ICANN76 | CF – GAC LAC Capacity Development Workshop (1 of 4)
Saturday, March 11 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Hello, everyone. Welcome to Cancun. Could you please start taking your seats? Thank you. Hello, and welcome to the ICANN76 GAC led Capacity Development Workshop, introduction on ICANN, GAC and PDP process session on Saturday, 11th of March at 15:30 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 are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the GAC room, please raise your hand in Zoom, and when call upon, unmute your table microphone. You may access all of the available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Nico Caballero, incoming GAC chair. Nico, over to you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, Gulten. And welcome, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN76 GAC Capacity Development Workshop. This is a second workshop after the pandemic. And we're basically building on a successful workshop at ICANN75. Basically, GAC members expressed interest in continuing such activities for the GAC and underscore the value of face-to-face

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.

interactions after, I would say, almost three years of pandemic restrictions.

Consequently, we thought this workshop provides an excellent opportunity to GAC participants, some new who would appreciate the info and some experienced who would appreciate a refresher. In my case, unfortunately, this weekend is also devoted to a board workshop. So I'll be leaving like in 10 minutes, and I'm very sorry about that. But we're basically dividing the workload with Manal. So I apologize beforehand for that. So with that, welcome again and back to you, Karel.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, Nico. And good morning to everybody. My name is Karel Douglas. I'm from Trinidad and Tobago. And it's a pleasure to have you all here. I do recall many of you from last time. And I know the success that we had last time is to continue that success onto another exciting capacity building workshop. So together, I have with me, Pua Hunter from the Cook Islands, and Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU. So I'm going to hand it over to Pua at this point in time. Pua?

PUA HUNTER: Hello, everyone. Welcome. My name is Pua Hunter. I'm the co-chair for the Underserved Regions Working Group in the GAC. I just want to say thank you to Nico for the welcoming remarks. We understand that you're very busy as incoming chair for the GAC. So thank you for making the time, just a say.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Before I forget, I hope to see you all at a welcoming reception tonight. Sorry, to interrupt.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Nico. And also thank you to each and every one of you for making the time to attend the capacity development workshop nicely organized with the assistance of Tracy and Karel, by our GAC support team, Julia and everyone in the support team. Thank you so much. To all our participants participating remotely, welcome. Thank you for your time as well. Without further ado, I will hand back the mic to Karel, who will take us through the rest of the agenda.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Okay. Thank you, Pua. And I may possibly move closer to the front table so it's easier for the camera guys. I think they're trying to keep track of me. But in any event, today is going to be very fluid. There's an opportunity for you to understand the GAC. So we do have a microphone, by the way, another microphone, not the one I'm holding, but that's going to be a roving microphone. So allows you an opportunity to ask questions, if you have questions or comments.

Kavouss, I see your hand. So just bear with me. Yeah. So the idea is that as much as possible, it is an interactive session. So we wanted to ask questions. Otherwise, it's just going to be one way, so we want a two way thing. I'll allow Kavouss who just put his hand up. Kavouss.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Very good morning, very distinguished friends. Very happy to see you, to see new faces, which is promising that we are building the successions for future of GAC. I had a discussion with the Deputy Secretary General of the ITU last week on the same subject of capacity building. What we discussed was that in order to be productive, an efficient capacity building is a session in which there would be full interactive.

That means encouraging, simulating the listener to raise question, to ask question, but not to be passive and not to, what I say, brain storming them with a lot of things that do not allow them to analyze and to, I would say, digest the situation. It is up to the speaker to at some appropriate time to inject this idea of stimulating and encouraging questions and so on and so forth. Sometimes by some sort of, I would say, imaginary question that, do you know that what is so on so forth? And then if they are reply, very good. If not, then explain. Otherwise, that would not be so efficient.

Moreover, just one more minute, I talk to him saying that if you want to have a successful workshop in particular capacity building, we need to devote to some specific issues, but not addressing all issues. It would be difficult to go superficially. The reason is that I have spent a life here, 50 years of works. And I gained a lot of experience that this interactive would be very important, in particular for the new, I would say, faces or new colleagues joining us, which may now better than us.

Let us beat that. The newcomers sometimes they have fresh ideas and so on and so forth that we may not have. So let's just listen to each other, learn from each other and so on and forth. I'm sorry to raise this

at this very beginning, but just wanted to share with you my expert years. And I thank you very much.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you very much Kavouss. And I didn't identify, but Kavouss is from Iran. Thank you very much. And just to underscore what Kavouss said, and in particular Kavouss you have been here for many, many years and I hope that you also would lend your experience to those who are maybe new or still learning. So I appreciate that.

And of course, your comments are really well appreciated. Yes, it is interactive. Yes, we want to, not necessarily deep dive today, but at least skim some of those important issues so we understand on what the GAC is doing, what we're about. And that is a perfect segue to our first session today. So without any further ado, I'm going to invite Carlos Reyes from the org, ICANN org, who will speak about the introduction to ICANN, and its role in the internet governance system. So Carlos, thank you very much. Over to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Karel. And thank you everyone for inviting me again. It's always a pleasure to speak with you at the capacity building workshop. With the guidance that we should keep it as interactive as possible, I have slides. The team has them for you as references. Occasionally, I'll point to them, but I'm really more interested in the discussion today. So, Gulten, thank you. Right on time.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

So slide number two here. I hope that at a high level, everyone here largely understands the mission of ICANN. Today's talk, I have 10 minutes to really talk about our engagement with other Internet governance organizations and our overall participation in the Internet governance ecosystem. So as you know, the five central pieces of our mission is to coordinate the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone for the DNS.

We also coordinate the policy development and policy implementation around that. We help evolve the governance of the root servers system. That's the third point. The allocation of the topmost level of IP addresses and autonomous system numbers. That's four. And then five here, coordinate with other bodies as appropriate to provide registries needed in functioning of the Internet as specified by Internet, protocol standards development organizations, etc.

What overarches all of this is collaboration and cooperation. We don't do this alone. If we can move to slide five, Gulten. Yes, so we work with our technical partners. So that's how the Internet works, right? There's not one single point of failure and one single entity that coordinates all of this. And together, we provide the governance for this incredible resource that now underpins communications worldwide, the entire global economy, your outreach to your constituents as governments. So there's a lot of dependencies on ensuring that the Internet operates in a secure, stable, and resilient way. And we do that with our technical partners.

