
ICANN81 | AGM – Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO
Sunday, November 10, 2024 – 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Hello, and welcome to the GAC meeting with the GNSO. My name is Julia Charvolen, I'm the ICANN GAC support team. Please note that this session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions and comments will be only read aloud if submitted in the chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six human languages and Portuguese. If you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Please state your name and the language you will speak if other than English, and remember to speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Nico Caballero, GAC chair. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome everyone to this session with the GNSO Council. Welcome again, Paul Nacho, Jeff, Greg, and of course, Nigel and Jorge. In terms of the topics we're gonna be covering this afternoon, we'll be talking about the state of cooperation between the GAC and the GNSO council WHOIS and data accuracy, we're gonna touch a little bit upon the SOIs, Statements of Interest, and for that matter, the general ethics policy being developed.

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.

And it is my understanding that it is still open for comments, right? And right after that, a short session on the new gTLD program, next round, the auctions, and the applicant support program, even though we have already talked about that at length in two or three sessions before with the full GAC. Also diuretics, and then time permitting, privacy and proxy work. It would be a miracle if we have time for AOB, but let's see how it goes. So with that, let me handle the floor to Greg. Sorry, Greg DiBiase, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thank you, Nico. Thank you to the GAC for having us. It's always a pleasure to come here and align on understanding on what is important to both of our communities. I think Nico, maybe we can start out in the spirit of that, on the state of cooperation between the GAC and the GNSO council, and I believe we have our esteemed GAC liaison, Jeff Neuman to kick this off for us.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure. Thank you, Greg, and thanks again to the GAC for inviting the council to your meetings. And I've been in the role of the GNSO liaison to the GAC for four years now. This is my last meeting as the liaison, so we thought this would be a good meeting to kind of go over the state of cooperation in the last four years, which for those that have been around for four years or more, I would hope you agree that it's gotten a lot more transparent how we as the GNSO and how the GAC operate and how we communicate with each other.

I think it's been an incredibly positive transformation. There's certainly more transparency and a lot more collaboration. I think if you go back 5 to 10 years, you would find an environment where it was very difficult, if not impossible, to get GAC members to participate in policy efforts.

There was some biases from all sides from the GNSO and the GAC about participating. And I think we've broken down a lot of those walls, and I know from a GNSO perspective, we very much appreciate how much the GAC has been involved in the policy processes, in the implementation teams, small groups, whatever else we've created over the past number of years.

I think just to demystify some of the stuff that we do in between the meetings, Jorge, as your GAC point of contact and I, have a call every month. And our goals are to essentially update each other on what the GAC activities are and what the GNSO activities are to kind of give an advance notice of certain policy efforts that may be coming down the road where we need volunteers or where we need just additional areas of input, but also to prepare the agendas for this meeting and to enable effective communication at these bilaterals.

So I'm gonna miss the conversations with Jorge every month, but maybe we'll find other reasons to talk. But I do also want to say, I know that, or I hope that the last four years have been positive and that GAC members understand more about how the GNSO works and operates, and I'm also hoping the other way around, that the GNSO has more insight into how the GAC operates.

There are certainly things that we can and I believe should do better. I think from a GNSO perspective, I'd like to see us provide more substantive input when the GAC comes out with the communique. We tend to limit a lot of our responses to what the GNSO has previously done. Sometimes that could be helpful, but oftentimes I think the GAC may be asking questions or want additional information.

So I'm hoping that in the coming years we can do that. I'm also hoping that we can have more informal conversations. These meetings at ICANN are great, but they tend to be very short. We have a lot of subjects, and it would be great to have intercession meetings where we can informally talk about policies and positions.

I note the Closed Generics group, the GAC members that participated, yes, we didn't come out with a definitive outcome, but I do think the conversations which were informal were very beneficial for GAC members for GNSO members, and I'd like to see that kind of thing continue so that we can actually get more work done between ICANN meetings and not just at these sessions. There's a bunch more recommendations I have for the GNSO, but I think in spirit of not taking up too much time because there's a lot of subjects, I think I might just turn it over to Jorge, because I know there's some points that you all have on this too.

