JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the GAC Meeting with the NCSG on Wednesday 29 October at 9:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking, in case speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I will now hand the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Thank you, over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome, everyone. Just before we start, let me give you some housekeeping details. This is a session, of course, with the NCSG that's going to be running for 60 minutes. Then we'll have a coffee break. Right after the 30-minute coffee break, we'll be meeting with the ccNSO. That's going to be a 90-

minute session, and right after that, lunch. That's the plan for the morning today.

In the meantime, I have the great pleasure of introducing Rafik, here to my right, from the NCSG. Farzaneh Badiei. Sorry for my horrible pronunciation. Then we have Manju Chen, to my right, and Michaela. Welcome.

This is a 60-minute session, and we'll be touching upon some very interesting topics, the main ones being the Human Rights Impact Assessment and the GAC Communiqué. We'll also be talking about RDRS, Registration Data Request Service, DNS Abuse Mitigation, which is a very important topic for the GAC, as everybody knows.

Then we'll touch upon RoRs, or Review of Reviews. Without further ado, and thank you to Manal and to Jorge for joining me right here at the head table. Again, welcome, everyone. I hope you had the chance to get some good Irish coffee this morning. Without further ado, let me hand the floor to Rafik. Welcome again.

RAFIK DAMAK   Thanks, Nicolas, and thanks for having us today. It's a good opportunity for us to meet with the GAC and to share some of our thought and position on several topics of interest that I think are relevant for the GAC, and we wanted to share with you. Just to maybe for everyone, NCSG stands for the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

We are the space for a group of the civil society and users in the GNSO, and so that's where we come from, that's why we are defending, like, when we get involved in terms of policy with regard or from the standpoint of Human Rights, and that gives you an idea how we will proceed for those different topics.

So, thanks again for this opportunity, and I guess we can move to the next agenda item. And just here to share, that's kind of the second time we are, we did or conducted Human Rights Impact Assessment of the GAC Communiqué, and we believe there is some interest from your side, and we want to share or give more insight about that HRI, and we'll ask here Farzana Badiei to go first.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Hello, everybody. My name is Farzaneh Badiei. I am a member of Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I'm also on the GNSO Council. We started doing the Human Rights Impact Assessment on GAC Communiqué since Seattle.

This is a civil society, non-commercial stakeholder group Human Rights Impact Assessment. It is not multi-stakeholder, but we strive to, when we are going to do Human Rights checks in PDPs, of course that's going to be through a multi-stakeholder model.

So the methodology that we use for this Human Rights Impact Assessment, they are based on a methodology that civil society organizations and Human Rights organizations use to do Human

ICANN 84 | ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PREP WEEK

Rights Impact Assessment and Human Rights due diligence on different organizations.

The method, however, it's very iterative, and we are working on it so nothing is set in stone, and we would like to be constructive. So, whatever we say here, we want to have a conversation. It's a conversation starter. So, we find that GAC advice, GAC Communiqué prioritizes enforcement over privacy due process and remedy.

Private disclosure to law enforcement supports disclosure of personal data to law enforcement without emphasizing enough on safeguards for the registrants. And when it comes to Urgent Requests, supports 24-hour disclosure, ignoring necessity and proportionality and enough emphasis on it.

When it comes to accuracy, supports faster verification, while we have at the council worked on this, but the method might be less harmful, but still Human Rights impact should be considered. And accuracy, in our opinion, NCSG position should never be equated with identification of domain name registrants. It will have severe Human Rights impact and also access impact.

End user rights are at stake as well if they cannot access websites because of stringent accuracy requirements. Then we have DNS Abuse. The language in GAC Communiqué is enforcement heavy approach may cause overreach, especially in associated domain

check. It might cause guilt by association. Remedy and due process should be considered by GAC as well.

Overall, Communiqué lacks rights-based framing. There's not much emphasis on Human Rights and remedy and what if things go wrong. So, that's about it. If we want to have a conversation, and we can have a conversation about other aspects on Urgent Requests and all that in the next slide. Shall we go to the next slide or if there are comments?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Farzaneh. Let me stop here for a little while in order to see if we have feedback in the room or online. And I have a hand from Bosnia. Please go ahead.

SUADA HADZOVIC   Thank you and good morning. Well, in my capacity, my name is Suada Hadzovic. In my capacity as the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group Co-Chair, I would like to share update on our work and it is based on our options paper for Human Rights core values.

