
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO
Monday, June 13, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

GULTEN TEPE: Hello, and welcome to the ICANN74 GAC meeting with the GNSO. Please note that this session is being recorded, and is governed by ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions and comments submitted in the chat will be read out loud if you put it proper form and if you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone or those of you in the room please raise your hand in Zoom, and when called upon, unmute your table microphone. Thank you. With that I will leave the floor to Manal. Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, and good morning, good afternoon and good evening on-line and in the room. Welcome to the bilateral. The meeting is schedule for an hour and I would like to start by welcoming Philippe Fouquart and Sebastian Bachollet, Jeff and everyone and Olga and all GNSO colleagues who are in the room and would also like to recognize all the efforts done by -- and Jeff in arranging for this meeting and coordinating its agenda, but before we get started with our discussions I would ask Philippe if you would like to say any opening remarks or introduce your colleagues.

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.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe Fouquart, GNSO Council chair. Just want to echo your words and say that we certainly welcome these discussions, I was about to say as always, but this time it's slightly -- and happily different from last time. It feels different certainly, I hope this will help our interactions moving forward. So for this dialogue I'll be helped, and assisted with my much more competent colleagues here, Jeff, our liaison, Olga, and for the abuse, and accuracy scoping team activities as well as Paul for the abuse small team so we will take turn as we move along our agenda.

So looking forward to that and over to you, Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, and we have a long agenda as we can see on the screen, so if we just go to the following slide, and get started with our topics. First, we have a subsequent rounds of new gTLDs closed generics and I think this comes very well placed after our earlier session on subsequent rounds. We were having our internal GAC discussion.

And as you may already know the GAC welcomes ALAC facilitation in the dialogue in collaboration with the GNSO and the GAC and

we also welcome input from the GNSO Council on criteria for the appointed facilitator for the dialogue. We have already noted to the Board that we believe that the facilitator should be a well-respected member of the ICANN community with a track record of respectfully and fact family building consensus and independent from commercial interests.

Of course, ideally the facilitator should have a good understanding of the closed generics issues and its history but not having been directly involved in SubPro PDP working group discussions to bring a fresh perspective to the process.

And finally, we also noted that the facilitator should be willing and able to proactively help different parties find a mutually-acceptable solution. That said we were interested it know how many representatives does the GNSO Council foresee appointing to this process? And the GAC also encourages the facilitator and ICANN org to consider a balanced number of participants from the GAC and GNSO Council for the dialogue to be effective.

So any, any -- is it clear yet how many number -- how many members will be participating from the GNSO side?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe here and maybe just to recap where we are along our process, so we received just like you, the letter from the Board around ICANN73, which we responded on the principle of the dialogue and accepted as well as the an assumptions of that dialogue, and convene a small team to review the procedural elements of that letter and the framing document along with the question of the team and the number of members of that team.

I should point out at that point we are in the middle -- ie; the small team provided their recommendations to council. Those will be reviewed at our council meeting on Wednesday, so bear with us, as usual this is on the results of the small team, this will need council's review.

Speaking personally, I'm confident that they could be -- those recommendations contain forward as a principle. Those will need to be reviewed.

Like you, we, the small team reviewed a number of questions, I don't know if you had a chance to have a look at the draft recommendations that we put forward to council. This obviously will be subject to a formal letter to you, Manal, and to my GAC colleagues on our initial inputs to this dialogue. The small team

reviewed essentially three questions, that of the facilitator, which you you alluded to earlier.

In a nutshell I think the conclusions of the small team quite align with what we have on the screen here. Some comments on the use of the word commercial, but not much diversions there. I should also point out that during our discussions there was also suggestions to use a professional mediator at some point, and also the need maybe to as far as the small team is concerned, to have independent members that would not be bound by their respective constituencies in those discussions.

