
ICANN75 | AGM – GAC Preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board and Working Group Updates
Monday, September 19 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

(Recording in progress)

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you very much. Hello and welcome to the GAC preparation for the meeting with the ICANN Board and working group update session on Monday 20 September. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN standards of behavior. During this session questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. If you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those in the GAC room, please remember to raise your hand via the Zoom room. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for the session on the Zoom tool bar.

With that I will hand the floor over to Manal Ismail, GAC chair.
Over to you, Manal, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Julia, and welcome back everyone. I hope you enjoyed your lunch. And as Julia mentioned this is the GAC session to prepare for our bilateral meeting with the Board. We normally -- sorry -- we normally split our bilateral into two parts, one to answer a question or topic proposed by the Board, and one for topics or questions that we posed to the Board. We haven't achieved much I'm afraid to say intersessionally, so I hope we can finalize and conclude our topics or questions to the Board at this session so that Rob can immediately after the session share with the Board so that they can come tomorrow with answers to our questions. So let's go to the following slide please, and this is the goals of the session, and it's for GAC members regarding bilateral meetings with the Board, and we need to review and confirm or revise GAC topics and questions that we would like to share with the Board, and if we go to the following slide this is by way of background to our new GAC colleagues so the GAC bilateral meeting with other community groups of course is a very important part of our regular face-to-face meetings, and during the last two years these bilateral meetings have remained important regular interaction points to preserve and expand GAC connections with the Board, and of course, with other parts of the community too. They can also provide useful venues to highlight and emphasize areas that are likely to be in the GAC Communique.

Recently the GAC has employed targeted topical Q and A agenda approach for these meetings so it's not just only the Board meeting but also, we try to follow the same approach in other bilaterals, with the GNSO and ALAC.

And this helped to focus the GAC preparations and discussions and coordination prior to the individual sessions. This session as I mentioned earlier is an opportunity to confirm the topics that we previously shared with ICANN Board in preparation for this week's meeting so we just highlighted the topics of interest without really specific questions or points of discussion and this is what we will be trying to do throughout this session. If we go to the following slide, please, so this is how we will -- this is the agenda basically of our bilateral with the Board, brief introductions at the beginning, and then a discussion of the Board topic or question to the GAC, and then discussion of GAC topics or questions to the Board, and finally any other business, if any.

Next slide. So, this is the Board question to the GAC, and it reads for ICANN75 the ICANN Board chair has proposed a single topical question for GAC consideration that would cover the first half of the joint meeting at ICANN75, and the question is, what collaborative actions should the community, Board and org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities?

And the similar question has been asked before, and the GAC support staff has helpfully tried to gather previous responses to help us come up with the final points that we would like to share with the Board in response to their -- it's more of a brainstorming question.

So, if we go to the following slide, this is the collective text that Rob has very helpfully compiled on one slide, but we try to split on two slides if we can go to the following slide, please, Gulden. And as said this is extracted from previous points that we shared with the Board.

So, as GAC members have previously stated, the ICANN community -- can we have a larger view of the slide please? As GAC members have previously stated, the ICANN community should prioritize the three priority work areas identified in the 4 June 2020 paper entitled enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model, next steps, as prioritization of work and effective -- and efficient use of resources, precision in scoping the work, consensus, representation, and inclusivity.

So, these are the three topics that the community agreed to prioritize during the exercise of how to enhance the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

Improvements in these areas will enable ICANN's inclusive and representative multistakeholder model to achieve timely and effective outcomes that serve the public interest. The GAC received an update from ICANN org staff on this important work earlier this week and supports the continuation of the various ICANN org efforts under way or starting soon.

Additionally, in the short term, ICANN org staff should consider conducting a community call after each public meeting between so and AC leadership. The whole Board and org executives to reflect on whether the meeting discussions have influenced thinking on any of the community strategic priorities, and this text was submitted by U.K.

So, I'm going to go through the next slide as well, and then we can start discussing how we would like to, to finalize the text on these two slides.

Some members of the GAC have also raised the idea that the committee and other SOs and ACs should consider producing regular reports perhaps two or three times a year on actions they themselves have taken to contribute to progressing strategic community objectives, again, as submitted by U.K.

In order to further progress and achieving the priorities it would also be important to review the policies developed in the past years, define those that are still relevant in view of the current priorities, and focus the work on removing the stumbling blocks for the implementation of these policies.

And this is per European Commission. A cross-community working group could be formed to reflect on possible procedural improvements with the aim of enhancing the policy development and implementation processes within ICANN. Again, as submitted by European Commission.

So, I'll stop here, and ask that we go back to the previous slide and see if you have any comments on the text that was provided by colleagues as well as language extracted by support staff from previous GAC discussions with the Board.