So next slide, please, Gulten. So who are these technical partners? If we look at the supporting organizations and advisory committees of

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

ICANN, that gives you a sense of some of those partners. As you know, there are three supporting organizations representing different policy remits of the ICANN bylaws. One of those areas is regional Internet registry community. And they're really dedicated to the numbers, the second N in ICANN.

So we work very closely with the regional Internet registries. The regional Internet registries have their own policy communities. But ICANN collaborates with them when it comes to global policies that impact the allocation of those number of resources by the IANA functions. So that's one area where we collaborate.

The Internet Engineering Task Force is up here. For those of you who have been to IETF meetings, you know they're slightly different than ICANN meetings. If you think ICANN is technical, the IETF is even more technical. And that's by design, that's that community. They're really at the forefront of operations. But we work with them very closely in different areas. And let's see. The root server operators.

As you know, there is a Root Server System Advisory Committee at ICANN. But the roots of our operators are independent organizations. They collaborate with us when it comes to operating and distributing the-- excuse me, operating root service and distributing the root zone file. ICANN is one of the 12 root server operators. But collectively, we participate and help evolve that system. ICANN facilitates that process. As I mentioned, that's one of the three areas of our bylaws. Excuse me, of our mission and the bylaws.

There are few other groups up here. Domain Name System Operators. We have a technical engagement team, and that's really a deliberate

effort on behalf of the organization to bring in other people into the ICANN community. As the Internet has evolved, well, if you think back to let's say the late 90s when most of us started getting online, and the 2000s as more people started joining, and now as more people start joining, the Internet is very different than it was then. So that means the communities around the Internet are also changing. And part of that requires engagement and bringing in those people, understanding their issues, understanding their concerns, and finding ways to participate in ICANN.

Sometimes that doesn't necessarily align with a lot of the issues that the supporting organizations or advisory committees are considering, but that doesn't mean the conversation is not worth having. And ICANN may not be the place for it, but I think overall, especially all of you from the perspective of governments, you're trying to find that right place to have a conversation. And ICANN and our engagement team can help you facilitate that. We can help you find the right venue for a discussion if it's not here within the ICANN community. So as the Internet evolves and as your interest involves, we can be part of that solution and we partner with you to do that.

So I'll pause there because as I said, I don't want to spend too much time on slides and remarks. And let's open it up to questions. Let's talk about how ICANN engages with its partners in the Internet governance ecosystem. Questions? Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Just for some people like me that may not know, what is the major difference between supporting organization and advisory

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

committee? What they do and the other doesn't do that. And what is the situation? How would the process go? Because end result, both avenue goes to the Board. So I don't explain. I leave it to you to say that because some people are, I give myself as I would say, a very primitive person may not know anything at all.

What is the support organization?   How the support organization works? And how the advisory committee works? And how any, I would say, inconsistencies potential between the two would be resolved. And who will be resolving and so on and so forth. Very briefly. And I'm very happy that you give a pause to leave the time for the others like me to raise the question and so on and so forth, to make it very clear. Because this question has been raised several times and so on and so forth. It may be good to briefly, if you wish, address the issue. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: At a high level, supporting organizations develop policy and advisory committees develop advice. We are coming back to this issue I think, in the next session. So I have another 20 minutes with you later to talk about the policy and advice work of ICANN. So I'll get into the details then. But at a high level, as Kavouss raises, supporting organizations develop policies, advisory committees develop advice. I like to say that advisory committees, especially compared to supporting organization, advisory committees are a very specific perspective, right?

Governmental Advisory Committee, so it's a perspective of governments. The Root Server System Advisory Committee, it's a perspective of root servers. The supporting organizations bring together different stakeholders to develop policy for one area. So in the

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

GNSO, in the Generic Name Supporting Organization, you have commercial interest, noncommercial interest, Internet service providers, the registries and registrants, the contracted parties. So it's a diverse city of views in the goal of developing a policy.

Advisory committees are functional in a sense that, obviously, you have your different views as governments of different nation states and as GAC members, but you're still a government. You have that perspective on the issues. So advisory committees have more specific views. Supporting organizations bring together different views around a policy remit. We'll talk a little bit about that later. Thanks for the question. Other hands? Okay, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If you allow me just a well complement of what you said. Supporting organization prepare policies based on which policy recommendation will be made which would be sent to the Board for the consideration and approval. And how that policy is made, based on the specific topics which will be discussed in that support organization.

First, a report will be prepared to identify the need for that policy. Then the policy development will be established and sometimes they may be two types. One type is expedited policy development, the other is standard. And that policy development invite all the constituencies of the ICANN to participate, including us, GAC.

And then that policy, once it get the consensus, I would say the ICANN consensus, does not mean the Governmental Advisory Committee consensus type. That means there might be some overwhelming

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

majority, yes, sometime some people, no. Then that would go to the public for comments. Sometimes maybe one or two public comments in order to get feedback from public. Once this come back, they review the situation and they update or complement the draft recommendation and then send that recommendation to the Board for their consideration.

What the advisory committee that means, GAC, one of them, we don't go to that process. Because all activities based on the public policy issues, which is a specificity of all governments of the world. And then we get together, as you know, we prepare this draft advice and so on so forth. We discuss it. Once it becomes an advice, either would be advised with full consensus. That means no one formally object to that or would be advised. Then it doesn't go to public for comment because we are the public policy issue organization. We don't go to the public. We direct go to the Board.

So these are the two avenue, one directly go to the Board after the discussion at the GAC. For this, we start from tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, consensus advice for the future. But the other one goes to the policy development and two times or one time each time for 30 days between the two going to the public for comments and updating that and so on so forth.