I'm picking up on a couple of elements in the proceed -- in the conclusion recommendations. Maybe I'll stop here with two things. First, on the premise of that dialogue, it's in the framing paper so I don't -- and I know it's also in your response actually. The fact that the output of that dialogue will need to fit into the PDP, I think it's in the framing paper, but the small team members felt it was important to reiterate that moving forward, A.

And B, to the size of the team, in addition to the extension to the ALAC, to some extent -- and we appreciate the fact that our ALAC colleagues would be happy with having one member within that team -- then the -- again, it's subject to council's review, but the feeling from the small team would be that a team of 6 to 8

members would be a good match on each side, just to make sure that the -- well obviously as usual it's not too small to be representative but it's not too large to facilitate the discussions.

So, I hope I'm being faithful to the discussion within the small team. If any one within that team would like to add anything feel free to chime in, and I see that Jeff would like to add something. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMANN:

This is Jeff Neumann. The GNSO Council liaison to the GAC as well as the GNSO liaison to the SubPro ODP. Just -- everything you said Philippe is right. I just want to offer like a slight clarification because I'm noticing this happening not just in -- we're so used to using the term PDP, and a lot of people use it because that's what we a lot of our work is.

There are other policy processes that the GNSO has at its disposal that may be more nimble, that may be a little bit -- I don't think it eliminates any of the required elements in terms of getting feedback, but it is more nimble. It's more flexible. That we can use, and just, just to help people understand a policy development process, a PDP is required if the outcome is going to change an existing contract, right?

So like the EPDP on registration data and transfer policies, those will all have an impact on existing contracts for registries and or registrars, but something like this, which is talking about a future new gTLD does not have an impact on those past contracts, so you don't have to do all of the formality of a policy development process. So that's the only clarification I want to use, that even though we all kind of do the shorthand as PDP, it's really -- it could be any of the policy processes at the GNSO's disposal. Right.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe and Jeff, for sharing the initial GNSO views on this, and we look forward to the outcomes of the council meeting on Wednesday, and I'm just looking to see if there are any requests for the floor? I see Jorge, Switzerland, and then Nigel, U.K. Jorge, please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Perhaps we can take Nigel first?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. Sorry. Good afternoon, Nigel Hickson, U.K. GAC. Thank you very much for this session, and thank you for the work that's been taking place in the small group.

We had a very good session earlier on gTLDs where we touched on closed generics and a number of other issues, and one point made during that discussion was the role of ALAC and the importance of having their voice in this process in some way. So I'd be grateful for you to comment, if you could, how that could be facilitated in this structure that you're outlining? Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nigel. It is indeed a stop check we addressed during the work of the small team. I think it -- the people, people felt it was important indeed to broaden the scope of the inputs including ALAC's views on this given the -- their past inputs to the working group. I think it's fair to say -- I think it's captured within the paper that will be submitted -- that has been submitted to council, that the main concern was about the balance between the number of GAC members and the number of GNSO members, and that by the inclusion of a third party that the issue wasn't so much about the fact that it was ALAC but the fact that it was sort of extending and potentially increasing the number of participants that we should not get to a group of 25, 30 people in the end.

So, with that, we reached out to ALAC through our liaison, Justine Chew, and ALAC kindly agreed to have one member within that

team which would exactly address our issue with this, so that's the suggestion that we are making as a way forward to both include the ALAC's input whilst not changing the balance of that dialogue. I hope that's helpful, Nigel. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel, for the question and Philippe for the answer, and also, subject to GAC colleague's interest, we also offer that this -- the one member from the ALAC could be counted from the GAC's quota just trying to help things out, but Jorge, you have been patiently waiting? Please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Sure, thank you. And very briefly, as both as topic lead in the GAC for subsequent procedures we are very much looking forward to seeing whether the council adopts the recommendations from the small team. We already had the opportunity of having a glimpse and sharing a little bit the information with the GAC just one hour ago, so -- and as you said, at least prima facie there's a lot of alignment.

