sorry -- by stating, and there is a quote. In identifying the public interest that is being served in a particular context consideration should also be given to individuals and groups that are not a part of the conversation in order to support and promote inclusion.

And there is a reference here, and then some GAC members stressed the importance of the impact on the outcome of the policy process, in ensuring meaningful participation from diverse set of stakeholders, and hence inclusiveness.

If stakeholders do not perceive their participation will have an impact -- if stakeholders do not perceive their parts paying will have an impact or that participation is organized in a meaningful way, then they will disengage even in processes that are fully open. In this respect the answer to tenth question outlined above between records achieving a reasonable balance between the interests of different stakeholders while also avoiding capture is especially important

So the essence here is, it's not just a matter of an open process, if you don't feel you are being heard and your views are being

considered, then even if the process is open, this might not be a good reason enough for being active and engaging.

So I think the next slide has the questions, thank you, Julia, so the questions, we have two concrete questions at the end and we can definitely skip this long introduction and we have already shared it with the Board so I'm sure they have already read it. We don't have to repeat it during the session. I'm sorry haven't we?

Okay. Sorry, thank you. So Rob is correcting me, we haven't shared this long introduction with the Board, this was to set the context and provide background to everyone on the topic so maybe we can decide to shorten it a bit, or share it in the final version and not go through it again during the session.

Flexible, let me know what you think, but first let's read the questions, first question the GAC noted in the issues of important to the GAC -- in the issues of importance to the GAC section of the ICANN73 GAC Communique, that the GPI framework could be adopted and applied by all advisory committees and supporting organizations in their work including, for example, through the process of developing an endorsing policy recommendations decisions and public comments.

Question is, how has the Board considered advancing discussion with different advisory committees and supporting organizations on ways to take into account the Global Public Interest as part of their work and outputs.

Then, second question, in addition, the GAC noted that the initial application of the Global Public Interest to the SSAD Operational Design Assessment appears to have been limited. What measures could the Board take to ensure that public interest concerns are not only considered, but effectively addressed.

And I'll stop here to see if there are any requests for the floor. Any comments or remarks on -- Indonesia, please, Ashwin, go ahead.

INDONESIA:

I just wonder in the GAC and Board meeting if there is a statement or whatever from a country or a group of countries, how the meeting will -- that kind of statement, that kind of statement might be -- might not be prepared you know, of long -- night before so it can be just a sudden information, through the meeting. You can still accommodate that one because we have done several times before, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Ashwin. So you're asking if a GAC member would like to make an estimate during the Board meeting?

INDONESIA: Yes, exactly, and it is not prepared beforehand you see because it can be very sudden request from the government or to that member, or group of members. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I mean, we -- if a government would like to make a statement but of course they should not expect a response. It's unprepared.

INDONESIA: I understand, yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We are preparing for the session, and if there's something unprepared, it will neither be endorsed by the GAC, nor be responded to by the Board, but are we talking about a complete case?

I mean, do we have someone who would like to make a statement during the meeting with the Board, or is this a general question?

INDONESIA: This is general question. I just wonder if this type of intervention during the meeting, which is not prepared, can still be accommodated. Thanks. That's all.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. I mean, I see Jorge's hand up so -- is this on the same topic.

JORGE CANCIO: It's on these questions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So I'm sorry, Jorge, maybe I can respond first to Ashwin.

So, it's a good point. I think we can discuss it. I cannot keep a government from speaking during the meeting, but again, normally it's good to give a heads up to the Board on what we are going to discuss during the meeting, but again, as I said, if a government seeks the floor and intervenes, I cannot prevent anyone from speaking out, but they should not expect this to be endorsed by the GAC.

It's an individual thing, and they should not expect a response by the Board either because as you've said it unprepared, and -- and maybe a better way of doing this in writing and not necessarily

during the bilateral. Anyway, it's good you raised the point. I think we can discuss it and agree on a best way forward. Finn, is this on the same topic? Please then go ahead.

DENMARK:

Finn Petersen. As to the question, I think we should use this for a dialogue with the -- and not have an individual statement that will -- could take up a lot of time, and as you indicated it will be a statement and nobody can react to that or is in a position, so if a member state, or member of the GAC or observer would like to give a statement, I think it would be much more productive if we had it in writing. It will certainly make life easier for all of us and I think we can look at the written statement and take our from that, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Finn. Makes perfect sense to me, and as said, this could always be done in writing, which is a preferred way of course thank you -- and Jorge sorry to keep you waiting. Please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you very much, Manal. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. This was more a comment on the, on the previous slides, and I think they, there's a lot of rich content on the issue of

inclusiveness, at the same time I'm unsure whether this is ripe for sharing with the Board in this in this format.

