ICANN83 | PF – GAC Joint Meetings with the GNSO and ALAC
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

DANIEL GLUCK

Hello, this is Daniel Gluck from the ICANN Policy Development Support Team. Welcome to ICANN83 GAC meeting with the GNSO, followed by the meeting with the ALAC on Tuesday, the 10th of June at 8:45 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments can only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six U.N. languages and Portuguese. If you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room.

When called upon, participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. Please state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking when speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. And I will now hand the floor over to GAC chair Nico Caballero.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Daniel. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your fantastic local coffee. Welcome, everyone. It's a pleasure to have this a little bit shorter meeting, I would say,

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.

because this session is going to be running for only 45 minutes, that is, until 11.30 a.m. local time. We're going to be talking about accuracy of registration data, DNS abuse, and we'll make sure to allocate enough time for Q&A sessions as well.

So, as I said before, DNS abuse, registration data, RDRS, Registration Data Request Service, and urgent requests and LEA or Law Enforcement Authentication, and then again, open the floor for AOB or A&A session that I hope we'll really have time to discuss in depth some of these topics. So, without further ado, let's dive in. Greg, the floor is yours. Please go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE Yeah, this is Greg. Thank you so much, Nico. As he explained, we're the GSO Council. As a reminder, or perhaps as education for newer GAC members, the GNSO Council is made up of representatives from ICANN's various stakeholder communities. These representatives look at potential issues that are within ICANN's remit and could be addressed by ICANN's policy development process. In other words, is there a policy that we could develop that would help address an issue facing the ICANN multi-stakeholder system?

So we're the managers of this policy, we look for issues, start the policy development process, manage that process from the beginning to the end, which hopefully results in recommendations that are approved by the GNSO, and then they go to the ICANN Board, and if the ICANN Board approves them, they become

effective ICANN policy. So real quick on kind of where we are, we have some substantive updates. We in the last year finished recommendations on two pretty big items, the next round of gTLDs, recommendations related to that, as well as recommendations regarding the transfer policy, how domains transfer between registrars.

We're now turning our focus on to a couple other topics. Chief among those are DNS abuse and accuracy. And so we'll have updates on how we're thinking about scoping the work and proceeding on making progress on these topics. So I think we'll start with Paul, who has an update on... Oh, there was a slide on our structure, but as you can see, we're made up of different representatives from different stakeholder groups. Okay, let's move to Paul, who's going to give an update on accuracy.

PAUL MCGRADY Thanks, Greg. Paul McGrady here. I have some slides because I think slides are a great way to bring abstract conversations into the concrete world. And so you guys will have to tolerate me being so formal today, but I think sometimes they help. Just a quick update on the council small team on accuracy. Following ICANN82, the council quickly formed a small team, and we were tasked with reviewing the written inputs received on our council's threshold questions regarding accuracy, and then providing a detailed summary of the inputs received.

And we also included some other sources for the discussion. So, for example, the INFERMAL study, the EU NIST2 Cooperation Group, and some other sources. And we will be providing some recommendations to council on how to best make progress on the topic of registration data accuracy. And so we have already begun our work. We began meeting a few weeks ago, we are moving fast. We have some preliminary recommendations that the small team is kicking around. We are not fully aligned on those.

They're very, very early stage, and so we do have some consensus building to do internally, but we have them in front of us and we are moving. We appreciate the GAC's response to our threshold questions, and those responses are being fed into our process, and we do appreciate the GAC's continued interest in the topic of registration data accuracy. So the small teams focus is making improvements to accuracy. As everybody agrees, this topic is important.

There's no dissension on that, and I've not heard anybody in the community say they would like inaccurate data. The group is now focused on the potential areas of improvements or ideas for improvement that could be the subject of future work. Someone did ask if we have a plan to restart the Accuracy Scoping Team. I don't think we do at this point, mostly because the council small team is working on scoping. So like I said, we're moving fairly quickly to get some recommendations to council on next steps.

So let me just go through a couple of slides and talk about some areas where we think there's some initial alignment and some things to move forward. So this is an important quasi venn diagram. I call it the Three Ring circus. And so on the left side of the left ring are things that some folks. believe, including that there's lack of evidence to support the inaccuracy issue, the current requirements in the RA are sufficient, further policy work is not needed immediately, someone to await NIST 2, and accuracy equals the RA requirements related to contactability.

So that's an area that we're not going to get alignment. On the far right. I should quit saying far right on the right. We have some things that other people believe, which are inaccurate registration data remains a significant problem. The current requirements of the RA are insufficient to combat it. Further policy work should begin immediately, and accuracy should include identity verification, and the inaccuracy is linked to DNS abuse. So the things on the in the left circle and the right circle are things where we're not going to get alignment. And we're stepping away from that dance because it wasn't getting us anywhere.

The things in the middle circle are what we can get alignment on, which is that accurate registration data is important to the DNS. A starting point for the definitions are the current RA policy, the agreements and the policy requirements, that more data is needed, and that we can consider voluntary improvements to accuracy. We persist in this word incremental. We had somebody

objected that word. I apologize, it's still on the slide, but it does seem to be a persistent word I can't seem to get off the slide.

But it's basically small bits of progress, keeping all the stakeholders in mind. And so as we dug in, here's what we came up with. We're going to move on to the next slide here. So we basically found what we are calling the three golden nuggets. I think we can skip this slide. There's some good background there, if anybody wants to take a look at that slide. But let's get on to the golden nuggets if we can, just because I see our time is short. We can get to the next slide. Okay, I'm not seeing the next slide. We have three golden nuggets we're supposed to get to.

Does anybody have that for me? Okay. Well, I'm going to ignore the slide, but hopefully it shows up. And the three golden nuggets are, if I can do this from memory, golden nugget number one is that in the informal study, there was an interesting thing that that study noticed, which was that when you move up accuracy verifications earlier in the process, So, prior to or at the time of registration, or shortly thereafter, they noticed a 70% reduction in malicious domain name registrations.

That 70% reduction in malicious domain name registrations jumped off the page at us, and we thought that that was definitely something that we are going to run to ground to see if there is something that can be done there. That would be something that may be able to be done fairly quickly. So we're tracking that down. The other golden nugget was that there may be some benefit in the

RDRS record to noting when a domain name is suspended due to inaccurate data.

And I think that is for both researchers as well as domain name registrants to see the reason why a particular domain name is suspended. And then, lastly, a need for further education of registrants as to the importance of accurate registration data, but also how their data is protected. I think that there may be a presumption that from a registrant point of view, that inaccurate data is a way to protect their information. But I think we can do some education around that as well. So those are the three things.

