ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GAC Discussions on RPM and WS2 Recommendations
Wednesday, June 24, 2020 – 13:00 to 14:30 MYT

JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Okay. This is Julia speaking. We are at the top of the hour. We will be starting the GAC discussion on implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations, and if I can give the floor to you Suada or Lina, please.
SUADA HADZOVIC:	Good morning. Hello everyone. I hope you are all well. This is Suada speaking, for the record, GAC representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina. So we have the session GAC discussion on implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations, and we have invited speakers Austin Ruckstuhl and Epharim Kenyanito from a cross-community working on ICANN and human rights and this session is lead by myself, and by Lina Rainiene, we are co-chairs of the human rights. Okay. Thank you, I'm giving the floor to Manal.
MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:	Thank you very much, Suada, and Lina, and welcome to our invited speakers from the across community working party on human rights. So just a quick introduction on Work Stream 2 recommendations discussions and with the adoption of the Work Stream 2 recommendations by ICANN Board last November, ICANN and individual community groups now have the obligation to undertake

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.

the implementation of those recommendations, so according to the Board resolutions Work Stream 2 recommendations directed to the community are for the community to implement with support from ICANN org, so I can see 3 parts to this discussion, one part on prioritization of the implementation of recommendations for Work Stream 2, second part is regarding the undertaking implementation of community recommendations and GAC here being part of this community. And the third and last part is following up on the implementation of recommendations carried out by ICANN, but are of interest to the GAC, concrete two examples here to come to my mind are the human rights, and the jurisdiction. So, I have a few things to say about the prioritization but I'm not sure Suada, Lina if you would like to -- you get started first, and then maybe I can talk about prioritization at the end or you want me to go first? I'm in your hands. I'm flexible.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Maybe it could be best to have it at the end. Maybe we can --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Then over to you, Suada.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Okay. Thank you, Manal. Next slide, please. So, here we have the first topic, and our session objectives are to present and describe the

current situation on the Work Stream 2 recommendations implementation, and to kick-off the discussion on the state of play regarding the implementation of the human rights core values from an ICANN org perspective followed by a discussion on what the GAC needs and wants to do about this implementation efforts from community perspective. So here we have the first topic. Starting with Work Stream 2 time-line. So ICANN incorporated a policy commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights in 2016. This human rights core values specified that ICANN's decisions and actions should be guided by respecting internationally recognized human rights and actions should be guided by -- as required bylaw within the scope of its mission and other core values. After that a framework of interpretation was approved by developed and approved by the ICANN Board this. Human rights framework of interpretation and considerations was subsequently developed within the multistakeholder ICANN community. It was completed in November 2017, gained plenary approval in March 2018, and was sent to the ICANN Board for final approval in November 2018 as part of the Work Stream 2 recommendations on enhancing ICANN's accountability. So, in this Work Stream 2 final report is seen as a big step ahead in the incorporation of human rights in ICANN's values ... we nearly 100 recommendations and precisely 116 recommendations on aspects ranging from diversity to transparency. The ... implementation of the Work Stream 2 recommendation will be founded out of ICANN's annual budget and operating plan and it will take several years to complete the implementation of these recommendations. So we have 8 topical areas, and 5 of these 8 topics

have implications for direct operation implementation. And in human rights we have 2 recommendations, ICANN support staff has closely reviewed the Work Stream 2 final report, and identified a total of 42 Work Stream 2 final report recommendations that impact the GAC in some way or form and you can find this document on that page and it is core meeting in 15 February, 2020. Next slide please. On the November 2019, the ICANN Board approved Work Stream 2, and the human rights framework called interpretation and you can see on this slide, that start ICANN was directed to start implementation of these recommendations possible to move forward without waiting for budgeting cycle. And ICANN org will provide support for those part of the recommendation that the community ... and the provide implementation started supports. We have in may 2020 that ICANN organization published a blog detailing the progress of its implementation work, it is on 18, may and last week we had an opportunity to participate in ICANN webinar on this topic, and current status is as follows. Implementation of Work Stream 2 recommendations is an important priority for ICANN org. For example it is highlighted in the 5 year operating and financial plan that was improved by the Board in may 2020, in fact, it is in session contingency and activities in progress, and in the fiscal year proposed adopted budget is 5 point 2 million dollars. And Work Stream 2 recommendations implementations is one of 5 key projects in this contingency budget. So, the situation is that ICANN org's internal Work Stream 2 team is currently analyzing all recommendations identifying work ... establishing dependancies and timelines and once completed this will be shared for community input. Considering work

