ICANN77 | PF – GAC Discussion: New gTLD Program Next Round (2 of 2)
Tuesday, June 13 2023 – 13:45 to 15:00 DCA

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to the ICANN77 GAC discussion on the gTLD program next round session being held on Tuesday, 13th of June at 13:45 local time. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance, the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC members to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod. This is to keep accurate attendance records. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment as indicated in the chat. The feature is located at the bottom of your Zoom window.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six UN language and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon on the Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.

Finally, the session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. This session is being recorded, and all the materials will be made available on the ICANN77 meetings page. With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC chair, Nicolás Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome, everyone. Good afternoon, good evening, and good morning depending on where you are located. Welcome to the session on next round of new gTLDs. We have three topic leads. We have Jason Merritt from Canada, Jorge Cancio from Switzerland, and Gabriela Mattausch from Argentina. This is going to be our last session of the day, mainly because right after this and right after the break we're going to have kind like a plenary the ICANN Board listening session on CEO search. So basically, and this is housekeeping details, we'll reconvene tomorrow at 9AM for the meeting with the ICANN Board.

So that said, we have mainly three, actually four topics. The first one is a review and discussion of proposed GAC advice language. The second one is the implementation review team update and the GNSO guidance process on applicant support. As I said before, the GAC topic leads are Switzerland, Canada and Argentina. So without further ado, Jason, please go ahead. The floor is yours.

ICANN|77
WASHINGTON, D.C.

JASON MERRITT:	Perfect. Thank you so much, Nico, Mr. Chairman. Welcome back from lunch, everyone. Hopefully, you're ready for an afternoon session of more new gTLD information. I'm happy to lead us through some items that we've been talking about a few times throughout this meeting and have a really good discussion about what's going on here and facilitate that if I can.

The first slide, it's almost a little bit of housekeeping here that I wanted to do, and it's to go back to the discussion that we had on closed generics previously. Really what I'd like to do here in this room if we can relatively quickly or have a discussion about it is get a sense of how the GAC would like to submit comments into the closed generics facilitated dialogue process that is ongoing.

So there's two options, and I think we should discuss them here. One is sort of obvious that individual countries or people representing organizations or whatever the process is, this is open for comment on the closed generics dialogue. So right off the bat, I would like to encourage in individual capacity as many people as possible to participate in this process. It's going to be extremely helpful for us doing the work on the framework to get as much feedback and see where the sticking points are, where the support is in order to move forward with it. So as an individual capacity, there's a lot of encouragement there. And I'm happy to clarify anything by email or you can reach out to me while we're here and I'm happy to discuss that independently.

The second piece is if we would like to submit something as a whole GAC, as a GAC broad, broad comment period into that. So that's sort of

my first question. Is if we would like to do a collective comment, and I'd like to get people's views on that. I mean, I can pause there, but realistically, what we have on the slide here is if we would like to do a collective comment, let's identify a few volunteers that would be willing to sort of lead the pen on this and circle back with the GAC to get comments and feedback. But we would really need some individuals that would be willing to take this up because it is a bit of a short turnaround. We've drafted up a bit of a rough timeline here, and these aren't hard deadlines or anything, but it's just to sort of give it a sense of what we're dealing with in terms of timing and potential commitment on this.

So what I can briefly do is just walk backwards here. The community has asked for comments by July 15th. If we went back to that, the whole GAC could look at some text and turn it around within a few days going back from there. Final draft would be prepared. And using the GAC mailing list, we can all sort of chime in on how we'd like to do that. So I'll let you digest the timelines and potential commitment, but I would like to open floor and get a sense of whether or not there's an interest in a collective comment.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Gulten, any comment or any question in the chat room?

GULTEN TEPE: Jorge Cancio from Switzerland has his hand up.

JASON MERRITT: All right. Switzerland, please go ahead. Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everyone. Jorge Cancio for the record. Just to compliment what Jason mentioned while people are digesting this timeline, which we prepared just yesterday. Or was it today this morning? I don't remember. And just to, yeah, let you know this is a timeline like the ones we've used in previous collective comments. And this means that there is a first period of 10 days of collecting broad inputs from the GAC members on the three blocks of the framework. With that, the penholders could consolidate the input into a first draft in a couple of days, then send it for a week to the GAC for comments, really drafting comments on that first draft and not coming up with new ideas, with completely new ideas.

After that comment period, penholders would again have three or four days to prepare a final draft based on the first comment period on the draft. And based on that, there would be a final circulation for just yes or no from the GAC to endorse the final draft, the final input. So that's a bit the roadmap. We are suggesting that, of course, could be adapted. And what is important is that both Jason and I, we are part of those six members of the GAC that are participating in the facilitated dialogue. And for reasons of hygiene, I would say it would be better that the penholders are different from us.