So these are the two differences. Their output is recommendation, policy recommendation. Our output is GAC advice. So there are two different things and differently treated and so on so forth. So I don't want to go today details of that. But that is a situation that we have to bear in mind that this is a very important, I would say, procedure for

GAC that its advice doesn't go to the public because they are representing the public. We are representing the public, the government and so on so forth. This is just a little bit of compliment of what you have said. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: Yeah. Thanks, Kavouss. You can definitely help me in the next session. So we'll go into those issues in more detail. But I think I set a timer for myself and I know I just hit 10 minutes. So I saw Karel stand up. If you have questions about ICANN's technical engagement or engagement at large with our technical partners, feel free to let me know. I'm happy to connect you with our engagement teams. We have different engagement teams that engage with different stakeholders. So thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, Carlos. Thank you so much. And Kavouss, thank you for your questions. We do have other questions. Unfortunately, time doesn't permit. So I do as much as possible ask that you connect with Carlos and others after this session. Carlos is going to be back, so that's a good thing. But I do recommend strongly that between the brakes, or in the brakes, or during the coffee breaks and in the corridors, those are fantastic opportunities. All right. So thank you Carlos for that insight into the ICANN org.

Now, so without any further ado, I have a colleague from the UPU, Mr. Tracy Hackshaw, who has been in the GAC for quite some time, who is quite experienced. And he would explain how the GAC fits in to the

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

ICANN ecosystem. So our role, this body here, how it works and how it fits into the ICANN ecosystem. Tracy, over to you. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thanks, Karel. I'll try. All right. How are we feeling? Good? Yeah? Everybody is here today, your week, good morning, good morning, and for those who are not physically here, good afternoon or wherever you are in the world, good evening, good night. So I am supposed to be speaking to the whole about the GAC thing, and what the GAC does, and where does it fit in. As Karel says, I'll try my best.

Maybe I could just point out what the GAC is. The GAC is founded in 1999, I believe, Gulten, in a slide that you have next. And it's supposed to be the voice, the voices of the governments in this ICANN ecosystem. It plays a role in multistakeholder model as the voice of the public sector, the public interest, as you want to say, governments as a whole, and it represents governments and intergovernmental organizations of which I am one. I'm with the UPU. Right now, I believe it's 180. Next figure. Let's got to the next slide. 180 GAC members government and 38 IGOs. So that's 218 entities within the GAC, which is quite a lot.

As you can see, only the governments as members are the ones who are allowed to vote, if and when we do vote. We vote on certain things like leadership positions. And the 38 observers, they participate actively like I do, but we can't vote. I think that's the only real difference we can see. One third of the current membership with voting rights constitute a quorum at any meeting. But as we say, their members and observers are equal. They contribute equally in the discussions. So if you're from

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

an IGOs, if you're from a government, you can contribute and have your voice, have your say, work on documents, join working groups, etc.

So by show of hands, how many people here are from IGOs, intergovernmental organizations, let's see. Hands high. Wow, that's high. 1, 2, 3, 4. So the rest-- 5, right? And the rest all governments, yes? Yes. Excellent. Did you know that you can participate fully as the IGOs in the GAC? Did you know that? You don't have to stay silent. You can speak up. Yes, you knew that, right?

And did you know as governments you can also speak up. You don't have to say silent. It's not five of us. They're not five GAC members, right? There are many more [00:28:30 -inaudible] governments here. They want to be able to start to speak more, get more voices speaking in the GAC, especially those from underserved regions.

Next slide is Gulten. Next slide. I'll get to the next slide. Having some fun? How many people have not spoken in a GAC meeting to date? Show of hands if you have not spoken at a GAC meeting. I still see some people who don't want to put their hand up. How people have spoken at GAC meeting. All right. Let's see. Hand, high, high.

Right, so those whose hands are down, are the ones, by process of elimination. At this meeting, I want to see the next time we ask this question, all the hands go up when you say you've spoken at that meeting, right? You can speak. Don't let the one or two voices dominate the discussion. We want you all to speak at a GAC meeting.

All right. I think we're missing a slide. So I'm going to go to my notes and see what's happening here. So the next line is really I was to speak

to the key role of the GAC. So the key role of the GAC is that it provides advice to the ICANN board on issues of public policy, especially where there may be interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements.

As Kavouss was just saying, provides advice in accordance with GAC operating principles upon ICANN Board requests or on its own initiative and the slightest back up. GAC advice is duly taken into consideration by the Board in accordance with Section 12.2(a) (x-xi) of the ICANN bylaws. We're going to start to see something here because I'm going to do a little bit of interesting switch now.

So the Board is by the bylaws, must take consideration of GAC advice. It must be duly taken into account, both in the formulation adoption of policies. Now in the event that the Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall also inform the Governmental Advisory Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. Now, I could be wrong and I stand to be corrected. That has only happened once or officially in the history of the GAC. I was actually involved in that. I'm not sure in my age, around 2010, during the .XXX issue.

For those who want to see the history of that, just Google it. And that went through an entire process of Board and GAC consultations and so on and so forth. At the end of the day, the GAC advice was rejected at that time. And .XXX was delegated into the root. And this was the one case where I think we saw the GAC and the Board have some friction that led to some reform of how the GAC and the Board perceives each other thereafter. So since then, there have been no cases that I recall of

official rejection of GAC advice by the Board. However, there have been situations where the GAC and the board have not agreed, right?

So next slide, please. Sorry, we do one just another slide. Gulten go to the slide with the pretty particular colors, right. Can you just zoom in a bit on this? Right. Now I don't want to go through this in any great detail. We tried to just last time and it didn't work that well. So I'm going to have a case spoken through here. But I'm just going to mention briefly, I believe you have this in your pack that you can look at.

I know it's going to be hard to see there, but this is a workflow that shows how the GAC advice is followed by the Board, what they do, at which point in the process it goes back for discussion, what happens if the yes or a no? You know, for those who are into IT, you know this, right? Decision flow, and what happens next, etc.

I'm going to ask my colleague, Rob, from ICANN org, to give an example, perhaps of what happened not that long ago during the new gTLD process, when the GAC and the Board did not see eye to eye-on-several things, but particularly on the IGO issue, which is still actually going on, intergovernmental organizations and protection of their names.

So Rob, can you just give us a little bit of a walk through as to what you would have seen happen during that process? And what are your thoughts as a whole, as an ICANN. I know you're not a GAC member, but you've seen a lot over that time, and what has happened. What are your thoughts about that process? Is it working? Do you think that it's really a process of consensus building, or is it a process of arguing and fighting? What do you think?