So as a background, our Working Group explored four possible implementation options through an online questionnaire circulated to GAC members and observers in February 2019, followed by a discussion at ICANN64 call. So, we discussed four options. Option one, establishing a standing item or question to be considered during the communiqué drafting process, such as does

the subject matter communiqué have Human Rights impact and or relevance.

Option two, implementing a similar standing item or question for other GAC communications where a position is conveyed. Option three, creating the position of a GAC Human Rights reporter responsible for flagging issues and leading in options one and two.

Option four, providing for the participation of the GAC in Human Rights Impact Assessments or similar procedural steps establishing for policy development processes as outlined in the work from the cross community Working Party on ICANN's corporate and social responsibilities to respect Human Rights.

So, the survey results provided valuable insights into members' awareness, priorities and challenges in integrating Human Rights within ICANN's policy processes. Building on these findings, the most supported is option four, by participating in policy development processes as it offers the most practical and sustainable way to ensure that Human Rights are meaningfully considered where they matter most within the policy development process itself.

This option allows Human Rights to be addressed early and systematically rather than as a separate or parallel process. Through this approach, we aim to ensure that Human Rights are not treated as an afterthought but as a core element of evidence-based and inclusive policy development across ICANN. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you very much, Bosnia. I have a question. Maybe I didn't understand well, but you said we prefer or we decided or I forgot and I beg your apologies. Who decided exactly what? Just to be clear.

SUADA HADZOVIC	The questionnaire shows the most supported is option four, by questionnaire.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	That's my point, supported by whom?

SUADA HADZOVIC	By GAC respondents to questionnaire. And I will share in chat the link to this document. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you so much, Bosnia. Greatly appreciated. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO	Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. Just to elaborate a little bit on what Suada has pointed to, which is basically the status of that discussion in the GAC. I was co-chair of the Human Rights and international law Working Group back then, before the pandemic, because as GAC and as this Working Group,

we took the introduction of the Human Rights core value into the ICANN bylaws very seriously.

We had active participation in the discussions that led to the Human Rights core value and also to the framework of interpretation that was adopted by the community afterwards. So, shortly after that, we engaged into a discussion within the Working Group. This is, I think, 2018, 2019.

And in 2019, we came to the GAC with this survey with different options to see how we could best in an efficient and also sensible fashion implement the Human Rights core value, taking into account what the framework of interpretation said, which invited the different SOs and ACs to consider how they could participate in the implementation.

So, we had those options that Suada mentioned. We had discussions in the GAC, in the plenary. I think it was in the summer meeting of 2019. And we reached more or less the conclusion that it would be most efficient if the Human Rights Impact Assessments would be constituent parts of the PDPs itself. And of course, the GNSO PDP, but also the PDPs of other SOs, as appropriate, as those are the channels whereby ICANN develops policy. And they have a very structured approach. Some would say a very lengthy approach that includes a lot of tests, a lot of assessments.

So that's where we found it could be included in the best manner. So that's, I think, the conclusion we had then. And so maybe I would also be very curious to know if our colleagues from the NCSG

can share that information, how the GNSO is intending to implement the Human Rights Impact Assessments within their PDPs.

As I've heard that now, well, it's six years have passed, but now this is going to be Piloted and introduced in, for instance, in the new PDPs on DNS Abuse. And of course, I think that the inputs of the GAC, be it through advice or be it through inputs to consultations, to Public Comments, are fed into what the PDP Working Groups discuss, what they prepare, the proposals they elaborate.

And exactly those proposals after multi-stakeholder discussion and preparation are the ones that, in our view, back in 2019, are most suitable to be analyzed from a Human Rights Impact Assessment perspective instead of analyzing each and every of the constituent parts of, for instance, ALAC advice or ALAC input or SSAC input or RSSAC inputs or other inputs that are prepared through the corresponding PDPs. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much, Switzerland, for that much needed background. And my apologies to my distinguished colleague from Bosnia. I was unaware of the whole context, and that's why I asked that question. Thank you so much. I'll give the floor now to the NCSG. Manju, will you take this question?