I think it's always useful to learn new acronyms so it's good to go from PDP to GGP perhaps, owe as long as its useful and it serves the goal, I think we are all for assumption al approach so it's not the form. It's the function, which is more important, and as Nigel

said of course for us the participation of ALAC is important, and also as Manal mentioned what is important is kind of a qualitative parity or perhaps in then we show up with 6 or 8 GAC people or perhaps with 3 or 4. So it depends very much what counts is really that ... parroting that dialogue because it's 2 parties and if ALAC is there, also let's say 3 parties but it's a community dialogue in the end. So I leave it by that, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge, and I'm really excited with a great deal of common it will its we're starting with, so very optimistic. I can see no further requests for the floor so I think maybe we're good to move on.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. I just want to echo sort of your impatience and to streamline the process and not over complicate things I think we're essentially talking about a series of meetings together to try and figure out a way forward under some working assumptions given by the framing paper, this would seem like despite the importance of the topic something that is quite straightforward from a purely organizational perspective. So I think we are all impatient of starting so formally depending what we discuss on Wednesday you will receive a letter, so hopefully next week if should council agree, that we should do so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Great. Thank you very much, Philippe. And just for the sake of correcting the transcripts the previous speaker was Philippe and not United Kingdom. So if we can move to the following slide and we have the GNSO guidance process, and we were asking if the GNSO Council could explain what is the aim, the basic process as well as the time-line for such a process, and how many interested GAC members -- and how -- I'm sorry, how many interested GAC members take part in the GNSO guidance process? Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe. I don't know how I should take that. But I'll take it as a compliment.

Yes, the GGP the GNSO guiding process which is sort of the counter example of what we were talking just a minute ago with Jeff and the fact that not everything is formally a PDP, and so that's very light weight procedure that we have at our disposal within the GNSO process toolkit, if you see what I mean, and that stemmed from the work of the ODP on SubPro, and the fact that by reviewing the work of the final report where a number of topics have been identified as needing further work within the IRT the ODP team and through our liaison came back to council with a

question as to how those could be addressed, and that maybe that would be given the nature of those topics.

That would be difficult to deal with within an IRT, so the question was put to council with the list of topics which there's a number of topics -- about a dozen of them -- which goes from applicant support to things like threshold to community priority evaluation the quick look mechanism and the appeal to that etcetera. So there's dozen of them, and the ODP came back through the liaison to council to determine how those issues could be dealt with.

So moving forward council is considering this very versatile process that we have at our disposal, the GNSO guidance process to address those through some representative model within our community to provide guidance on those topics.

That's a proposal that is put to council. It's only for discussion during this week's meeting so there's still work to be done. So that is where we are there's a consent of the within the draft process that we have, a consent of a steering group that would oversee potentially oversee the work of --- work streams on those specific topics. Certainly, as we move along those elements will need to be clarified but that's essentially the idea.

There's also possibly for those work streams to be -- those teams to be made of -- to consist of subject experts, all solicit subject experts although that would need to be clarified as we move on. So, that is off the top of my head what I can offer

If anyone would like to add anything, Jeff, please do.

JEFF NEUMANN:

Sure. So all these acronyms I know get really confusing so to try to help a little bit the guidance process was created to -- for the GNSO to provide feedback or guidance on issues whether they were related to policy or implementation, so the question that came back from ICANN to the GNSO was that the final report had said that this work needed to be done as, by an IRT an implementation review team and they said it may involve policy so is it really for an implementation team which is led by ICANN staff? Is it really appropriate for that work that you called for to be done, to be led by ICANN staff as opposed to a community mechanism?

And, the easiest way to deal with that, because as people know in this community, someone could call something policy, another person could call it implementation, the reality is they're both right and they're both wrong. There is no right clear line so with

a guidance process it doesn't matter whether it's someone calls it policy and another person calls it implementation lineup.

It was designed to handle that kind of thing. It's also more flexible so it could be established in a representative model. It could be established as an expert only model. It could involve different groups outside the -- it's meant to be flexible and respond to individual situations so that's what makes it different than a PDP, a policy development process which is very structured, has very strict requirements because the output of those could affect existing contracts.