So, any comments or -- and Rob please yeah go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Manal, I don't know if it would be helpful, with you sitting on the Board whether you have any insights from the context of Maarten asking this question and whether that might prompt some additional thoughts from folks. I don't know if there is any

context you think in addition to what's been shared that would be helpful. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, yeah, I think that the Board is trying to reach out to the different parts of the community and see how we can collaborate on achieving the strategic objectives of ICANN as laid out in the ICANN strategic planning document. And they are posing of course this exact same question to different parts of the community so that they can gather input from all the different stakeholders and try to see how we can collaborate more effectively and efficiently to achieve the strategic objectives of ICANN.

And I'm just a little bit worried. I haven't logged into the Zoom room so I'm not sure if we have any requests for the floor from the Zoom room. Just give me a second.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Manal, this is Julia. I can confirm we have no comments.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Julia. Thanks. So, apart from the text on the screen, let me pose the question differently.

How would you like to, to answer this brainstorming question? Any additional ideas to those already displayed on the screen? And I have heard also some interest from GAC colleagues from Brazil that they would like to understand how can we get involved in the strategic planning activity, and I think this may be a good opportunity to pose this question here, and seek clarification from the Board on the exact process to ensure that we can provide input and maybe also try to engage early in the setting of the strategic planning document, and influence the formation of the -- the creation of the plan early on.

So, maybe this is one point that we can add based on discussions with GAC colleagues during the break.

Anything else? Or shall we move to -- so if nothing else, we will -- I will try with Rob to finalize this part, fine tune it, and maybe remove the names of the countries, and have it shared with the ICANN Board as a GAC contribution. Please Brazil, go ahead.

BRAZIL:

Thank you, Manal. Just a general comment on this paragraph suggested by the U.K. Nothing against it. My only concern is that we're always adding procedural layers to processes that are already complex so just to reflect a little bit if there is an actual advantage in recommending this -- an additional meeting or to

discuss something later on, as I think many members have pointed out in previous occasions, a constant complaint that we hear is that we are too -- GAC processes are too heavy in terms of procedures and rules and, etcetera, etcetera.

And I think we should be very careful when we suggest adding another layer to any sort of process. Just thinking on this. Not against specifically this point, but I think we have to think a little bit better perhaps, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil, and I see your point. I wonder whether U.K. is -- I'm not sure, is Nigel on-line? I know he's not in person. Yes, please U.K. Ros, go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, sorry. I had my hands up in the Zoom room but thank you, Brazil, for your constructive comments. I think this proposal was really put forward in the interests of transparency and having an open discussion in this instance, but the point is very well noted. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, U.K. you are okay with removing the text?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, in this instance.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for confirming, and apologies for just being connected to the Zoom room right now, so I will be keeping an eye on the hands up, and I see Rob, and then Jorge. Rob, please go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. I would normally yield the floor to Jorge, but I wanted to ask a question first, if I may. Robert Hoggarth, for the record. What I attempt to do and what some of you who are new may not fully appreciate about this process, what we try to do – and you'll see this for the communicate as well -- is that we are editing the document live in a Google environment, and when I heard the comment from Brazil, my -- just the initial thought in terms of reaction was, instead of eliminating the entry, was just to add the be mindful of other community obligations language.

As I interpret it -- and please correct me, Brazil -- it was more a concern of introducing new layers of work. I'm sure if that was what the U.K. actually contemplated. So, I had already done that based on your conversation. I'm happy to propose squaring out this paragraph but wanted to raise that before that was done. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. And let me know if there are any immediate reactions to this, and meanwhile I'm giving the floor to Jorge, please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, thank you very much, Manal. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record.

Just a question, or a request for clarification. In the question from the Board, isn't there any more information on which strategic priorities they are referring to? Probably they are putting this in the context of the strategic plan, but maybe it would help if we knew more exactly what the context of the reference is.

I know that Rob already raised this a little bit before, but I'm not sure if, if we are missing something here about what is the exact reference in the question of the Board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. So let me try to maybe be more clear on this. So, there were no specific priorities during the Board discussion on this question, rather they had the full strategic plan in mind, and the Board brainstorming on this was related to the different priorities on the strategic plan, and how can the different parts of the community either collaborate or provide input on each, and the role of -- of course, discussion within the Board was talking about the role of the Board on each of these priorities, and how they could contribute with the community, and, of course, from this side of the table it's the other way around.

The different priorities, and how the community can collaborate with the ICANN Board and org on these topics. So, it could be that we see ourselves able to contribute to a specific priority on the strategic plan, or it could be general guidance on how efficient collaboration between the GAC, the Board and org could take place.

I hope I'm able to shed some light on the context, and please let me know if it is still vague. And seeing -- Velimira, please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: It was more a reaction to what Jorge suggested in the question because I'm not quite sure that this is the way we have read it in the sense that the way we have cultivated to the question was much more linked to the area that were identified you know, in the questions circulated to us so basically it's on the next slide. So, I'm just mindful of the clarification of this point in case we need to adjust also our possible contribution to the Board in this respect.