ROBERT HOGGARTH:	Thank you very much, Tracy. Tracy recruited me to speak like five minutes ago. So just please appreciate that aspect. I think what you're trying to get to here is a recognition that the GAC plays a very high level role within the operations of ICANN. And the critical element on the previous slide in word that was used was shall. And that is that the Board shall consider the advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee. Those are very important words.

As Tracy noted, there have been very few if only one instance where there was a decision by the Board not to accept the advice. And that from the observation of staff and other observers outside of the GAC is a recognition that the Board takes the input from governments extremely seriously. And that reflects the work that you all do in the GAC communique and in your other discussions with respect to making sure you're very specific about what goes into that advice.

The key element, and I didn't like you asked me my personal views. I didn't like the word friction or disagreement so much the way you described it. I think it's more a reflection of what the Board can or cannot do at particular points in time. And so the more recent experience Kavouss and others can speak to this is that the Board chooses not necessarily to act on the advice and uses different procedures to clarify what did the committee mean when it provided certain bits of advice.

Or because of circumstances and timing, the Board will determine to defer acting on the advice because a particular issue may not be ripe. And that's a particular area of focus that many of you who are new will

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

see that the more experienced drafters will carefully consider how the GAC is describing its advice or conveying its point of view, and that can be very important.

A couple of examples recently have been in the areas of setting up for the next round of new gTLDs where there have been recommendations made from different review groups, where the GAC would like to see a final conclusion, but the Board comes back and says, yes, but we haven't finished implementing certain bits of advice, so we'll wait. In another circumstance more recently with regard to IGO protections, the advice wasn't particularly ripe yet because there were still policy development activities that needed to be completed in the GNSO. And so once again, the Board doesn't want to reject GAC advice. And so there will be a determination to defer it.

When you go back to the chart, if we can go back to that slide, Julia. Without again speaking to the particular boxes, you see a couple of loops. And the reason for those loops is to permit that dialogue to take place. And there are certain signals that you will see that the chair and the vice chairs will point out when they occur where the Board has signaled to say, we're not ready to rule or make a determination on this advice accepting it or rejecting it. So let's talk. And so it will create opportunities for interactions between members of the GAC and the Board to clarify, to see if compromises can be reached. So it's a very interesting set of dynamics, Tracy, and I'll let you field the queue of questions. Thank you.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, Rob. I know there may be some questions coming up now. Yes, Kavouss is there. Before I go to Kavouss, let me just get through the last couple of slides before we get back. I know it's going to be on this question a little bit. So hold that thought, Kavouss and others on this issue. And I know you're going to ask the questions. So let me just finish that slide.

Next slide, Gulten. All right. So the GAC has a rule within the broader community. There are several meetings that the GAC has with the wider ICANN community. The main one that the GAC has going on today is the Board-GAC Interaction Group, BCIG. BGIG, sorry, and the meeting with the Board that happens at every ICANN meeting. So this is an ongoing intercessional group that meets. At every at every ICANN meeting the GAC meet with the Board to discuss the issues.

As Rob was highlighting, it's an ongoing process. And there's a GAC scorecard, I believe, still that they review advice and where they are with that and so on. So as a GAC member, you'll be asked to look at GAC advice as it passes through its various stages, where it's at, and you'll be asked almost all the water account as to where they are with reviewing particular decisions and the what themselves will actually hold you as a GAC to account at where you are with the feedback coming back to them.

The GAC also meets with the wider ICANN community, all the other SOs and ACs, as you mentioned before. The GAC participates in the PDP, which will be coming up next, the policy development process. This has been increasing over the last few years. POC, the GAC sort of stayed back a bit, but now they're moving more further into that process, but

in the groups themselves, including the most recent group, which was looking at the overall SubPro.

And in particular, the last is related to the IANA transition and its overall accountability and so on. The GAC participates in cross community efforts, including other working groups and other community stakeholders' sessions that they have. And the GAC participates also in specific reviews such as the transparency review and other reviews of other SO's and AC's that they're invited to.

The GAC also has, at its disposal, we built a quite high level governmental meeting once every two or three years or four years is case maybe. And this meeting is due, another one is due post pandemic. Last one was held, as you can see in Barcelona in Spain in 2018. And I believe there's some plans to have another meeting shortly. But one is due because every two years has been normally been held. So we should have one shortly.

At this meeting, the GAC reps would invite their high-level officials to speak and to participate fully in these meetings, the ministers or the permanent secretaries or the equivalent to come to the GAC itself at the ICANN meeting and you sit and support your head of official in a meeting at a high level. So look out for that coming soon.

I'm going to flip through quickly the last couple of slides as you get to the questions. The empowered community. So just go out to that, Gulten. So the empowered community is what the mechanism in which this post IANA transition emerging community is now empowered to exercise the nine policy to make ICANN more accountable that GAC participate fully in that empowered community today. Now there are a

lot of slides here. So I'm not going to go through every single slide. As you can see, [00:42:57 - inaudible] has flipped through them. Maybe Gulten works through them bit by bit. We have seen that the GAC takes part in the [00:43:04 - inaudible] through its decision-making process.

Next slide. How does GAC work? We have a vice chair and leadership positions. The chair is elected by its members and the vice chair is also by its members. Terms are different. Two years for the chair and one year for the vice chair. We just went through the election for chair and vice chairs, and you'll see a new leadership team emerging at the end of this meeting. I think I'll pause here. And I'll take some of those questions that we had on the discussions we had about the GAC process of decision making and its GAC advice and issue with the Board. Kavouss had a question, but other questions can come in. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. Let me explain you the situation. In the application of law, it is not appropriate that a particular specific case be generalized. .XXX was a specific case. We cannot generalize that to be a generalized case. In my view, the relation of the Board and GAC are very good in a safe and helpful situation, number 1. Number 2, we have created these Board-GAC Interactive Group that whenever they provide advice, before they embark on the advice, they would have a meeting with the GAC, seeking clarification from the GAC to properly understand the language of GAC advice. And that is the positive actions. Very good.

Second, the .XXX was approved before the new bylaw. The new bylaw increased the level of the objections of the Board to the GAC advice from 50% of the Board member to 60%. And GAC was, I think still is very, very

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

successful to increase this level to 60%. But this is not the end of the business. Even if they oppose by 60%, they will come back to GAC according to the bylaw to get into the negotiation with the GAC. To provide perhaps a solution for the situation. In order to avoid that, they be considered that opposition to the GAC. So this healthy environment and situation exists.

