ICANN75 | AGM - GAC Discussion on Subsequent Rounds
Monday, September 19 2022 - 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

[THIS SESSION IS BEING RECORDED]

[RECORDING IN PROGRESS]

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you very much. Hello and welcome to the GAC Discussion on subsequent rounds on Monday the 19th of September at 7:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. If you're remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the GAC room, please remember to raise your hand in the Zoom room. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for the session on the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor to Manal Ismail, GAC Chair. Manal, please, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Julia. Welcome, everyone. We will use the next 60 minutes to discuss the next rounds of new gTLDs and we need to review recent developments on the Operational Design Phase and discuss and prepare for the upcoming facilitated dialogue with GNSO Council on closed generics. We will be provided with some background on closed generics and previous GAC advice positions and review and have a discussion of ICANN org briefing paper and receive an ICANN update on status of the GAC-GNSO expected dialogue on the topic. We will finally be discussing priority topics as they relate to SubPro or next rounds of new gTLDs and SubPro PDP Working Group final report and hoping to be ready and prepared if needed, any potential GAC consensus advice to the Board. Our GAC topic leads on this are Jorge Cancio, GAC Representative from Switzerland who is joining us from remote as you have seen this morning. Thank you very much, Jorge. I know it is not easy in your time zone but appreciate that you can make it. Our second topic lead is Luisa Paez, GAC Representative from Canada who is not able to join us in this meeting, as you might have all read her e-mail on the GAC mailing list. We all wish her all the very best. Before starting the, I would like also to welcome our guest speakers. We have Jeff Neuman, GNSO Council liaison to the GAC and I understand also we will hear from Mary Wong from ICANN Org.

With that, shall I hand it over to you, Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. I hope you can hear me okay. Jorge Cancio, GAC Representative for Switzerland.

Unfortunately, I'm not able to join you in person but joining remotely, and it is already 9:00 a.m. here in Switzerland so the harder part of the day is over already. I hope that we can have a good session on subsequent procedures as Manal mentioned, we have a number of recent developments on the agenda, which we will go through.

Basically, these are on the one side facilitated dialogue that are between the GAC, GNSO and ALAC on the so-called closed generics and the other issue is which has emerged very recently is a new process launched by GNSO on applicant support which will use the procedure on the so called GNSO guidance process or GGP, another acronym we can add to the acronym romance as Nico said during the weekend.

Without further ado, let's go into the recent developments just as a matter of recalling of refreshing our memories. You may remember that the collective positions from the GAC on the final report of the GNSO on subsequent procedures and this means that on the rules for the forthcoming round of new gTLDs that

were included in a collective comment that we submitted on behalf of the GAC in June 2021.

You can have a look at such collective comments. I think it is linked in your briefing papers. So, that is the latest time where we summed up our positions on the recommendations of the GNSO.

The GNSO sent their report with the final recommendations to the ICANN Board in early 2021.

And then the ICANN Board, after some time, they decided to launch so-called Operational Design Phase or ODP, which will prepare their decisions on the final recommendations of the GNSO.

It is planned that the product of this Operational Design Phase that will be an assessment will be delivered to the ICANN Board by December 2022, so in three months, more or less. There has been delay in the submittal because of other priorities related to the WHOIS disclosure system paper related to the work that has begun under the name of SSAD-light.

We will discuss it in a different session. One of the issues during the Operational Design Phase that has come forward is the lack of policy recommendations from the GNSO, from the GNSO

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

Working Group on the question of closed generics. And in this regard, the ICANN Board decided that the best way forward is to start a facilitated dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC. There are differences of opinions to certain extent on the question of closed generics between the supporting organization and our committee. And we have agreed to engage in such a facilitated dialogue, which you might have seen in your e-mails.

And we have also agreed to include in such dialogue a representative from The At-large Advisory Committee. The discussion is to begin based on a problem statement and briefing paper that has been developed by ICANN Org that has been distributed to the designated representatives in the dialogue.

And there will be an informal get-together of the participants in the facilitated dialogue during ICANN75.