You know, basically I'm referring to the points that are in the bullets. I thought that actually in the question we were supposed also to contribute, you know how to, how to achieve those three, but now I understand in the discussion between me and Jorge that possibly we might also be looking throughout the entire document again and see what are the strategic priorities.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, yes, it's either on specific topics from the strategic plan, or effectiveness of the collaboration between org, Board and community, and obviously in relation to the three topics that

were highlighted by the community as an important aspect of enhancing the multistakeholder model.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you for the clarification. In this case it does make sense to keep, I think, what we have proposed. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry, can you speak closer? And this is European Commission, not Netherlands.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Velimira Grau Nemiguentcheva, European commission. In this case it still makes sense to keep our proposal, if of course GAC colleagues do not have anything to add.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Velimira. So, thanks to European Commission, and again we have the question on the screen if there are any additional points, we would like to reflect. And I see Jorge's hand up. So, thank you.

SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, again for the record, and thank you for providing more context about what the

Board is referring to. I'm just having a look at the, at the ICANN strategic plan for fiscal years 2021, 2025 and, of course, I don't think we can go into a lot of details in this response, but if we look at the strategic objectives, you have subject matter or substantive objectives around security, ICANN's governance, the unique identifier systems, geopolitics and financials.

The response, as we have it, I think more or less addresses the questions about ICANN's governance, how we can work better together, and this I think relates well to how the question is framed.

But maybe we want to also stress a bit the special role the GAC has regarding the questions that are being framed as geopolitics in the sense that of course it would be good if the Board and the community relies on the GAC for considering geopolitical issues that impact ICANN's mission, and that we are of course here to help in, in addressing those aspects and to, to provide ICANN and the community at large with the government perspective about these developments which happen to a large degree also in the intergovernmental relations.

So maybe there could be some, some reference to this underlining our special role in that field of the strategic plan.
Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jorge. Excellent points. So, let's add something along the lines that Jorge mentioned, that the key role of the GAC in geopolitical issues, and the role we can play to inform the -- not only the Board but also the community.

And thank you, Julia, for sharing the link of the strategic plan in the Zoom chat, so please colleagues, if you would like to refer to the strategic plan, you will find the link in the chat. And now, please Ros, U.K. go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM: Ros KennyBirch, U.K. Thank you, Manal. Just going back to Rob's point, thank you very much for adding that text mindful of other community obligations. I think this does show that this meeting could be considered and planned according to resource constraints, and therefore, we are happy to keep this proposed text and keep our proposal bearing in mind that again it will be considered in the context of being mindful of other obligations and being a consideration. Thanks very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Ros, and could it be helpful if we, regarding the same text if we could not necessarily say -- a call after each public meeting but say, for example, have check points to make

sure I mean just to make sure that we are not enforcing a certain number of calls -- and we keep it a little bit flexible but at the same time we have check points? And I see you nodding, so thank you.

UNITED KINGDOM: Happy with that proposal, thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ros. And so thanks to U.K., and I see the Netherlands in the chat also agreeing to Jorge's comments, so thanks Netherlands and thanks Switzerland.

Any other comments on this part? Okay. If not, then I can work with Rob on fine tuning the text, and we will be sharing this tomorrow during the meeting, not necessarily -- we don't need necessarily to share this before meeting with the Board, but let's now move onto the part on our questions to the Board, or points that we would like to discuss with the Board.

Yes, Rob, please go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Robert Hoggarth from ICANN GAC support staff. I'm very sorry for not using the Zoom room to raise my hand. I quickly did that but that broke protocol. My apologies.

Manal, if I can have Gulden scroll down just a couple of slides, I did attempt to put in some language -- just one slide back, Gulden -- oh, no, I'm sorry one more down. I had a space available slide for additional drafting and editing and I've added a couple of additional entries. One was to capture the question that you had phrased earlier in the call, and so I just typed that in, and then I tried to conjure up something that reflected Jorge's wise counsel.

As usual, I fall far short of completely voicing his brilliance, but Jorge, if you can take a look at this and perhaps suggest how it might be edited maybe that could save you, Manal, some editing on the back end. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. Thank you for doing this realtime, and it's definitely good to confirm since we have already proposed text on the screen. So, Jorge, if this reflects what you suggested earlier, and the text reads the GAC recognizes its key role in understanding and advising the Board in the context of ICANN strategic geopolitical goals and is happy to do that work with the Board at any time.

And, meanwhile, there is also -- and I think this could go within the, the core of our response, and maybe we can up with a

question on how can the GAC, as a committee or individual GAC members get more involved in ICANN strategic planning?

So, so, yeah, maybe just we can switch order if it makes sense to GAC colleagues. So, we can provide our thoughts, and then end up by asking how can we get involved in the upcoming cycle?

And I see some nodding in the room. Just trying to read Jorge in the chat. Thanks, if you can send me the text -- okay so thank you for the offer, Jorge to finalize the text, and thank you Rob for confirming that you will share it with Jorge so that he can work on the -- on fine tuning the editing. This would be very helpful. Thank you.