For my distinguished colleagues Tracy, maybe in future, for the empowered community we need to have devoted session. I worked for that for two years in the accountability, work steam 1, very, very sophisticated and complex issue. But it comes after the transition of the IANA function, stewardship, sorry, transition of a stewardship of IANA function by the government of United States to the global community. After we have done that ICG that I was a member of that and our chair Manal also was member of that ICG, then we have the accountability. Accountability starts off the voting that separating the responsibility and authority of the people.

ICANN Board and ICANN org they have separate responsibility and communities. We separate that and based on that, we created this empowered community, which is very, very important subject to that. But what I would say that now in the new bylaw, any advice we have given first we have to give rationale for that advice. Otherwise, it will not be agreed. And the advice would be effective if it is full consensus advice. That means no government formally object that.

If that is the case, the Board will take that with more attention and so on so forth. And as our distinguished colleagues Tracy mentioned, there has been no other cases that the Board reject the advice of the

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

GAC and that is good and that is helpful. We need to continue these collaborations. We government, we cannot go alone. We have to work with the others.

And I mentioned the African proverb they told many years ago and I will repeat it many times, if you go to the short journey, you can go alone, if you want to go the long journey, you can go with others. So in order to be successful, we have to work with others. And we have to see this collaboration is quite necessary. Otherwise we will not be able to do that because not all expertise are in GAC. Let's just admit that. We need others and others need us. So we have to put hand in hand and collaborate with each other. I'm sorry to make this additional complement of what you said, but that is necessary. Thank you very much.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you Kavouss. I think now is very important so maybe you can take up the slot next time. That'd be great. Thank you very much. That was very helpful and I think also very informative as to what's happened since he's been involved. So speaking from that mouth, so to speak. Any further questions on this topic? Excellent. Are you a first time speaker?

TIAGO DALTO: More or likely online maybe. My name is Tiago Dalton, representative for Colombia. I wanted to get your information if you can get back to it for the high level meetings. Do they require a special topic to be

addressed in the high level meetings? And what are the results from those meetings? Is there a communique coming from those?

TRACY HACKSHAW: I noticed a communique coming from them. I'm looking at my colleague, Rob, to see if there's any additional insights he can provide. Rob at the back.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. I'm now here in the back of the room. You don't need to turn to look. The high level governmental meetings do result in a report that is generated. And so you can see on the GAC website the reports from previous meetings. The agenda for the meetings is prepared by the GAC. The high-level governmental meetings are intended to be GAC events, not ICANN org events.

However, the ICANN org staff does support them with all of the appropriate meeting capabilities. So what basically happens is one of the member governments of the GAC steps forward to offer to host the meeting. They basically act as the chair of the meeting, send out the invitations. Because it's a high level meeting, there are conversations that go on among foreign ministries or other levels of activity.

Presently, as Tracy noted, it has been a period of time since the last high level governmental meeting. If there are any members of the GAC, newer representatives who are interested in exploring the opportunity for your government to host the event, please reach out to us as GAC support staff and we'll put you in touch with the appropriate members

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

of the chair and vice chair team who can help out in that regard. There's a lot more Tracy, but I think that's sufficient at the moment. Thanks.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much. Taking one question from a new GAC member. Show of hand, who is a new GAC member, first meeting. Show of hand, first meeting on-site. Look at that. Online, anybody online? First, meeting online? All right. Can't see from here, but I guess there will be. Anybody whose first time, one last question from a first time GAC member. First time meeting, I should say, first time meeting. Any questions? Yes. Oh, there's no mic. Oh, yes. There's a mic there. Introduce yourself.

UNKNOW SPEAKER: Yeah. I'm from Chinese, Taipei. And I have a quick question for the election. You mentioned in your one of the slides that any candidate, when he wins, when he or she wins the election, the vice chair that would go one year and the maximum two years. And so my question is that when the two year period expires, I believe that the same person can run for the third year, but can the same country that he or she represents, propose another person to run for that and wins.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Rob.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. I came to hide here in the back of the room and the cameras can always find me. The vice chair positions as well as the chair position are essentially positions for individuals, not for governments. And as a result, the elections are more focused on the individuals who are going to commit the time, effort, and work to the chair-vice chair team. In terms of the term limits, wiser people than those of us in the room. Maybe Kavouss was a part of this.

But the history is somewhat cloudy in terms of the progression. But the recognition was that the chair would serve for the full two years for a total of a maximum, I'll say, of two full terms. So a chair can serve for, as Manal has, basically, five and a half years, but it's two full terms. The vice chairs serve one year terms. They are limited to two consecutive terms.

An individual can return after a break of a year and run again if they would like to continue to serve. An interesting statistic in Manal's five and a half years, there have been 18 vice chairs who have chosen to serve and volunteered to support the work of the committee. So the vice chairs tend to be much more fluid in terms of their participation and the variety of not only the governments and regions but of the individuals who participate. I hope that was responsive to your question. Happy to chat with anyone about the election or about the leadership slots at any time. We're all here at the back of the room throughout the course of the week. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you for that very enlightening response, Rob. All right. So first time GAC members, first time GAC meeting members, first preference

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

for questions next round, right? Yes? Yes, excellent. All right. Thank you very much for participating in this last session. I'm going to hand over now to Pua Hunter, who is the co-chair of the Underserved Regions Working Group to continue on with our program. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you so much, Tracy, for that awesome presentation. And thank you also to Kavouss and Rob, for further clarification on the presentation. Some things that I didn't even know about, even though I've been in the GAC for over 10 years. So to all our new members, please feel free, to Karel point about seeing or coming up to our GAC colleagues and also our GAC support staff, GAC colleagues like Kavouss, who's been here with us for a long time, as well our GAC support team, Rob, Julia, Gulten, if you have any questions relating to how the GAC operates. We've gone over the six minutes. So we've got our next session on, and this is the policy development process, PDP, as most people call it. I'll hand over to Carlos. Carlos, over to you. Thank you so much.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Pua. Hi, everyone. I'm back. So I think in the next 20-25 minutes or so, we'll spend some time exploring some of the issues that Kavouss introduced, the relationship between the SOs and the ACs. Specifically, I'm going to focus on the Generic Name Supporting Organization and the GAC. And the reason for that is that's where most of your work will take place. The Country Code Name Supporting Organization has its own policy development process.