So it would really need to be some volunteer or some group of volunteers really wanting to engage into this effort to prepare a GAC collective comment, provided, of course, that the membership is

agreeing that it's useful and meaningful to issue such a collective comment. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Switzerland. So that's the first question for the GAC. If we agree on this road map, any question, any comment? Is it okay? Sorry, European Commission. Please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you very much, Nico. This is Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. I don't have specific comments regarding the road map. It's very sensible in itself considering the tight timeline. But considering also the call for volunteers, I would propose that we pause this procedural discussion once we have had a discussion on the subject because I think this is also on the agenda for today. Isn't the case? Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Gemma. Any other question? Any other comment? Or you would like to go ahead with it?

JASON MERRITT: I'll just clarify. I think for today, the issue of closed generics is, if I'm not mistaken, is not on our agenda. We're going to be talking about the proposed GAC advice, the implementation review team, and the applicant support process. So we sort of decided to insert this slide at the last minute because it's sort of a follow on from the last closed

generics discussions. What we can do if there's, I mean, we can ask one more time if there's any volunteers right away that are interested in doing this. And if we don't get any-- hold your enthusiasm back, folks, but if we don't get any volunteers initially right now, what we can do is we can circle back via the GAC mailing list, maybe put this timeline in writing, give a little bit of context around it, and see if there is any appetite, a, to do a GAC collective comment and if we get a volunteer to do it. If not, if that doesn't materialize sort of fairly quickly, I think then we'll just have to revert back to relying on people and countries in their individual capacities. But we can take it from there.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Questions, comments?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Yes, Nico. This is Julia. Nigel Hickson has his hand up. UK.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Okay, UK. Sorry, Nigel, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, mister chairman. And thank you, Jason. Nigel Hickson, UK, GAC. I mean, really just to say that completely agree with Jorge that this could be a very valuable exercise indeed. As one of the members of this facilitated dialogue, I agree with Jorge that we shouldn't be the penholders because we're going to be the people that are going to have

to in late July and throughout the summer holiday are going to have to work on all the comments that we're hoping that we receive so we can produce a final framework. But I think having a GAC collective input is very important because it will enable the group to better respond to the public policy concerns that governments have. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, UK. Any other comment? Any other question? Are we okay to move on? Sorry. Julia, go ahead.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Sorry. Yes, we do. Kavouss Arasteh from Iran.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Okay. Iran, the floor is yours. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I suggest perhaps for consideration of our colleagues that for date 16th to 20th June, collective input from GAC members, perhaps should be on section by section but not spread over the entire questions and so on. Maybe we do by section. Title of this section and subpart of that section. So comment on that and the next section, so it would be better later on to for the group when they receive all comment, they put the comment or receive comment into that section preparing the final consolidated parts. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. So if I understand correctly, by section, you mean predictability, and then RVCs and PICs and applicants support and so on and so forth and community applications and auctions. Is that correct?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Actually, are we going to comment on the draft framework or comment on the five topics? I thought that your talking comment on that framework. But if you have topics, there's no problem. Again, I said that it would be better to have comments on some subjects separate from the others. Thank you.

JASON MERRITT: Thank you. I think if I understand your comment, what you might have been referring to is the sections of the draft framework. So the application, evaluation, post delegation phase, in terms of putting a skeleton together on where to take comments in. But to answer your question for clarification, yeah, you're right. We were talking about the draft framework for closed generics.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Canada. Any other comment? Any other question? Seeing non, back to you, Jason. Let's move on with the agenda.

JASON MERRITT: Sure.

ICANN|77
WASHINGTON, D.C.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: I'm sorry. China, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, very quickly. Guo Feng from China for the record. I fully agree. We have perhaps comments with regard to the three section now we have. Perhaps, before that, we may want to have some overarching comments on this framework. And plus those specific comments regard to three sections. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, China. And we certainly be happy to take any questions or any general or specific comments. Okay, back to you, Jason.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. Thank you. Thank you for that. So we'll circle back and follow-up probably the GAC mailing list and see if we can pluck a volunteer to help us out with this. So if we are moving along then to our first topic, what we'd like to do today is just go over in a little bit of detail some of the proposed advice language on new TLDs for the communique from this meeting. So we've gone over this a little bit already throughout this meeting in presentation form. So it'll be a little bit of a refresher, I think. The intent here is to have advice on five key areas that have been sort of earmarked as pending from the Board and from the SubPro recommendations. And those are predictability, RVCs and PICs, applicant support, early warnings, and auctions.