I hope to visualize them for you instead of just read them out loud. But in any event, those are the three things that we're focusing on in our initial recommendations. As I mentioned, the Accuracy Small Team is moving very quickly, and we will have some draft recommendations to the council, I think, within the next several weeks. And so we heard the GAC and we are underway, and happy to take any questions, either now or at the end. Thanks, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Paul. And I just want to add one clarification on the venn diagram part. In the areas that there wasn't consensus, that doesn't mean that policy might not address this at a later date, but in the interest of having more efficient PDPs that are narrowly scoped and could go faster, we wanted to start with things that we do have consensus as our starting point, and then move on to start

the, I guess, harder work of bridging consensus on these topics that are on the left and right of it.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Greg. Paul McGrady here again. Yeah, that's absolutely correct. What we didn't want to happen was that the small team get bogged down in some of the discussions that the broader community have not been able to reconcile. Instead, we wanted to focus on what we could agree on and find solutions that we could recommend fairly quickly to council. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE: Do you want to keep going or stop for questions here?

NICO CABALLERO: Just one second. Thank you so much, Paul. Greg, one question. When you say faster, any idea about timing? Are we talking about years? Are we talking about months? Can you elaborate a little bit more when you say faster? What exactly does it mean? I mean, you don't need to be exact, just give an idea.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, I don't have exact timelines, but there is a focus within council, a topic that we've been talking about are how to make PDPs more efficient, right? Delivering things in closer to a year or two, as opposed to five, whatever, right?

And so part of the thinking on that is we've seen that when work is more narrowly scoped on a specific topic, that there seems like there's a path to consensus, things can be a little more efficient. So that's our goal, and that's what these council and these groups specifically are thinking about it. So, specific timelines, no. Aspiration. Yes.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you. Thank you. I never asked, for the record, for any kind of specific. So before we move on, before moving to DNS abuse, are there any questions or comments from the floor? This is a good time to ask anything to our distinguished colleagues from the GNSO.

In the meantime, I don't see any handouts so far, but in the meantime, let me ask you or Paul, or anybody from the GNSO as regarding resuming the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Teams and Outreach. There's a question. Oh. So, before I give the floor to the European Commission, any news in that regard, anything you can share with us?

GREG DIBIASE

So I think this team is doing a scoping exercise, so we don't strictly see the need to have a scoping team, just to have one. So if this issue can effectively identify areas for work and we can begin on that work, then a scoping team may not be necessary.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Greg, I have the European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo here for the European Commission. First of all, let me thank the GNSO Council representatives. I think this is very informative for us, and as you mentioned it, it's an important topic for the GAC, so we are grateful for updates on this topic. And also, I think it's very positive to hear that the small team on accuracy is expected to deliver some recommendations pretty fast, because timing was also another element of concern, as also Nico has expressed earlier on.

Two points concerning the previous experience. So concerning the accuracy scoping team, we understand at the moment there seems to be no intention to resume that work. So this is something to be taken into account for us. And also an invitation also to take that experience into account, because one of the elements that probably created the problems in the scoping team to move forward was precisely the definition of accuracy. But we also found a divergence in the understanding concerning the accuracy requirements.

So, in particular, whether the accuracy requirements to be taken into account are the full set included in the RAA or limited to the WHOIS specification. So one question that we have had for a long time and also we are planning to ask the Board is that whether

there is a possibility to have an understanding on the current status of compliance with the full set of accuracy requirements inside the RAA. Because we have more or less information about what's happening with WHOIS specifications, the contactability requirements, but we do not have a lot of information about other practices covering the full set of the accuracy requirements. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY

So, thank you very much for that. This is Paul McCready again. Yeah, I mean, that's something that you're asking the Board about, and that would be good information for the council to have.

And at the end of the day, just because this particular small team has some essentially recommendations that we think can move quickly, doesn't mean that would be the end of a council process, certainly not if the data on that issue is brought forward. So all I can say is thank you, and we look forward to continuing to work on this while also moving forward what we've started right now. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission, for the question, Paul for the answer. For the benefit of our distinguished translators, I would beg you to speak a little bit slower so that they can do their job. So thank you so much for that.

Moving on to the next topic, because I don't see any other hand, which means that we're in agreement so far. So yeah, DNS abuse. And for that, I will have my distinguished colleague from Canada to read the questions. Please go ahead.

RIDA TAHIR

Thank you, Nico. I'll just proceed to the next topic, which is DNS abuse, and read out some of the questions that the GAC has put together kindly with the support of the DNS abuse topic leads in the GAC as well. So the first question, and maybe I'll do them one at a time, if that's okay, is for the council to provide an update on the DNS abuse small team work and timeline for the outputs.

JEN CHUNG

Thank you, Canada for reading out the first question. My name is Jen Chung. I'm the lead on the council small team on DNS abuse. So first, we'd like to thank GAC for inviting the council small team on DNS abuse to present during the June 2nd webinar. We did a quick update there and there were some questions that were answered. But in lieu that not the full GAC was there, we're going to repeat a little bit of this information.

So, in short, during the Seattle meeting, DNS abuse again was identified as a potential area for future policy work. It was previously addressed by the DNS Abuse Small Team back in 2022. And that iteration of the small team produced a set of four recommendations and also identified a gap in the enforcement

mechanisms under the current contracts. So the contractual amendments between ICANN and the contracted parties were negotiated to define DNS abuse and establish mitigation obligations in cases of evidenced and actionable DNS abuse.

And the small teams recommendations on these was one of the catalysts and factor that gave rise to these negotiations. So now that these amendments have been taken effect, and now it's been a year plus and related data has been received through reports from ICANN compliance, council proposed to revisit this issue, and it has anticipated doing that actually in the outset. So in April this year, the small team was reconvened and we had a new assignment form to take a look, to see the effectiveness of the contractual changes and to also consider future policy development, if warranted.

So the small team was signed to do four things. The first thing is to evaluate the DNS abuse mitigation efforts across ICANN. And these include efforts on industry, the Contracted Party House, and other community groups, and also industry firms that are focusing on combating DNS abuse. The second thing that the small team is assigned to do is to review the recommendations proposed by the DNS Abuse Small Team back in 2022 to see if there's anything that we need to address there.