MANJU CHEN	Yes. Thank you very much, and thank you for sharing the report. I find it very useful. I just glimpsed through it while you were talking. But we will definitely study it afterwards. So, to the question of how GNSO has incorporated Human Rights Impact Assessment and its PDPs, I guess to answer this question, I'll have to put on my hat.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Excuse me. For the benefit of our distinguished interpreters, would you please slow down a little bit? And that goes to everyone, as a matter of fact. Thank you.
MANJU CHEN	Go ahead. So, okay. I'm not used to speak slowly, but I'll try. So, I'm putting on my hat as the chair of the Standing Committee of Continuous Improvement and GNSO. And we have been working on continuous improvement, as the title suggested, within the GNSO sphere. And since this ongoing PDP, I don't know if you guys are aware of, it's called a PDP on Latin Diacritics, we have incorporated Human Rights Impact Assessment in the Working Group Charter.

And starting from now, every PDP Working Groups will have a requirement to do Human Rights Impact Assessment in their work. But the thing is, so this Latin Diacritics is actually the first one ever Working Group PDP that has this requirement. They are also exploring how to do it, especially Latin Diacritics is more of a

technical issue that people might have trouble linking it to Human Rights impacts.

So they are on their process to do it, but definitely for the future PDPs, for example, the DNS Abuse one that everybody was looking forward to, well, no, I don't know, like most people, not everybody, I corrected myself, that will also incur Human Rights Impact Assessment requirement in its charter, and hopefully by then we have more experience of how to do it, and we'll do a full on HRIA. But I guess I'll pass the mic to Farzi, because they did Human Rights Impact Assessment too, to a PDP that's ended, but we kind of did it afterwards. It's on the transfer policy, and maybe she can share more how they did it, and what are the results. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADIEI   Yeah, thank you. So, we asked the GNSO Council if we could do another formal Human Rights Impact Assessment for the transfer policy, and as a result of that, there were some gaps in the policy to protect the registrant and provide them with dispute resolution mechanism. So, that was the result, but of course, the method that we used, we have to come up with a more elaborate method for the PDPs, a more formal and elaborate method. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Farzaneh. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO	Thank you, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So, thanks very much for those responses, Manju and Farsi. At least personally, I would be very interested in knowing more about the methodology, if you could share it. Maybe we, I don't know, maybe we can also share or work together on such issues with our Human Rights and international law Working Group, because we do this in other places.
	We do it, at least to a certain extent, in the Council of Europe, which has a very strong Human Rights background. So, I think that that could be a good way forward, for instance. Thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you very much, Switzerland. I don't have any other hands online or in the room, so for the sake of time, let's move on, and for that, I will give the floor again to Farzaneh. She's going to walk us through the RDRS topic, from the point of view of the NCSG. Over to you.
FARZANEH BADIEI	We have been discussing the RDRS and Urgent Requests and registering data at NCSG, and when it comes to law enforcement authentication, we believe that authentication does not equate to accountability. While authentication ensures that the requester is who they claim to be, it does not ensure that the request itself is lawful, proportionate, or rights compatible.

ICANN 84 | ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
PREP WEEK

Another issue is that technical validation must not replace legal threshold, so merely verifying law enforcement credential does not meet requirements for necessity, proportionality, or due process under international Human Rights standards. And then we have to also consider that there is a global diversity of legal regimes. Many jurisdictions lack independent oversight or judicial authorization for data access, and the global rollout of RDRS or any other system that we have, without safeguards, risks normalizing unaccountable disclosure practices.

Another factor is that authentication of law enforcement should be through transparent processes that can be vetted with special protocols in place, and we would like to work with whoever is doing the authentication process, or if, when GAC has plans on Public Safety, a Working Group has plans to do that, we would like to work with them to ensure that the processes are transparent.

So, fundamental rights assessment should precede disclosure. So, registrars, so first of all, there should be no automated disclosure of the domain name registrant private sensitive data. The registrar should conduct case-by-case Human Rights Impact Assessment when requests pose risks to privacy, expression, or security of individuals.

And this is not just in security of individual and the freedom of expression of individual, it's also the end user, it could affect the end user as well. It would be for the disclosure; there should be

necessity and proportionality attest. Registrars should evaluate whether the request meets international norms.

And also, it should be context-sensitive risk assessment, special scrutiny is needed when requests raise flags for end users, or domain name registrant security freedom of expression. And we insist on institutionalizing safeguards.