So the formality of a PDP is not needed when you're talking about new gTLDs, and trying to figure out those kind of processes like applicant support. It has nothing to do with -- I saw a comment in the chat -- that said this is an important issue. Doesn't it have to be a PDP? And the answer on that is importance of a subject is not determined what's in a PDP versus something else.

It's again whether it impacts an existing contract, so by putting it into a guidance process we are not saying it's not important. It is, applicant support as recognized by all, by the GAC the GNSO and the ALAC as being extremely important. And so if this is put into a GGP by the GNSO Council it's not a comment on the importance.

It's very important. It's just a more flexible way to deal with it. I hope that makes sense.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe, and Jeff for the thorough explanation. Any follow-up from GAC colleagues or any questions?

Okay. Seeing none I think we are good to move on, Philippe. Okay? So let's go to the following slide please, and, yeah. This is on DNS Abuse, so as you can see there is no concrete question here, but the GAC continues to have a great interest in DNS Abuse, and as we agreed we welcome any update from the GNSO small group on introduce subject to development. So anything developed?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. I'll happily hand over to Mark or Paul as co-conveners of the small team to give us an update if that's okay?

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you. This is Mark speaking, esteemed members of the GNSO ones well, so I am one of the co-chairs for this process. The other one is Paul McGrady right here and this is a relatively recent

team. We have been convened for the past few months, and our task was fundamentally to discuss what does the community mean when it says we need to tackle DNS Abuse?

Does that carry any policy implications that the GNSO can actually act upon or is that something that is more you know abstract, something that the actors need to think about, so our main mission has to be been to try to understand what does that mean? And to do that we carried out a community outreach of which the GAC very kindly participated.

We received your reply and it has been considered along with all of the feedback of the community. We have been over the course of the past 3 or 4 months going through all those comments and trying to extract what are the feelings of the community and what are actionable points within ICANN's remit out of the questions that have been raised.

If I may provide a very brief summary of findings, not too exhaustive because there have been indeed many contributions, but some of the key outcomes have been that even if we take this to a PDP or a similar process, the community want it to be very focussed, very narrow, it wants to be something that's faster. So we have been discussing the different models that could take

place. What are the questions that would be better suited for that direction?

It has also been raised that there is a bit of a problem of understanding and communication around this issue. There are many different sub-groups and many different initiatives going on at the same time about the same question, and this forum. This particular small group has served as a very convenient place for members of different groups from ICANN to meet together and exchange ideas that have been developed within those contexts so this has been very helpful in advancing the different groups and their standing of this question.

I feel that through this collaboration that we had throughout the non-contracted party house and the contracted party house we have been arising at some interesting points together and that has helped immensely advance the process, so we have been exploring questions from several different angles and that's also pretty good and finally, one point that's very important is that if we are not exactly pursuing certainly options through PDP then what other avenues are available to the community? What could we do as a community to reach possible outcomes that don't fit the scope of the PDP?

Reminding everyone that is a small team we do not represent the GNSO Council's voice. We represent a group of individuals very focused on the subject who wants to try to reach regions to provide the regional council to the best of our abilities so that they can act as they see better fit, and try to advance these questions. So, so far we have finished the actual review of the comments, and we have moved into talking to ICANN compliance.

Now, this was a very fruitful chat, and I would like to invite those who are very interested in this subject to join us on the 16th during our formal group session in which we will try to dive more deeply in our talk with compliance. What came out of that. The conclusions that we have reached together and the hopefully the members of ICANN compliance will be -- as well to carry out the dialogue but to summarize briefly they have a certain understanding of the contracts that is within that understanding.

It is being enforced and this is perfectly reasonable, but perhaps as a community we might be looking forwards those contracts in different ways depending where we stand in the community. And about how they are being forced or what we would like them to be interpreted as much that's something we need to discuss as a community as well.

