
ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – GAC: Wrap up on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussions
Wednesday, March 11, 2020 – 10:30 to 11:00 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Hello everyone. Welcome. May I please ask our technical staff to -- thank you, Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, and welcome back everyone. I hope you're already back because we cannot tell virtually but I hope everyone is back in the zoom room. We are now starting our second half of the discussion on subsequent procedures and this session is scheduled only for 30 minutes. So allow me to hand over directly to the topic leads. I understand we will be discussing the applicant support program and allowing time to ... next steps but over to you, Jorge or Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ: Hello, Manal, it's Luisa here.

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.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Go ahead.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, and so we have -- yeah, I believe 30 minutes, and we wanted to have an opportunity to discuss the applicant's support program so we will be getting to that slide shortly. I know the applicant support program has not yet been discussed in this ICANN virtual meeting by the PDP working group but as I mentioned earlier this discussions have been on going since a few years back so there's still an opportunity of course for GAC members -- for us to continue our discussions into this important topic. So I'll -- perfect so regarding applicant support program as we previous mentioned I will give an overview it is an ICANN community-based initiative which was led by the GNSO and at large, it was aimed to increase under served region as access to the new gTLDs application, and how it worked was that qualified applicants two of complete -- have to meet certain criteria, would -- could benefit then from pro bono services and reduced application fees however it is important to note that in practice the program only received 3 applications and only one of the applications was qualified so there's a good context for us to improve this applicant support program for future rounds of new domain names. And regarding previous to date on this important topic I will review some of them. We have expand and

improve outreach to targeted regions in the global south. We also have -- we noted that ICANN org should identify which regions are considered as underserved and underrepresented, and we want context are they defined as such. We also provided that the ICANN org should, should deliver regional targeted capacity building efforts to all ICANN community stakeholders to allow stakeholders to be better prepared for a subsequent round, as well as providing clear measurable goals and indicators for applications from the global south, and linked to ICANN strategy objectives as well as have ICANN co-ordinate pro bono assistance and finally members from underserved regions should be offered additional supports due to external issues which should not prevent entities of those regions from applying to a subsequent round. So I'll stop there and I do want to give Jeff or Cheryl the co-shares of the PDP SubPro working group an opportunity to let us know how this conversations are going in the working group, and what else would be helpful and constructive for the GAC members to discuss in this session and inter-sessionally so that we can improve this applicant program. Thank you. Pass it to Jeff or Cheryl, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record here and, yes, Jorge your lives are much clearer. I was running across

my calendar which has a UTC column. 15:45 UTC tomorrow that the third and final subsequent procedures session will be running and applicant support, and we trust also community applications is also going to be primary topics discussion during that session, so we look forward to further GAC input during that, as we have had the pleasure of excellent interchange in our other two sessions so far in this meeting. I think as I -- and Jeff also mentioned in our capacity building work we did with you at the beginning of your ICANN67, huge effort that GAC is making, and we especially appreciate the amount of time that you are able to commit to this -- what we obviously feel is a very important issue of subsequent procedures, and getting the future -- any further round in a far better situation in terms of predictability, effectiveness and efficiency for all involved as a result of our recommendations which of course are still under discussion. The good news is, as I think it was clear to mention is that we believe that where our working group is currently heading, and what recommendations we are likely to see come out of our work for this particular topic of applicant support is going to be very much in sync and very much in keeping with the desires of the government advisory committee, and indeed the other advisory committees including the at large advisory committee, which also has a particularly keen interest in the matters of applicant support programs. The group has recognized and agreed with many if not all of the

comments and criticisms that the GAC and other parts of the ICANN community have have rightly pointed out that troubled and limited the previous applicant support program. I mean the it's clear a great deal more needs to be done to get did right the next time and that's exactly what the plans are and we have indeed taken particular note that we need to carve out additional care and concern and consideration for underserved and underrepresented parts of the domain name or aspiring parts of the domain name industry community as well. We've also however not limited ourselves to terminology such as the global south. This is because the working group server recognized not only are their geographic locations in these situations of recognizing and trying to corral what is an underserved region in this context, but that underrepresented and underserved parts of communities may indeed even exist as special interest groups that are desirous of a gTLD within even well emerged and highly-developed countries so we are trying to steer away from recommendations which would be using classifications that are purely geographic or purely socio-economic and development based. I think that gives you a fairly good baseline, and obviously we are happy to respond to any further questions regarding this. Back to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I can see Kavouss's hand up already so, Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes. Once again, thanks to the co-chairs for providing this very helpful material. I think with respect to the GAC views to date, I have one comment and I have one question. The comment is that I support the substance, and objectives of all of the 6 bullet points with some slight addition for instance in bullet 2 when we say ICANN org should identify which regions are so on so forth to say that ICANN Board in consultation with -- in our case in consultation with GAC because we have already have a working group dealing with the underserved countries so we have to have the opportunity to raise our hands, so but these are the -- just some of the small changes but I support the principle objectives and substance of 6 bullets. Good, thank you very much for the authors of that. These are very good. But now my question is that, to whom these bullet are addressed? Sometime you say that ICANN should do that. But okay but where this appears? Does it appears in the -- which document? How we should do that? It is -- it's not in a communique. It's not a letter to the ICANN, but how it appears? Where they include this? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, Kavouss, you mean where can we submit those views or what is the source of those views?

IRAN: No, I am not asking about the source of the views. I'm saying that how we submit these views? Where we submit that, and where would we include it? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I will defer to our topic leads, but I believe we -- once we agree on the views we can start compiling our inputs on submitting it to the subsequent procedures process, but I see Luisa as hand up so Luisa, please go ahead.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Manal. It's Luisa Paez for the record and thank you Kavouss for your question. So it turns out that clarifying in the slide these were inputs provided by the GAC in several processes, so one of the processes was in the different stages of the CTT review where the -- so the CCT review, the competition consumer trust and consumer choice, that the GAC provided

certain inputs in particular for recommendation 29, register 30, 31 and 32 so there was a lot in the context of the CCT review that most of the previous GAC input that is seen there in if the slide was submitted to improve and address the applicant's support program, but happy if others, or even support staff, or Jorge, you have any additional chairs, that would be helpful. Thank you but I do know -- lastly I do note that we still have an opportunity to provide further advice, input or criteria that we as a government would think would be helpful for future applicants from, as Cheryl mentioned underserved regions not only as it was coined the global south but as well as underserved regions in our own countries, I mean in particular in Canada we have the northern communities that are not very well served so, yeah, all to say we still have an opportunity to provide further comments. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Manal. And a little bit following up on what Luisa said, I would like to draw your attention, everybody's attention in the GAC to the excellent GAC scorecard which was prepared by support staff with our modest help, and there we have a

summary of previous GAC input on each of these topics and the GAC views to date you see on the slide our summary of those previous GAC inputs because this, as you know has been a process which has started 4 years ago so we had inputs to the first 2 as consultations from the SubPro team, which were in 2017, and then we made a comment also in October 2018, and a second comment in 2018, and also other comments in, in other sittings so there you can find the links to the details of all these positions, and now, it's really the time to intervene on the final drafting of the recommendations of the PDP working group, and that's why we are raising these issues, at this meeting. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. Kavouss, please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes. Thanks to Luisa and thanks to Jorge for the clarification. I understand that this views already included in various elements of the recommendations and if the recommendation is that finally approved by everybody this element will be of included. There's no risk that any of this will be deleted, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Luisa?

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Manal. It's Luisa Paez for the record. I just wanted to read Cheryl's comment in the chat. I think it's important information for GAC members so we can think about this considerations a bit further. So Cheryl notable too is that we have also taken a closer look, and more likely to make very specific recommendations regarding preparation (outreach and engagement project planning etcetera) implementation guidance program for this in further rounds so expect to see specificity about preparatory work which was too little and too late it seems in the previous 2012 round. So this is to prepare for a future new gTLD round. So again, we do encourage GAC members so we can think a little bit further in terms of further advice and input if we want to get a bit more into the specificity of having better outreach, and engagement project planning we can think about it a bit more inter-sessionally. I'll stop there and see if there is any further questions. If not we can pass to our last item which is community application. Can I see if there's any hands up? Kavouss, is that a new hand? So perhaps Kavouss is an old hand so I will pass it on if we can go, please, to the -- if there's no further comments regarding applicant support program we have now community based application to

discuss with the GAC, and I will pass it onto Jorge Cancio. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Luisa. If I may, on community based applications it seems a bit unlikely although Cheryl may correct me, that this will be discussed tomorrow because they have two others ... but I would urge each and every one from you, especially those who have an interest in this special category of top-level domains and how to improve its functioning to look into the GAC scorecard, and to be involved in the work we will be carrying on inter-sessionally. So very quickly as you see on the slide the community based top-level domain was a category first seen in the 2012 round which was intended for use by community groups so that that would be an economic cultural community or a link linguistic however of the more than 1000 applications that went ins 2012 round only 84 self-identified as such in that round, and of those only 25 to go through an evaluation process that would have given them priority over noncommunity applications, and of those 25 who went through that process, the so-called community priority evaluation, only 5 applicants passed finally the test. They've raised a lot of concern and of issues, and also triggered different GAC advice dealing with the deployment of the 2012 round. I remember GAC advise in 2014,

2015, and also later on and this was -- this is captured in the section on GAC use to date which you can find the details of in the GAC could scorecard. As I mentioned before, and it -- those views were directed to make this evaluation process more predictable and also provide the applicants with an appeal mechanism against evaluation which they didn't agree with, and there was a study commissioned by the council of Europe on this matter which went into very much detail of course from a human rights perspective and which is still very valid today, and which at GAC forwarded to the subsequent procedures PDP working group for considerations. So I'm not sure whether there is a second slide on this. No, not really. Then let's go back to the slide on community based applications so I think just 3 minutes for discussions on this issue because the last 5 minutes we would need for confirming next steps so I would open the floor with this, and pass over to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge, for this brief on community based applications and I see Kavouss's hand up.

IRAN: Excuse me, that is an old hand. I'm sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's an old hand. Okay. So any questions, or any reactions on this issue before we go to next steps? Okay. If not, then I thank you very much Jorge, Luisa, and Benedetta for the excellent and very well structured presentation. I know this is a result of several other material and I very much appreciate the efforts you have put in this. If there are no questions or comments on this issue, then maybe we should go to the next steps Jorge is this okay? So can we go to the following slide please? So, on next steps we have discussed some inter-sessional work, so the GAC leadership and its current topic leads on subsequent procedures of new gTLDs namely vice-chairs, Luisa and Jorge, will be leading this inter-sessional work on this high interest topic identified in the GAC scorecard. So, the aim of this work is to co-ordinate potential GAC input to the GNSO subsequent procedures PDP working group. Prepare for ICANN68, and co-ordinate potentially update GAC positions for the GNSO subsequent procedures PDP working group final report that is due for July 2020. And finally interested GAC members are encouraged to approach GAC topic leads in order to lead, and or actively contribute on any of the subsequent procedures key issues. So, let me pause here, and see what everyone thinks on

the proposed next steps. So does this sound sensible to everyone? And I see Jorge in the chat saying Luisa and myself are very happy to work with any interested GAC members. So please, we had some excellent excellent exchanges here, I hope we keep the dialogue and we keep the discussion inter-sessionally, and if there are any need for inter-sessional calls we can definitely plan for this, and if we need not only more engagement but maybe also more leads. We may end up with one lead for each topic if, if just to share the load, and I'm sorry, just Luisa saying that noted that only if there is consensus GAC would provide input and thank you Luisa for this note of course everything at the end is subject to our discussions and consensus so please make sure to participate and to reach out to the topic leads to get involved in the topics of your interest so anything before we conclude, Luisa, Jorge, any final words? Okay. If not, then let me again reiterate my deep thanks to Luisa Jorge and Benedetta for the tireless efforts behind the scene, and realtime reporting during the meeting as well so Jorge please I see your hand up. Go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you so much, Manal, and just very briefly, I think that we have very good material in the prepared for this meeting. Now we have to really discuss this, and we look very much forward to

the active participation of all interested GAC members, I think this is a very important topic. We are preparing the policy for the next extension of top-level domain, and if we want to avoid problems further down the road, this is the time, in the next month to look into the documentation that active get engaged and make your voice heard. So I hope that we may receive a lot of e-mail from interested GAC members to participate. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. And Luisa, please, you have the final word.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Manal. Just making sure you can hear me well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect thank you Manal. And, yeah, just wanted to close this session by thanking those GAC members that have been able (inaudible) PDP working group on subsequent procedures, and

we do encourage all GAC members to review the -- can someone mute the phone or computer? Thank you. So there is the GAC scorecard which is quite comprehensive and might be a bit intimidating but once you start scrolling through it you'll see it will be -- it's a very useful guide to understand previous GAC input in terms of the topics that we have discussed in it this GAC meeting. As well as we -- GAC support staff works very closely with the GNSO support staff of the PDP working group subsequent procedures to try to keep up to date as much as they can the status of those topics that are of interest to the GAC. What's the status and ongoing discussion in the PDP working group and so the find -- the draft final report, the recommendations that we are expecting them in June 2020, so we have from now until then to have -- continue our discussions and inter-sessional work to see if we do have areas of agreement and consensus within GAC members to provide anything that could improve the applicant's program. I think it will be a very helpful for future rounds so we look forward to working with all GAC members, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Luisa Jorge, Benedetta, Cheryl and Jeff, and thanks to all my GAC colleagues for the active engagement. So this concludes our discussion on subsequent procedures, and

we should be starting now our communicate drafting session, but maybe we can just give us a minute or so to be ready technically and then we'll start. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]