loads and budgetary constraints ICANN org will consult with the community to prioritize Work Stream 2 recommendations vis-a-vis on going work. Based on these discussions, and we didn't approve the budgetary frameworks ICANN org will provide the necessary facilitation and support the community for proceeding with the aspects of Work Stream 2 implementation. Given the complexities and interdependancies, it is critical to prioritize the implementation in the context of a broader ICANN work. The Board organize and community have had several discussions on prioritization of work more generally but also more specifically on prioritization of these recommendations. But in the recent ICANN blog post from Teresa ... from [inaudible] didn't mention implementation ever the new human rights core value at all. So our discussion would be is the community waiting for ICANN org action? Should [inaudible] steps be taken to identify who needs do something, and what must happen next to get implementation efforts moving? And what role, if any, could or should the GAC play in participating or offering encouragement in these areas? Next slide. Please. So, this is extracted from the Work Stream 2 final report in annex 3, and we can see that ICANN, the organization should propose the framework to the community, which should include multistakeholder involvement in its development and regular review. If we take the human rights core value into account, and ICANN organization could consider instruments such as human rights impact assessments to assess the impact on human rights and however this is up to ICANN organization to develop and implement. Next slide please. We have this document, it is very useful. This is Work Stream 2 implementation assessment report. And in this

document we can find assessment and time-line, and it is an estimated and more than 12 months is needed for, for implementation of the recommendations considering human rights core value. And in this moment I'm passing the floor to invited speak others to Austin Ruckstuhl and to Epharim Kenyanito. Thank you.

EPHARIM KENYANITO: Good morning, good evening good afternoon everyone for those in different time zones. Thank you so much. This is Epharim Kenyanito, for the record. I'll start off by saying the implement the first human rights impact assessment done on ICANN org in 15th may of 2019, and this I noted identified that human rights impact ICANN org and some of these impacts, so this methodology only focus on ICANN org as an institution only but it not look at the whole ICANN community. And the recommendations have 5 areas so some of them could effect the human rights governance [inaudible] and expansion of the human rights methodology. [Inaudible] human rights in the supply chain, and human rights implications in remote participation, and data privacy. So some of these -- more of these recommendations are very very important, and it will be really good to see maybe as part of the next step on from ICANN org from this because given this report was released before the November 2019 Board resolution in Montreal, it will be good to see or to have an update or a regular updates the web sites on how far this recommendations are being implemented, impact all and when the next due diligence process will be done. That's just a few comments on regarding that support. I will leave it to

Austin to talk about the exploration how to expand this work from the cross-community working party and.

AUSTIN RUCKSTUHL: Thank you. This is Austin Ruckstuhl, for the record. I'm currently the co-chair with Epharim of the cross-community working party and human rights and actually as far as commenting on ICANN org I think you know Epharim has already mentioned that we'd like to see more work done, but we can go into our proposed plan for how a tool that we'd like to present for how the GAC can work on implementing some of these we can 2 recommendations but I will actually reserve that, and see if Suada, you want to sort of say anything else before I go into talking about the tool?

SUADA HADZOVIC: We have session topic too maybe at that start with topic 2 and I'm getting the -- I'm passing the floor to Lina, and after that you can join the -- you can present your tool. Thank you.