So, if we go to the next slide, we will see that there is already even an agreement on the selection of Mrs. Melissa Peters Allgood from ICANN Org who is trained as a mediator to act as a facilitator for this dialogue.

And there will be a balanced presentation of both the GNSO and GAC for the time being.

We have six representatives from each sub-organization together with one representative from ALAC. On the GAC side we have Manal Ismail, our chair, myself, and Luisa Paez as topic leads for subsequent procedures, and Nigel Hickson from the U.K., and Ronke Sola-Ogunsola from Nigeria, and Ian Sheldon from Australia. This designation was made after a call for volunteers.

If we go to the next slides, we see as said this dialogue will start after ICANN75 and if we reach agreement at the level of framework for closed generics there will be a consultation of the broader community and following the community input the proposed framework on close the generics if there is such an agreed proposed framework will be considered through the appropriate GNSO policy development process. So, maybe short policy development process is needed to, let's say, to transform the framework into policy recommendations.

And if there is not an agreement between the different parties, the Board will need to consider appropriate next steps on closed generics.

Of course, as is mentioned in the slides, the GAC may always issue GAC Consensus Advice on this matter or any of the other SubPro related topics at any given time during the Operational Design Phase and before the board takes a final decision on the

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

subsequent procedures final report. So, I think that we can go to the next slides.

After that, I will pause for a short moment. As mentioned before, we -- at this moment, the Operational Design Phase is happening. It is basically a process between the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council where ICANN Org presents the GNSO Council with questions on how to construe, to interpret, or to assess the recommendations and the guidance included in the GNSO subsequent procedures recommendations. And as said before, that once the operational design assessment is ready, the ICANN Board will finally consider the recommendations and decide whether they adopt or not those recommendations at that moment of time. There is, of course, an opportunity also to furnish the Board with GAC Consensus Advice on any of the issues and there will be an ICANN Board vote on the recommendations and thereafter, the implementation work, as such, will begin with the establishment of implementation review team, which will likely include the development of a revised Applicant Guidebook. I say revised Applicant Guidebook because there is an Applicant Guidebook from the last round from 2012, which will need to be adapted or written anew.

Yes. And we may issue GAC Consensus Advice during this time, which will still take a number of months, at least, until this work

is finished. So, I will pause here before we deep dive into closed generics in case there is any questions or remarks in general on these recent developments. I will have a look at the chat. Thank you very much, Benedetta for posting the link to our collective comment of June 1st 2021. I see Susan has her hand up. Up, please, Susan. The floor is yours.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Jorge, and thank you for the update. Over the weekend during the capacity-building session, there was a presentation on SubPro. I am just recalling a question from our colleague from Brazil, which I thought was just worth revisiting here, which is when will we as the GAC be able to determine what the rules were for the -- well, the rules for the first round and rules for the second round when, at what point in preparing for the second round, will we understand what has changed?

I'm just wondering if that would be after the publication of the revised Applicant Guidebook. If you had any thoughts on that?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you very much, Susan. I will try to give you an answer to this. I guess this goes in different phases.

The subsequent procedures work, which were finalized with the recommendations from the GNSO in early 2021 is already a change to GNSO recommendations of 2007. They are, in the end, the policy basis whereupon the board has to take decisions. I see there is some echo. Okay. That has been solved. So, there is already a delta, you can say, between the GNSO recommendations of 2007 and GNSO recommendations of 2021.

And I'm not sure whether there is any analysis of the changes.

In any case, there is a huge difference in -- in the amount of detail between the 2007 recommendations and the 2021 recommendations. So, that is a first aspect to consider. And probably, as you say, whenever the -- the guidebook, the Applicant Guidebook is issued, there could be a comparison between the 2012 guidebook and the 2024/2025 guidebook, whenever it is released.