So I think it was pretty helpful this morning to have that GNSO-GAC session that gave some insight into how they're thinking and seeing some of these issues. And perhaps that may change or maybe not change our skeleton proposed advice here. But we're going to walk through each one and get your feedback as we go through here. And just to clarify, closed generics is one of these pending topics, but we're treating it separately because it's a special topic.

So we can go on the next slide, please. So the first item that we had proposed here was on predictability. So I don't want to read the slides verbatim to you going through this exercise. I think maybe the top line bullet that we've put there encapsulates what the advice is trying to accomplish here. And so this one is again to ensure the equal participation on equal footing on the spirit team.

And I should have started with this, so just to back up. All of this language was previously submitted as part of the GAC collective comment to the SubPro recommendations. So none of this is really new or novel language. It's previously approved and discussed GAC comments. So, we were just trying to repackage it in a way for advice to the Board to get some visibility and decision making points on these key issues of importance to the GAC. And I think part of that reason is also because the implementation review team, which we'll touch on a bit later, has already spun up and started work. And so we would really like to get decision points on these items in particular so that as the IRT works through its work, it can propose and go through the implementation kind of policy for these. So apologies, just to back up there for a second.

So the first proposed advice is predictability. I can take questions or comments after each one or I can go through them and take them at the end.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Jason. I think it would be better to take questions now, for the sake of time in order to make sure that we'll have enough time to discuss all the different topics. So do we have any questions on this, on predictability so far? Anybody?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: We have a hand raised from Kavouss Arasteh, Iran, and then from Jorge Cancio, Switzerland.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Okay. Iran, you go first, and then we have Switzerland. Go ahead please, Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. Still this, for me, at least, for me is not clear. If we are commenting on five parts A, B, C, D, E, this is one issue, or we are commenting on the framework of the closed generic, as is mentioned in the document applications and evaluation. Which one we are commenting? Because the issue is a little bit at this explanation are not quite clear. So we are commenting on A, B, C, D, E. Am I right?

JASON MERRITT: Thank you for that. Apologies if it wasn't clear. We were discussing GAC comment, collective comment for the closed generics topic previous to this. And now we have shifted into the next item on the agenda, and that is to go through the five items, A, B, C, D, E, that are proposed topics for GAC advice within the communique. So we've moved on from the framework at this point, and now we're discussing the issues at hand that we would like to potentially put into the communique.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Canada. I have Switzerland. Go ahead, please, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland. Allow me to complement a little bit what Jason said. In the sense that these five topics that we have included here, as Jason mentioned, have their origin in the GAC collective comment we prepared in June 2021. And as all of these topics are still under discussion between the Board and the GNSO Council or beyond we have raised this to the attention of the GAC. We have circulated it previous to this meeting in this advice form to ask for your reactions and it is also included in the draft communique we will be discussing this week.

So I think that beyond comments or questions, what we really need today is your reactions whether you want this in the advice of the ICANN77 communiqué section. So it's really up to the membership. We as topic leads have just thought that there is opportunity, that there is window of opportunity of raising this to the level of GAC advice, but it has to be really the GAC membership who decides whether this goes for

advice or not. And the different topics we have today before us, I think that in this session we have right now it is really yes or no question and also a high level question of whether there is anything big in the proposed language that you would like to change, to add, or to erase. Because the words missing is something we will be doing during the communique sessions. So I hope this explanation of the task before us right now is helpful. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Very helpful indeed, Switzerland. Thank you so much for that. Any other comment? Any other questions? Are we okay with this? Yeah. We have anybody? Yeah, Julie.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Kavouss Arasteh from Iran.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Jorge. I think now it's clear. You're asking whether these topics should be GAC advice or should be conveyed differently. My personal view or my view, not personal view, is that at this stage, it should not be GAC advice. It should be issues important for GAC or follow-up actions of something we have helped. Because of the definition of the GAC advice, because of the rationale, because GAC advice go to the scrutiny of others, it's not only advised to the Board.

You know very well that after each advised of the GAC, at least one of the constituency, GNSO, scrutinize the whole text one by one and publish something. So, this is a suggestion. It is up to our distinguished GAC colleagues, not to be GAC advice. Thank you. That's important issues for GAC or follow-up action of the previous issue. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. So if I understand correctly, you would like to put this under issues of importance to the GAC. Is that correct?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, chairman. Sí, Señor presidente. Yeah.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Gracias. So, again, the floor is yours. Any other comment? Any other question? Any different opinion? Any support for Iran's suggestion? China, please go ahead.

GUO FENG: Thank you, Chair. I'm looking at the language on the screen. With this, I think I'm open to keep it as advised or to move it to the section of issue of importance to the GAC. But when I look at the language here and the rationale followed, I think our attention here is to perhaps, we, as a GAC, want to participate in the proposed standing predictability implementation review team to participate this effort. So perhaps my question is, so why not we clearly say that? We, as a GAC, want to be in

this effect.   The present language does not clearly say that.   This is what's in my mind at this moment. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, China. But I got a little bit confused because you said you would like to keep it as advised but also as issues of importance. So which one? Did I get it wrong?

GUO FENG: To me, I think both are okay for me. Perhaps I'm open. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Which means you don't have a special preference. It's okay either way. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, China. Any other comment? Any other input? Egypt, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Nico. And thank you, Jorge. So just I'm seeking clarification. Don't we have the same topic on our agenda with the Board as well? So I was just wondering, if yes, would it be better to decide finally on whether we have it as GAC advice or not after the discussing also with the Board. We've heard today on the topics from the GNSO, and we have the same topics with the Board tomorrow. So maybe it would be easier for colleagues to decide after discussing with the Board. But I stand to be corrected. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Egypt. That's certainly a good idea, but again, the floor is yours. I mean, it's up to the GAC to decide. I'm okay either way. Jason?

JASON MERRITT: Thank you for that. I think it's a very reasonable approach where we can here as the GAC, maybe breeze through some of the five or six items, give everybody a flavor of what we're proposing, put some context around it. I mentioned before that the session this morning from the GNSO was very helpful. I think the session after the Board meeting will also be helpful, and we can revisit the decision on whether or not it's advice, issues of importance, or something else. I think that's a reasonable approach.

And in terms of sort of the wordsmithing or the potential strengthening or softening of language as we go through it, I think that that's a discussion that we can have as part of the communique. And as far as I'm aware, those types of edits and things like that can be done at any time within the communique. And so as people start to understand like, get a better understanding of what we're proposing here, perhaps, they can utilize the Google document that's been shared and start to think about how they would like to potentially shape the advice on this. So we can continue with the next topics and just kind of go through them and see where the discussion takes us.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: So if everybody agrees, then let's move on to the next topic, Jason, which is-- Unless anybody has any question or comment about

predictability, we'll move on to registry voluntary, RVCs and PICs, if everyone's okay with it. Jason, floor is yours.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. So this is the second of five items that we have proposed here. And again, this is related to RVCs and PICs. So the language is as stated before, existing language, existing kind of GAC views on this. And really, really the essence here is to make sure that these PICs and RVCs are enforceable through contractual obligations. If I remember correctly from this morning, the GNSO had also flagged this as something that they had supported widely as well. So it seems like a bit of alignment there. So I can pause. Any comments, questions, or clarifications?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: We do have some comments in the chat room. And thanks to Jeffrey Neuman for helping out here. So, Jeff says, as a point of information, at this point, the issue of the composition of the spirit is with the implementation review team in implementing the adopted recommendations. The final reports recommendation which was adopted by the Board already makes the spirit open to all interested participants. Thank you, Jeff. I have a comment from Egypt as well. Manal says, we can definitely discuss now, but maybe conclude after our discussion with the Board if agreed by topic leads and GAC colleagues. And then finally, the United Kingdom. He says, good afternoon. I think we need to decide on whether advice or not after the session with Board.

So if we agree that that's the best way forward, and I see some nodding. Unless I have any comment otherwise. Julia, yes?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Jorge Cancio from Switzerland.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Okay. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you so much. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I think we are innovating a lot by free consulting, draft consensus advice both with the GNSO and the Board before we decide on that. And of course, it would be unwise to take final decision right now to go forward with an advice or not before talking to the Board. Today, we had this little scoring exercise with the GNSO to feel where the pain points could be with them if we elevate any of these pieces to advice. And of course, it's very important to hear what the Board says. And I think we can and we should definitely factor that in into our discussions during the communique.

But beyond that, I think that it's very important to hear now whether in principle or as a basis or as a first impression, our GAC colleagues really think that these different pieces of potential advice merit being elevated to GAC advice. To have a sense of the room, it's important to know the opinion of the GNSO, of the Board, but it's very important to hear the opinion of our GAC colleagues. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Switzerland. Comments, reactions? And I have the United States. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. Just to note, to echo Jorge, Switzerland's comments regarding the innovation of this process. I think it is a productive path forward, and it'll be interesting to see how we collectively feel about this as a GAC after the meeting. Just on a note with the PICs and RVCs language that is presently on the screen, this does look like familiar language. We do see certainly this language in previous communiques, and we look forward to addressing the posture of this language that is whether it is an issue of importance or whether it is actual advice after we have had those conversations with the Board and other GAC colleagues. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you. Thank you very much USA, and I have a Denmark. Please, Finn, go ahead.

FINN PETERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Finn Petersen from Denmark. I do agree that we in one way or another should address the question of PICs whether it will be important for the GAC or an adviser. I think that is up to be decided after we had the meeting with the Board. But as principal, it should be in. Concerning the first one with the spirit, if I understood right from the intervention from the GNSO, it is already foreseen that it

is open for everybody to participate. If that's the case, then there might be a need to reformulate it the way the advice or a note for importance for the GAC because if we already have the possibility, we shouldn't stress that this should be open for everybody if it is obvious that it already is open. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Denmark. Jason, would you like to take that one?

JASON MERRITT: Yeah. I think it's a very reasonable kind of way to approach that. We can revisit that language and see what we want to do if we want to strengthen it or something like that. I take your point that it may seem redundant to say we should be involved when there's already a commitment to be involved. I think it's just whether or not we want very clear solid clarity that the GAC will have its own sort of definitive role there. So we can take that away and think about how we characterize that going forward.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Denmark, and thank you, Canada. Any other questions, comments, inputs? Julia.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Kavouss Arasteh from Iran.

ICANN|77
WASHINGTON, D.C.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Iran, the floor is yours.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, chairman. If you allow me, we need to little bit explain the situation. GAC advice should go through the careful consideration to be GAC consensus advice in order to be effective. When we want to reach GAC consensus advice, sometimes negotiations on the language that we may lose the objectives because we have to reach consensus. This is in the yard. Then go to the Board, goes to the procedures. 60%, if not, and then come back at the [inaudible - 00:41:41]. Whereas, issues important of GAC does not go to that difficult process in the GAC. And then when it goes to the Board, we'll provide some latitudes for further discussions. I'm not suggesting to take approach a or b, but I have to say that there are two different things, and we have to be careful not to push for so many advice at this stage. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Iran, for the brief comment an explanation. Any other comment? Any other question? Are we okay to move on? Jason, back to you.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. So we can move on to the next number three issue on applicant support. Again, very, very top level. What the GAC is seeking here is to reduce or eliminate ongoing registry fees to expand financial support to applicants from underserved regions. This would be the third item of

potential advice that we have flagged. So I can pause here, see if there's any broad stroke comments, questions.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: And, again, we're encouraged, and I have a Hungary, but before I give the floor to you, Peter, since this directly affects underrepresented regions in general, I would encourage all countries from underrepresented regions or not to use their native language and ask any question, sorry, or any comment in Spanish, Portuguese, French, Russian, Arabic, or Portuguese. Having said that, Hungary, please go ahead. The floor is yours.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Nico. I'm afraid I can't use Hungary, on your encouragement to use my native language. Anyway, what I really wanted to say is just a small remark that Jason in your introduction you mentioned underserved regions, which I think we accepted yesterday. So probably, we should be correcting it here.

JASON MERRITT: Thank you for that.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Go ahead, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Great. Thank you. And just speaking as the applicant support GGP alternate, I'd really like to hand it over to our primary, excellent primary representative Argentina in a moment. But, I just wanted to give a bit of an update and background in this regard. And I wanted to add that while the applicant support, GGP, we've both been working on is quite tightly scoped. It's key that the GAC is considering the applicant support program and its success in a much broader context as well. This goes to points made during our earlier meeting with the GNSO, and diversification of the global DNS market is absolutely crucial, and it's imperative that we build an applicant support program, which serves and supports applicants. A program that people are aware of and are empowered to apply through.

The last program unfortunately failed in that regard and it's incumbent upon us a GAC to ensure that it's a success this time around. The work won't and shouldn't stop with the GGP we're a part of. Well, of course, as a GAC, be further wordsmithing the proposed advice. There's some additions we want to make. So really welcome comments from all GAC colleagues on this. But Gabriella over to you to add anything.

GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Sorry, I'm not sure if this is the moment because I had a space at the end of the presentation, but maybe we can start now saying something. I'm not sure. Okay. Just to be clear and review a couple of things that we mentioned in the previous ICANN in Cancun, Rose, and Tracy, and I, we are participating in the working group, the GNSO guidance process on applicant support. And this group was created, just to give guidance is not a decision. So it's just to give guidance on the implementation. And

we were working on six specific tasks regarding the development of metrics for success.

And also, we are currently working on the task six, regarding, it says specifically creating methodology for allocating financial support where there is inadequate funding for all qualified applicants. Well, this is a little bit confusing because we were told that there is no financial support, it's just a reduction of the fee. So the beneficiaries won't have money, just a reduction of some fees, not all. So we were discussing this in the group, but again, we just give guidance and recommend, we don't take decisions. And it's important for us here in the GAC to give advice or to do it in any form we decide as a comment or anything. But for the dialogue with the Board, I think it's important to use terms that are clear and specific.

For example, expand financial support. We are not having here financial support. We are having just a fee reduction. So the first part is okay to encourage the Board to eliminate or reduce meaningfully. I mean, I don't know if this is the word, but to reduce significantly the fee. Because we were talking about in this GGP working group, what happened? We were talking about having 10 successful applications. For example, this number is totally arbitrary. I'm not sure where this 10 successful application comes from. It's very little. Is very, very little. Imagine the 10 applications in the 2000 that they are expecting to have is it, like, 0.5 or less percent. So this is not going to be enough to increase participation of the regions underrepresented in the DNS industry.

Second thing I wanted to emphasize is that to ask the Board, I mean, first, to give more fee reductions for application that qualify. And second, I mean, from underrepresented regions in the DNS industry and also that this reduction has to be significant. Because in the group, we were discussing what happen if we harbor more, and we don't have the support enough to reduce 85%. Then, well, we can reduce the reduction. I mean, I'm not sure if I'm explaining correctly, but instead of having 80% of the fee reduction, having then 70% of fee reduction. And this is not going to be enough at the end. So just to emphasize that this reduction should be 100% or at least 85-90% of the fees. I'm not sure if you, Rose, would like to add something else.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thanks, Gabriela. Just to come back to the main point I made that I think clearly lots to consider for the GAC and just to emphasize how crucial this applicant support program is here. So I think we went into a bit of the detail on the GGP there, but again, this is broader than that. We, as a GAC all want to work together, to ensure that we're supporting the diversification of the global DNS market and really welcome colleagues' views in this regard. Thank you.

GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: Sorry. One more point for the wording, for the word, and also for the communiqué is something else in the program. In the GGP working group we are discussing also to make it more flexible, the rules during the program. And this is something that we are not with 100% because we are for the program that is transparent, clear from the beginning, and is predictable. And if we are going to change the rules during the

process according to how many applicants we have, it's not going to be clear, transparent and predictable, and it's going to give the discretion to the people evaluating or managing the problem. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Argentina and United Kingdom. Before I open the floor again for questions, let me very quickly read. There is support from Australia. Support you are seeing how the conversation with the Board progresses before deciding on how to include this language in the communique. Well, you can read. Everybody has access to this, so I won't waste time reading. Julia, do we have any requests for the floor?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you, Nico. Yes, we have a queue. We have GAC representative from France, China, and then we have UPU.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Sorry, France. All right. France, please go ahead.

JONAS ROULE: Thank you. I will take the floor in French. I fully agree with the aforementioned comments and I think they are of crucial importance to ensure diversity. I would like to take this opportunity not to cast a shadow on underserved regions, but maybe to add a topic on the agenda, which is the geographic TLDs, which rely on public funding. And the public funding is usually less than that of the private sector and the industry, and that also supports the diversity of representation of

territories. And it would be something that we could further develop in the future within GAC or perhaps within the communiqué. We should also keep in mind the fact that there could be some kind of support to applicants of geographic TLDs and they definitely should be supported. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Julia, who's next? China. I'm sorry. Yeah, China. Go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Chair. Upon your call, I will take the floor in Chinese, perhaps you want to wear your earphone. Okay. Thank you so much, chair, for giving me the opportunity to speak. We are talking about supporting applicants right now. I think this issue is particularly important. In the first round of the new gTLD, while it was opening up, this mechanism is particularly important. It was important and it will be very important in the next coming rounds as well. We should keep this mechanism in place for sure. In China, Mainland area, we also have certain regions that are less developed and underrepresented. So I think this mechanism and its success would be able to provide a lot of people with the support that they would need.

Second, in the wording, it is saying that we are providing financial support for applicants from underrepresented regions. Region is a geographical concept. Like Peter Major mentioned earlier, in previous discussions, some representatives have raised the comment saying that we should use the wording of underdeveloped or underserved regions. Why are we using the word underrepresented region? Should

we put underdeveloped and underserved? Should we include those two words in the final wording? Perhaps we put all three up there. I think this would be able to cover more applicants that wouldn't be in need.

And again, region is a geographical concept. Perhaps there are also some communities or some groups of people that are underserved and underrepresented, and they do not have the capabilities. And they would also need support in getting or obtaining gTLDs. So, I am also raising attention to add groups and people that are underserved and underrepresented. So I would say we're underrepresented groups or underrepresented communities. Do you think that is something that we can include in the wording, or do you think the mechanism today is only going to be supporting regions, a geographical region? So that's my suggestion. And I like to hear your thoughts on this. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, China. We have one more request for the floor, two more, three more. All right, so who's next, Julia?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you. Tracy Hackshaw, UPU.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: UPU, please go ahead.

ICANN|77
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, chair, and I'd like to support the last, exactly the last points that China made, that's a very important point. I think we should take very careful note of the observations he made in terms of region versus communities/groups and the suggested wording that's very important. And I was at a very significant discussion within the GDP group, I believe. I'd like to thank Gabriela and Rose for making such good representation of the GAC in the room for that our points. I would just like to make a call now for several GAC members to take a careful look at this. Because even though we do have a voice in that work, the way that the work is shaping out, I think there is still a lot of work to be done. Unfortunately, I wouldn't be able to speak in that group but there's a lot of work I think that needs to be done.

And I would want to encourage all GAC members, especially those from underserved regions to take a careful look at the output of that, of the GGP exercise because there's some aspects I think need to look specifically at. The last initiative in this regard a few years ago, the Jazz working group made several very good recommendations including those related to marketing and communications and so on. But it didn't go very well. It wasn't successful. It didn't achieve the objective. And I don't think the current situation, if I may totally frank is fixing that right now. I'm being honest with you.

So I think you need to take a careful look at what's happening, especially the marketing and communications aspect, how well the underserved communities really know this project is on the wave of it from ICANN. How well will it be sensitized and how well will it be supported? It's very important that we make that observation now

before the project is kick started, green lit and gets underway before it's too late. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, UPU, Tracy. I have Portugal, the United States and Iran. Anna, please go ahead.

ANA NEVES: So now, of course, let's hear some Portuguese. Right? So I'll turn into Portuguese language. I support France and China, these points were pending of discussion, underrepresented regions versus underserved communities, [inaudible - 01:00:59] included those out of this or maybe less developed countries. We need to work here on these terms. And on the other hand, our communities in our countries, they have an industry. So where we have room for gTLDs, so we would need to discuss this of the underrepresented regions very closely so that they do not have to pay for the registry fees. This is a possibility. It's just a matter of organizing the support for developing this type of industry in these countries or communities. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Portugal. Sorry. I have a request for the floor from the USA. Is that right?

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes. Thank you, chair. I'd take my hand down, but I can still make the point. Just to note that I think that we need to take a critical look at the

precise language that is on the screen under 3A1 here. But we can do that after discussion with the Board. It's really just to ensure that the reduction or elimination of registry fees isn't overbroad, just general. So I think we can address that later after discussion with the Board. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, USA. I have Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. We are talking of, yeah, they are talking of many words, underserved community, underserved region, underserved country, underrepresented community, underrepresented region, so on, so fourth, developing country, least developed country. These are the difficulties that we have to resolve. The language we should use should be a language which could be easily identifiable to provide that support. If it is not identifiable, so that would be no support properly distributed. So this is important. We first clarify the situation what you are talking at, developing country, and this developed country are something that in the UN that exists. But all of these others Tracy told that underserved country or underrepresented if defined, I would like to know where it is defined. It is officially defined somewhere? Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Iran. I have Egypt, and then I need to close the queue because I need to go back to Jason. We barely have 15 minutes to wrap up, right? So Egypt, go ahead, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Christian Arida for the record. So while I do appreciate the proposal by China and by others to include a wider definition, I just have to agree with our esteemed colleagues from Iran that is important to have a term that is well defined so that we can, at the end of the day, have a KPI that we can measure. So when we talk about underrepresented regions, we can cross check the numbers, what does it mean to be underrepresented in the applications. But underserved, I'm really not sure how can we measure underserved communities or underserved regions. So I'd love to see that in, but I'm not sure how we can actually measure that. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. And for the sake of time, we'll go back to Canada. Jason, the floor is yours.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. Thank you very much, and I'm very happy that that discussion happens sort of organically as we were going through some of the issues here or the proposed topics. I think maybe in the interest of time what I'll do is we'll move on to the fourth topic on the next slide. And I will just briefly touch on them because I think we're all sort of generally aware of what's going on. I don't want to preclude any discussion or

questions or anything else. So happy to take that here. But essentially, the fourth item that we had proposed was this issue of GAC early warnings and consensus advice, which has been a hot topic for the GAC, so to speak, throughout this process. We have issues with recommendation guidance 30.2, and we would like to see recommendation 30.6 included. That's sort of the baseline position of the GAC that we would like to reiterate as part of the advice in this.

So I will pause quickly there and again see if there's any issues or questions as to how we would like to approach this. Keeping in mind, I think it's a good idea that we had meant, like, that was suggested that we revisit these things after the Board discussion as well as communiqué is open for drafting and contributions now, and I think that also goes to the previous topic that was discussed. So I'll pause there for a moment.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, Canada. Questions, comments, any input? Julie, are we okay with the chat room? No request for the floor? Okay, seeing non, back to you, Jason, let's move on.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. That's good. So we can go to the fifth topic. I think we can skip two slides to number five. There we go. And again, here we have the issue of auctions and mechanisms of last resort and private resolution of contention sets. Again, was discussed this morning in our meeting with the GNSO. We'll get some feedback from the Board in that discussion. But our positions are fairly clear here in terms of what we

would be potentially seeking advising the Board on. Would be to ensure that options of last resort are not used and that we would strongly disincentivize or ban private auctions. So I will pause there on that item quickly for any comment or questions.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you, again, Canada. And we have five minutes and then I need to wrap up the session. So any specific comment on this topic? Any question? Anything you would like to add? If that is not the case, then back to you again, Jason.

JASON MERRITT: Sure. Thank you so much. So I think we can move on to the next topic on the agenda then, which would be the SubPro implementation review team IRT update.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Gulten, would you please?

JASON MERRITT: Which would just be one or two slides forward would be fine. There we go. So again, in the interest of time, I think we've heard a little bit on the IRT throughout our meeting, throughout the different sessions here. I think the highest level key message is that so myself is the GAC appointed representative to that IRT. My good friend and colleague, Nigel Hickson, is also is an alternate there. And of course it's open

membership across the community. So if anybody would like track it or follow the discussions going on there, that's an option as well.

I think the key takeaway here is that this has just spun up. There have been three meetings to date. And they've largely been in my view quite administrative in nature. And so a lot of sort of introductions to topics, discussions on timelines, where things are headed, how to map out work, how to maybe recategorize work. There are 98 approved recommendations as we know and 38 are pending. So we're going to be working through those 98 and then seeing what happens as the other 38 come onboard working through those as well.

The proposed time frame to conclude the IRT right now has been marked at approximately 24 months, although there seems to be a goodwill and probably a lot of support to see if we could wrap this up earlier than that, if possible. So those discussions will continue. There is another meeting, the fourth meeting is being held, I believe, tomorrow during this ICANN session. I might be talking through too much of this stuff. So maybe we'll go to the next slide.

This is a bit of background, how this all started, call for volunteers, the representatives appointed like I had mentioned. So we can skip through that slide. This is a little bit of sort of governance or terms of reference, so to speak for the group in terms of what it will do, what it won't do, how it's going to approach issues, how we intend on working through these recommendations. I think we can go to the next slide.

And then we've outlined some of the key dependencies on the IRT. So we've touched on a little bit the 38 outstanding recommendations as those start to get approved and roll in, those will get built into the

process as we go. The GGP as we've touched on a little bit today for applicant support, which is ongoing in the background. Closed generics, which has been quite a topic at this meeting that we'd be going through that as well. There's also a name collision analysis project study that is ongoing. And implementation review of recommendations from WorkStream 2 as well. And I believe and independently, there's some work being done on a PDP for IDNs.

So I apologize for going through that very quickly. I will remind or point out that as the representative, I did send out to the GAC mailing list a bit of an overview of where things stood just prior to this meeting, which was a little bit more comprehensive than what I breezed to right now. But essentially, things have just started and we're working through getting to some of those issues. So I think that was a lot to maybe take in on the topic, but I can pause there and happy to try to address any questions or comments on this overall topic.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Canada. Argentina, are you going to go ahead with your presentation or should we take questions from the floor?

GABRIELA MATTAUSCH: I think I just explained a bit, if someone wants to raise questions.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO: Okay, just to make sure. So do we have any quick question? We're at the top of the hour. We need to wrap up the session, but if you have any final comments, any final questions, we can go ahead very quickly.

Seeing none, well, let's wrap up the session. Thank you so much Jason from Canada, Jorge Cancio from Switzerland, Gabriela Mattausch from Argentina, Ross Kenny Birch, and Nigel Hickson from the UK. And I'll see you tomorrow, 9AM because the next session is going to be the ICANN Board listening session on CEO search. So the meeting is adjourned. Thank you so much, enjoy your evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]