The third item that the small team is tasked to do is to assess the impact of the contractual amendments on DNS abuse mitigation efforts. And the fourth and final thing is to discuss the insights from

the INFERMAL study and all the other reports that are on this topic as well, and see how these insights can inform next steps on what we're going to do about DNS abuse? The small team started meeting middle of last month, and we've had three meetings so far.

Again, this is a meeting that is open to all observers, and I think some GAC colleagues have already taken advantage of the fact to actually see what the small team is doing. And we've reviewed insights on the INFERMAL study, the ICANN compliance data from the one-year contract amendments, the NetBeacon white paper, and also the DNS Abuse Small Team final report form from 2022.

We talked about how these can inform the next steps, and we started looking at the gaps related to DNS abuse mitigation named in these source documents, so the ones I just listed, including, I guess, the white paper, and there was also articles and blogs on the effectiveness of the contractual amendments. And the list of gaps cover a wide range of issues. So the small team has prepared a draft categorization of these identified gaps in this matrix that you, I think, probably Seb, sent it over to our DNS abuse topic leads in the GAC, and I'm sure the full GAC will be able to see this quite soon.

The goal of this exercise is to assist in identifying what gaps warrant deeper investigation through an ICANN issue report. And it's also important to note that this is a preliminary analysis based on early discussions. It's a very high-level document review and it also reflects an initial interpretation of these issues, and it's not a final assessment. So, with all of these caveats in mind, when you take a

look at the gap matrix, we want to see your inputs and your comments on that.

And GAC, of course, is invited to share the gaps and issues via Seb, our GAC liaison, that the small team can take into consideration with this regard. The plan is to deliver the assignment within six months. So this is a timeline within six months. But due to the importance of the topic and also listening to the community in the discussions so far in the Prague meeting, the small team aims to deliver its assignment earlier than the expected six months, as all the groups seem to be quite aligned on, there are gaps remaining in DNS abuse mitigation.

The question is which gaps can be addressed and further investigated in an issue report. I think I'm going to stop here and see if there's any questions on that, and then I'm going to pass it back to the second question.

NICO CABALLERO I don't think we have time for that, so let's go straight ahead to the second question. Rida, please, sorry about that. If there's time, we'll--

RIDA TAHIR Thank you very much. The second point is more of something for consideration given this morning, we had a great discussion on DNS abuse and many ideas from within the GAC, from the topic leads on this issue, but also from other parts of the community.

And so I invite the council to share their thoughts on the GAC's views to seek additional policy work on DNS abuse before the delegation of new gTLDS in order to best address the impact of DNS abuse. Please go ahead.

JEN CHUNG

Thanks, Canada. So this is going to be a short and sweet answer. I think the small team and also the council has been keeping our eyes and ears open on all the discussions that have been happening so far, and we will continue to do so. The small team recognizes the goal that a tightly scoped, a focused scoped PDP will help achieve this goal.

But right now, we're still in early discussions about what it is that we're going to do, and we cannot promise any outcomes specifically. But we know this is the goal that the entire community is working towards, and I think we're aligned on that. I don't know if Greg wanted to add some more on this.

GREG DIBIASE

No, I think that's right. I think alignment on the idea of a narrowly scoped PDP on a specific topic that has a high likelihood of consensus will help us. move towards this goal. And so, yeah, we understand this concern and I think this will be top of mind for this group as it goes forward.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you very much Jennifer and Greg. Questions or comments at this point before we move on to the next topic, which is RDRS, but still on DNS abuse? Any question, any comment? I don't see any hand in the room, I don't see any hand online, so back to you, Rida. Sorry, is it Manal? Yeah, Manal, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Nico. So, RDRS continues to be a topic of importance to the GAC, and on this, the GAC would like a status update of the report by the Standing Committee on RDRS. What are the GNSO's thoughts on next steps after the standing committee issues its final report. And, mindful of time, I think I might read the second question as well. So, additionally, the GAC would like an overview of how the RDRS addresses key elements and recommendations of the SSAD and an overview of additional policy work that may be required. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS So this is Sebastien Ducos, who is your GAC liaison, but also happened to be the Chair of that Standing Committee on IDRS. So in that second quality. We are basically working on finalizing our report, we're working on the chapter four of a, and I'm not Sebastien Bachollet, I'm the other Sebastien in the community, I'll have to note. He's a good friend. So we're working on chapter four of a four-chapter report.

The first, focusing on the trends that we saw on our pilot. Our pilot has been running for now a year and a half, a two-year pilot, but we decided after a year that we had enough data to start reporting on that. The second chapter on possible technical improvement, and I'll get into that point answering to your last question here in a minute. The third is in general and lessons learned whilst we've seen the tool being used.

And the final, which is taking us a bit more time than anticipated, I believe that in Seattle, I was hinting to a final report being ready by now. The final is actually, we're diving into the recommendations of the SSAD to look at them in details and offer back to council recommendations on it. We treaded very carefully here because we are not a policy drafting body, we're just a small team that became a standing committee.

So we want to be able to give an enlightened opinion, an expert opinion on what we think the recommendations, which parts of the recommendation should stay or should be changed or altogether abandoned. But our report is not policy in drafting, somebody else is going to have to take that to convert that into policy. So if we go into where we are in terms of timeline, we're now because on top of it with the guidance of council.

We've been asked to run a comment period, so we're looking at finishing our report in July and having a comment period starting in, let's say, mid-August to mid-September. Comment period open to everybody, including the GAC, obviously. In terms of where

we're going with this, it has already been agreed that the RDRS in its present form should stay on. There will be policy work coming after this, or I'll leave it to council to guide us on this, but we assume that there will be policy work to be done on this to bring back the SSAD recommendations to something that is more RDRS compatible.

It might be a bit more than an RDRS today. It'll be something hybrid between the two, as per our recommendations and as per the policy work that is going to be done. In the meantime, RDRS is going to be on. We already have a list of possible technical updates that we might consider even outside of the policy development, and that's a discussion for the council to have back with the Board and the Board with Org because so far Org has been financing this exercise that is coming to about $2 million, if I remember, or even past $2 million over the pilot program, so not insignificant exercise.

And so we will have this interim product, RDRS, possibly improved by the technical updates, running for a period, I'm going to be as diplomatic as Greg, of a number of months in order to review the policy that was SSAD and have then a successor system. But in the meantime, there's no break, RDRS continues, and continues working and operating the way it is. I hope that answers your questions, but otherwise, I'm happy to answer any.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much, Sebastien. I don't see hands in the room or online. I'm sorry, sorry, yeah. European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you again, Nico. I'm sorry for taking the floor, and Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. Thank you, Sebastien, for this very useful update. This is more a comment than a question, and it concerns the participation in RDRS. The GAC has been very supportive of this tool, we have expressed this on several occasions, and the European Commission is on the same line.