NICO CABALLERO:

Before I give the floor to Jorge and given the fact that I, I'm a terrible master of ceremonies, I don't know, and I wanted to ask Jorge, if this is a point in which we welcome the incoming GNSO liaison, and for that

matter, give a big round of applause to Jeff Neuman. So thank you so much again for that, Jeff. So going back to you, Jorge, you are the GAC liaison to the GNSO. So in terms of being the MC, is this the point where we welcome Sebastien Ducos?

JORGE CANCIO:

This is great. Yeah, I think this is the right moment. We thank Jeff as we just did, and we welcome Sebastien Ducos and we hope that the conversation will continue with you, with me, perhaps with somebody else as well on our side. But I think it's a very good basis that has been laid by Jeff during the last four years. So, I don't know if you want to say a couple of words to the committee.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

No, just to say thank you. Well, first of all, thank you for people that appointed me, but I'm looking forward to this conversation. Jorge and I have known each other for years, so I know it'll be easy. But if Jorge moves on or if anything else, I'll be working with this group. I hope to do as good a job as Jeff did. Looking forward to it. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you again, Sebastien, and thank you again, Jeff. So let me give the floor to back to Greg at this point, I'm sorry, it is to you. You see, a terrible MC, terrible master of ceremonies. Back to you, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO:

Yeah, I can assure you that I want to read everything that was on the slides. If we go to the next slide, we see what the speaking notes were that were distributed to the GAC and to the GNSO council beforehand. If you pay attention, you see that a lot of what I was going to say, actually, Jeff already said, so I won't repeat it. I think we have grown in understanding and trust between the two committees or sub organizations in ICANN.

I think that we are key partners for this multi-stakeholder approach model that we have in ICANN to work effectively. And whenever we have still had disagreements, it has been much more focused, and that has allowed us to be much more practical, pragmatic, also in finding solutions as, for instance, with the IGOs that was one example, or with the Closed Generics where we didn't achieve a final result accepted by the community. But it wasn't because of a disagreement between the two committees. It was because perhaps the matter wasn't ripe. So if we go to the next slide, I will be very brief on the definition of potential improvements. And a lot has been said. There's an echo. A lot has been said by Jeff already.

I think it's important to deepen the interactivity, also, the informality of the dialogue. You've seen that during the last three or four years, we've established the tradition of sending messages and questions in writing one week or two weeks beforehand to the GNSO council. And that helps the GNSO council to prepare. But of course, we can improve that, deepen it, and also have more substance, or I think it would be good to have more substance coming from GNSO councilors, also from GNSO PDP working group chairs, perhaps without the need of curating every

comma, because it's an informal discussion. We are not engaging in a too formal thing.

I think another thing we've heard from the GAC membership is that we would appreciate also more intersectional structured information coming from you. So whenever you adopt a resolution that you think this may be of interest to the GAC, we would appreciate this coming also with some short explanation to the GAC to be distributed and to be discussed. And of course, this depends on the perspective, but sometimes we have discussed things and there has been a response. So the responsiveness has grown over the years. We have seen it with DNS abuse, with the contractual amendments, with all the discussions, but sometimes we grow a little bit impatient.

So maybe the speed is something we can discuss. And finally, an open question, I think is whenever the GAC thinks that a question should be looked into by the GNSO or the GNSO council, whether we shouldn't perhaps also discuss informally how beyond the bylaws how the GAC could best prompt the GNSO community to take the initiative on a matter without having to go through GAC advice to the board, the board asking you things like that. So perhaps there's room for improvement, and I leave it by that. Thank you for your patience.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Jorge. Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Jorge. Thanks, Jeff. Nico, I think with that, we can maybe proceed to the first substantive topic which is data accuracy. So the council is recently aligned on a new approach to address this issue. We are sending out an assignment form that has a number of questions. First, ICANN on some regulatory background and how regulatory developments may impact our work on accuracy, and then a number of questions for the community. And we're doing this for a couple reasons.

First, is to gather data. Policy development works best when we gather enough data to identify what the problem is we're trying to address. Second, to level set on what the issue is and expectations. We've seen in the last year, there has been some conflicting expectations or an understanding of what the underlying problem here is.

And then third, there has been a concern raised on how new regulations could impact our work. So that's the direction we're going. This is in advance of the scoping team recommendations, which are still pending.

And kind of the reason they're still pending is we didn't think they would be sufficient to give us the data that we needed to move forward, right? So there was a recommendation to look at ccTLD practices, and there was a recommendation for registrar audit. While we think those could be helpful, they might not give us the full picture we needed to proceed on this issue. So we're optimistic, we have sent these questions already to ICANN for the regulation piece. ICANN'S regulatory team is looking at these questions regarding regulation.