But I guess this will be something for ICANN Org to prepare. I guess what could be interesting is to inquire and perhaps this is a question we can put to Mary Wong, who is joining us in some minutes, whether there will be such a comparison between the

main changes or the main deltas between GNSO recommendations of 2007 and 2021 that will be brought before the board whenever they take a decision on the GNSO recommendations. So, I'm sorry to give you such a long answer to -- to your question, but, I guess, there is -- there is no easy answer or no already available document, which maps out very clearly the differences between the last round and the forthcoming one.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. Manal speaking here. Susan would like to respond to you, and I would like to let you know Mary has already joined and Jeff has his hand up as well, but first, Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Only to thank Jorge for his tremendous response. It was great. I appreciate all that information. Thanks, Jorge.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Jorge, shall I give the floor to Jeff next?

JORGE CANCIO: Yes, please. Jeff, if you can provide a short answer to the very complex question, I would very much appreciate that. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: This is Jeff Neuman and thank you for inviting me here. It is a pleasure over the last many years now to come before you and help you -- so that you can understand the complex, as Jorge said, rules of the program. I just wanted to add to what Jorge said, which is a great answer. I think that the only thing I would add is that the way that the final report is structured, it -- it is that there are -- if you looked at the executive summary or just the outputs, what is called the outputs, there is certain types of outputs.

There are affirmations, which is where the Working Group and the GNSO just said, yes. We liked the way it was done the last time and do that way again.

There are affirmations with modifications, which is, yeah. We were -- we really -- we liked the way you did it but would put a little bit of a change here or there. There were recommendations which reflect changes to what was done in 2012. So, I think an implementation guidance, which also are suggested changes from the way that it was done the last time.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

So, there already is a high-level roadmap of what has changed or what is being recommended to be changed for the subsequent round and if the Board adopts that it is a pretty good guide to start with at this point and will make an understanding of the next version of the Applicant Guidebook, I hope, a lot easier. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you very much, Jeff. Yes. You are absolutely right. I was looking more for a high-level summary of the changes, but, of course, if you look into the recommendations and the affirmations and the implementation guidance, you will see the changes both from the -- in respect to the GNSO recommendations of 2007 and also with respect to the Applicant Guidebook of 2012. So, with this and the interest of time, I think we should make progress go to the next slide where we start to deep-dive on the question of closed generics.

I don't know if, Manal, do you want to start with this, or should I proceed?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please proceed, Jorge, for the sake of time, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Thank you so much, Manal. So, here, as a reminder, you see the input made by our predecessors while a few of you, perhaps, Manal and some others were there in Beijing in 2013. There, the GAC issued an advice on closed generics or generics with an exclusive access, meaning that those would be top-level domains with a generic term but used only by one applicant for their own purposes.

There, the GAC advised that for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. This language has been supported or recalled, reaffirmed by the GAC on several occasions that we mentioned here. We don't need to go into the details. And if we go to the next slide, we see that during the discussions within the GNSO on the matter of closed generics, the GAC made some inputs.

In this case, we are quoting the input that we made within the collective comment of June 21st, which was sent to the attention of the Board, but we had made similar comments already before to the attention of the subsequent procedures Working Group. In the end, just for your recollection, the GNSO Working Group was not able to find a consensus solution on the matter of -- of closed generics.

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

There was a number of possible approaches discussed within the subsequent procedures Working Group and here in this input and in previous inputs the GAC already made some -- some comments that were mentioning that the -- basically that the free registration of closed generics wasn't an avenue that the GAC was contemplating and that the GAC was still holding on to the GAC Beijing advice and that some sort of consensus solution should be sought within the community that would be consistent with that advice, meaning that any closed generic should be serving a public interest goal.

So, if we go to the next slide, I think that we can continue our -- our focus on closed generics and I don't know if Mary, are you already here in the room?

MARY WONG: Hello, Jorge, I'm here.

JORGE CANCIO: Hi, Mary. I think I can pass the floor over to you to elaborate a little bit on where we stand with this facilitated dialogue, which has been kickstarted recently. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you, Jorge and Mary, just noting that Velimira has her hand up for the European Commission. If I may take -- please, European Commission, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. I will be very quick and it relates actually to the question raised by Susan and by the helpful responses of Jorge and Jeff. I have one suggestion building upon, you know, the very useful capacity building we had on the new round of gTLDs over the weekend. I think if the new application book or whatever name or form that is given to it does not cover such a comparison between the forthcoming rules and the current ones probably it would be very helpful to have something foreseen by ICANN relevant colleagues in order to inform not only the GAC but possibly the entire community. I think this will be a very helpful document in the context of the tradition to it and of course, as GAC would appreciate having such tool, at least for the GAC community. This is a suggestion to close -- to close this topic. Thank you.