Every time we talk about disclosure of domain name registrant private sensitive data, we need to talk in parallel about, at the same time, about safeguards. Without safeguards in place, we cannot disclose registrants' data, private data, in an accountable manner. That does not hamper Human Rights. And that's it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much, Farzaneh. Indonesia, I saw your hand up. My apologies, I didn't see it before. Please go ahead.

ASHWIN   SASONGKO   Sorry, actually I want to ask for the first one, you know, the Human
SASTROSUBROTO   Rights. Because you have so many countries, member of ICANN, and every country has their own culture. I just wonder if when the discussion on Human Rights also take care about the differences in culture of every country, because the perception might be different, Human Rights here and Human Rights there. Thank you.

84 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
PREP WEEK

FARZANEH BADIEI   There is a set of universal Human Rights, they are enshrined in different international Human Rights laws and declarations, and they are not culture-dependent. Of course, there has to be respect for culture, but the universal Human Rights, not murdering people, not prosecuting them, taking away their liberty, is universal.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Farzaneh. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO   Thank you, Nico. Jorge, for the record. Just to elaborate a little bit also on the question from our dear friend Ashwin, this was thoroughly discussed, I think, when we were discussing the inclusion of Human Rights core value into the ICANN bylaws.

So, this is a discussion that took place like eight, nine years ago. It took a lot of time, a lot of interaction between the community, and basically the Human Rights core value, which is an important element of the bylaws and complements the mission of ICANN, referred then to a framework of interpretation.

The framework of interpretation was also discussed and elaborated through a cross-community Working Group, I think with a sign-off in the end by the different SOs and ACs, although my memory could be slipping on how the procedure was exactly.

But the instruments that were explicitly referred to as defining the Human Rights were all instruments that are at the level of the United Nations and are broadly accepted by all members of the

84 ICANN | ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PREP WEEK

United Nations. So in that sense, they are really universal standards of Human Rights that we all have committed to. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Switzerland. The floor is still open for comments or questions. I don't see any hand online or in the room, so I'll turn it back to you, Farzaneh. Any further comments regarding RDRS, Urgent Requests, and Registrant Data Requests?

FARZANEH BADIEI   Just one more comment. We are not denying the need for mitigating DNS Abuse and online crime should be tackled, but whenever the law enforcement, the Public Safety Working Group requests for expediency in coming up with DNS Abuse Mitigation mechanisms or disclosure in the RDRS as well, we appreciate if there could be equal emphasis on having the safeguards in place to protect registrants and end users and the internet. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much, Farzaneh. Again, the floor is still open. Before we move on to the next topic, which is DNS Abuse Mitigation, and I see a hand. Oh, that's Michaela, actually. Michaela, over to you.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO   Thank you. Michaela, for the record. Now, a small intervention just to say that we are very interested in hearing or reviewing the

board's, I forget the exact terminology now, the gap. It used to be called a gap analysis, a kind of analysis of setting the scene of where we are when it comes to RDRS and data requests. So, I'm very keen to see what will come out of that particular paper. And I believe there's also a vote later today about the future of the RDRS. So, we'll be keen to see the results of that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Michaela. Any other comment or question? Okay, seeing none. Then I'll turn it back to you, Michaela and to Farzaneh, in order for you to walk us through the DNS Abuse Mitigation point, NCSG's point of view in that regard. Over to you.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO   Thank you. Michaela, again for the record. Thank you for the time to discuss this issue. So, we thought we would zoom out in terms of, you know, to open up the discussion. So, we decided to talk through some of the guiding principles that we utilize to kind of guide, well, to guide, to lay the groundwork for our response to the interim report on the potential PDPs that can come out into the ICANN constituency space.

So just a few to highlight today, because I realize there's a lot of text on the page. We really want to emphasize the need for transparency and accountability when it comes to developing any kind of DNS Abuse Mitigation policy. Granularity in mitigation as well, so thinking about who is the right actor to be reaching out to,

to really think through, for example, referring to SSAC's 127 report that came out earlier this year, thinking about who are the actors that can have the least risk of leading to consequences that may expand beyond the target of the DNS Abuse that we are focusing on.

And that's one area that we wanted to emphasize, and access to appeals and redress are as kind of a last point that we just wanted to emphasize. But moving into perhaps the more nitty-gritty points, which I think are, for us at least, the most fun, is thinking about the report itself, and we wanted to just give an overarching kind of feedback on what we saw as we reviewed the report, one being we would highly encourage the drafters to consider resources that are a bit more diverse than the ones that we saw there.