And then we're gonna send the questions out to the broader community which includes the GAC because we know there's really important feedback to be had from this group. We're gonna collect that information, align on understanding, try to better scope the problem and proceed from there. So that is the approach that we're going forward with now. We understand that this is a really important issue to the GAC and there's some urgency in addressing this. So hopefully this puts us on a good step forward to proceed on this issue. So that's hopefully a helpful high-level summary, and I'll pause there to see if people have questions.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Greg. Let me open the floor at this point for questions or comments regarding WHOIS and data accuracy. I see I have Denmark. Denmark, please go ahead. Finn.

FINN PETERSON:

Thank you, Chair. Finn Peterson from Denmark, for the record. And thank you for highlighting this and give the state of play that you are in. Only to inspire you also, so you know it that 27 EU member states have worked together and have under the umbrella on NSI2, the NIS2 corporation group adopted all of them [00:17:20 - inaudible] certain guidelines.

Those guidelines among others look at how to verify WHOIS data and especially the three elements which are mentioned in the directive. The directive said that the data should be accurate, but from the regulator

point of view, going through this process, this validation and verification, it is assumed that the data is on a, let's say a correct level. So that might inspire you and your work and the team that and not going perhaps down in two theoretical paths, which will not give any result in my lifetime. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Denmark. I have the USA. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER: Thank you. This is Owen Fletcher from the United States. Thank you for the comments. Greg, I think you mentioned that you'll be sending out the list of questions for community inputs, including from the GAC. Can you clarify when the GAC will see those and on what timeline you'd hope to get a response? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, so I think ICANN is gonna reply to their part by the 29th of November, then they will go out to the various communities and we're asking for feedback by the 31st of January. And of course, we're open to feedback on those timelines as well, but that's what we're thinking right now to give us some flexibility around the holidays, but also realizing that this is urgent work and trying to keep the timelines relatively tight.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, US, for the question. Thank you, Greg. I see no more hands in the room or in the chat room, which means that we're okay to move on to the next slide. This is the second issue at hand. Over to you Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, thanks, Nico. I think this is relatively short. We just want to note that the code of conduct was released by ICANN, that GNSO hasn't had a chance to react to this, so we don't have unified opinion on it. However, we just wanted to note that we're curious to hear if the GAC has initial impressions and that's something we take as a factor in our consideration. So just kind of teeing that up and seeing if there are initial reactions that you can share with us.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Greg. The floor is open. What I can share with you at this point is, as you can read on the slides, that the GAC basically gives a lot of importance to ICANN's transparency and credibility which somehow is directly related to the SOIs in our point of view. But I would be very happy to hear from other colleagues in the room. And I have the UK. Go ahead, please, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it's always a delighting honor to be speaking with the GNSO council. This issue came to the GAC's attention over the last couple of years, I suppose. And indeed, we gave it some attention in our communiques in recent meetings. And the reason we did this, or certainly the reason that some of us were advocating for it

to be center stage, so to speak, was the importance that generally governments place on transparency and ethics, et cetera.

And this statements of interest issue was something which we thought was really important indeed. So, certainly speaking for the UK, I can't speak for anyone else, absolutely delighted that ICANN Org has come out with this consultation, the content of which we find very positive, indeed a very clear and explicit statement on SOIs and where they're appropriate. So the only thing I would say is that we would urge all parts of the community to come together on this and get this agreed as early as possible. So thank you very much.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, UK. The floor is still open. I have Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Yeah, I just wanted to take the opportunity to support what Nigel just said. I think that the board has been quite diligent here in reacting to the community, including the GAC and at first sight, the content of the code of conduct in what refers to SOIs seems to go into the right direction. We might still look into the enforcement, how far that goes and how effective that can be. But yeah, we would also be very thankful for hearing opinions from the GNSO council, from members of the community. I think that could be very useful. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Switzerland. Any other comment or question at this point? So let me just repeat that the GAC would greatly appreciate hearing about the first impressions coming from the GNSO Council. Jeff, I don't know if I should pass it to you or to any of the distinguished GNSO council members at this point. Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. So we haven't discussed it yet, we don't have a preliminary position yet, but we'd have this request and we'll be sure to follow up. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, and what I would say on this issue is it's very likely that the GNSO council as a whole may not have a view on it, but certainly to the extent that there are stakeholder, group or constituency views, we'll certainly bring those back as soon as we can.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Jeff. We have a hand to my left. Please go ahead. Please identify yourself.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm one of those laymen who try and understand what's going on. I'm a member of Parliament in Kenya. I sit on the communication committee and I'm a fourth term member of parliament, I'm not new. I have been on these issues of communication for some time. One of the major problems that we are having is as the

Government Advisory Council, we are the gentleman who are sitting here, they bring their views back to us for endorsement. We never really get too much information back.