MARY WONG: Thank you very much, and actually, I was going to comment on this, so thank you, Velimira, and Susan from the United States. I'm not aware if such a document exists. What I am aware of is that my colleagues in the global domains and strategy

department, a few of them were with you I think yesterday, are indeed looking and preparing materials that can be helpful in informing the community about the preparations for the next round. We know this is an important project for the community and know there is lots of information, and there will indeed be some changes -- and not all, Jeff, right -- between what was done the last round and the next one. I will bring these suggestions back to them and make sure if we have a response or follow up that I will take it back to the GAC. Also, looking ahead in terms of next steps we are looking at what is happening now with respect to the specific issue of closed generic gTLDs. I think that 80% of the slide might be familiar to those of you who were with us in The Hague at the last meeting.

We touched on this as well. This is more by way of an update. Overall and especially for those members who are newer to the GAC, there is a process to be followed for what is now going to be a facilitated dialogue between the GAC and Generic Name Supporting Organization with the participation also of the At-Large Advisory Committee on the topic of closed generic gTLDs and I have here a slide of the process and you can basically see where we are. We already completed the first two stages and are now in the third phase, which is the confirmation of the participants from all three groups. And I would like to thank the GAC for having quickly confirmed who your participants will be. I

understand that ALAC has done the same. And by way of breaking news, I expect, from what I hear, that the GNSO should be able to confirm its participants at some point during this meeting.

What this means, and in view of the next steps below, is that we are not formally starting the facilitated dialogue at this meeting. We certainly hope to do so very, very soon but there are preliminary steps and preparatory work we need to do as staff supporting the dialogue with the group but that the group also needs to agree on. And one of this is the agreement on what the scope of the problem is that this dialogue is intended to solve, which we have put into a problem statement that I believe that the GAC has seen and there is an accompanying briefing paper that is meant to be a reference and starting point containing some, hopefully helpful background and relevant information. We also will want to have the participants agree on norms and commitments and participation to do it in good faith and so forth.

We hope and anticipate that that will not take too long but we will then be able to kick off the dialogue that may lead to outcomes that are agreed, definitely and especially between GAC and GNSO. And I'll touch on this in my next slide. And I'm very conscious of time now. So if you can quickly move to the next slide. It essentially is pretty straight forward. If the dialogue results in an agreed mutual outcome that there is a road ahead

for policy issues and something that can then be done to achieve agreement on what to do with closed generics, that needs to go through the appropriate policy process within the GNSO. And depending on what the agreed issue is, there will be a process for that. However, what is also important to note is that we are not anticipating one or other outcomes or any other kind of outcomes. That is really dependent on participants and discussions. But if there is no agreed outcome of the dialogue as Jorge said just now, there is no current policy recommendation on the matter.

It is all going to have to go back to the board. Of course, the timeline depends on the pace and progress we can achieve throughout this dialogue and I believe that is all I have, Manal and Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO: Perfect. Thank you so much, Mary. We will pause here for a moment in case there are questions or comments on closed generics from the GAC, from GAC members.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I can see the US, please.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

UNITED STATES:	Thank you. Question to Jorge and Mary for clarification. I understand that the -- the framing paper, forgive me if I'm not using the correct terminology there. And the scope of the discussion that will take place does not include what are referred to as edge out comes. So, is that without or with prejudice to an ultimate -- I mean, are those two edge outcomes, what is the -- where do they sit after this -- this discussion takes place, if you could just clarify that. I hope that makes sense.
MARY WONG:	I can start but I think Jeff might have comments to add as well. Just speaking from the staff support and process perspective, the reason or one big major reason why it has been suggested that the two edge outcomes not be included within the scope is really because those were the outcomes that the community could not agree on during the extensive policy discussions. So, rather than relitigate something that had no consensus, and nothing seems to have changed to indicate that that could change, we thought it might be preferable to focus the dialogue on the rather large space in-between. Edge outcomes are either all are permitted, or none are permitted. I hope that is helpful.
JORGE CANCIO:	Before going to Jeff very shortly to mention that we looked at this from the GAC -side also in our letter of April 22nd.