But we are looking with concerns at what is happening in terms of registrar's participation to the system. Recently, we have seen that some of the big registrars have withdrawn from the system and this is a point of concern for us because while we noticed an increased use, in particular from law enforcement, then if there is a request or see that there is no participation on the other side, interest might drop quickly, so this is a point of concern.

And the second very quick comment is that it's very important to see the interplay between SSAD and RDRS. You said it. I would rather say, though, that RDRS needs to be SSAD compatible than the other way around because SSAD is the outcome of a policy development process. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Thank you. So, to your second point, the main issue and why we're in the situation today is that SSAD, as was recommended, cost upwards of $100 million to operate, and that's why the Board came back to us. So we'll try to make it as compatible as possible, but evidently, in order to keep it to a more cost-rational product, some of the features might need to be reduced.

One of them, for example, as a first hypothesis, was the one of authentication, which in the report that we got back from the ODP, the ODA, was, from memory, about 50% of the cost. We're now working with the help of the PSWG and Gabriel Andrews, we're working on regaining authentication features from law enforcement in particular. We have discussed that other groups may require that authentication. There is even discussion that everybody might need some level of authentication, in particular with regards, for example, to legal implications.

When we share data, we need to make sure that the receiver of the data obeys a certain number of rules about safeguarding the data itself, and we might need to authenticate that person, if only to be able to follow on those terms and conditions.

So we're still working on it, essentially. Obviously, it will be as SSAD compatible as possible, but because part of the exercise was simplifying the cost around it, there will be some changes. Your first question, I've already forgotten. Can you help me?

GEMMA CAROLILLO Well, it was a comment regarding concerns on participation from the registrars.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Oh, yeah. So let's keep it one major, but one registrar dropped off. And they didn't drop off the face of the earth, they have a system that is actually very compatible with RDRS, it's still absolutely functioning. They just asked not to have to go through RDRS for now. There are two things that we're already discussing as a potential, for example, technical update, even before we go through the whole policy process, is to help RDRS users, requesters, find those forms for non-participating registrars, who more often do not have their own system.

And so where RDRS would say, today it says that domain is sponsored by a registrar that is not participating, we want to change that to not participating, and here's the form you should be filling in those cases, for example. In terms, I know that I've heard it here in this room several times, in terms of mandatory participation, I want to be very careful about making mandatory a system that is still not unstable, but still in development, because participation has implications for registrars' investments, heavy investments in order to connect into the systems.

And I want to make sure that by the time we demand that of registrars, the system is fully ready to accept them and is not in constant change, which is still the case today. So thus that mid-tier or that temporary solution of saying, maybe we don't make it fully

mandatory, but RDRS knows where to find these people and where to find their form in order to make it as easy as possible for the user. I hope that answers your question.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much for the answer, Sebastien. Before we move on to the next topic, which is, and we have six minutes exactly, so I would greatly appreciate a little bit shorter answers for the next two questions. Just for the record, to my knowledge, and communication is a very important thing, to my knowledge, at least up until June 10th, 11, 24, and for the record, the GAC is not intending to stop the next round of new gTLDs.

I heard some weird, on my way to the coffee machine like, 30 minutes ago or something, I heard some weird questions in that regard. So, again, to my knowledge, I haven't heard a single GAC member stating anything related to that concept, and I stand to be corrected. That not being the case, all right, let's move on to topic number five, Urgent Requests. Rida, would you please help me with that?

RIDA TAHIR

I'll keep it very short for my part so we have more time for the discussion. The GAC has been following the IRT work on the important topic of urgent requests. And so we welcome an update on this work from the GNSO and also the next steps GNSO believes

would be appropriate after the IRT's recent discussions. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT

Thank you so much for the questions. My name is Thomas Rickert for the record. I'm the GNSO liaison to the IRT. And to respond to the first point, we're talking about urgent requests. As you may recall, the EPDP recommendations did not specify a timeframe within which a contracted party needs to respond to disclosure requests. And following two productive trilateral discussions, the council acknowledged and agreed with the GAC's suggestions that the discussion regarding the response time for urgent requests should continue within the EPDP One Implementation Review Team.

That's the group that I'm part of. The council confirmed this understanding during its public meeting at ICANN82 and encouraged ICANN Org to resume IRT meetings in the near term. That has happened in the meantime. Council understands the importance of this work and looks forward to supporting this group's progress. In our letter to ICANN Org, we also suggested that we should limit this discussion to the timeline discussion.

Because as we see in these discussions, folks are coming from different backgrounds and we have the tendency to try and really relitigate topics that have been previously discussed. As part of these discussions, we're also talking about the importance of law enforcement authentication, and I think that Gabriel Andrews,

who's in the room as well, would be best placed to speak to that because that's where we as the GNSO community need the public sector to help us.

Because, as you can imagine, a contracted party, be it a registrar or registry, needs to know who they talk to before being able to assess whether a disclosure request is legitimate or coming from the right source, and then take the other legal checks that are required.

So, the discussion of authentication is part of what we're deliberating, and that will have an impact on the time periods that can be specified. Actually, we will meet during ICANN83, so if you're interested in listening in and maybe joining the discussion, the IRT discussion is taking place this afternoon. Thank you so much.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Thomas. We have two minutes for questions. I don't see any hand online. Anybody in the room? I think I saw a hand a while ago from a non-GAC member, but no problem at this point seeing no GAC members requesting the floor. I think it's Nadia. I'm sorry, Paul, go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Nico. Paul McGrady here again. Since we have two minutes, I'll take 10 seconds and apologize for my confusion over the slide. That was the slide that I approved when staff sent it to me in draft in my head. I had another visual, happier slide about the golden nuggets. So staff is doing an able job and they're terrific,

and I got really confused about missing out on the golden nugget slide. But anyways, confusion was mine. Thanks for the 10 seconds. Appreciate it.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Paul. Questions, comments? That not being the case, thank you so very much to the GNSO Council. Thomas, Greg, Jennifer, Sebastien, and Paul, thank you very much. And at this point let me call to the head table, our distinguished members of the ALAC, thank you so much. 7:31 already, so Daniel, or I don't know, is it Julia or Daniel, please go ahead with the recording. Thank you.