And, yes, please Gulden. Oh, we have a hand -- and Brazil, please go ahead.

BRAZIL:

Thank you very much. I think that was the idea. Just to complement that the first point, perhaps add the question to the Board regarding where they are in terms of this plan because I understand that this has already started. So, to know what already exists in terms of preparation for this next strategic plan so I think -- two things. To know where we are and then how we can get more involved.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Perfect. Noted so two parts to the question, where, where the Board is regarding their strategic -- the new strategic planning cycle, and how the GAC can contribute to this cycle?

And I see Rob already taking care of this on the screen. So please if you can confirm that -- yeah, please Rob, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: If I can also -- Robert Hoggarth ICANN staff. If I can also add to the discussion about the GAC getting involved in priorities, a number of you may recall recent e-mail from me asking for volunteers to potentially contribute to a prioritization effort. Manal, I recall that you and Susan Chalmers of the United States participated in a pilot effort with respect to that, more recently as that work has continued Ros from the U.K. and you are now playing a role in some of those discussions and if Luciano or someone else from your delegation would be interested I'm sure the GAC chair would be more than happy to turn over her alternate responsibilities to you to participate in that effort. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. For the reminder, and I see nodding from Brazil, so I hope it's okay if you would like to -- this would be perfect. Being the alternate representative on behalf of the GAC regarding the prioritization of the GAC work and thank you for confirming. Perfect. Thank you, Rob, for the reminder.

And I saw a hand up from Jaideep earlier, but it went--

INDIA: Jaideep Kumar, from India for the record. This is a question we are posing and the additional paragraph to add to the response to that question is that the intention? Because I'm -- the question is on strategic planning whereas in the later -- the paragraph on additional paragraph to add to the response it's for ICANN strategic geopolitical goals. So, I was wondering whether we are referring going to restrict to the geopolitical goals only or general engagement we are wanting to commit ourselves that we would like to be engaged in the entire strategic planning and not just on geopolitical goals.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, the part on geopolitical roles -- goals has to do with the current strategic planning. It has several pillars, one of which is the geopolitical pillar, and Switzerland suggested that we

highlight the key role that GAC can play to achieve this specific strategic goal.

But ultimately, we are asking about the next cycle, and where are we in it in terms of time-line, and how the GAC can contribute to this new cycle, so apologies if it is a bit confusing, and that's why I was suggesting to switch order, so that we can provide our thoughts on how we can collaborate in terms of the current strategic planning, and then pose a question on the coming one.

So, just doing a time check -- and I think in the remaining 30 minutes, maybe we can see our questions to the Board, but first I have Rob, and --

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I'm sorry, that's an old hand.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Oh, old hand. So, Charles, please Canada go ahead.

CANADA: Thank you very much. Charles Noir for Canada. Talking about how we might be involved in this next round of planning, I'm curious if anyone recalls the extent to which we were involved and how we were involved as a GAC in the previous cycle, not that

we need a complete history, but I would be interested to understand what our previous engagement was, or how the board engaged with us, and we with them. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada, and let me -- I hope my memory serves me well, and I'm sure Rob would help me if not -- so the exercise starts bottom up, so we have a brainstorming exercise on trends that the community sees, so each, each SO and AC they do their own brainstorming on things they believe is trending. For example, geopolitics or any emerging technologies that for example we see threatening or useful to ICANN's work, so it's more of brainstorming on the trends, and then these trends get prioritized by the committee, or supporting organization or advisory committee, and then they start collecting everything from the community, and working on the prioritization based on, on how it got prioritized by the community, and finally try to plan the strategic document -- strategic planning document based on the trends they got, bottom up from the community, and then they put it up for public comments.

I hope this is accurate. We are going to seek further clarification on the process during our bilateral with the Board, but at least this is what I recall historically in the previous cycle. And again, I stand to be corrected.

I have Egypt next, Christine and then Rob.

EGYPT: Christine Arida, Egypt for the record. I would like to seek clarification on the geopolitical strategic goal part. And while I do agree with Jorge that's an important area that GAC could help with; I would like to understand do we mean to get involved as GAC? Or as individuals GAC members? What's the proposal here?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, I'm happy to try and -- Jorge if you would like to elaborate, please feel free to chime in. So, we normally are flexible whether input could be submitted by an individual GAC member, or as a community collectively as a committee. And I think here if we are going to provide input or updates to advise the Board or the community, it would probably be on individual basis regarding developments that are taking place nationally.

Whether we can submit -- a GAC, or there is a channel for individual governments to do that, I'm not really sure, but again, as I said, when -- the strategic planning itself is general on trends, but the ongoing geopolitical developments naturally emerges at a national level, and it is good to be brought to the attention of other colleagues here and maybe beyond the GAC to the

community, and I also note that ICANN started organizing the geopolitical forum for like, two, three times now, and there is one also on Thursday.