And we said that we generally agreed as GAC with the proposed parameters for the dialogue, noting that the discussion should focus on a compromise to allow closed generics only if they serve the public interest goal and the two edge outcomes, allowing closed generics without restrictions and prohibiting closed generics under any circumstance are unlikely to achieve consensus and therefore should be considered other scope for the dialogue. Basically, with some diplomatic language, we agreed this is a baseline for the discussion at least from the GAC side.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just to confirm what Mary and Jorge said, the first question that was posed, why do you think this exercise would come up with an output that was not already feasible to achieve during the SubPro exercise? And that's why we tried to see how different this could be to facilitate a middle round. There was agreement to exclude the extreme opinions, as Mary said, that could not really reach compromise so that we can start with the middle ground in mind.

Please, US, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: I think ultimately the question is where does that leave the GAC in -- in terms of following the outcomes of the discussion? In terms of revisiting its original position.

So, is the GAC able to independently of this discussion revisit its position from the previous round or is it --would it be bound by the outcomes of the discussion?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Oops. Thank you, Susan. I think we -- of course, we committed to this process, so we will be bound by the output, but, again, I don't see it deviating much from the -- what we initially requested that closed generics should support a public interest purpose, so, I'm not seeing a big problem here. I think that the edge is no for closed generics or first come, first serve for closed generics, but meeting in the middle, we will see how we can have closed generics that would satisfy public interest. And I stand to be corrected from my colleagues here as well. I see Brazil's hand up and Jeff, while you have the floor, you can feel free to continue as well. First, we have Brazil. Please go ahead.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal. It is more or less along the lines what Susan said. First, if somebody could give a concrete example what a closed generic is, because I think there's a problem of – a concrete example not just conceptually but concrete example of what one of these might be, because some comments we received in Brazil is sometimes it is not clear what the economic interest is around those kinds of generic -- of generics.

The other thing is in terms of process, it is not very clear where the discussion is going and I just wanted to understand, for instance, we have this GAC team that will be meeting to try to be part of this facilitation process.

Is this group mandated somehow by GAC, do you have to provide a mandate beforehand, or it is understood that the mandate is already there? And then after the facilitation exercise completes its course, is the results coming back to GAC for validation or not?

That is not very clear to me. Again, about the middle ground that is something -- I understand the original position of the GAC, as you mentioned, Manal, is restrictive in the sense that we understand it should be allowed only when public interest is served.

If that -- so, I suppose if you don't change our recommendation in this regard, we have to assume that any position that is discussed in the facilitation process as far as the GAC is concerned is one where the solution is subject to achieving this objective. I mean, the public -- the public goal is being served somehow.

So, I think there is this kind of guideline that would be -- it would always be there for the GAC team that is being part of this -- of this facilitation exercise.

If that is not the case, perhaps it would be necessary for us to change this -- this kind of recommendation to allow another level of flexibility to this discussion but I understand that is not the case at this point. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. So, quickly on the process. So, there was no agreement on a way forward regarding closed generics within the SubPro team and there was no default to fall back to if we don't have an agreed way forward. So, we were sort of stuck how to proceed. That is why the board suggested a facilitated dialogue between those who have different positions on the topic, mainly the GAC and the GNSO.

They offer to facilitate this dialogue. That is why we have a facilitator to the process.

And we thought that maybe if we avoid the very extreme positions and try to make it a small group, this could help us to end up in a different way and try to reach a common way forward. So, the mandate is there from the GAC. I mean, we have already appointed six persons. And we are committed to bring back the dialogue to the GAC as we go.