But there's a requirement in the ICANN bylaws and in the ccNSO operating procedures to consult with the GAC. So that's built in. And the Address Supporting Organization, their policy work takes place at the regional level within the regional Internet registry communities. And at ICANN, it's limited only to global policies. So the likelihood of an ASO policy development process, global policy development process is limited. So most of your work will involve the policy work of the GNSO.

So, Gulten, thanks for pulling this up. As I mentioned, every supporting organization has a policy development process. It's documented in the bylaws and in their operating procedures. But at a high level, there are some steps that apply everywhere. Every supporting organization has a step where they identify an issue, a question, a topic, a set of issues, a set of topics that they're wrestling with. And if that community thinks that the issue is within the scope of their mission, then they will consider whether or not to initiate some sort of policy development process. And usually, that requires some sort of reflection on whether or not an actual policy will result as the outcome.

In the case of the Generic Name Supporting Organization, there's a very specific term, which is a consensus policy. And the reason that is important is because a consensus policy means that the outcome is binding on the contracted parties. The contracted parties are the registries and registrars. So policies that the Generic Name Supporting Organization develops will be implemented by the ICANN organization and enforced through contracts with the contracted parties.

Obviously, we have a compliance function as well that ensures that those commitments are being met. So the policy remit of the GNSO is

gTLD's generic Top Level Domains, and the outcome is a consensus policy. So that's why I think it's important to focus on that because that's really where you'll see a lot of interaction between ICANN policy work and public policy, which is the remit of the GAC advice.

So next slide, please. And next slide. All right, I'm not going to spend time on the composition of the GNSO because that's a very factual and you can always look it up. The Council is the group that manages the policy work. So let's talk a little bit about the process. I mentioned the first step is really identifying the issue. And what's important to note is that the issue doesn't have to come from the supporting organization.

The ICANN Board could request some sort of issued report or an advisory committee could request an issue report. So if there is a situation where, let's say, the GAC, or the Root Server System Adviser Committee, or the At-Large Adviser Committee, thinks there is an issue that the Generic Name Supporting Organization should take on, they can request that issued report.

The issue report is actually developed by the ICANN organization team. We help identify some of the questions that are out there, what research already exists, what work has been done in the past. Really, it's just a reference point for the community to discuss the initial stages of potential policy work. Kavouss highlighted this earlier, but it's important to note that along a policy development process, there are multiple opportunities for public comment. And public comment is important because at every stage, that input has to be considered.

So in the issue report, if for some reason, you think the issue report doesn't address a particular angle of an issue or a particular topic within

a question, etc., you can state that, you can provide that input. And in this case, because the issue report is a product of ICANN organization, we'll consider that in the revised issue report. So public comment is always a helpful mechanism to participate in a process. If you don't have the bandwidth to track an issue very closely, join a working group, etc. So always look for public comment opportunities and we'll talk a little bit about that later.

So in the scoping phase. This is where you see a lot of discussions within the GNSO about whether or not that issue actually applies to the mission and the remit of the GNSO. A good example of this right now is DNS abuse. There have been a lot of conversations around the ICANN community and outside the ICANN community about DNS abuse. I think a lot of stakeholders recognize that it's an issue. But the GNSO has been wrestling with, okay, what is the expected outcome? What type of consensus policy do we want? And how do we structure the policy work so that it results in a policy that is actually enforceable.

And that's where you see a lot of to and fro and back and forth and discussion and deliberation. It's not that they don't recognize the importance of the issue or that they don't want to do something about the issue. It's that they're trying to understand how to structure this so that the result is actionable. It has to be a consensus policy that can be implemented by the ICANN organization and enforced through contracts.

So the scoping phase is very important because you have to ask the right series of questions or you have to frame the issue in a way that the work will actually produce a policy. And that's where I think a lot of

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

stakeholders sometimes can lose faith in the process. Because the work can be so controversial or convoluted or confusing. There are multiple steps. There's public comment. Everyone has a view. But the intent is to arrive at a consensus policy. So it's very important that the issue is framed in a way that can result in a policy. So the scoping phase can take some time.

The next phase is initiating the PDP. And here it's more an issue about resourcing. It's calling in the different perspectives and the different stakeholders to a policy process. The GNSO has different types of working groups, and they're structured the composition in different ways. But ultimately, when the GNSO initiates a policy development process, it's a reflection that this is an issue that's important. We're hearing this across our community. We want to develop a policy or we'd like to arrive at a policy eventually. And we are going to dedicate the resources to do that.

That means working group members, staff support and time. That's very important. So that step is a very deliberate recognition of an issue and the importance of the issue within the policy mission of the GNSO. So initiating a PDP, obviously, there are formal votes, etc. But the point there is it's time to get to work. We have our charter. We have our questions. We know where we want to arrive. Let's start the work.

Next slide, please, Gulten. Okay, so this is the big phase. Phase or step four is the working group phase. I was in a session a few days ago, and we talked about how the working group phase can take 3, 4, 5 years, depending on how the discussions are going. And that can be frustrating, right? Like, sometimes a working group may be outlast how

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

long you're representing your IGO or your government as a GAC member. So ensuring that you're participating in a way that sustainable is a challenge and that's why the commitment to start a policy development process is such a serious consideration within the GNSO.

And you have to keep in mind that the goal is a consensus policy. So we have to ensure that all the views are represented. And sometimes, as the pandemic indicated, other things happen, right? You could get a new job. You could get a new assignment. The European Union could pass GDPR and then that impacts other ongoing policies development work. Or something else may happen. And that's something that the ICANN community is wrestling with right now, is how do we adapt the policy development process and evolve it?

So the working group phases is important. This is where all the discussions happen. As I mentioned, the GNSO has different types of working groups. Sometimes they do welcome observers. Well, observers are always welcome, but sometimes they do welcome participation of the advisory committees. Sometimes it's limited just to the GNSO, etc. There are different participation models.