Now that we have carried out all the discussion that we have back and forth we in dented -- we had an aggressive time-line we wanted between ICANN73 and 74 to be able to deliver the results of this and we have managed to do that. The team members have been incredible. We were setting ourselves another aggressive time-line between 74 and 75. We want to have at least a very solid basis for a recommendation. Hopefully deliver them but not make any promises but we want to have a very solid basis for what we recommend to the GNSO Council and that leaves us open for the feedback during the time. So it's not necessarily a closed process, so if any GAC colleagues during this time would like to manifest an opinion they're free to communicate with the chair of the GNSO, and by elector, by whatever means they find more suitable.

To kind of conclude this very broad presentation, I would like to say that moving forward we are looking towards continuing to integrate different points of view on this, and we know that the GAC has recommended in several of its Communiques actions to be taken in relation to the DNS Abuse, and we would request that perhaps now that the subject is maturing we try to understand better what we mean by tackling DNS Abuse. What exactly do we as a community expect as the next step to are that. What are we looking for, if we can start trying to think together about that

direction that would be ideal, and definitely something we can work with.

So for now I wrap this up, and we are open to any questions that the community may have. I open the floor now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mark, for this thorough update, and for the kind invitation extended to GAC interested members to follow the discussion. We will be following closely the results of the working group, and looking forward to the progress of the group. Any follow-up questions or comments from GAC colleagues? So seeing none I think we're good to move on to the following slide which I believe is on accuracy.

So, what is the GNSO Council's appreciation of the advancement of the scoping exercise on accuracy of registration data? And is the GNSO Council expecting the work to be concluded within a reasonable time-line given the submitted change of project request?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe so I'll hand over to Olga Cavalli to give an update of the progress of the accuracy scoping team which was convened, was it sometime last year probably? And

indeed there's a change request that is on the way, and some of the assignments have been completed whilst others are being worked on by the small team and for this I'll hand over happily to Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Philippe and colleagues. My name is Olga Cavalli. I am a liaison on the GNSO and the scoping team is chaired by ... I think there is a slide that has a kind of a general overview of our work. Maybe you can show it to the audience? So the scoping team started in its deliberations in October 2021 with the review of available resources on this topic.

The team has focused its work on 2 main assignments. Number 1, enforcement and reporting and number 2, measurement of accuracy basically establishing what the current status is. So as part of the work the scoping team has engaged with ICANN org to better understand the implementation and enforcement of existing requirements as well as reporting. Based on this review the analysis as well as the input provided by ICANN org in relation to the accuracy reporting system, the scoping team is considering the following, how the current state of registration data accuracy can be measured, and, whether the identified objectives of the existing accuracy requirements are being met?

The scoping team identified a number of proposals for possible data gathering, such as conducting registrar survey and re-starting the Accuracy Reporting System, ARS. The ICANN Board has directed the ICANN org to undertake to the -- this is difficult. EDPB European Data Protection Board whether or not ICANN org has a legitimate purpose that is proportionate for example. Not over weighted by the privacy rights of the individual data subjects to request contracted parties, to provide access to individual records as well as bulk access to registration data in order to review the accuracy of registration data.

And this issue the scoping team focused on those proposals that do not involve access to registration data. The scoping team also had further conversations with ICANN org on the development of scenarios for the EDPB and expected next steps. Finally, the scoping team is expected to review whether there are any issues that are not addressed by the existing accuracy requirements and how such issues can be demonstrated and confirmed through data gathering and analysis.

Let me tell you that once additional data has been gathered the scoping team is expected to assess the data and commence its work and assignment 3 effectiveness and 4, impact on improvements so the scoping team is expected to deliver its are write up for assignment one and 2 to the GNSO Council hopefully

shortly after ICANN74, and it may need a pause to work while the outreach to the EPDP is under way and other venues for that gather and explore and work and assignments 3 and 4. Thank you very much and if there are any questions we can address them. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olga. I think this is very clear, any questions or comments?