LINA RAINIENE: Thank you, Suada. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is Lina Rainiene speaking, award an already mentioned I am co-chair of human rights international law working group, providing input for this Work Stream on the GAC merits. So let's move to the section which is directly concerning GAC, because as

EN

we all know the recommendations are related to the advisory committees themselves and the GAC is an advisory committee within the ICANN community. Also is effect... consider on the new human rights core value for the ICANN, so as you may see on the slide, there was an extract from the final report from the annex 3 of this final report, which those provisions seems more definitive on the expectation for the ICANN community groups regarding the new core values, so the framework is interpretation. The enumerated some specific practical directions for the ICANN to support organizations which is emphasized on the report. So it states that it's up -- nevertheless the ICANN is supporting the organizations but it's up to every supporting organizations and advisory committees are develop your own policies and frameworks to fulfill the core value, and in doing so, all balance of the -- all merit of the core values should be taken into account, so supporting organizations would consider defining and incorporating those humanize impact assessment in the policy development processes, on the other hand, the advisory communities are are advised and encouraged also to consider similar measures defining and incorporating the impact assessments in their respective ... so if we would go to the next slide please and we can see here that there was some work already done within the GAC, and the certain compilation of the recommendations which are relevant, and might be of interest to the GAC was developed, so I would use the opportunity to thank again everybody who participated in this effort because this document is very helpful to see in one place in concentrated manner, the contents of the recommendations. And the -- as for the GAC, it is important to analyze, understand, prioritize, and

decide the way forward, regarding the implementation of the recommendations, so for this matter, the discussions within the working groups on working group on human rights and international law have been on going, and this group should assess the contents. On the other hand some other groups will are related could be engaged as the group on operational principles of the GAC, and notwithstanding that, the insights and assessment results could be provided, and discussed coordinated in the -- with the GAC leadership. As Suada mentioned. The document is available to every single GAC member, so I would encourage to use it and dive into it. It's not a very lengthy, and quite comprehensive for content. So if we would move to the next slide, we can see what, what in addition have been happening within the GAC representative who are engaged in this process, so the GAC representatives are participating and collaborating closely are the cross-community working party for the human rights, and as it was mentioned already, that this working party published the report on the designing of human rights impact assessment where the -- the main processes are outlined, and the shaped -- so that multi-stakeholder impact assessment, and as far as I know, I wasn't personally engaged in this process, but there is a tool developed assessing the -- helping to assess the list of the recommendations, and on the other hand, we had a number of virtual meetings with the representatives of the cross-community working party, and where discussing the possibilities to facilitate the GAC in assessing the impact of the recommendations, so the sample tool is already under the process of development. It's already started to develop, as already was mentioned by Austin. He will present more detail this

tool, so I would like to ask to move to the next slide because I see the sequence is not exactly as the last one -- yeah, so this is already the -- flow for the co-chairs of the cross-community working party for the human rights, so this session, for us its important, to discuss and to gain the insights from the GAC members and from the community members where we are standing in the -- in the light of the implementing of the core values. How do we see our way forward. Whether we as a GAC thinking of ability to trigger those processes internally and of course we are participating throughout the discussion in the community. And the design to agree on the what possible extent to implement those relevant recommendations. So, now, I would like to hand over to the Austin, I suppose or Epharim, how you will agree to give us an update and what's happening in the cross-community work and introduce us the tool. Thank you so hand over to you

AUSTIN RUCKSTUHL: Thank you, Lina. This is Austin Ruckstuhl again, for the record. And so, yeah, thank you for introducing this tool and what you see on the screen right now is a screen shot of what the tool looks like at the moment. It's always evolving. We've evolved it many different times which is sort of what the paper that was just referenced to the cross-community working parties co-shares authored about a year ago, maybe a little bit more than a year ago. And, that paper details how it was an iterative and multistakeholder process of performing a human rights impact assessment on the subsequent procedures PDP.