But as the working group develops its reports, again, we have public comment opportunities. So you'll see initial report, draft report, final report, etc. And every step of the way the document is published for public comment and there's an opportunity for you to review the discussions and potentially provide input directly to the working group. The working group has to consider it. And it could inform its

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

deliberations and it could modify its discussions based on the input that it receives from the public.

Some of you may be thinking, well, this is a very technical issue when my government wants to provide input. It may do it in its language, in its working language, that's totally fine. We can find the translation services available. If your government wants to make a statement in your working language, we work with that. I've helped a few governments through that.

So don't worry about your working language and the working language of ICANN. The input is valuable, and we have a translation language services team that helps us find translation services for official documents. So please take that into account when you're thinking about providing public comment.

Let's pause here because I think the working group phase is very important. Because that's where most of your discussions happen as a GAC members and as a GAC as a whole. So I'll pause here. We still have about 10 minutes or so. Kavouss has his hand up. I'll start a queue. Yes, I was going to say I need a-- I know, Tracy wants us to highlight new GAC numbers. I see a hand there. Any other hands? Okay. Let's start with a new GAC member then we'll go to Kavouss. Okay.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I have participated in many PDP. Sometimes the time is very painful. 2 o'clock in the morning because they have to change the time according geographical situations.   Let us explain what are our difficulties.   The difficulty of governments is that they don't have

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

sufficient resources to participate at these meetings. Our activities are almost limited when we are present at a meeting.

Intersessionally, there are handful number of the GAC members they are active. Handful. It doesn't go beyond 10 out of 180. We have to do something. If you look into the PDP, in many areas, even if we have been active, we remain in minority. And at the end of the report, there is minority statements. GAC have minority statement, ALAC and others.

And one of the issues which have been raised with the Board is that what they do with respect to minority statement. Because at the end, the Board decide although we are in minority, but our point are important. So some of the questions we have raised in the past and in future is this one is minority. But what we have to do is to look, maybe we ask Rob- sorry to ask you something, bothering you- to make a list of all those policy development in process. Many, many.

And we have very limited capacity and resources. And sometimes other shortcoming and so on so forth. So if you want to be active, sorry, if you want to get benefit of that, we should be active. Sometimes even on the public comment, which is also open for GAC, a GAC does not participate fully. Very few will participate.

So we have to see the area that we must pay more attention to this public information available even if we don't attend in the preparation of the PDP. When it is on the public comment, we provide the comments, and so on so forth. So we have to look, what are the problems, what are the difficulties that we have? Otherwise, if you continue like this, may not be very productive. We will be behind the train, it will go. They don't wait for us.

So we have to be very active and we have to see whether each government apart from very few, they have a unit or unity. Sorry, a unity inside the government dealing with the ICANN and GAC activities or not. It should not be one or two persons. It should be a group of people following all these situation in order to provide information for the GAC representative of that country coming to the meeting.

So we have to look at our deficiencies, our problem, our difficulties. So maybe in further development of the capacity building, we have to address some of these issues. What are our shortcomings? What are our difficulties? What are our problems? Which are the areas that we should concentrate? There are many, many things. If you come to the point for this, in my personal view, the most important point is this SubPro because it's now.

The issue took about six years 2016 we started, 2023 now. Still, I don't know when we implement that. And still, we have problem with implementation. Do we go with option one or we go to option two? And many issue has not been resolved yet. The issue of geographical name has not been resolved and many other issues has not been resolved.

And now we say that in some area, we have difficulties. We have difficulties between the policy making of the GNSO and the GAC advice. And one of the issue is the closed generic, and it's under discussions. And now ICANN provided some sort of activities to have this bilateral or group of six from GAC, six from GNSO.

But when I read the result, I don't understand that. I don't understand that how an issue which is closed could support the public interest. Something is closed is not public interest. So still we have to discuss to

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

see what we can do. So there's a lot of things. So let us slightly modify the way that we tackle the situation. The way we may be going may not be take us to the objectives that we have. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Kavouss. Let's go to the other question over here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks for the floor. I'm not a new GAC member. I'm a GAC member since almost 10 years now. I have a clarification that I would like to seek from Rob, because I'm a little bit confused. We all know that GAC members are appointed and nominated by their respective governments. And we stand at the GAC in that position. So I believe that even for election, maybe there's a difference for election process. But I think even for nominating himself or herself, I mean, within the team, within the chair, either the chair or the vice chair, you need also to be appointed by your government.

Okay, when I follow Rob's explanation, does that mean that even if you no longer have the support of your government, but you are still standing for your one year or two-year position as a GAC or vice chair, will that mean that you have to stop or still continue even if your government has taken back or retires it's support to you.

Because you're saying that we're standing at the GAC individually, while we know that before the election, we get so many letters of support, I mean, for government seeking support, from other countries. And this letter do not come individually. This letter come very much officially

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

and most of the time through diplomatic channels, which means that even for elections, GAC members are supported by the government. So I don't know if you can clarify a little bit on that. Thanks.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. That's an excellent series of questions, and Carlos doesn't want to give me 45 minutes to answer, so I'll pick the spots. First, when I said that they are individuals, we had the situation recently when Jaideep left from the vice chair role and it was out asked to me, okay, well, from that government, can we just send somebody else? And the answer was no, because you are as GAC representatives, you are electing individuals into those roles. You are correct, however, that to be eligible for those roles, you need to be a GAC representative or an alternate.

So it's at two different levels, but it's essentially a recognition that you choose to serve. You only do so obviously with the permission of your government. That would be my expectation. Because you want to make sure that you're supported, that you have the time to devote the efforts to it. But when you vote in the elections, you're not electing a government, you're electing an individual, and that's where it just doesn't continue.

And this becomes a broader point that I'm happy to discuss with people as individuals. We recognize that every government has a different reason for being in the GAC. You know, you may have different approaches in your government. You may come from different ministries. You may come from different levels of your government bureaucracy or your political environment.

And so many delegations operate differently. You've seen in the GAC membership roles, some delegations are one person. Others are seven or eight. And so the work of the committee within ICANN is different from a number of other international organizations in which it does take some time to acclimate to understand sort of the culture and the way people operate.

As Tracy noted earlier, there are very few votes. There are many more decisions reached by consensus or by lack of objection. And so it is an interesting different environment. We as a support staff are here to help you understand the operational aspects. We try to focus on these capacity development workshops to have your colleagues lead and share the information because they're in the best position to provide it.