I see Velimira, European Commission. Go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Olga, for your very clear presentation. It's definitely helpful I think to put everybody well knowledgeable about how the work in the accuracy is advancing.

I just wanted the possibly to make a one clarification where the question was coming from several of the GAC topic leads on this, let's that say that we were a bit surprised to see there this is a dependency created between the questions that are intended to be send to the European Data Protection Board and the work of the scoping team on accuracy. And the main reason for this is that one of the main issues it seems in many of the discussions is the issue of measurement of accuracy.

And, we have the impression that we are in a kind of a vicious circle, unfortunately, at least from GAC topic leads perspective in the sense that you know several years ago there were already some numbers in some of the reports on the level of in accuracy, I know there is no consensus among the different stakeholder groups of the ICANN community, on this but however we were hoping with the very clear assignments of the GNSO Council that we could advance I on would say more timely rather than creating dependencies on questions in relation to the accuracy simply because it seems ... starting point already for a number of years, and now it seems again to be a kind of a blockage point.

So from that perspective, and apologies if this is not necessarily a question which you can directly respond, but we are wondering whether the GNSO Council will be reflecting what might be the most efficient, you know and timely way to take it from there because I would say that sending questions to the European Data Protection Board also carries the risk if not necessarily having clearances or of sending questions that might not necessarily be of the scope, so for us this is somewhat creating you know, further risk in terms of continuing the work. So thank you for this. I hope it was clear.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Velimira, for your comments. We have been talking outside the group to clarify these issues. I will pass your concern to the group. As I said, I am just a liaison, but we will work with the leadership team and with the chair to address your concerns. Thank you very much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. This is Philippe. Thanks, Velimira, for this and it wasn't a question so I'm not going to address it in as much as that's more related to the work of the accuracy scoping team in itself.

I just want to say that as Olga just said the first 2 assignments will be sent, the result or conclusions of the first 2 assignments will be sent to council and should the team decide to an opportunity for them to reach out to council to have some views on this particular topic. So procedurally there's a way. That's up to the team to decide. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olga and Philippe, and thanks to GAC colleagues who remember to raise hands in the Zoom room. Next Susan, U.S. and then Nigel, U.K. Susan, please go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to Olga and Philippe and Mark for the updates here, appreciate the discussion, the U.S. remains committed to contributing to the scoping team's efforts to understand the current issues around accuracy and whether further policy development should be recommended to the GNSO Council, specifically we would welcome further investigation into the legal considerations around increasing third party accountability for accuracy, and whether and how ICANN's Accuracy Reporting System can be re-started to provide updated data regarding accuracy.

I'd like to thank also my colleague, Velimira, for her comments regarding the letter that has been proposed. Might not characterize it as creating a dependency in terms of the issues that the letter proposed. I think that normally these scoping teams as part of these -- as part of the entire exercises questions do arise, and so we look forward to discussing this further within the relevant GAC sessions and with our colleagues from the commission and others. Thank you again.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Susan. Nigel, please, U.K., Go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you very much. And I'll be very brief. Really to -- I mean to thank Olga for the report, to thank the team for their work and for the progress that is being made. This is a particularly important topic I think for some of us governments, and I can't speak for other governments. I've tried but one listens -- but no, I mean it's important because I think it's something that is understood. The accuracy of data is something that is understood by politicians. It's understood by officials. We all went through the Mickey Mouse episodes in the early days of registration of domain names where people gave ridiculous names for their you know for the registrant or domain names, and so it's important that we work on this, and we give urgency to this topic because it's one of the, if you like, credibility points for the multistakeholder model at ICANN, and you know, I know I'm not teaching any one anything that they don't understand on this.