So we just sort of looked at different areas and you can see the columns here so the idea is you use the rows to identify issues and then you use the columns to sort of dissect those issues from a human rights perspective and then there's own more columns off to the right where you can sort of and actually I will post the link in the chat and you guys can all go look at the tool if you'd like to see more information on it -- but the other columns provide information and a space for people to collaborate and say what a best case scenario would be or what change should possibly happen in that case. So previously this tool what we are calling is tool is really just a glorified excel spreadsheet of ... in this case it used to be empty and we would rely and people who have heavily involved in the PDP to help us populate and we would attend the calls, and as a working party, we would kind of join forces, and investigate, and sort of ask questions and do what would typically be done in a human rights impact assessment and then document it in this collaborative way where everyone could edit the tool. So we are proposing that we sort of merge these 2 ideas so we can use this idea of a tool or this template to have a starting point for where the GAC can go with those that document, that mentions sort of the GAC specific things that need to be addressed as Par the recommendations of the Work Stream 2. So there were 42 of those and what we've done is add a row for most of those especially those towards the bottom of the list. If you do pull up the document you have you will you will see the one that is are in bold and dark blue are specific call outs and specific actionable items that SOACs can do within the ICANN world to, yeah to sort of assess their work and in the context of Work Stream 2, and possibly make

corrections. So what we've done is where it says description, we've kind of pulled that column is bays pulling the data that's most relevant and so you get about 28 or 30 rows here and we've pulled that into the tool for you this is just a proposed way forward that then you can as a community, if you'd like to, GAC members could then fill in ha column where it's sort of allows you to say, what is the current situation in the GAC? So if the first line is about definitions and interpretations, we can have your help from the GAC and from your community help us decide how does the GAC -- does the GAC currently have a publicly available PDF of definitions and where does that link. And sort of do an assessment and in this way we tie you had it to human rights but it's hopefully more useful. You'll see the utility in using this as a way of starting your Work Stream 2 implementation process. It could even be taken from this tool we could then adapt it even more so we could add a column that is very GAC specific or add a column for you to say in the GAC we don't have you know, stakeholders from every stakeholder group because defense the GAC or however you need to adapt this tool for your needs that we are totally here to help with that. And that sort of where we see our role right, as the CCWP on human rights is we want to -- we see the benefit and the value obviously in this Work Stream 2 recommendation work, and ear kind of trying to propose a way forward in that you could even add rows so if you'd like to add concept that is are not part of those 32 recommendations or 42 sorry, but some of the 30 that we've pulled in this F you you want to talk about the process of drafting a communique, and issues that come up in that process, that are related to you know diversity or transparency or accountability or any

of those kind of issues you could add additional rows as part of this process of kind of the GAC reflecting on these recommendations, so we think, and my experience has been over the last couple of years that this sort of process allows for discussion. It allows for kind of joint learning and transparency, and doing this process, and I think this might be a starting point. So we would really appreciate your feedback, at this point it's just a proposed tool, and you can even you know, set up calls with us individually, you can reach out to myself or Epharim, and probably Lina and Suada would be happy to hear your feedback as well on how you feel about this as a way forward. And there's even this column where it says severity of impact so it basically as a starting point for implementing Work Stream 2 recommendations, you kind of need to prioritize them nay right. So like Suada mentioned it will probably be a year, a 12 months process probably minimum to get through these different issues but if you can prioritize them on a way based on severity of impact or whatever kind of column you want to add then we have a clearer starting point and we can sort of process them in a once they're sorted way. So Epharim and I are available to do kind of additional trainings on this or we to have additional sort of guided conversations. If people aren't super engaged or excited about this, then we could also reach out to individuals like we did during the subsequent procedures PDP process. We reached audit it a few people who are very very kind to help us, and, yeah, so this is where we are at. This is WA we are proposing and I will turn it over to Epharim to see if he's got any additional things that I probably have left you had. Thank you.