There are others from the community, including from the non-commercial side, that have been developed that could have perhaps informed this report, so we highly encourage those being referred to in future, and happy to share any links and answer any questions if others have any on what that could look like.

On the post-registration identity checks, we also just wanted to reiterate, as Farzanah already emphasized so helpfully, that when it comes to registrant data, we want to emphasize that this is about contactability rather than identity verification. We also would like to emphasize that a lack of standard dispute and recourse mechanisms for registrants was a gap that the non-commercial

side would have loved to have seen move forward, but at the moment, it does not look like it's a priority gap, but we just wanted to keep that on everyone's radar for future and to also guide the work going forward and the upcoming PDP or PDPs, should it be one or two or more.

And similarly, on the recommendations for proactive monitoring, we just want to emphasize, because there were a few that came up in that report, that any kind of proactive monitoring should be undertaken with the utmost care. So, even when technically feasible, this might not always be the most advisable approach. Moving into the actual--

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Let me stop you there just one second, in order to see if we have any feedback. In the meantime, let me ask our interpreters, are we doing okay in terms of speed? A little bit slower, right? All right, all right. So, Michaela, I beg you to slow down a little bit. So, any comments or questions at this point? Any question for Michaela or we should move on and then I'll open the floor for comments or questions. Again, back to you, Michaela.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO   Thank you, Nico. Apologies to the interpreters. The last slide, and I don't want to take too long on this because I'm very keen to get feedback from the room to just discuss very quickly the upcoming PDP or PDPs that may come out of this going forward. We are very

excited to get, to understand and gather more opinions from stakeholders, so enjoying having these kind of bilaterals.

We would hope for any kind of clear timelines and milestones for any potential PDP. We also would be very keen to ensure that definitions are very clear, that there are a very clear scope and clear timelines for any kind of upcoming PDP.

One topic that has also come up quite often in this week's meetings has been around the timeline, so whether this will be two parallel tracks or one sequentially and then moving into the other when it comes to the two topics that were highlighted as priorities.

From the non-commercial side, for the sake of resources and ensuring we have the capacity to properly and fully and thoroughly engage, we would like to see a PDP process that moves sequentially rather than having one at the same time as another to ensure that we can properly delve into each topic.

And this is in reference to the unrestricted API access for domain name registration for new customers and the associated domain checks. So, perhaps I'll pause there and turn it back to Nico. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Michaela. Comments, questions, thoughts? Okay, I have Germany.

RUDY NOLDE	Just a quick question for my understanding. You talk about on the unrestricted API access that it neglects to account for undue burden. Could you elaborate what kind of undue burden are we talking about?
MICHAELA SHAPIRO	Thank you. Michaela, for the record. Thank you for the question. What we are envisioning is it is just one extra step that could add and to take longer in order for a registrant to access that domain. This is not to say that there should be no friction when it comes to adding new customers. We just want to make sure that there is a question that grapples with that topic.
	So that being said, I might not have the answer today, but I would hope that the PDP could add that to the charter. We just recognize that that question around how to find that balance wasn't included in the draft charter as we saw it. I hope that answers that. Thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Germany. Do we have any further questions in the room or online? Okay, seeing none, let's move on to ICANN reviews, RoRs, Reviews of Reviews. And for that, I'll give the floor to Manju Chen. Manju, over to you.
MANJU CHEN	Thank you very much, Nico. I will speak slowly this time. We have a lot of time still anyways. I don't know if I have to go through the

backgrounds because I think our GAC colleagues know very well. I guess since we have a lot of time, I will just go through them to make sure we use fully this hour.

I didn't put it on the slides, but I guess we all knew this came from this discussion where should we start the Accountability and Transparency Review 4, even if we haven't finished the implementation of ATRT, which is the Accountability and Transparency Review 3.

And the discussion went to this point when the Board decided that seeing the efficiency of all kinds of reviews coming around in the ICANN communities, maybe there's a need for a review of these reviews to see how can we, in the future, to review better. And that's why the Board, this year in September, approved this charter of the Review of Reviews where they're assembled, a cross-community group to conduct this Review of Reviews.