The end process will not come for adoption in the formal sense, but there will be ongoing coordination between the group and the GAC all the time.
We will seek feedback on what we provide during this process, and Jorge, also, if you would like to chime in.

On the -- if we need to have -- and this will help so much if we have a GAC internal discussion that would inform the six representatives who will be participating to the process, we can indeed do this even over a call intercessionally and have this discussion to be guided by your input and whether we can help the process by being more flexible.

I'm not sure did I cover all points you mentioned? I see you. And regarding examples, I'm sure Jeff will be able to provide concrete

examples so, hotels or books or any general name that could be exclusive to someone is a closed generic, but I'm sure Jeff will be able to put it in a simpler way. Please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Sure. This is Jeff Neuman again and think the examples you gave are right on point. I think if you think about in the last round, you had Amazon, for example, had applied for .books or Google applied for .search, but they had proposed to run the registry not as normal registries are run where they allow third parties to register names under that top level but the entity itself would control the entire domain space. So, while it is -- you know, you look at those are commercial examples, but it could also be something like the World Intellectual Property Organization applying for .intellectualproperty. And, you know, not operating that in a manner that would allow third-party registrations, but it could run that in a manner that provided useful information to end-users about intellectual property issues. That would also be considered a closed generic. So, there are many different types.

I wanted to hopefully put your minds at ease a little bit that I believe that the small group will spend a lot of time talking about how to implement the GAC advice.

Right?

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

So… we have the GAC advice, which is that closed generics should -- must serve a public interest goal. Now, how do you do that?

I think that is where the discussions, we didn't have agreement in the subsequent procedures policy development process. So, it is taking that high-level advice and figuring out a way to implement that, that would both satisfy the GAC as well as members of the rest of the community. So, I hope that puts your minds a little bit at ease, that I think that we have a shared objective. And maybe I'm just being optimistic.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: No. We are all optimistic. This is the main essence of the exercise. So, we will try to achieve something.

Jorge, shall I hand this over to Jeff, I think, the remaining slides or --

JORGE CANCIO: Yes. If you allow me for one second.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please.

JORGE CANCIO: To close and recap on closed generics. Of course, my understanding is the six GAC representatives will be guided by the Beijing advice and also by the inputs that we have delivered on a consensus basis to the GNSO during these last years regarding the question of closed generics. And, of course, I think -- and there is the expectation that we go back to the GAC to -- to seek guidance to -- whenever we -- we have more concrete ideas on how to implement, as Jeff put it, the Beijing advice, how to put flesh on the bones of that requirement of serving the public interest goal. So, I think that is our shared understanding.

You will be hearing more of us as I'm also part of that group of six in the coming months. So, maybe now as -- as an introduction to this last point that we have on the agenda, you may recall from the capacity development [weekend] that one issue that really is of concern for the whole community is the limited presence of top-level domains outside of North America, Europe, and some parts of Asia. And in the last round, there was an Applicant Support Program, which had limited success. I think that is a consensus in the community and therefore there are recommendations in the GNSO final report and subsequent procedure on applicant support.

And now that GNSO very recently has taken that decision to launch a specific process on this matter called the GNSO guidance process where I think that it is important for the GAC to actively participate because it tackles some of the digital divides as Brazil put it, that are important in the remit of ICANN. And with this introduction, I leave the floor to Jeff.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Jorge, this is Manal speaking we have a hand up from the Netherlands. Can we take this first?

NETHERLANDS: For the regard this is Alisa Heaver from the Netherlands and without making the debate more complex I was wondering if closed generics were only regarded as English words, generic words, or also generic words in other languages.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I will give you the pleasure of answering this question and then proceeding with your slides. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure. The answer is no. It is not limited to just English. It is whatever is considered generic. There is a definition in the contracts for what that means.

That would be in any language and any script. I only used English examples, but it is not meant to be limited.