EPHARIM KENYANITO: Thank you very much, Austin. This is Epharim Kenyanito, for the record. Just to add that this tool hopefully will be used to do some self reflection, and to encourage conversation, so basically it's adapted all the Work Stream 2 recommendations that have -- are relevant to SOACs and try to translate them into human rights language so all of them have some impact on human rights or the rights of individual SOAC members, individual GAC members, and that is hopefully will help everyone understand maybe the importance of the work of human rights and the importance of Work Stream 2 to human rights agreement. ... section on human rights and the bylaw human rights but just how human rights is crosscutting across all the recommendations and across all the work that we are engaged in as an institution, whether we see it like permanently or not. And looking forward to what can everyone -- learning and getting feedback how to keep improving this tool because human rights impact assessment from those [inaudible] session that we had in Montreal, they are evolving processes for those who even followed this similar processes at other institutions, it's you've seen the various tools. The various methodologies and you have to keep improving and making sure you're covering all the various issues you know in a way that's inclusive to everyone, and trying to make sure this you cover all the bases. I am looking forward to hearing what everyone thinks and ... and work together. Thank you.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Thank you, Austin and Epharim. We will be inviting people to react -- to provide the initial reactions and now I see that Julia already put up a slide which we missed because we changed the sequence. Covering the results of the discussions within the GAC how we think it's the best way or it's the first way from the beginning to approach the our work within the GAC, so there was a discussion last year by involving the GAC members to supply their opinion and prioritize 4 options, developed by the working group. So those 4 options were prioritized and the option of establishing a standing guide and... which can be Kurd during the communique draft was decided no to the pursue but the remaining 3 options were decided to keep in our work, and to see how, how we will proceed, whether we will supply the mixture of those so as the main priority was chosen the option 4, which provide for the participation of the GAC in the impact assessments or similar procedural steps, established for the policy development processes on so we will be keeping our selves engaged within the processes happening within the community but also the GAC decided no the to discard the possibility of establishing a standing item or question which could be considered for another type of GAC communications arrest a position is conveyed, or as an alternative or as a supplementary option could be also to create a position of the GAC human rights [inaudible] so appoint a person, several of them who would follow the issues related to the human rights, and who would flag those issues to the GAC. So this is the current situation that we

have, and I suppose we will proceed within this manner for now. So, that would be all for this status quo, and I maybe will hand over to the chair of the meeting to invite discussion. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Lina, Suada, Epharim, and Austin for the presentation. I think we have a good background by Suada, and GAC interests in certain topics like the human rights, and relevant implementation, and Work Plan by yourself Lina, and thanks, Epharim, and Austin for sharing and presenting this tool. I think it looks very useful, and interesting collaborative mechanism for everyone to participate so thank you for sharing it and presenting its features. Let me pause here and see if we have any immediate reactions or questions to any of our presenters. I see no hands up. I think there is a lot to be digested here, and thank you for the presentation, I assume the slides are already linked to the GAC annotated agenda so I hope everyone will have the chance to read through the slides, and maybe provide any comments or questions later. But, at a broader level on Work Stream 2 recommendations, I believe maybe as GAC we need to have a plan to implement our part and follow up on implementation of parts we are interested in, so -- and we can make this like we have Suada, and Lina for human rights, we can also have others volunteering for other areas, and to make sure we do the necessary progress for this important effort, I know Work Stream 2 recommendations specifically are of significant importance to the whole community coming out of the transition process, so I'm sure everyone will be interested in seeing some progress in all aspects, and all recommendations. So, if there