And from the GNSO side, we have two representatives, one from the Contrary Party House and one from the Non-Contrary Party House. And this review will review the reviews and their past outcomes to be evaluated, include, as you can see on the screen, so it's a bunch of reviews. So, it's basically to review how we conducted the reviews and their outcomes.

It's like super tongue-twisting, I guess that's a challenge for all of us. So, this is the background and the work has actually just begun, so there's not much we can share for the NCSG position. Can we please go to the next slide? Yes, but we are keen to hear what GAC

is feeling about this Review of Reviews, aside from the tongue-twisting part.

Of course, we all know that the Review of Reviews, CCG, the cross-community group, has just published. It's this document that lists out the purpose of the review, which also is quite confusing because you are not sure whether it's the purpose of this Review of Reviews or is it the purpose of the reviews that they're reviewing.

So that's a very, I guess that's a clarification point that we all need to ask the CCG and I definitely encourage GAC to ask the same question to them. And I guess this is a very new process, it's barely a process, it's a new thing, and this unprecedented, and I guess one of the caution points, we want all of us to have in mind is that we wish we stop inventing new things to circumvent what we already have.

But of course, when it's needed, we kind of need to do something. But in the future, hopefully this Review of Reviews will help us to stop inventing new things and just carry on the ordinary reviews that we already have. But yeah, that's all from NCSG. We look forward to GAC to share how you feel about this Review of Reviews.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, Manju. Before I open the floor to comments or questions from our distinguished GAC representatives, I do have a question and the question is, given the broad scope of reviews to be evaluated, could the NCSG share, can you share your

perspective on the key priorities or criteria that the cross-community group should adopt to ensure this Review of Reviews is effective and delivers actionable improvements, so to say, to the community? Sorry for the long question, but what is the NCSG's take on that?

MANJU CHEN

So, I'll try to take the first step. Well, Rafik will rescue me afterwards. Can we go back to the previous slide so it's easier to see what the review is reviewing? Yes, so I guess first of all, we kind of listed on the next slide where we think it's very important that this review produce actionable outcomes because one of the reasons why we need this Review of Reviews is really the implementation of the review recommendations are just cannot finish.

The reviews were done in time, but the implementation were taking forever. So, how we make actionable recommendations and practical implementable recommendations out of this Review of Reviews, I think is one of the first kind of priority for the NCSG.

In terms of the content, it's really, I guess it's difficult to kind of decide now because as we were explaining, it's still confusing whether the purpose of the review is the purpose of the review or the purpose of the reviews.

So once we get that clear, I guess we will have more constructive feedback on which review should be prioritized and which review

should actually be, I guess, carved out of scope of this review because we also know that there's a Continuous Improvement Program going on that's also conducted by the cross-community group.

We definitely don't want people reinventing the wheels or parallel effort on the same thing. So, I guess after the two sessions during this ICANN meetings, we will know more and we will have a clearer prioritization from the NCSG. But for now, the most important part is really we have to closely monitor how they conduct this effort to prevent, they're actually doing the reviews instead of reviewing the reviews and they predict actionable recommendations. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Manju. And maybe we should review that as well, right? Thank you. Thank you so much. And I have Egypt and then Switzerland.

MANAL ISMAIL   Thank you, Nico. It's me here. Thank you. So, let me talk in two capacities here. First, as a GAC representative, and I would like to highlight that the GAC underscores the importance of ICANN reviews and is very keen to see ICANN review system back on track effectively and efficiently and to ensure that ICANN continues to fulfill its bylaws mandated mission, commitments and core values in a transparent and accountable and inclusive manner.

84 | ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
PREP WEEK

It's also worth noting that the Review of Reviews also fits under GAC strategic objective one on government's role in ICANN, the caretaker of which is our dear friend and colleague Jorge Cancio, GAC representative of Switzerland, where we have agreed to contribute to the community consultation group efforts.

And as you may already know, the GAC is also represented on the group by two members, Tracy Hackshaw of UPU and myself. So, I happen to be also one of the three co-chairs of the group. So, I'll try to address some of the confusion. If we can go to the following slide, please.

So, let me first quickly say that we had a very good session last Monday and we collected input on the draft purpose of reviews. And just on the very first point of confusion, you mentioned, Manju, the purpose of reviews is the general purpose of reviews in general, not that of the group.