So, so I think in terms of going forward I understood there might be a survey of the registrars to understand sort of more the facets in terms of the accuracy of the data they hold, but we would certainly like to as Velimira from the European Commission has mentioned we'd certainly like to ensure that this work can go ahead, you know, alongside the legal questions that ICANN have asked are the EPDP, thank you very much.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Nigel. I think all the scoping team and the GNSO find this issue very very well vent. I would like to stress the fact in the scoping team we have representatives from the GAC, from other SOs and AC and also different stakeholder groups and so it's not limited to only GAC members. So your comments and participation is very much welcomed. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olga, and obviously a topic of great interest to the GAC. Any further requests for the floor okay if not then I think we're good to move onto any other business, and we have identified 3 potential topics if we can go to the next slide, please.

So first, the SSAD light and I this I we agreed that GNSO Council may provide an update as events warrant, so anything specific under this topic

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe here, and for this I'll just hand over since I think we've heard you Sebastian remotely hand over to Sebastian who is vice chair of the GNSO Council for what's now I think has to be called the WHOIS disclosure system, I think you will clarify that Sebastian that's now a trademark from Goran I think.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. He already had his hand up and I apologize that I overlooked your hand Sebastien.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: All good. And I want be able to quote particularly written by Goran. I have to learn the [inaudible] again or the term because we decided not to use an acronym. So just briefly, last time we -- I reported to the GAC I believe that I explained that we are a small team reviewing the SSAD ODA, we were tasked with ensuring that the ODA represented the policy recommendations, and we're also tasked to look at possible outcomes to the ODA given the fact that the pricing and I'm sorry, I've got my 4 year old here -- the pricing of the system that was going to be developed for it was way above expectations.

So we worked as a small team. We worked also with the Board and particularly the GDPR caucus within the Board to come up with solutions to go forward and the solutions we are envisions is one of the SSAD light but indeed ... already started calling the WHOIS disclosure system but essentially it is taking the part of the recommendations that focussed on flowing, sorry, requests from a request to ... the contracted party that to be able to analyze the request and eventually disclose, or not, the corresponding data but in any case responded to the request, and to focus on that

rather than the accreditation which was not only very -- well it was about half of the development of the end product.

More importantly, it was the bulk of the operating cost of the system and very quickly appeared to be redundant in the sense that the contracted parties quickly said they would have to re-- for legal reasons for themselves their own protection would would to, reaccredit every request regardless of ICANN's ... much we had a very good session an hour and a half ago where staff was able to present to us the first ideas or the first solutions that they would have for this SSAD.

And I want to be careful about the terms I'm using right now. It's a solution on paper. And all solutions work so much better on paper, and -- but in very broad light it's solution that is very heavily reliant and based on technology that staff knows and has been using for years, on technology they use for example for the contracted party [inaudible] and that's sort of tools internal tools.

Something that has been tried and tested that they know how to manage, and run and develop on, and so they would be able to work on this purely internally, which also allows us to go and adapt and remain nimble in in the future as this proof of concept is first stab at it that we know that we will work on it -- sorry, I don't know where the emphasis is -- but in any case that we didn't

expect the final product to come out of this immediately, and we want just to test hypothesis, see how we go, correct where we need to correct it, and having been -- having -- being able to do this internally with staff without constantly requiring and relying on external consultants is in my view good news.

The next step on this is before staff actually start working on it and developing -- envision about 6 weeks of work on it and given the fact that there are their slate is not empty in 6 week it's going to have to be taken from other project that is are on going we will be discussing with the GNSO this week how this is handled, and without going to foregone conclusions essentially out of the 3 projects that they raised as being in conflict with this one, there are 2 projects that can be paused with minimum -- I was corrected -- not without any effect, consequences but with minimum consequences on work flows.

And the other project that was flagged is the one of SubPro which has just been discussed, and in principle whilst there's few experts that are -- will have to be pulled out of SubPro in if order to help this new project, the work on SubPro will be able to continue in any case, continue delivering what was meant to be delivered between now and ICANN75.