Maybe what can be included in the GAC questions as a message is that we have been following discussions on this and maybe two or three elements could be highlighted at very high level so I don't know if Rob would be in a situation, and in a position to trying to do that in the sense that we see inclusiveness as something beyond openness, and going into the direction of meaningful participation, and that we look forward to continuing this conversation with the Board also in light of future an analysis of the GPI, which they will apply for instance to the SubPro ODP.

But without going to -- into that detail, of course, but just saying that in the future, we look forward to continuing to discuss this with them because it's a very important to us.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. I think it makes perfect sense, and I was also of the view that we should shorten the introduction, but I think it was useful for GAC colleagues here, but not necessarily needed for the bilaterals, are so we can definitely short pen the introduction maybe one slide would be more than enough, and then we can get to the questions along the lines that you mentioned, Jorge.

And I think this also would address the concern of Kavouss. Any further comments or questions on GPI that drove the public interest part? Seeing no -- Velimira, please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. I'm just following a little bit on Jorge. I would agree this is too much information for the Board however I have seen that there are a number of GAC colleagues who have participated in drafting this, this let's say view of a good number of members of the GAC how it [inaudible] should look like.

So I'm just thinking probably, and here I'm turning to Rob, probably there is a possibility to give this short analogy as how we see as a tool or do those members of the Board working on a Global Public Interest so that it fits in their discussions because in this inclusion is something that some of the back members, not necessarily European Commission but other members have raised as an important topic, and given that this work ICANN was quite [inaudible] from what I saw on the document it made useful probably for the RV and colleagues working into this to have it in mind. We just question whether there is another reasons to communicate but to those members who are involved in the GPI framework reflection.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Velimira. I see Rob's hand up. Please, Rob, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, Manal, and I appreciate the comments of the topic leads on this, staff is more than happy to take that larger work product and fashion something that the GAC may be able to share in other contexts. As Velimira suggests either directly, with Board members responsible that are that -- like Avri Doria or others. From a process standpoint what staff can do is continue to work with the topic leads on it and thus when they are comfortable with the work product we can share we've done in the past with the full GAC list, so that folks have an opportunity to see that as Jorge has noted, the timing is not completely ripe yet because there's a second sort of test taking place as part of this subsequent procedures operational design phase.

So I think that alternative that's been offered make perfect sense from a process standpoint. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. So, yeah, definitely once everyone is comfortable with the text and language it could be shared with either the Board or the relevant Board members, and we have an open channel I would say with them.

So I think we are good to move onto the last slide in the remaining few minutes. Yes, please, Rob, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Manal, one last clarification to understand my marching orders here after this session, I will work to recast slightly slide 9 to reflect Jorge's point about the fact that the GAC looks forward to future conversations with the Board on this topic. I will leave it to you during the meeting tomorrow as to how deeply you or others may want to get into the discussions with the Board, simply to you know flag that there may be future conversations on this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Rob. So, let's go to the following slide, please, and this is discussion of future back information opportunities, so the Board and the GAC have made substantial progress in the last few years on interaction and collaboration, opportunities are coming up to build on this progress example the next round of new gTLDs, and the back played a significant role in development of the Applicant Guide Book for the first round of new gTLDs, and again this is in the context of the collaboration we're having with org in providing any necessary information to the GAC, and also helping us to bring new GAC colleagues up to speed on different topics,

and in particular the next round of new builds, where the GAC played a significant role during the first round, and second round is approaching so we really need to all GAC members to be ready to participate and up to speed.

So GAC is playing an important role in policy development and discussions about the next round, and Board is interested in continued effective engagement. Help get new GAC participants up to speed to prepare for next round. I'm going through the bullets, obviously I already covered them. Discussion of sharing org papers, summarizing how GAC advice was considered during first round of new gTLDs, and consider methods for future org GAC -- on this topic, for example, topic specific, webinars, etcetera.

So on the third bullet there was a discussion that org can share with the GAC how the GAC advice was handled during the first round so that everyone is on the same page, and up to speed, and also, as was obvious yesterday there is a request for continuing to have informational webinars, and briefings on the previous round so that we can draw on lessons learned and make sure we are not working from scratch again.

So this is just an exchange with the Board, no specific questions, any comments? I see no further questions for the floor, and we

are right at the hour so I would thank everyone for your participation and active engagement. I'm just checking the schedule. So we have a 30-minute break right now and then after the break there is the community plenary session titled 5 year follow up to who sets ICANN's priorities?

I have to say that the GAC led in the reference session five years ago, and participated to the organization of this session today with the help of Nigel Hickson of U.K. on behalf of the GAC, so please make sure to attend and we will reconvene here in the GAC room and on Zoom at 13:15 local time, 11:15 UTC to start our discussion and GAC WHOIS and data protection. So please, see you after the session. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]