NETHERLANDS: Great. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN: Talking about the applicant support GNSO guidance process. The good news here is that this is another subject as Jorge said there is general consensus amongst the entire community that we need a stronger applicant support program than what existed in the 2012 round. So the subsequent procedures final report in its recommendations have a bunch of high-level recommendations about the Applicant Support Program that was adopted by unanimous support, including support from the GAC in its letters to the Board and to the GNSO or I should say to the GNSO and to the Board.

But there is -- there is a bunch of detail that needs to be worked out that the policy members of the GNSO didn't feel qualified, I guess is the word, to -- to establish or develop that program in more detail.

So, the guidance process, the GNSO guidance process, which is a fairly new process of the GNSO, in fact, this is the first time it is

being used, is a much lighter weight process than the normal policy development process and it is intended to be used for mostly implementation type issues which this Applicant Support Program is currently believed to be. Like I said, everyone has supported the recommendation -- the policy recommendations. I think to borrow from what Jorge said, this group is there to put more flesh on the bone, I think is what Jorge said, of those recommendations.

And so, the -- there was a call for expressions of interest, for participants in this group that went out, I think, somewhere in early September. So, around September 5th that went not only to the GAC but to all of the GNSO stakeholder groups and to the ALAC to get this team together to really drill down on the specifics of the applicant support program and to determine what -- or get the help, I should say, of experts that are very familiar with setting up grant programs or other types of financial aid programs so that we can make sure that this time around we have an effective program that does expand the top-level domains to regions that were, unfortunately, either not able or, in fact, may not have even know about the new TLD process. So, at this point, there is also an expression of interest process that was started in September 13th. I guess it is just a few days ago that is looking to see if anyone wanted to step forward from the community to

chair this group. That expression of interest, I believe, goes until September 27th, if I'm remembering my dates.

If anyone is interested, it doesn't have to be someone from the GNSO or it could be someone from the GAC. I will note that one of the recent EPDP chairs, Janis came originally from the GAC. So if this is something you are interested in, have the time -- and I know it is a lot to ask, but it is an open call for someone to chair this group. Then my expectation is that the work will actually begin somewhere in early October, so, just a few weeks from now. And it will be a lot of work, but, again, it is something that we need as a community. It is something that we all share a common interest in making sure that the next round does have applicants from all over the world and from all types of organizations and to just spread out the infrastructure across the world.

So, I'm looking forward to this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr will be involved in it and is from the ALAC and was heavily involved and co-chaired the subsequent procedures group with me. So in future meetings, she might be more helpful in giving an update and that is all I have.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Perfect.

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry. Go ahead, Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO: I just wanted to thank Jeff for the overview and I'm afraid we are running very short of time. I don't know, Manal, how do you want to manage this?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, I was going to pose the same question to you because we are just at the scheduled end time. And we were supposed to have a GAC Discussion. I think that we had the discussion during the slides, and we can dedicate more time intersessionally, Jorge, if you see appropriate at a later time, but I don't think we have enough time this session with this.

JORGE CANCIO: Absolutely.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

JORGE CANCIO: If I may chime in very quickly, we have posed the same question to the GAC for the last three or four meetings, which is whether anyone wishes to come forward with GAC Consensus Advice proposals or texts regarding the subsequent procedures final recommendations. So, we are still in time to do that as long as the Board has not taken a final decision on those recommendations.

So, my call would be to remind colleagues to -- to look into that, to really think hard whether there are aspects of the final recommendations, which deserve GAC Consensus Advice and maybe the prior GAC positions may serve as an inspiration, and you have everything in your GAC briefing paper. Of course, if you are interested in following subsequent procedures more closely, there is a dedicated e-mailing list, which is managed by Benedetta from support staff. Please get in touch with me and Benedetta or with GAC staff in general if you want to join these discussions and, I guess, we will have another occasion to discussion this in the forthcoming meetings.

Of course, if there are important developments or proposals from the membership, we can also have intersessional calls on these matters. I will leave it at that, Manal, and give the floor back to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge and thank you for getting out of your way to join us today and thank you to Jeff and Mary as well and thanks to everyone. This concludes our discussion on SubPro. It is time for a 30-minute break. Please be back at half past for our bilateral with the GNSO. Thank you very much, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR