

---

MARRAKECH - GAC: New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Discussion  
Monday, June 24, 2019 - 15:15 to 16:15 WET  
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you everyone and apologies for the delay and welcome to our subsequent procedure discussions. We have with us the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures working group, and we also have other colleagues from ICANN org to discuss the assumptions that they are working on in preparations for outcomes from subsequent procedures. For the sake of time I will pass over to Luisa who is leading us on this topic and has done excellent progress and even started to create a GAC focal group on this, so Luisa please over.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you, Manal. Hopefully everyone got coffee or stretched your legs. This session will be focused on the subsequent procedures PDP, we're loading slides so you will soon have visuals to follow but in terms of the agenda of the session, we will first have the two co-chairs of the ICANN PDP give us a quick overview of where the PDP is at, a timeline, then I will turn it over to Cyrus from ICANN org who will introduce to you an information document that talks about assumptions to get run for a new

---

*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.*

---

round of gTLDs, so we have invited him to present to the GAC and he's available for questions. And then we will focus a bit more internally on what would an interest to the GAC and next steps. So while we have the slides loading, I will pass it onto Jeff and Cheryl here. Thank you for coming.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you for having us here again. Cheryl and I are two co-chairs of subsequent procedures, actually look forward to coming here in front of the GAC and we've been doing this I don't know how many meetings in a row now, but we enjoy coming here and giving presentation and mostly just hearing back from the governments on your thoughts on new gTLDs. So even though we're kind of here all together, the subsequent procedures PDP co-chairs but also ICANN org, these are two very different efforts, and one thing you will hear is that although it is about new gTLD's. ICANN org's efforts are not part of the development process and the policy development process is not part of the ICANN org effort, although very much reliant and related to each other.

So Cheryl and I will be addressing what is going on with the policy development process, and I think we can go to the next slide. One more slide. There we go. So just to do a little bit of a recap which some of you are probably heard many times, the GNSO made recommendations in 2007 approved in 2008 by the board,

---

became consensus policy that we would have a sustainable, reliable introduction of new gTLD on an ongoing basis, and the first incarnation of that was the 2012 round for new gTLDs, and after that round had already started and was well into its implementation, in 2015-2016, this working group was charged with reviewing the 2012 new gTLD program and making recommendations on anything that needed to be changed in order to follow the GNSO policy of introducing subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

The policy development process that Cheryl and I are leading, although ideas not involve the rights protection mechanisms, subsequent to a separate policy development process, does have well over 40 subjects. Initially we broke out into five separate Work Tracks, with Work Track 5, which you will be hearing about at a later session I think on Wednesday, deals with protection of geographic names at the top level. So today we won't address is that, we will address that on Wednesday but every other issue follows within our policy development process, and that was called initially Work Tracks 1-4, and that included things like community applications, what do you do when there's multiple applications for the same string, applicant support, so how can we do better outreach to developing nations and make sure we get a wide diversity of applications.

---

So that group did a lot of work between starting in 2016 and in July 2018 we came out with an initial report, and we had a public comment period on that initial report that closed in September of last year. And there were a number of subjects we realized after we released the report that we did not cover as extensively as we wanted. So came out with subsequent report, things like auctions and would that be appropriate mechanism going forward, released that in 2018 and got comments.

In addition Work Track 5 issued its earlier report this year, might have been end of last year, got comments back and Work Track 5 is in the process of -- or already gone over the comments and incorporating those into its work. So what we are doing right now in terms of working group are getting together after reviewing all of the public comments is trying to get final recommendations put together so that we can then present those to the GNSO council and ultimately to the ICANN board.

Here is a timeline that was really just of our working group. So that includes Work Tracks 1-4 plus Work Track 5 which is the geographic names. There's one addition to this, according to this slide it has us finishing at the end of q3/2019, however, we believe that we are going to do a public comment period on some of the newer ideas that have come out since comments were submitted, so more likely we believe this policy development process will end at the end of this year, so at the end of q4/2019, so when we

---

redo the slides, we will make sure we put the correct date in there. So at the end of q4/2019 -- and that's calendar year, not ICANN fiscal year, so the end of December 2019.

So before I turn it over to Cyrus and ICANN org about the document they came out with, just a little bit of history, background on why ICANN org has started this exercise. For some of us that have been around for several decades, we remember when the GNSO passed its policies in 2007, if you go back in time, ICANN org had done preparatory work, had prepared since fiscal year 2005-2006. In other words, ICANN had to start their budgeting process to have a new round several years before the policy was finalized. They did this because they at the time believed they would launch the round in 2009, which again was three years after they started budgeting for it. A lot of us know it didn't quite work out that the program launched in 2009 but it did in 2012. But ultimately ICANN org knew it had to build systems, assign people, figure out how to do evaluations and all of those related activities. It had to start planning well before the plan was finalized, so similarly, you will have seen the ICANN org's assumptions, which I will turn it over to Cyrus to start talking about that document.

---

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much, Jeff. Good afternoon, distinguished GAC colleagues. I must say it's really a pleasure to be here and not be discussing the issue of two-character codes at the second level, for which I have been up here numerous times, and hopefully we will see the end of that soon. But the purpose of the discussion today as Jeff mentioned is for us on the org side to share with you some of our preliminary thinking that has led to certain assumptions, these are operationally focused assumptions. So I say that to make a distinction between the policy work going on, the advice that may come from the advisory committees like the GAC and others, ours is really focused on implementation of this service. And part of the reason we have begun looking into it now even before the policy process is complete, is because this is going to be a complex service and program to plan, implement and execute and operate. It's a multiyear effort.

Our objective here has been to get a head start on getting ourselves ready and to the extent that we can, actually move in parallel with the policy development effort with other parts of the communities. There are reviews involved that pertain to subsequent procedures, there's GAC advice that needs to be considered, a number of moving parts. All of these were taken into consideration to get ourselves ready so that when the time comes that the ICANN board decides and tells the organization go

---

ahead and start the implementation, we actually have a head start in the execution.

A bit of the background and history here. Since the beginning of this calendar year the organization has been briefing the ICANN board of all the relevant facts and policy development work and reviews and others that are relevant to the implementation of the next window for subsequent procedures or next round of new gTLDs. So to that end one of the exercises that the organization has undertaken has been actually to come up with certain operationally focused assumptions, as I mentioned earlier, to help us in the planning process. We have these assumptions because we have incomplete information, the policy work not done, some of the reviews under consideration, so on and so forth. So we have to start from somewhere and we think with the policy development work completion, at least from the PDP working group perspective, expected to take place by the end of this calendar year, this is the right time on the organization side to begin the preparation work in terms of getting ourselves ready to begin planning for the implementation of the subsequent round. I underline this is a multiyear effort so when the ICANN board tells the organization go ahead and implement, it happens in three weeks or four months, it's a very complex issue. We have a core team within the organization, all of whom are sitting here with me with the exception of our CFO, and I asked all of these

---

members of our team to be here because this program, once into its execution phase and even planning phase, frankly, requires input from all parts of the organization and beyond for having a complete project plan to execute.

Before I hand it over to my colleague Trang, let me do a quick introduction at who is at this table from the org side. Ashley [indiscernible] head the engineering and IT, at the end of the table is Karen Lentz, or policy guru, Christine operated the previous round, and to my left, there is Trang Nguyen, the project manager for the subsequent procedures. So part of what we are doing here, we have put the assumptions together, shared with you a briefing, not sure if you have seen it. If not, happy to send it to you and we wanted to engage in a discussion with parts of the community, including of course the GAC, to get your input and debate validity of some of the assumptions just to be sure we're on the right track from your perspective. Once we get your input and the community, we will take into consideration, fine tune assumptions, share that and plan to take the updated assumptions to the ICANN board for their consideration and hopefully give the mandate to essentially begin a fully funded mandated project.

I would like to us keep the discussion junction focused on these assumptions. We're not here for or ready to debate whether this should be a next round for gTLD or when it should be, none of that



---

is really pertaining to the discussions today. I would respectfully ask we stay focused on these assumptions. I will hand the microphone over to Trang who will walk us through the assumptions. Allow us to go through the slides. Shouldn't take us very long, and then hopefully we will have ample time for questions and answers. Thank you very much.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you, Cyrus, I'm with ICANN org. I just want to emphasize a couple of points that Cyrus mentioned, number one, being these assumptions are operational beginning assumptions, not policies. Policies are being discussed with the subsequent procedures PDP working group that Jeff and Cheryl are leading. Some of these may draw on the work of the PDP but absolutely not policy assumptions. And these are working assumptions, at this point which means they can change and may depending on certainly the outcome of the PDP or input from the community as we get them.

If I could ask for the next slide, please. We have a documented 33 assumptions which are categorized into eight buckets. The first have to do with the timing to the next application window. Two assumptions here, the first being that the completion of the subsequent procedures' PDP working group's work as well as the ultimate action by the board on the recommendations will serve

---

as a dependency for the opening of the next application window, in other words, we do not anticipate there will be another application window until the conclusion of the PDP's work.

The second assumption has to do with the fact that the policy implementation, readiness activities and all of the operational processes will be defined and completed prior to the opening of the next application window. In the last round, the applicant guidebook was finalized and approved but did not necessarily contain all of the necessary information so there was a lot of activity that occurred after the opening of the application window to continue to define processes and procedures, and one of our assumptions for leading into the next round would be that would not happen again, would be done before the opening of the application window.

The second set of assumptions have to do with expected volumes of applications and processing time. On the volume side the assumptions are mainly that the application volume in the next round will be roughly the same as last round which was around 2000, and that this volume would decrease in future rounds and that there will be no changes to the current 1,000 TLD per year maximum delegation rate. The assumption on the application volume we have to start somewhere. This is how many we received last round so this is the basis for the next round.

---

On processing time, our assumptions are that there will be one application window per year which will last 1-3 months, and that prioritization will be used to sequence application processing, a mechanism used last time as well, and the assumption is we will continue to use that mechanism. The third set of assumptions have to do with policy implementation. We are expecting that the PDP working group will come out with changes and potentially even new policy recommendations for implementation guidance so we're operating under the assumption that we're not simply redoing the 2012 round, there will be changes for things we will need to implement and because there will be changes and things to implement. We anticipate that policy implementation materials will need to be developed and those will be developed in conjunction and constitution with the community and the policy implementation work will result in comprehensive and detailed -- the 2012 applicant guidebook when approved did not necessarily contain the necessarily level of detail for all the processes and much work occurred after, so we anticipated in order for us to define and document all the processes and procedures prior to the next application window that the application guidebook would need to be more detailed and we anticipate all the materials will be developed before we open up the next application window.

---

The fourth set of assumptions have to do with operational readiness. Specifically that we would need to build a new operational infrastructure. We would leverage as much as we can from what we have from the last round but there's going to be a lot that would need to be rebuilt and the operational infrastructure includes peoples, systems, processes, and when we build the new operational infrastructure, it would be built for the long term introduction of gTLDs, and this operational infrastructure will be built and in place prior to the opening of the next application window.

This next set of assumptions have to do with systems and tools, a very important component of our operational infrastructure we're building, several assumptions under systems and tools, it will cover two slides here. The first covers a few assumptions which are essentially that technology investments will be made and limited to only those capabilities needed to ensure the security, stability and consistency of application submission processes and communications. Systems and tools would be designed based on a clear understanding of the program processes or requirements. In other words, not going to build a system in a vacuum. Based on understanding of processes and other things. System testing completed to the opening of the next application window, and the systems and tools (no audio).

---

Not sure what happened to the slide, but the last assumption was the development of internal knowledge and expertise will be a priority and as little as possible will be outsourced. Thank you very much. This next set of assumptions have to do with operational processes. Three assumptions here and they are generally that the well-defined operational processes are critical to the [reading] and that the designed and documentation of processes as well as training of staff on those processes will be completed prior to the opening of the next application window.

The second set of assumptions have to do with people. Proactive resource planning will be completed in order to adequately staff the program in order to meet deadlines. We will have the necessary staffing in place, and ICANN org staff will be used to perform program management, operations, and administration functions. And we will outsource critical application processing functions, such as application evaluation and objection processes, those activities that cannot be performed by ICANN org.

As some may know the ICANN org fy19 and 20 do not include allocation of resources to support the work would do. The planning and everything we have talked about currently lacks the funding to do so but part of this work we're doing in terms of documenting, these assumptions and engaging with the community, would be so that we can inform the board's thinking,

---

so funding would be provided to support the necessary work moving forward. To support program operations additional staff hired based on needed skills and experience and we will augment staff with temporary resources as needed to address workload expected to be retained for 24 months [refer to screen].

The last set of assumptions have to do with cost. Operating on cost recovery basis, funded from application fees to be collected and comprehensive cost planning for program readiness and operations critical to accurate reporting and management of costs and tracking costs associated with the development activities to support the readiness of the program for the next round. And those are all of the assumptions that we've documented to share with you. Luisa, should I turn it back to you to run the Q&A?

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you very much, we really wanted this opportunity to have GAC members ask questions. I believe Manal circulated with the GAC mailing list the actual document, so you will all have time to meaningfully consider it, it's important. I believe it's five pages, the document so not very long so we really do encourage everyone to please read it, but at the moment let's open it for any preliminary questions from the floor. Yes, please, representative from Iran, thank you.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I had the opportunity to attend the meeting before this one in which this was presented and at least myself personally, much more clear than before. I know this process is just for implementation, assumptions to facilitate the proper implementation, taking advantage of the experience that we have gained from the first round, has nothing to do with the policy development process and would not in any way interfere with that one so, thank you very much. And then I would like to congratulate ICANN, Cyrus, and the whole team which provides good information.

I have two small questions, is there a timeline for the SO/AC, talking for GAC, for the timeline to respond? Usually you know GAC is more active when in session and not as active as between the two sessions due to the structure of the government and many other things. So whether there would be some timeline to react. And the other issue, we should be quite careful with reference to the budget, reserve budget, existing budget, for the existing process, and if you want to use the existing budget of the [indiscernible] account, which is not for this, reserve account for unforeseen activities, if want to use to finance the future applications, we should be careful of the number of applications not to allow that some one or two using multiple applications and absorbing all existing money from the reserve account or from the existing and so on, so forth, some sort of arrangement. I'm

---

sure Cyrus have been thinking of that but very grateful, and at least I'm much more clear of the situation and that's good that we simplify -- not simplify -- facilitate, in order to achieve the objectives of the second round that we're waiting for years. Thank you again.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Kavouss. In answer to your question, the timeline at the end of August at the latest, part of that dictated the ICANN org has workshop planned for I think mid-September and we would like to have the input consolidated, be able to share it with you as well as with the ICANN board. And on the budget comment, anything related to the financials of such a program will be presented to the board finance committee for review and approval so there's a system of checks and balances above and beyond just the organization itself. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you and echoing the representative of Iran, we thank ICANN org in terms of their work in developing the preliminary assumptions and welcome the opportunity -- we took note of providing if necessary any inputs from governments at the latest by August for when afterwards the document will be considered by the ICANN board. Just looking around, if there are any more questions? Yes, please.



---

NIGEL CASSMIRE:

Nigel Cassmire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. Two questions, the first relates to the assumptions about the expected number of applicants, and I suppose that would inform the size of organization put together to manage this thing. With that in mind, the first question is supposed it gets swamped. Is there any thought of putting a limit on the number of applications that might be commensurate with the amount of resources provided to deal with it? And number two, related to the financing of the round, it was mentioned that it's cost recovery and you typically looking to recover all or most of the cost from fees.

Coming from the Caribbean where there was a third of applications last time because of the cost and that's one of the policy things reviewed right now, in terms of keeping the fees down, my question is -- and I haven't been following the auction proceeds part of the discussion -- whether or not funds from the auction proceeds are being considered at all for use in keeping the cost of fees down for future rounds. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. This is Jeff Neumann I can talk to the first question on application limits. I can talk a little bit about the cost recovery aspect but I'm not as familiar with the auction proceeds work so would defer that to others that may have more experience.

---

On the first question that you asked, are there any considerations to limiting the amount of applications. So the GNSO's subsequent procedures policy development group or policy working group, that is one of the issues that our group has been discussing for a number of years now, and most of the group and the people that have commented have not been in support of limiting the number of applications, primarily because there would be in their view no fair way to impose such limits and no enforceable way to impose limits. Both in the absolute number of applications as well as applications by any individual person or entity. So both of those issues are the topic of discussion within our working group and we're still developing our final recommendations. But in looking at the discussions so far there has not been a high level of support for placing limits on the number of applications in total or to limit the number of applications by percent or entity and cost recovery.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Nigel, that's a very good question. In terms of the finance source for different objectives in rolling out the program, such as outreach and awareness campaigns for underserved regions or support for applicants in terms of subsidizing some of the -- there is a cross community group considering what to do with the auction proceeds, we're not involved in the org side. Whatever they said is considered and adopted by the board, of

---

course we will do that. in terms of the source of financing for this program, a cost recovery means that the program has to self-fund itself. The question is how do you pay for this program upfront before you start collecting fees. And several options available which I think the ICANN board is considering, one to borrow from the remaining application fees from the 2012 fees and then reimburse that fund when the application fees come in. The other source, ICANN has a reserve fund you could borrow from that and then reimburse it. So those are discussions taking place, some of the board level, some at the community level, and hopefully we will be settled I think within the next year or so at the latest.

JEFF NEUMAN:

I was kind of trying to follow along with the transcript. I think the transcript says that there has been a high level of support for limiting -- it's actually the opposite, there has not been a high level of support for limiting the number of applications, so I just want to make that clear from the transcript. I want to say there are extensive discussions taking place within the working group on the notion of outreach and making sure that we have planned for or at least recommending ICANN org plan for an extensive outreach campaign as well as an applicant support program to help those in underserved regions with not just financial support for applications because we recognize that the costs were high and may still be going forward, but also with other forms of

---

support like technical support, consulting support, legal support, et cetera. Those have all been topics of discussion within the working group.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, and we were having a bit of the discussion earlier during the underserved region working group session looking at GAC members to provide further input in the applicant support program. I know you have made that call several times, so we encourage in particular those from underserved regions to review the applicant support, as Jeff mentioned, providing funds, mentoring, technical capacity, how to reach other important elements. And are there other questions? (No audio).

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

According to my experience, you can have any policy you want, the issue is how to implement it. To put a limit is very difficult because you have that outside ICANN. In ITU we have the [indiscernible] positions, there is no equal access but there should be equitable access. That means no application should be rejected, but it is impossible you have equal access because depends on the need of the people. You cannot force the people [indiscernible] no, we can't do that. This is number one position that we should be quite cautious about the issue. And then borrowing money from the existing reserve account, that should

---

be carefully looked at to see how it works, but any policy, we should be mindful how to implement that. If we cannot implement that, extremely difficult, instead of resolving the matter, makes more problems. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: Thank you very much for the comment. I will take it to the next agenda item. Just looking at Cyrus, is there anyone else from Jeff or Cheryl, any final comments?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Just wanted to thank the GAC members, and Luisa, for having this opportunity, having this conversation, face-to-face, tremendous value for us and hopefully to you, in terms of being able to disseminate the information and get feedback in fine tuning the assumptions.

JEFF NEUMAN: And I echo what Cyrus said. And I also look forward to hearing about the new GAC focal group, and I know Cheryl and I would love to interact with that group if that's something you want us to do.

---

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect, thank you very much. And on behalf of the GAC we thank you for your time and for presenting today and in particular for the co-chairs for your tireless efforts in shepherding the PDP process. So just looking at the time, we have around 15 minutes left. You are welcome to stay or --

[applause]

LUISA PAEZ: Okay. So just looking here at the slide, after having the opportunity to engage and discuss some of our things with the co-chairs of the policy development process as well as ICANN org and the implementation, we wanted the session to focus a little bit now how to look internally within the GAC efforts and wanted to give a quick overview of the last follow-up on GAC advice that focused on this topic for subsequent rounds of gTLDs, in the Kobe meeting as some will recall if you were able to attend the meeting. So the follow-up advice was in relation -- and I will read it quickly. [reading] [refer to screen] so this was an important follow-up of previous GAC advice. In particular in relation to GAC advice in Kobe focused on that review.

Next slide. And this was just to give you a quick refresher. We have a lot of new GAC members in relation to the GAC Helsinki advice in 2016, that focused on the future gTLD policies and procedures, focused on requirements, making sure meaningful

---

consideration of costs and benefits to be conducted before a next round as well as looking into the policy and administrative framework. And we have here the rationale, and any previous GAC advice is at your disposal for review, and it's a great resource and hopefully we use it more as we go on. So now regarding focusing a little bit on what concerns GAC members and governments within this very broad policy development process and subsequent rounds of new gTLD in Kobe there was agreement at the end of the meeting to create a scorecard, a preliminary scorecard, with the help of the GAC support staff as well as the ICANN support staff working with the policy development process to try to map out based on previous GAC advice how well it is aligning with the current discussions and deliberations going on in the PDP. As we know, it is sometimes challenging for governments to participate in the PDP. There's currently a lot of inter-sessional work going on but perhaps that is a good entry point to help us prioritize our work.

I'm not sure if we are able to bring it up on the screen, this draft scorecard, but if not, it is available within the GAC website and it was part of the GAC briefing as well. Next slide, please. And so then in terms of next steps, it was decided in Kobe to create a GAC focal group to be able to look and analyze a bit more this preliminary GAC scorecard and help prioritize the work of the GAC and organize our internal efforts. And so there was a call out for

---

interested GAC members to join the, the focal group, I believe a month ago and we have received some interested GAC members to join the focal group. So great news. And in terms of the GAC focal group, we will be meeting with those that have confirmed interest, the meeting will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:15 in diamond room. We wanted to reiterate, this GAC focal group is open to everyone. There will be a separate mailing list created. We have experienced sometimes most GAC members feel more comfortable engaging in a smaller setting so hopefully this can be more conducive for a more meaningful and truthful discussion. Sometimes in these types of plenary sessions, it's more intimidating, it's harder to get into the nitty-gritty of the substance. So the idea -- and to date I believe -- I forget exactly who has confirmed participation. I believe we have eight GAC members but maybe my memory is not that clear, then the idea would be for the next steps for the GAC focal group to meet tomorrow, review the preliminary graft scorecard and then present to the GAC in the Thursday plenary session and discuss with all of you here in terms of what are the next steps. We will probably discuss in the GAC focal group the GAC scorecard as well as potentially the document that ICANN org shared with us today as well. So just a quick overview, I again encourage you to take a look at the GAC website when you go to the agenda of each session, you will see then all the different briefings there. You can also download them.



---

And I will stop there to see if there are any questions. But we will get more into the substance within the GAC focal group and in the Thursday plenary session, but I just want to hear from GAC members, any questions, comments. Thank you, yes, representative from Iran, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you for the presentation. I think with respect to the GAC Helsinki advice, there was a question raised in the group of Jeff, and I have conveyed that question to our chair Manal. In paragraph b of that GAC advice that group had difficulty how to understand that. And I have requested that the leadership look at that question, that paragraph b and provide clarity, that issue still pending, further clarification from GAC what was meant by paragraph b of Helsinki advice. I participated in the group irrespective of the sometimes very bad window, UTC 3:00 of the place I'm living but questions raised, and the GAC advice to the ICANN board should have been complemented but another sentence that the board is advised to convey this message to the GNSO dealing with the matter. But the board do not deal with the short comes and so on, so forth, the board just approves the PDP. If the PDP has not taken into account this issue, it is not very constructive to say that board takes into account all questions raised, all difficulties resolved. So this should be before that.

---

So perhaps at the same time, should be communicated our views to the GNSO and group or amend sentence or put additional sentence to the GAC advice saying that the board is kindly requested to convey this message to the GNSO in order that these shortcomings, problems, difficulties, to be addressed to the extent possible. This is something we could do and moreover, anyone from the GAC attending or participating in the PDP process needs to be mindful of all previous GAC advice and raise any questions to the group to be properly addressed. This is my suggestions, I leave it to the people to decide, ICANN is the last point, they just look into the recommendation, does not address the shortcomings, usually the group should have addressed this question. So that's a little bit of a need to address our questions or reformulate our question or our concerns. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, representative from Iran. Just to clarify a little bit, when you are referencing the Helsinki, it's the Helsinki GAC advice, if you can go back to the Helsinki advice just to make sure we're all on the same page, thank you. So GAC Helsinki communique advice in 2016, you were referring to b?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Paragraph b of GAC advice, thank you.

---

LUISA PAEZ: So the one that is referring to an objective and independent analysis of costs and benefits should be conducted beforehand drawing on experience with and outcomes from the recent round, correct.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The question is it's good to raise the question but also good to say how who do that, we should at least suggest some mechanism. This is always with respect to our advice. In previous GAC advice we had after the [indiscernible] the board, the board asked the GAC representatives, our chair was there, okay, thank you very much for your advice. Can you tell us how you want to do that? So we have to also suggest some approach, so making cost and benefit analysis, how do you make that? Let us know whether you have any solutions or proposals, so this is the question. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ: Perfect. Thank you. Just looking at Manal, do you have anything to add? We will consider that into the discussions of the GAC focal group, and I was just wondering, and Benedetta, just looking at the time, we're done but I just wanted to bring quickly the draft scorecard for those of you that have not seen it, I'm not sure if it's possible to bring it up. If not, that's okay. Perfect, but I know this

---

session has been completed, but just give me one more minute.  
Thank you.

Thank you, Benedetta. And again, Luisa for the record. As I mentioned, the session has been completed, concluded, however, just to give you, when we mentioned the preliminary GAC scorecard. It has been put together with great work of the GAC support staff as well as working with the ICANN support staff on the PDP sub group, working group, so you will see there's color coding, so the areas of interest in terms of application process, application requirements, safeguards, public interest commitments, evaluation, string contentions, those are all very important to the GAC. So the key color coding gives you a sense, the green general alignments, so this means there's more or less a good alignment in terms of previous GAC input to the current discussions going on in this PDP.

Then we have the yellow one, less alignment, medium priority, and then the red, possibility of no alignment, higher priority. So this document hopefully a useful tool to prioritize the work of the GAC focal group that will be meeting tomorrow, and we will send an email to those GAC members that have mentioned their interest. So thank you for your time in advance and then we will be reporting to the GAC on Thursday in the last session. So I will close it there. I know we have concluded the time here, and thank you very much for your attention.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa, and many thanks to you. I know you have been putting so much time and effort in this. And thanks everyone, and I hope you will be participating actively to the focal group and to the PDP itself.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]