So if you're new or even you've been here for a while and don't understand a particular matter, please reach out to us as staff at any time and we'll be happy to explain to you operational aspects of things, and we'll leave it to your colleagues to talk more about the substance and the particular tactic strategies or policy decisions you all make. And again, I could have talked much longer Carlos, but I'm trying to limit. And I hope I answered your question. I think I saw a thumbs up from back here. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: Any other questions? Yes.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	My name is [01:19:56 - inaudible]. It is my first GAC meeting that I can take a standard speech. I have been participating in ICANN for many years. I have been observing and watching the development of policy. I find one thing that is very amazing and sometimes troublesome. It is because for policy decisions involving public interest, we need to take into consideration of different stakeholders.
	But for that, it will definitely be somewhat time consuming. So when I'm following all this policy development process, all the policy making and the paper generating of writing, I'm just wondering whether within the GAC group or a different GAC stakeholder or even the other stakeholder or group, whether there is any kind of mechanism trying to control the timeline and the time to spend for resolving certain particular important policy decision. Thank you.
CARLOS REYES:	Thanks for the question. I think the entire ICANN community wrestles with the issue of timing. There are a few mechanisms charters. When a working group starts, there's a charter which outlines questions. Sometimes there's an attached end date expectation. I've seen a few charterers that says, the working group will deliver something by x date. What happens oftentimes as a work effort gets underway and as you have different stakeholders around the table, sometimes you may have to adjust that work plan. And you may have to revise a charter, etc. So there are those steps.
	I think the area where the policy work can be confusing, especially, as Kavouss has noted, there's a lot of policy work and it can be on the development side or it can be on the implementation side. Once the

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

Board approves a community recommendation, especially in the GNSO context, there is an implementation review team that helps ICANN org prepare for the implementation of that policy. And there are a lot of opinions about implementation review teams, but sometimes some stakeholders use it as an opportunity to revisit questions that had already been answered because they didn't like the outcome, etc.

So I think one of the guiding principles in all of this is trying to keep in mind the overall objective. And the commitment that working groups and communities make is not necessarily to the outcome, but it's to each other, right? So being genuine in that commitment about, yes, I know that this policy isn't 100% what I wanted, but does it get us mostly there? And being flexible and willing to compromise, I think, is important for the overall health of the multistakeholder model.

The other point I like to make about timing. Sometimes it's super helpful to break down the issue. We've seen a lot of policy development processes recently that have phase 1 or phase 2 or sub working groups that tackle different issues. So the groups are evolving how they approach a question or approach a policy challenge because not everyone has the bandwidth to be at every single step of the work. So it's sort of a reflection of as the work becomes more complex, the how we work is also more sophisticated.

And I think in many cases, it's just going to be trial and error, we're going to learn what works and what doesn't work. Another example is the operational design phase. That's an effort by the ICANN organization to help the ICANN Board better inform its decision making. So that's a recognition on the part of the ICANN organization that that process can

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

be more transparent, can be open to the community perspectives as well.

So we're trying to improve that as well. And I think the GNSO has an effort to improve the policy development process that's called PDP 3.0. So there's always this effort of self-reflection and trying to improve the work. But yeah, there's no one answer. I think every group is trying. So yeah, thanks for the question. Any other comments or questions? Yes.

ROSS KENNY BURCH: Hi. Thank you so much. This is Ross Kenny Burch from the UK. So I just wanted to thank all of you for the excellent presentations today and for hosting this important capacity building day. As we've spoke about capacity building is key for GAC members and particularly new GAC members as well, of which I hope to meet many of you over the course of this week.

The slide we saw earlier in the presentation showing our technical partners demonstrates the rich ecosystem of Internet governance and how we rely on all stakeholders to keep the DNS stable, secure and resilient. So I think that was really great to see in this opening day. Separately, it was also encouraging to see the high level government meeting raised in the presentation, which provides an important opportunity for senior government officials to engage with ICANN's work and the multistakeholder model.

So we look forward to the next such meeting to be planned as soon as is possible. Finally, as I said, we look forward to meeting new colleagues from all across the globe throughout the week. Please do come over

and say hello. And in closing, for having organized this meeting in Cancun, it's wonderful to be here. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: I should have also tried doing this in Spanish, but sometimes ICANN work is difficult for me in Spanish. Any other questions, comments? All right. I'm available if you have questions. If you see me around the venue, feel free to stop me. And if I don't have the answers, I'll find someone who does. So thank you very much for the invitation. Karel, back to you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Wow. A round of applause for Carlos and also a Tracy, please, Tracy Hackshaw. Thank you so much. And this is the beginning. You know, so far we've heard about ICANN, we've heard about the GAC, how it fits into ICANN, and this important PDP, the policy development process, which I believe is a process to move things along. And Kavouss did mention it takes some time and it also takes a lot of work. And that's why we want you to be a part of that to come onboard.

So if you see a committee that interests you or work in group doing work that interests you, then by all means, come see, well, me or anybody else from the committee, or one of the vice chairs, or the chair, Manal will be here later hopefully, or the incoming chair Nico. And they'll be more than happy to welcome you and tell you how to get involved.

And I do see some familiar faces Swada who is also a member of the public working group. I'm not going to go there. But one of the vice

chairs. So a new member who is coming, I do apologize. And later this evening after lunch, we're going to get into some of the big topics. So it's going to be quite exciting. Kavouss did mention some of those topics already. You did mention SubPro. We're going to talk about that.

If you didn't know what that means, you're going to hear more about it. We're going to speak about the DNS abuse, a big issue, and also WHOIS. So these issues that are very important to the GAC. And why is it important? You're going to hear about it? What are those issues right now? You're going to hear about it? And how you could get involved? You're going to hear about that.

So unless there's anything else at this point in time, I want to thank you for your involvement. And we're going to take a break for a one and a half, sorry, 1:15. I think we reconvene at 1:15 eastern. So you have an hour to, of course, enjoy the beautiful, the beautiful settings of Cancun. And I know many of us are hoping to have that opportunity to see some of the sea and the sand and so forth. So thank you again, and we take a break at this point in time. And don't forget the social this evening, the social at-- we'll hear more about that. Okay, take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|76
CANCÚN