are no specific questions on this part, maybe I can now speak very quickly to the prioritization part, we still have 20 minutes, and I have already flagged this during the opening plenary, that one of the 3 topics we discussed among the SO and AC chairs and ICANN CEO was the status of reviews and implementation of the review recommendations. Given that, as we also mentioned earlier, the current recommendations in queue for implementation are around 180. This includes Work Stream 2 recommendations of course we have 116 recommendations coming out of Work Stream 2 but also 35 from the CCT, 22 from RDS WHOIS and in addition to the ATRT3 so a number of recommendations with potentially hundred more expected to come from the security stability and resiliency second review team. So -- and the discussion with -- this discussion focussed on prioritization of Work Stream 2 recommendations as a crucial first step, as Suada mentioned, taking into consideration the budget and work load of the community. And there is a plan that will be conducted -- I'm sorry a plan that will be shared in consultation with the community to agree on how to prioritize Work Stream 2 recommendations. So, quickly, on this discussion, and, of course,, when we talk about a huge number of recommendations, we have two aspects here to talk about. One, how to avoid such a large number of recommendations coming in future, in the future so this is a forward looking aspect, and how to manage the existing situation with the number of recommendations that we already have in queue. So, one of the outcomes of this discussion was that a possible approach may be to first categorize all recommendations, this includes identifying the dependancies and interrelationships, and also identifying any

limiting factors we have in terms of bylaws requirements, in terms of budgets, so that we can identify how -- the impacts and the -- of each recommendation and we can work through the prioritization, and there was also a suggestion that SO and AC chairs can designate a small group of representatives from each community or constituency to work with the ICANN, and this committee doesn't have to be necessarily only from chairs and vice-chairs, but maybe also community members who have the relevant experience, and expertise if they have participated before in review teams, so this would be helpful, so this is one suggestion that we as chairs were asked to take back to our constituencies, and revert back with some feedback from our groups so I invite you to again think this over, and just again, let's agree on how we would like to participate to this collective exercise. Again this is prioritizing Work Stream 2 recommendations but ultimately it will be looking into streamlining and prioritizing recommendations that are coming through in general, whether from Work Stream 2, or from other review teams or maybe also recommendations from PDPs as well, so remains to be seen. I'll pause here again for any comments or questions. Okay seeing none, then I think.

OTHER SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please.

LINA RAINIENE: There is a comment in the chat from JAIDEEP, there is a suggestion related to the recommendation one keeping... diversity consideration within ICANN, and in the absence of any universal accepted definition in ICANN Blues the issue of definition of diversity needs to be addressed on a priority basis. Suggestion to prioritize the definition on the diversity.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, JAIDEEP, and thank you Lina for flagging this. Apologies for overlooking this comment. I see also another one in the chat, again from the... I believe for the implementation process to enhance the SO and AC accountability the community could also conduct a survey to address the issue and develop an implementation process for those participants and users that do not have adequate representation and participation in SOAC activities example people with physical disabilities, and users from underserved and non-English speaking language -- so, thanks for the comments, and we need to make sure we don't lose those comments, so let's keep track of them, and have a channel for people to provide their comments. I see a third suggestion is it? Yeah, I see another, I want to draw attention to the need to discuss the issue of jurisdiction in the remaining 20 minutes at least briefly. I do apologize for seeing this late, and key still have 12 minutes, if there are any comments on the jurisdiction or suggestions,

please go ahead.

LINA RAINIENE: Julia, could you please put the slide -- I raised my hand but in manner of saving the time could you put the slide and the jurisdiction just for the -- and very briefly I will say that as we now not all aspects of jurisdiction were covered in the final report. There was there was a proposed to have certain follow up, follow-up work, and therefore, now we simply put it on the agenda, this item because in preparation to the previous item [inaudible] from the GAC members that they -- jurisdiction should be discussed so in saving the time, I am -- I see that there are people wanting to speak so I will give the floor. It's the.

[Voices speaking simultaneously]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Lina. Yes, Russia, please.