The group is mandated by the charter, which is already approved, and we are working through the scope of the charter. So, this draft purpose of review thing is in relation to ICANN reviews in general. So, the group is trying to put one efficient and effective system for all ICANN reviews, whether we have reviews that should be conducted on regular basis or with certain frequency, or things that may come up occasionally or upon certain conditions. But at the end, we need to have, I was trying not to use the word Holistic, but it's one collective system of reviews that is working efficiently and effectively.

On the implementation, and this is something I got to learn through reading into the background material, I was surprised to know that the implementation time itself is variable. So, for example, the frequency of a review is every five years, if the review itself takes one year, the implementation would have up to four years. If the review itself takes three years or two years, then the implementation will have much less time, which is, I would say, very difficult to plan with this variable time and variable number of recommendations as well, and it ended up with a significant backlog of recommendations. But I'm here jumping into analysis.

I don't want to do this right now. I'm just addressing the point you mentioned on the implementation. So, I'm not sure if you have any other questions. Please let me know. If not, I would like to, again, mention that we had a very good session with excellent input on the draft purpose of reviews so far on whether we are heading in the right direction regarding the purpose of reviews, what's missing from the list, and things that should be reviewed, and how to measure the success of a review.

And again, here we're talking about the ICANN reviews in general and not the group itself. We will have another plenary session tomorrow, and I hope everyone will be able to attend and participate. The agenda is going to be recapping on the feedback that we have gathered throughout this week.

We may pose additional questions, and we will definitely allow an open mic, and at the end share the work plan phases and next

steps. We also had an informal meeting of the group yesterday, and we agreed to have a webinar intercessionally, so that we can also give more time for discussion sharing of input, experiences, challenges, so that we can analyze and avoid or address the challenges that were faced before.

So, stay tuned to intersessional webinar, or maybe two to address all time zones. And we are also thinking to allow people to submit questions, maybe even in advance. So, be prepared with your list of questions.   And finally, we would very much welcome, appreciate, and encourage your input, either by participating at tomorrow's plenary session, or joining the group as observer. And it's worth noting that we have agreed to allow active participation by observers as well on our calls. And also, there is the email address, inputonreviews@ICANN.org. So also, any ongoing input is much welcomed.

And finally, the Wiki page has everything in terms of the recording of the plenary meetings, the recording of the co-chair's meetings, the minutes of our meetings, and the prep session. Very useful background material, which I would also encourage colleagues to look at so that we are all coming from a common starting point. And I will put the link to the Wiki page in the chat now. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so very much, Egypt, for that super mini report, I would say, and your comments, and the links, and all the information provided. For the sake of time, we have seven minutes. Would you

like to give any feedback to Egypt in this regard before I give the floor to Switzerland? No? Okay, Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE GANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Gancio, Switzerland, for the record, and thank you, Manal, of course, for sharing this huge burden and representing together with Tracy the GAC in this cross-community effort.

Just wanted to mention or recall that the GAC had some language in its communiqué in Prague, recalling the importance of the review system. And acknowledging that we needed some sort of solution, and now we have this Review of Reviews, and that it is very important for the accountability, but also for the inclusiveness, the openness, and the transparency of ICANN as a whole.

So, I think what was a crisis, really, in Prague or before Prague, and lots of community discussions could be an opportunity now to improve how our community works, how we work together, and I hope we can work together to seize this opportunity.

There are good standards being developed by the larger internet governance community on how to improve multi-stakeholder processes, so I hope we can continue a fruitful discussion on that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. NCSG, any feedback to that? We have four minutes. Go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Can we go back to the, so on the other topic, we are focusing on accuracy conversation that is ongoing at ICANN, and we have organized a meeting on Wednesday at 4:30 p.m. On accuracy, we also have a position paper. It is very important for us for the accuracy discussion, for the definition to remain as contactability and nothing further, but we are going to have a multi-stakeholder conversation there, and you're very welcome to join.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Farzaneh. Any further comments or questions online or in the room? I don't see any hand online. Any hand in the room? If not, thank you so very much, Michaela, Manju, Farzaneh, and Rafik. You're always welcome here. It was a pleasure having this session with you.

We need to wrap up now. Let me give some, and I don't see any hand, just to make sure. Yes. Okay, so just another housekeeping detail. So, we're going to have a coffee break now. Please be back in the room at 10:30 for the session with the ccNSO. Thank you very much. The session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]