And they do continuous updates to a web page as well. So maybe individual input from governments could feed into, or inform this web page, and then be brought to the attention of the wider ICANN community. Again, I'm speculating, and trying to--

EGYPT: Can I come back?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, please.

EGYPT: The reason I'm asking that and I'm seeing Jorge in the chat is saying he means as GAC. It's because in the strategic plan there is reference to actual legislations in the individual areas, and I fully agree that it could be also brought -- or maybe inputted from individual GAC members, but if we're going to tackle that as a GAC, I think we should have some mechanism because usually geo-political issues could tend to become very difficult to get

consensus on, and, and in that case, I think it's important that we know exactly how they are going to do that.

Is it proactively identifying priorities or hot issues or is it more reactive looking into what's coming up and individual members chime in with their input? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Christine, and I think it's a good point, and maybe a good discussion to have here within the GAC, and meanwhile I'm just seeing the queue. Also, we have Rob. We have Slava and we have Nicholas so Rob first and then I'll follow the order. Please Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. I just wanted to call folks' attention in response to Canada's question. I put the link in the chat of the GAC comments on the ICANN 2020 to 2025 strategic plan that were filed back in 2019. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Rob, and so Russia, please. Slava, go ahead.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION : I have a question about ICANN strategic geopolitical goal. Has ICANN especial geopolitical goals or we should use more challenge, geopolitical challenges?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry, Slava, I didn't get the question if you can repeat again.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I said, is it the right approach we talk about geopolitical goals. Has ICANN especial geopolitical goals, or we should talk about challenges.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you, Slava, and I think -- I'm not sure how exactly it is referred to in the strategic document itself. I see your point. You're suggesting that instead of geopolitical goal they refer to geopolitical challenges, and frankly, I'm -- as I said I'm not sure of the exact language, so maybe we can check, and we can try to influence this in the new cycle, as Brazil were suggesting.

So... we are talking now about the current strategic plan, so it's difficult to make any proposals for this current one that is already adopted and being deployed, but again, the new cycle would definitely be open for suggestions, so thank you for flagging this, and just we need to make sure also the exact language used.

I have -- I'm sorry, I have Paraguay. I have Brazil. Then I have Egypt, and then we need to move on for the sake of time to address the questions we want to pose to the Board. So, Nicholas, please go ahead.

PARAGUAY:

This is Nick Caballero, for the record, from Paraguay. I recommended -- I suggest erasing the words in parentheses or individual GAC members in order to avoid any kind of confusion or any kind of misunderstanding. Because I absolutely concur with what my distinguished colleague from Egypt suggested. So, would that be okay for the -- for the GAC as a whole? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nicholas, and any objections to deleting the reference to individual GAC members?

We don't need to commit right now. I think we should be flexible, and definitely if an individual GAC member wants to channel something, they can do that through the GAC, or again individually without necessarily referring to this now, so let's delete it, and I think also Jorge confirmed that the intention was collective, GAC as a committee.

Brazil, please go ahead.

BRAZIL:

Sorry to take the floor again. I understood Nico was referring to the other but not to that one. Not that one, yeah, yeah because -- well, I don't know if -- would leave perhaps the possibility open that members can contribute somehow to this process. I'm not sure -- or I will make a point but perhaps leave it how can the GAC and not as a committee. But leave it open the possibility as a committee or its members maybe more flexible but won't make a point of it.

I just want to comment on the second paragraph. I think it's a complex discussion, and yes understand we are trying to reflect something that is already in the strategic plan, so it's not a matter of discussing it -- it is already there so it's not much one can do about it at this point, and I think we are living in a very politically charged time in history, let's say, and I think it's better to have the discussion even if you don't have consensus than leave to the Board to take its decisions or take the direction it thinks is the best without counting on some sort of advice or at least having the context of the debates that can be -- we can have in this specific space.

So... I think it's important to have a mention. We agree it's important to have a mention about the key GAC key role in

discussing those topics understanding that having consensus might be something very difficult to achieve depending on how the discussion is conducted. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil, and, in fact, I thought the reference to individual GAC members was in the second part regarding the geopolitical issues, and the feedback that individual governments could -- or the input, I mean that individual governments could bring into the geopolitical discussions, and definitely on the first part we are working as a committee. So, if this -- yeah, sorry. So, with that, I think Paraguay this is an old hand, right? Egypt, is this a new hand? Please go ahead.

EGYPT: I'm not going to take more time on that topic for the sake of moving on just to say that I think we can still do something within this current strategic plan because the goal actually talks about identifying and addressing, addressing issues, geopolitical issues in terms of again to answer Russia challenges and opportunities.

So, I mean, we can do that as a GAC, for the coming years, yeah, I don't see why not. It might prove challenging as my colleague from Brazil mentioned but we can still try to do this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. Noted. And I have next Iran and -- I'm trying to move on, but I see also Indonesia. So, we will be moving on afterwards. Please. Iran, please. Hossein.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. Hossein from Iran, for the record. My comment question is general as well. I already type it in the chat, but as far as it didn't receive enough attention. I'm like sharing it with everybody. Just for my information, or maybe you can consider it as a recommendation. Is there any document or somehow a master list of all contributions GAC has already done to ICANN Board?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm not sure about the format we have as an output to the trending exercise, but if we can find this output -- because we normally do it either on Jamboard if we were working on-line, or on a whiteboard we split into breakout groups, so I'll try to see how this was integrated and if it is available, we can share it. We will share it with the group, and I see already Rob has a response, so please Rob. Go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. There are two ways to answer that question. One is if you're talking about all of the comments that the GAC has made there is a page on the GAC website. I put the link in the chat just now. If you ever want to ask us from staff about providing a compilation of particular comments on various topic matters or subjects, we are happy to do that as well. In the short term though if you consult the link, I just put in the page you will see a variety of topics that the GAC has commented on.

In terms of Manal's reflection in reference to strategic planning input, or other input with respect to evolution of the multistakeholder model, which could also arguably be a part of strategic planning in some sense, you can also find those on that public comments page. Again, at any time GAC support staff is happy to help any of you do some of that research. But you're also welcome to do some research on the website, and then get to us about any particular issues you may have. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob. And interesting discussion but we need to move on so Ashwin, please if you can keep it short, Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Manal. The interesting one is about the strategic issues planning, and also geopolitical things. I think I just wonder how the individual countries can put the -- what to call it -- the issues in this field? There are so many issues, and every country might have different issues from other countries, just like we have geographic names problem. We have geographic names issue, but we have sensitive names issue.

We also have what was it -- the future development in, in telecommunication using the space based satellite for example which might have disruption on our telecommunications operators in Indonesia. Not only in Indonesia but also in other countries. How it will be connected with ITU regulations because satellites will go directly to our handphone, not through numbering but through IP numbers and we will have to do the IP communication so that will have a big disruption on our telecommunications operator all over in many countries so that is kind of things, strategic things might be discussed in a -- in a -- they may happen in the near future thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Indonesia, and indeed, in the -- I mean, we will need to prioritize and see in geopolitical things that is in relation to ICANN work, and this may be another long discussion that we might not be able of course to cover now, but I would like

us to move onto questions that we need to pose to ICANN Board so if there are any -- if there are not any further comments on the text we see on the screen, I would like us to move to the next slide, please.

So, the -- yeah, so these are the suggested topic areas that GAC members have expressed interest to discuss with the Board. So, I'm just seeking clarification whether there are specific talking points or specific questions that colleagues would like to raise with the Board. First, was the GAC advice, and methods for Board GAC dialogue on the handling of GAC advice in the context of the new round of new gTLDs, the next round of new gTLDs, and that is put forward by the U.S. and Brazil.

And I understand this is what we have been promised as a document to describe how previous GAC advice, and early warnings have been handled during the first round so that it can inform the GAC during the upcoming round, right?

And I see U.S. nodding, so -- yes, Rob and then Niue. Rob, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. I just want to prevent a little bit of telephone tag going on in terms of expectations. I have taken it upon myself to reach out to ICANN org staff to have a conversation about what

the expectations were out of I guess it was a Board workshop back-to-back in the January February time-frame, and the ICANN org staff is talking about how to if fulfill that request, apparently there is not an existing document that reflects that, so they are looking into how to provide information in this area for the GAC to consider before the next round thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Yeah, indeed, there is nothing ready that could be shared right away, but I understand they offered to go through the exercise, and do the compilation, and share with us what happened during the first round to inform our participation to the second round. Please, Niue, go ahead.

NIUE: There is one question I would like to add, and that is whether – I've said it before and it has been said so many times.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If you can speak into the microphone.

NIUE: Within ICANN and it is basically a geopolitical question, does national law supersede ICANN Bylaws?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I think we had the same question a couple of weeks ago during ICANN 75.

NUIE: But we didn't get a reply.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, why should we expect a different thing this time?

NUIE: Because it has been said very many times and it's off the record, but†--

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yeah, I mean, I mean if we posed the question before, and the answer is already documented in the transcripts that are attached to the GAC Communique of ICANN75, then frankly, I don't feel the need to reiterate the same question, but I'm flexible to see if any comments or reactions to this? Denmark.

DENMARK: Yes, thank you. I will not react to the specific, but I think we should -- Finn Pedersen, Denmark. We should try to limit the amount of questions and if there's urgent need to have this

maybe it could put -- be put to the ICANN Board in writing, and there might be written answer to that. Not to have a discussion -- we have already gone to discuss the first point and it took a long time here and I have difficulties to see that we can cope with six point or seven points. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Denmark, for the helpful and constructive suggestion, and I see Niue nodding so I'll take it as the -- the suggested way forward, and let's go to the second point which is Ukraine support, and we had a question from U.K. on ICANN support for Ukraine, and it included Ukraine's request for increasing Starlink supply and I'd rather keep the question generic, if okay with the U.K., and I see nodding so instead of asking about specifics, we will keep it generic asking about the status or seeking update on support that has been provided to Ukraine.

I see Brazil, please go ahead.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal. Yes, the problem is I think we have faced this situation before. Sometimes we see that topics and paragraphs will show up in the -- in our -- the minutes in the Communique, and more often than not they have not been really discussed in

our meetings and that's part of the process. For expedience purposes sometimes we are drafting this before and we don't really have a discussion on some topics. I have two issues that I think deserve some level of discussion but I'm not sure when or where they could be discussed.

And I think one of them perhaps could be discussed in this context of the debate on Ukraine support, because I think that we had a lot of during the opening ceremony today, I think ICANN's chair made some very valid points on certain issues, specifically regarding Internet access, connectivity, issues that are important to many regions and many countries in the world.

We fully recognize the very particular situation of Ukraine and fully support a debate on this topic. But I think we understand -- important to understand the context if there are other programs that ICANN has regarding other regions, if there's possible to set up programs directed to increase connectivity in other countries and other regions countries that might be in similar situations or in -- even more deprived than Ukraine but are under other distressed situation. So if ICANN has a role to play in this area, I think it would be interesting to see the broader context if it's possible, to have programs that are broader and can be directed on it other countries and regions. I don't know if that's

the best place to have the discussion, but I think it's important discussion.

The other one I think is something we wanted to raise and might be with a question or not a question. Relates to digital divides, and I think during some of the sessions of the capacity building exercise yesterday, it's eye opening for me at least to see the high level concentration of registries, registrars, and even general, general TLDs in the north so we are talking about a clear instance of digital divide that is serious and relevant and certainly ICANN is in the middle of the discussions as well, and we don't see this kind of debates taking place.

And sometimes we are left in at that kind of straight jacket discussing procedures and answering questions that are preformatted, and I think we should try to have broader discussions on issues that are more relevant and see what kind of role ICANN could play in those topics that are -- I think strategic to many of our countries.

So... there are two discussions we wanted to bring. We don't expect to have answers to the questions. I don't think if the appropriate locus for those debates would be during the discussions with the Board, but I think at least in the case of the Ukraine support, we could perhaps extend the discussion to the

support ICANN is entitled or it is in a position to provide to other situations as well. Without in any way diminishing the importance of the role it's playing in relation to the very dramatic Ukraine situation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. Two very good points, and I normally pose the question. We hear the answer from the Board, and I pause to see if there are any follow up comments from GAC colleagues so if you would like to bring this up during the discussion you are most welcome. I know there is the auction proceeds program from the first round of new gTLDs that is being directed to such initiatives so the Board may have a story to tell.

And regarding the second point you mentioned -- yeah, the digital, the digital divide, having registries and registrars concentrated in the north, also there is the applicant support program within the new gTLDs, and this is a program trying to reach out to underserved regions so they may have a story to tell. I don't want to speak on behalf of the Board, but I think two valid questions that you may bring up during the discussion.

So, going to WHOIS disclosure system and proof of concept design paper. Latest updates from the Board including detail on a timetable for work going forward, this was proposed by U.K.

Any comments? So -- yes, Brazil. Is this a new hand or an old one. Old one? Okay, then I have Iran. Is this a new hand?

IRAN: Yes, thank you, Manal. I wanted to second what Brazil mentioned. I would prefer as well if we can put it in a more general way to ask ICANN Board if they have already done during the past, any kind of support to countries for example who -- which they have lost hugely their connection because of the war or something like that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Noted, and I have Ukraine next.

UKRAINE: So, in this point we talk about current, current support. I mean, to 1 million dollar which was allocated for Ukraine from ICANN, as a representative of the government of Ukraine, I can say that this financial resource is now using not efficient, and as GAC representative, I want to ask to ICANN Board for a review, review current report of Emergency Telecommunications Cluster, which are responsible for this money, and we, we can discuss our further steps for use of this funding more efficient.

At the same time, I support our GAC colleagues for add maybe separate ... about support of other countries, or support of some, some issues of digital divide. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ukraine, so noted. We will formulate a general question in light of Brazil's suggestion, and support from Iran and Ukraine.

UKRAINE: I mean it should be two different questions because ICANN's support in Ukraine, it is a current question and we have separated the financial resources which was allocated, already allocated, so and the second question regarding future possible support for any other country regarding digital divide.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Ukraine. Noted, and also noting support to Brazil's comments from European Commission, Egypt and kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the chat, so thank you everyone.

I have U.K. and I do seek your understanding if we can just go over time, a few minutes to go through the three remaining points very quickly. So, Ros, if you can keep it short, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Ros KennyBirch, U.K. Thank you, Chair. Yes, just going to the WHOIS disclosure system design paper. Just to clarify that the U.K. submitted this as a proposed topic before that was published on September 13th, so just to say that in the interest of previous comments about keeping the topics a bit broader, happy to omit that bit including detail on a timetable for work going forward.

I understand this was a proposal on this in the design paper so we can discuss perhaps that design paper as a whole, but I hope that provides some clarity and help-- thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Noted. Would you like to leave it until the very end, if time allows, or you would like to withdraw the whole thing?

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I would like to remove the whole thing -- the U.K. would like to remove the whole thing.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay.

UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, including detail on a timetable for work going forward component, but keeping the topic of the design paper. Is that --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So, keeping the topic receiving the latest update but not necessarily in deep details including the timetable right?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, exactly.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay, thank you, noted. So just deleting the parentheses and the time -- reference to timetable.

UNITED KINGDOM: Exactly.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, registration data accuracy, also was proposed by U.K. So, any specific points that you would like to propose or certain questions

of course by you or any other GAC colleagues? Anything specific under registration data accuracy? Yes, Denmark, please. Go ahead.

DENMARK:

Yeah, thank you. Finn Petersen from Denmark.

Thank you, I was actually thinking the same question as you raised here on point 5, 6 and 7. The accuracy is very important for Denmark, but I think there is a process going on. The DNS abuse mitigation have been discussed, and progress have been made in certain terms. We still want to see improvement and also complaint enforcement.

I think we have it in -- I know that ICANN have a webinar on complaint enforcement, whether there is something specific to ask the Board at this time -- I think it's important on all three points that we have a specific question that the Board are able to answer, if things are in process, the Board normally refers to the outcome of those elaborations. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Finn. And, yeah, reiterating if there are any specific questions under 5, 6 or 7, or points for discussion, so first

under registration data accuracy. Anything in specific or shall we delete the topic? Yes U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Ros KennyBirch U.K. Thank you, Chair. So, this was a topic that we proposed, and specifically we were looking to clarify what work ICANN believes can be taken forward by the accuracy team while ICANN awaits a reply from the EDPB to its June 2nd, 2022, letter. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, if you can please repeat, in a dictation speed so that Rob can -- I see he did a great job. But -- so clarify what work can be done forward by the ICANN scoping team.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, whilst ICANN awaits a reply from the EDPB to its June 2nd, 2022, letter.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much. So, anything under DNS abuse? And Japan, if you would like, or any other colleagues of course, if there are any specific points you would like to highlight

or specific questions? And if not, any objections to deleting 6 and 7?

Yes, please, Japan go ahead.

JAPAN: Actually, sorry, I missed the way like are we talking about the deleting the 6 and 7 from the list?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, we are asking whether there are specific questions or specific points that you would like to discuss with the Board under this title? Please go ahead.

JAPAN: Japan again. In that case, we, the Japanese delegation already send the exact text. It was like two question as was described number 6 and number 7. But it's just short and just... DNS Abuse Mitigation and compliance enforcement which is quite different in appearance I take it so maybe ICANN -- I would like to ask the GAC supporting team, the transition from our original question we submitted on the August 27th, to come out to this just two short titles.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, Rob, are you familiar with the referenced e-mail?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I am, indeed, Manal. You will recall that the CVC decision at the time was to remove the general questions and keep the topics. If you guys would like to re-enter and include the questions, happy to do so.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, thank you, Japan. Thank you, Rob. I have a very final request from the -- for the floor from Velimira and then we will conclude, thank you.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much, Manal. I would like to come back to the question on registration data accuracy. I will try to be brief. Basically, my question is a little bit of a procedural aspect in the sense that currently there is some work going on by the accuracy team and it's kind of important moment there, I'm just thinking and given that this -- that wording has changed in this, in this question, I would like to ask our U.K. colleagues whether it would be a problem if we could exchange with the other GAC representative from the subject matter, so my colleagues from the United States just to see whether procedurally speaking the

Board can really put some more information on this, and, of course, happy to liaise.

So, I'm wondering for the sake of time, if it's okay for the other colleagues from U.S., and from U.K. that we look into this probably in the course of today lunch break for instance just for the sake of time, but I, I'm not quite sure, you know whether this is the right moment for this. But happy to discuss because as I said, I think a little bit of coordination is indeed within the GAC team on this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, European Commission. So, are you suggesting that you still discuss this and come back to us? So, ift--

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: If okay for my colleague Susan --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, yeah, I see nodding. Rob, is it okay to give like an hour or more, and then we can send the final.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: That's fine, Manal. Yes, certainly. We are totally in your hands, the earlier it gets to the Board the more likely you will have preparation for an answer. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, and we are concluding now, and sincere apologies for going ten minutes after time, if you can please be back in the room at the hour to start our discussion on subsequent procedures, and to colleagues who will look into the question please the earlier we receive it would be very much appreciated.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]