RUSSIA FEDERATION: Hello, do you hear me? Okay, I will speak in Russian.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sure.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: [Interpreter Speaking] my name is… I'm from the Russian Federation. Speaking for the record. Currently ICANN, being a global organization, and basically working above country levels at the same time remains in the jurisdiction of one country, and has to adhere to all the laws and regulations including programs of economic and trade sanctions, as stated in its bylaws. Therefore, a decision of one country authorities or government, would effect accessibility of the Internet service and any other country. First of all, we would like to underscore that none of the countries or a group of countries should not have the right to create impediments for the critical structure such as the Internet to operate. Or, the… the work of ICANN including through lawful regulation of ICANN operations. There should be a right that should be guaranteed for all participants and users of the Internet to interact with ICANN, and also, to be their claims be regarded without any bias. The Russian Federation has been supporting a neutral position or creation of a neutral position for the operation of the ICANN. I would like to think for the comment that was made by the jurisdiction sub-group as part of the Work Stream 2 -- I'm not going to repeat it. It was on your screens. In this regard, or due to the fact that a number of countries have issues with jurisdiction, we believe it is necessary as part of a new working group or any other organizational structure to conduct a detailed systemic analysis of ICANN jurisdiction including looking into various alternatives such as various immune its or international jurisdiction, or some other alternative options, and to work out recommendations with regard to ICANN jurisdiction. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia, for your comments. Sorry, just changing headsets. Thank you for the comments. And, I think we as I said we need to have a plan to follow up on all we can 2 recommendation that is are of interest to the GAC so let's work on such a plan and identify volunteers off line, and maybe discuss this plan inter-sessionally. I'm seeing also comments from Finn from Denmark concerning jurisdiction. It is important that recommendations relating to choice of flow and choice of venue provisions in ICANN agreements are implemented. Thank you Denmark. Just checking. So I can see no other comments or questions, and I hope we can identify -- it's on the -- I believe they were 5 issues of interest to the GAC identified to be of interest to the GAC with 42 recommendations to be implemented, so a lot to be done here. I hope we can collectively have a Work Plan to follow up and progress on this. Any other requests for the floor? Or comments or questions? I see no hands up. Okay then, any final remarks Lina or Suada, before concluding the session?

LINA RAINIENE: Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. And -- yes, please go --

LINA RAINIENE: This is Lina speaking. We, for sure will continue to be engaged in the work on going work within the community, and participate in the cross-community working groups. We will also engage in the, in the discussions on the tool so we will try to get concentrated information and update the GAC on that. And yes, thank you all, and we are looking forward of further activities and, of course, we will contribute to the preparation of the plan on behalf of the -- from the side of human rights priorities. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Lina, and I see a final comment from Russia in the chat so Russia welcomes the continuation of work on the issue of jurisdiction, and is ready to participate in this work, so thank you Russia for offering to help, so we have diversity of community work on policy, we have guidelines for good faith removal Board members -- removal of Board members, third topic is human rights, 4th is jurisdiction, 5th is increase SOAC accountability, and the 6th is transparency. So those six topics were identified to be of interest to the GAC, we already have Russia for the jurisdiction, we have Lithuania and Bosnia and Herzegovina for the human rights, so please let us know the topics you would like to volunteer for. And to your question Jorge, I think step one was identifying the topics, having topics -- topic leads, and then working on pursuing the implementation of those

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

recommendations, and having some progress in that respect. I believe there is also some sort of inventory compiled by support staff, this is the -- if I'm not mistaken the link is provided in the GAC read so please take the time to consult this inventory, and let's have collective plan on -- as I said, 3 things, that we need to pursue, on the prioritization activity, and how we would like to participate in this community effort, and who would be our representative or representatives within this committee. Second the implementation of recommendations that are for the community to implement, so we need to have a plan for this, and finally, following up on recommendations that are ICANN implemented but of interest to the GAC so we would like to follow up on how this is progressing. Anything else? We have reached the end of the session, I see no further questions, and should be concluding now. So thank you for this discussion, and now it's time for a 30 minute break, and please be back in the Zoom room in time for the following GAC session. I think it's a communique drafting session. Thank you everyone. And thanks to Lina and Suada of course, and Epharim and Austin, co-chairs of the CCWG on human rights so much appreciated thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]