DANIEL GLUCK As a reminder, this call is being recorded and we're live. Back to you, Nico.

NICO CABALLERO Would you mind closing that door, Daniel? We're starting the session? Please take your seats.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS But don't take them out of the room.

NICO CABALLERO Exactly. Good point. So welcome everyone to the GAC ALAC session. I have the privilege to introduce you to, well, you already

know her, Avri Doria. We have Tracy Hackshaw as the GAC speaker. Avri Doria is going to be speaking for the ALAC. And, of course, Jonathan Zuck and his fantastic team, Justin Chew. We're going to be talking about the ASP, the Applicant Support Program and some nuances in that regard, and equity in the next gTLD round.

Again, the GAC is not intending to stop the next gTLD round, just for the record, because I heard weird stories in the hallway. And also, we'll be talking about public interest frameworks and advisory roles. And for that, again, the ALAC speaker will be Justine Chew.

And then we'll open the floor for Q&A, and hopefully, given the fact that this session is running for 45 minutes, I hope that we'll have enough time for a Q&A session. So with that, let me welcome again my good friend Avri Doria. Avri, the floor is yours.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Surprises me to go first. So the applicant support, and I did put through a couple slides, but if they're there, yes. And I apologize. There's far more words on this slide than I normally do. First of all, I want to say that watching the effort that the ICANN staff has put forward during the Implementation Review Team to sort of take this policy, to put forward an implementation that will work, has really been very impressive and quite heartening and watching it goes along.

Unfortunately, I had a friend that asked me to help them register and work with putting in an applicant support application. And we

found that it is a lot harder to do than one would hope, and especially for something that's aiming at people that are new to the process, new to ICANN, new to our way of talking, new to our way of filling out forms. And I became very concerned while looking at it from an implementer's perspective, from a policy perspective, and for whatever, it is a really good policy, it looks really good.

But the implementation relies on a certain understanding, not only of the nonprofit and related worlds, it relies on sort of an understanding of how that exists in different cultures, and how it's described in different cultures, and how different laws in different countries do that. For example, we had one, the first thing to do to register before you even really get help on doing this is to declare the name of your company.

If your company doesn't end in one of the Inc. or Limited, or what have you, but it's something like Institute or Institution, it says, well, that's not a proper company. Is this a sole proprietorship? Is this an individual? How do we satisfy that? And it really just takes going and reading the rules of the place where something's registered to find out, oh, that is one of their acceptable names.

And it's a very small thing, but it's a small thing that block someone because they get back a notice saying, sorry, you have an improper name, give us a proper name of a proper institution, otherwise, it won't work. And so I'm inclined to get alarmist at a very small sign. But this was a first sign that sort of says, how are these

hardworking, very dedicated people going to deal with the scope and variety that the policy and the implementation accepts?

So that has really begun my concern with this. And so I've looked at it and I'm wondering, do we expect the people that are processing these things to do the research? If I get a name of something that isn't familiar to me, should I research it to make sure that it is or isn't? Or do I just send the notice saying, sorry, wrong? And so at the moment, as I'm watching the program unfold, I'm very concerned that we're going to have a lot of false negatives coming up with people.

Remember, when we're going for applicant support, we're going for sort of the people that are farthest away from our process, both economically, awareness wise, we're pulling in those that haven't been involved. The whole intention is to get those that are as distant from the center of what we do as possible. So I'm bringing that up early enough, hopefully, in the process of the actual implementation to sort of say, we need to look at that, and we really need to find a way to help those folks.

And as far as I could tell, the implementers and those are really trying, and they're coming up with solutions, but it's really something that needs to be paid attention to, I don't know how to help. The other thing I wanted to just bring up is I watch the numbers, I'm concerned about the numbers. I don't believe I see enough people applying for it. We're about halfway through the

application, there are many that have begun the process, very few that have gotten into the process, but still not enough.

If you look at what kind of effect, remembering that we have said that this new gTLD program, the one that GAC has decided not to try to stop, but at least yet, that it is meant to reach out to the applicant support people, it's meant to reach out again later to IDN. Those are the measures of its success. And so I'm sort of ringing one of my early alarm bells to sort of say on applicant support, I'm not yet convinced that we were in the track of succeeding at pulling in a significant number of candidates for that.

So I'll leave it at that. I do want to start out by saying, everybody's working really hard to get it met. I think the scope of the problem is larger than we've put our arms around. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Avri. I'll give the floor now to Tracy Hackshaw on behalf of the GAC.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes, thank you, Nico, and thank you, Avri, for the very insightful position that you've taken, well, that At-Large has taken on this. And you've articulated, I think that GAC shares a lot of your concerns. And as we discussed yesterday, we are trying to understand, and I just want to be very brief about this, what exactly are the obstacles that are currently in place?

You saw the slides yesterday. There are about 40 or so odd applications somewhere at the start of the pipeline, and only four have come through to be finalized, not yet evaluated, just finalized. And in that group of people who are applying, we are seeing signs that it's leaning towards one region again, which we are concerned about. North America, to be totally frank. And we would like that to be looked into.

We do have observations made with the Board during the bylaws consultation about doing course corrections when we notice something like this happening, where the region that is moving towards, maybe getting more of the support, is going in a certain direction. We want to ensure that does not happen and that we do course correction in terms of the outreach and engagement. And we also want to understand, as I said earlier, what exactly is stopping the applications from coming through?

Is it that it's a lack of support, understanding of the resources available? Is it a language issue? I know the In Your Language project is underway, and I think we do want together to work to see what we can do as At-Large, as the GAC, to go back to our communities to assist, but also to have Org understand what these challenges might be, so that they themselves can assist us with that assistance, if you see what I'm trying to say.

So I think the discussion we should have now is around how we could help unblock these obstacles if they're in fact obstacles, and improve the throughput of the application so we can actually start

seeing the numbers in a real way. Clean up the data if we need to clean up that data and move it forward to a point where we get to a stage that we know it's Region A or Region B is still struggling, and let's work on those regions and particular countries as necessary. Thank you. I can leave it there for discussion. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Tracy. Thank you again, Avri. So let me open the floor now for questions regarding the ASP, that is the Applicant Support Program. Any comment or question in the room or online? And I see a hand, the gentleman. I can't get to see your name. Go ahead, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA Okay, thank you very much. My name is Tijani Ben Jemaa, I am from the At-Large community. You speak about what are the barriers for some regions, but the regions are not considered in the policy. They are not considered at all. If you see the entries to this program, there is no mention of region at all. So this program is not made to include regions at all.

And also, I think we said at the beginning that it will be a remedial round to introduce more diversity. For example, IDNs, community application, et cetera. But unfortunately, there is no entries for them, except for the Indigenous people community. We have the chance to have two dedicated entries to the program. So the

problem is at the policy level, not at the implementation level. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you for that. But let me go back to your mention to regions. I don't understand. You refer to regional engagement? What exactly did you mean?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The eligibility criteria for this Applicant Support Program, there is no entries for regions, there is no mention of regions at all. While at the beginning we thought that it will be around to include other regions. We want to have more DNS industry in other regions.

TRACY HACKSHAW: I'm not sure how to respond to that, except that I know that discussion came up multiple times in the various GTP, et cetera. It is what it is. The horse has bolted, that's what I'm saying. So the issue I think here is that we can't go backwards and fix the policy, unfortunately. We have to know that what we've predicted is coming true, which is what we've said in those processes, we should now take the steps, I hope, to make the course corrections that we need to do.

If there needs to be additional effort placed on the regions in implementation, then let's do that, because otherwise you will go back to 2012 and wonder what happened again, and have another

remedial, and it doesn't make sense. So we are seeing what's happening, we are identifying the issues. Let's take the steps we need to take now to make that course correction.

And we have a template with the Board on GAC consultation that we do have this sort of agreement that we can do course corrections based on what we see in the monthly reports. I think we should start taking that up and providing that guidance or advice as we need to. Thanks.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much for that, Tracy. And for the sake of time, I can take one more question, two. Netherlands and Brazil. Netherlands, please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Marco speaking for the Netherlands. I'll be brief because I think, meanwhile, Tracy has said it all, but I would like to reiterate my comment I made to ICANN staff yesterday while we were discussing the ASP. Yes, it's a concern also for us to see that while all the policy is in place and we have built this wonderful system, it's not progressing.

And I would also like, as ALAC seems to be part of the target audience of this ASP, love to hear from people what they feel are the obstacles, and then especially those obstacles where we as a government can help in resolving them other than redoing the policy. Because, as Tracy just said, I don't think that's a feasible

option. So let's focus on what obstacles we can remove that fall within the mandate or realm of us as a government. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Netherlands. I have Brazil, and then Mrs. Craig. Brazil.

EUGENIO VARGAS GARCIA Thank you, Chair. My name is Eugenio Garcia, from Brazil. For the sake of linguistic diversity, I'll be speaking in Portuguese. Thank you for your understanding. I only have one question regarding something I see on this slide regarding the next round implementation. I believe that we need to focus on diversity and equity of applicants from other countries, countries that are not considered Western countries. How can we ensure that developing countries or countries from the global south are participating?

We need to focus on communication, outreach efforts, targeting countries that are not part of the Western sector or block of countries. So what can we do to ensure diversity in the next round? Thank you so much.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you very much, Brazil. Who is this question for?

EUGENIO VARGAS GARCIA This is an open question. This is a question to everyone.

NICO CABALLERO Okay, thank you. Sorry. Jonathan, would you like to go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK I think the complexity there and I think it's a very good question. I think you're used to the word ensure is a difficult one. In other words, we can't ensure that there will be applications in these regions. And certainly, the communications program that was put together by ICANN Org was much more expansive than Western countries. I think the real problem is that it's a more retail effort than people hoped it would be.

I think some of us tried to predict that a lot of handholding was going to be necessary, and there was a hope that if we just push enough information out at a high level, that that'll be enough. And I think the reality is that it's going to really take on the ground support to bring these applications to fruition, and it's not going to just come from promotion, because the promotion has happened quite a bit of it including in underserved regions that wouldn't be considered part of the West.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Jonathan, thank you Brazil for the question. Any other comment or question before we move on to the next topic? I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Mrs. Craig, go ahead.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Thank you. Claire Craig, for the record. Yes, as Jonathan said, we anticipated some of these problems would have come up. But Tracy mentioned something, and I wanted to go back to that, which was that this is a good time to do course correction.

Since the program for application support is almost halfway through and we are seeing the limited number of applications that have gone through the pipeline, what specific course correction can be done at this time to probably help to get some more applications and to help to get them through the process? And how possibly can the ALAC and At-Large community support any efforts that you all may be presenting?

JUSTINE CHEW

This is Justine Chew from the ALAC. I'm not specifically going to try and answer Claire's question. But in the interest of time, can I suggest that maybe through the liaisons, the two ACs liaisons, you could collect more feedback on ideas of how to push this forward, and then we take it on intercessionally.

The other aspect of it is, if you have a topic lead for ASP, I believe it's Tracy and probably someone else, we're happy to do, I'm going to roll, Avri is in here, I'm one of the people on the IRT for ALAC, so I'm definitely in a position to ask difficult questions of ICANN or if I have to. So I would like to have some support and some collaboration, we get to do that. I just need to know what to ask and how to ask it. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Justine. Thank you, Claire, for the...

CLAIRE CRAIG Sorry, I forgot to say that I am one of the co-vice chairs of the ALAC.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Claire. So, for the sake of time, we need to move on. And for that, let me give the floor back to Justine, who's going to walk us through the public interest frameworks and advisory roles. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW Thank you, Nico. So this is Justine Chew again, for the record. I had a couple of slides as well, so hoping that the person would bring it up because I have to refer to them to tell you what I'm going to talk about. To begin with, I'm certainly not in going to be lecturing anyone on public interest. I was reminded recently by your illustrious chair that the governments do have a public interest framework that they work within.

It could be specific to each country, and that's fine. But I want to concentrate our discussion. Could I have the slides up, please, whoever's controlling the slides? Sorry. So I want to concentrate our discussion on the global public interest aspect of it in the context of ICANN. So, in that respect back in, I want to say 2016, if my memory serves me correctly, that ICANN did try to have

community discussions on possibly defining global public interest for ICANN.

And the short of it is that it failed, because ICANN being a multi-stakeholder model and population, we couldn't come to a strict agreement on what global public interest means to ICANN. So of that exercise, the Board, and I'm looking at my illustrious colleague on the right as well, led the effort to come up with a framework, but mainly for, I would say, the Board's use to assess public interest. And this framework, it had a dual purpose.

One is to determine its use and utility for the Board, as I mentioned. But the second aspect of it is that it was kind of a demonstration, wishful thinking for how the community might also try to use it to evaluate certain public interest considerations, again, given a particular issue, or in the ICANN context. So when we talk about certain things, you have to frame the question, otherwise, the conversations get out of control and you don't actually come to anything, amounting to anything useful.

Okay, my slides has gone again. Little help here, please, with the slides. Okay, thank you very much. Please don't move it until I say so. What happened eventually was there was a pilot of this public framework, GPI framework. And the pilot itself identified five overarching categories and then subcategories of public interest. So you'll see them on the screen, I'm not going to read them out. And I bolded the categories to distinguish them from the actual subcategories of public interest. Can you move the slides, please?

Next slide, please. And the pilot happened, it concluded around about 2023, I want to say, and it came up with a report. And these are the key findings of the report. And I have to say that when the Board applied this public GPI framework, it applied it to two PDPs, Policy Development Processes, or the outputs of the PDPs. One is the SSAD, and the other one was the subsequent procedures. So, based on these two Policy Development Processes or the outputs thereof, they found that 36% of the SSAD ones and 78% of the SubPro ones actually thought about public interest, GPI considerations.

And it was central to the actual discussions when the policy was being made and so forth. So now, based on these sort of inputs, I want to ask the GAC, because they brought up this topic for us to talk about, how can the two ACs collaborate to strengthen this GPI considerations? The GNSO itself has introduced moving forward, new PDPs that they create would have to go through this GPIF checklist. One of two that they now introduce to the PDP process.

The other one has got to do with human rights impact assessment. And in terms of the function of the two ACs, we have the ability to give advice. So my question to you now, and just drawing on two of those categories that were identified in the GPI framework, which is the benefit to internet community and ICANN global multi-stakeholder community and PDP, what does my colleagues from the At-Large and what do our colleagues from the GAC think that we could collaborate together to ensure that the global public interest is included in any discussion that we have within ICANN,

not just between us, but also outside of between us, and take that forward? Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you, Justine. I have Egypt next.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Nico, and thank you very much, Justine, and thanks to ALAC for this useful exchange. I have to say that we did not have an internal discussion within the GAC on this, so I'm not in a position to be speaking on behalf of the entire GAC. But that said, it's definitely useful to have this brainstorming with ALAC from an advisory role perspective. I think it's been a good step from the Board side to have this framework and due thanks to Avery Doria.

I know she has been leading this effort on the Board. And as you rightly mentioned, Justine, GPI is linked to ICANN mission and anchored in its bylaws. So it's good to have a structured but flexible framework for clear, consistent way of evaluating the global public interest in respect to any specific recommendation, advice, or decision, rather than doing this subjectively.

Most importantly, also, it's good that this framework has been transparently announced and made available for the community to be aware of, voluntary use or be guided by, and provide feedback on. And it's encouraging to know that the results of the pilot suggests that it's useful to have this in different contexts. That said,

I think there are two advantages of trying to pilot this also from a community perspective.

First, to see whether and how it fits within our work, and it's good to have, as I said, consistent and predictable way of evaluating global public interest across ICANN. And second, to provide feedback on the framework to the Board and to other parts of the community who may be using it.

As I understand, it's a living document that we can continue to modify and fine-tune out of practice. So I look forward to having an internal GAC discussion on this and to continuing our bilateral exchanges, as I said, not least in our advisory roles from the GAC and the ALAC side. I'll leave it at this and hand it back to you, Nico.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much for that, Egypt. And thank you for the question, Justine. Right off the bat, I can tell you that we agree we should be working to benefit the internet community, beneficial, inclusive, supportive of underserved communities as you correctly pointed out, and human rights, of course, and that ICANN's global multi-stakeholder community and policy, PDPs, so to say, should be diverse, respectful, inclusive, and so on, and so forth.

But again, as Egypt also pointed out, we need to have internal discussions, and then we will be able to give you some more substantive answers. Egypt, go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL

Sorry, just one more thing I forgot to mention as I was refreshing my mind on the topic. I think it would be most effective to have such a framework part of the process and not just as a tool to double-check the end result whether it serves the global public interest or not. But having it throughout the process, being mindful of that criteria while developing whatever recommendations and or resolutions, and so on. And having this built-in part of the process, rather than just a tool to check the end result. Thank you, Nico, I'm sorry. Back to you.

NICO CABALLERO

No, no, thank you, Egypt. Thank you so much. Before I give you the floor, Justine, just one thing, and this is something I mentioned during the prep call there are different interpretations as regarding the meaning of GPI, of Global Public Interest, right? Even among governments, we have different interpretations of what the global public interest is.

There are also commercial or technical, or even legal interpretations about what exactly the global public interest is. So taking that into account, let me just repeat that we'll be having internal discussions and then we'll get… because mainly because this is a very good question. How? It's like agreeing on world peace. We all agree that there should be peace and around the world. How? That's the main point. So back to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you, Nico. This is Justine again. Absolutely, totally agree with you. And if I may just kick the ball off, there are some mechanisms by which collaboration could be facilitated already. So I'm thinking things like the closed generics conversation. I think there was very close collaboration between the ALAC reps and the GAC reps on that group, the closed generics.

And I also remember working very closely with your topic leads on ASP when we were pushing out the recommendations for implementation of SubPro Recommendation 17.2, How to Implement the Applicant Support. So there are examples of these kind of collaborations that we feel address also public interest in some respects, but again narrowly framed to either whether it's closed generics or ASP or something else.

So certainly, some of these mechanisms are in place. The other one I would suggest is while GNSO has introduced this GPIF checklist into the process, I'm certainly not sure how that is actually being done throughout the PDP. It remains to be seen. But I would suggest also that any time a PDP is initiated, there is a process of drafting the charter.

So I think that is also a good place to look, where both ALAC and GAC should probably pay more attention when the charter questions are being drafted, that we ensure that elements of public interest is also inserted there. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you for that, Justine. Before I give the floor to Switzerland, please refresh my mind. What exactly GPIF means? This is becoming some sort of interest language from Jupiter or something. GPIF checklist in PDPs. I mean, I understand PDPs, but for the benefit of the newer GAC representatives, let's try to explain, because I don't understand myself what GPIF is. So GPI is Global Public Interest. What exactly is GPIF?

JUSTINE CHEW Global Public Interest Framework. That is the framework. Sorry, this is Justine.

NICO CABALLERO Oh, all right, all right, all right. Now I get it. GIPF, I thought it was yet another acronym.

JUSTINE CHEW Sorry, I take responsibility for that. The link is wrong. It's GPIF, not GIPF.

NICO CABALLERO Sorry about that. This is again for the benefit of the new… remember, we have 83 new GAG representatives from Istanbul to Seattle, 60, 23 from Seattle to Prague, so it would be a good thing to explain what the acronyms mean and, if possible, not to add

additional acronyms. That would be greatly appreciated. Before I give you the floor, Avri, I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. Yeah, maybe a general comment, because global public interest or public interest, it's a very important notion that we have in the bylaws. In the end, the Board in its decisions has to abide by the global public interest. The Board is supposed to motivate and justify in its resolutions how this is done.

But maybe this is similar to the national public interest or the general welfare, or similar notions, which maybe you recognize them when you see the decision. But it's very hard really to set up a list of criteria how to really substantively define what it is beforehand. And I know the GPIF, this framework that Avri spearheaded when she was in the Board is a good checklist that we can use. But of course, if we use it just exposed, it doesn't make too much sense.

So, I agree with Manal that we have to embed it into the processes, into the PDPs, or within the relevant decision-making processes, where at the end we have a decision from the Board. And so the Board wouldn't be in the position of having to make up you exposed how they complied with the GPI, with the Global Public Interest, they could map it.

So that's the theory, that's the beauty of it. At the same time, let's be aware we are in ICANN, it gets sometimes very ICANN-esque. If we can use Kafka-esque, we have the ICANN-esque situation here and we end up with layers of process over process, over process, over process, over process, with tons of acronyms, and as Nico was saying, nobody understands a word, and it is no longer open and inclusive for people who just want to make the right thing.

So just to remind ourselves, let's do it, but let's do it in a simple, in an accessible, understandable way. Let's remind ourselves, and maybe this is a task for us for the coming years, to cut back on complexity, get back to some simplicity. And again, I'm a bit of a broken record in different places, and you will expect what I'm going to say, there are the Sao Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines.

Maybe it's worthwhile comparing our extremely complex PDPs and other processes with those guidelines and see what is really needed, what are the essentials to have the processes open and inclusive? Because sometimes, due to over-processification, we render the processes only understandable to the real insiders who can devote their lives to this, and that many times is matched by those with more resources.

And that renders the processes much less inclusive as they should be. And in the end, and I finish, as it is so difficult to define beforehand what the global public interest is, it's a little bit like democracy.

The best way to ensure that the final product lives up to global public interest is to have a real simple, open, inclusive, meaningful, real process that makes it possible that everybody relevant is at the table when decisions are made. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you very much. Switzerland. Avri, sorry. Go ahead, please.

AVRI DORIA Thank you. First of all, I very much endorse the Sao Paulo guidelines. I often follow behind you saying, yeah, yeah. Although, I fear that they will suffer the same fate as the GPI in that they will be abstracted from their beginnings. When we talk about the framework for GPI, it's based upon the values that we have in our bylaws, the bylaws that we should be paying attention to, and it's based on what's in our foundation documents.

So, in other words, they were rooted in, because, you're right, if we're going to argue about global public interest, we all have different views. Within ICANN, we're supposed to subscribe to the bylaws and the articles of incorporation, the values that have placed there that, in some sense, we've all agreed to by being here and working within that context.

And when we talk about the framework abstracted from that, we start to lose what we mean, and it just becomes a table with a bunch of things and a checklist. And that's one of the things I wanted to put in, in response to the question is, what does GPIF

mean? GPIF means we have bylaws and we have articles in corporations that have values and public interest values in them, that this is a way to follow through with them.

The other point I want to make is it's critical that if we're going to ask people in the PDPs to adhere to them, to at least speak to them, and if we're going to ask people in the advisory committees to address them when they're judging the results of a policy process, that the Board needs to, again, respond to them and not sort of give them a quick pass over, but really look at them and sort of say, okay, this is what was done, these are what the values are, this is what the bylaws say, this is what adheres and doesn't adhere. So for them to be valuable, the Board has to also use them. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much for that, Avri. We have one minute and two requests for the floor. So I'll give the floor to the lady right here and then to you Jonathan for a wrap-up. Please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. And the global public interest framework is a voluntary framework that has been developed for the community in order to consider while developing PDPS. So currently, actually, it can be integrated and it should be integrated with the policy development process.

So, currently, the community can actually use the global public interest framework in order to look whether their

recommendations, the impact of their recommendations on the global public interest. However, how many PDPs, Policy Development Processes so far have actually used the global public interest in order to look at the impact of their recommendations on the global public interest.

And here, I say it's a voluntary framework, the community is encouraged, but we need also, and maybe this is a call to the entire community, let's test this framework. Maybe it doesn't work as it is. Maybe it needs to be enhanced. Maybe we need to do some modifications to it. So in order to know how it works, and if it really works, we need to start testing it. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much for that. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK Yeah, some of what I was going to say sort of got said. I think it's really important to repeat what Avri said, is that our take on the global public interest is in the context of ICANN, not meant to be a framework for global public interest outside of ICANN. So it's a little bit of a red herring to talk about different countries having different ideas for national public interest, because they have them for the work that gets done at the national level for policy, and we're looking at an established context here of bylaws and expectations for this community.

And this is a way to give you a mechanism to think back to the things that are buried in the documents that we have in terms of bylaws and articles of incorporation. This is very much like the evolution of human rights rhetoric as well. There's a value to simply saying we need to build human rights into our public policy. And we did that long before we started defining what they were, and it's the same thing here.

I think part of what's come out of this is the timing by which we get into the discussion of global public interest may be more important than their definition, because if you are required as part of the charter process, for example, to delve into some kind of exploration of the global public interest, you're going to want to turn to something to help with that. And so just the mere fact that you have to discuss it, I think, will lead to some take-up of this tool, if not this, then another. But just starting with making it a part of the chartering process, I think, could be a very important first step.

NICO CABALLERO Thank you so much, Jonathan. I'm happy to tell you that we basically agree on a way forward to see ways on how to collaborate to strengthen global public interest consideration, certainly. So we'll be in touch, our liaisons are gonna be in touch. And sorry for going over three minutes over time.

Before wrapping up, let me just give you some housekeeping details. Please be back at 1:45 for the meeting with the ICANN Board. We'll have a 90-minute lunch break now. Thank you so

much, Avri, Justine, Jonathan, and my distinguished GAC colleagues, Tracy, Manal, Rida, and Christine. I'm sorry. Thank you so much. Enjoy your lunch. The meeting is adjourned.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for having us, and welcome to the 83 new reps. That's exciting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]