So these are going to be the discussions we will have during this week. At the end of the week I hope to be able to go back to -- council but to also our colleagues on the Board in order to confirm that we are able to go -- sorry, there's a fly on my camera -- the current, being in the garden, and so yeah, by the end of the week come back to the Board, the council camp back to the Board and understood that the question they asked of us, priorities are cleared and we can continue with the work to this I'm happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, I'll turn my microphone off to let my 4 year old discuss.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sebastian, to you and to your lovely little one. So any comments or questions? Okay. I see -- I'm sorry, I see a hand up in the chat, Netherlands, please, Alisa go ahead.

NETHERLANDS: I was wondering on the SSAD light if we enter this process, and if I understood correctly might ensure a 6 week delay, are you -- to what extent is everybody sure it will remain at a 6 week delay? Or could it become much longer, yeah, thanks.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: This is Sebastien. To be very clear, ICANN staff is estimating 6 weeks the time it will take for them to scope -- this is purely and

paper. To scope the exercise of the SSAD. What it will be, how can it -- how much money will be involved, that sort of exercise, and all this for us to discuss before ICANN -- by ICANN75. There is no development that's going to be triggered before that discussion is had. There -- it is only a scoping exercise. In the meantime -- and this also until ICANN75 I expect, there will be no Board decision on the recommendations. That is, is stalled, and stopped, until we define the path forward.

We look -- we define together the path forward. So this 6 week -- could the 6 weeks last 8? Yes. But in principle we have until ICANN75 I'd like to have some results before in order to be able to prepare. But it's not 6 week -- and then we've broken everything after 7 week if it had it has to be delayed a bit. Again, I would like to have by end of September something to discuss, but in itself it's not those 6 weeks that are delaying the decision process on this, this -- it will be other factors before we go back to the Board and ask them to fully confirm a path forward. I hope that answers your question.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sebastian. I see Alisa nodding here. I see another request for the floor, and we're running out of time, so please go ahead.

BRAZIL: Just quickly, I just want to understand something. Being a proof of concept, this exercise. So it's essentially expect that you validate or not the recommendations but not necessarily to present any sort of alternative much because just to, if you could and elaborate a little more on it aspect. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Excellent point, and we struggled to put a time on this. By proof of consent I think, yeah, it -- it's the proof of the concept of having a centralized system in order to pick up requests, and have them processed that we are trying to get the concept of. That in itself is only a thin part of the total recommendations. So this is not about proving the concept of the recommendation in general. It's just to go back to basic and say -- as opposed to requesting parties going directly to the recommending stars or registries or contracted party, as opposed to going directly is it worth having a centralized system to pick up those requests, and, and pass them through to the relevant party. So that is what we are trying to prove the concept, and I hope that answers your question.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Sebastian. I see nodding here as well. So thank you, Brazil, for the question. So I see we are at the top of the hour, but Philippe, if you agree I don't think there is something concrete for

ICANN priorities. We had it as a place holder because it is a hot topic, and if you allow me quickly on GPI we have exchanged on this at ICANN72, there was a plenary at ICANN73, and we had an our Communique that the GPI framework would be adopted and allied by all ACs and SO.

So that said, how does the GNSO Council see its role in ensuring that public interest concerns are not only considered but also effectively addressed? Is it and does the GNSO Council intend to adapt the GPI framework tool to the GNSO Council's own needs? Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. This is Philippe here. I have to say that we didn't have the opportunity of discussing this within council. In general, speaking personally I don't think we are going to have time to have inputs from individual members of council, but just to say that given the trial, given the topics that we will be discussing together there might be an opportunity of having an input of that nature to the discussion that we will be having. Certainly, we will be up to date to decide there's been a number of elements discussed within the small team relative to definition, for instance, of the closed generics so central that will have to play in that context. Otherwise, generally speaking we didn't have the opportunity of discussing that, so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. I fully understand, and thank you everyone, and apologies for exceeding the time, and apologies for not being able to accommodate everyone who should have been on the head table because of the limited number of seats we are stuck with. So with that again, thanks Philippe, and thanks to all GNSO colleagues and GAC colleagues please be back in the room at half past. Enjoy the break and come back to enjoy even more the GAC social. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]