So in the Government Advisory Council, is there a way to input the involvement or whatever of members, of parliament or the politicians who are actually the ones who will vote for some of these things? Because if it comes to us and we have got a document that doesn't make sense, 80% of the time, it is voted down. And then all our executive committee has done a lot of work on this, has not shared some of this information. And guys like us, we've been to Johannesburg, we've been here and there. Is there a way, Mr. Chair, without being presumptuous, that us politicians who actually care to be here can have a say or some sort of involvement in this process.

And I also chair the African parliamentarians against corruption. And remember that much of corruption with AI is becoming extreme and difficult. So what you are doing here is very much relevant to the status in Kenya. So we request if there is any way to input even 2% of us not in the board. I'm not asking for our input in GSE and in the code of conduct discussions, et cetera. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Kenya. So a direct answer would be through the Kenyan GAC representative. We don't have any way to decide how you internally choose or how the GAC representative from Kenya gets elected. We don't have a say there, but that would be the most direct way. I strongly recommend you get in touch with your

country representative. Again, we have no way of dealing with an internal election at this point. But on the other hand, you're more than welcome to join any of the other constituencies within ICANN. Again, that's a very good coffee conversation for later on. Thank you.

Any other question or comment from the floor? I don't see any other hand up, which means that we can move to the next topic. Topic number five, new gTLD program next round. We talked a lot about this before, but over to you again, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE:

Thanks, Nico. I think we have Paul to lead us on this topic. Paul McGrady.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Greg. Thanks, Nico. Paul McGrady here. Just a few items. The first item had to do with the issue of auctions and how we seemed to have landed as a community that there should be no private auctions.

Part of that innovation around that evolution was this notion of a secondary string option for applicants in a way to help avoid contention sets and therefore fewer needs for the ICANN auction of Blast Resort. So if I said we're avoiding auctions, what I meant was we're avoiding private auctions, let me clarify. And so I think that the questions that we received from the GAC had to do with essentially what's the Geno's opinion of that particular evolution, that particular innovation or solution.

And so the council took a look at the letter and we recognized in coming to these conclusions and coming up with these ideas, that the board has to balance a number of different factors including the relevance subsequent procedure recommendations, supplemental recommendations, ALAC advice, and of course GAC advice. And as a result of realizing that, that the board has different voices it needs to listen to and consider. The council has approached this topic from a very pragmatic perspective. But I don't want to give the false impression that it's all, unicorns and flowers.

There are some of us that still harbor both procedural and substantive concerns. But ultimately it looks like council will not stand in the way of this approach. But we do want to talk about you know, process improvements for these kinds of things. So in any event, we're hoping that today we can have a little bit of dialogue from GAC members about where you've landed, different points of view and that sort of thing, but bottom lining it, concerned, but on board, I think.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Paul. Do we have any question for Paul or comments or anything you would like to say regarding contention sets, auctions, or for that matter, outreach activities or other IRT and issues of mutual concern? And I have Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. It's a bit of a follow-up to the discussion we had in the GAC, just one hour ago, more

or less. So basically, I think we are landing in a very similar place, like, okay we are not perhaps a hundred percent convinced, but we see a lot of merit in the board taking action in trying to address the concerns in calling for the community discussions this summer, this northern hemisphere summer, as we asked from the GAC and trying to balance the different interests, so that is quite similar.

At the same time perhaps my specific question to you, Paul, if you have an opinion, is what do you think about these replacement strings or alternative strings, whether this fits in? Well, that's the first one. And the second one is whether you feel comfortable with the use of the ICANN auctions of last resort, especially when you have competing applicants with very different budgets. I know there's no simple answer to that.

PAUL MCGRADY:

I don't know if I should thank you Jorge or not, but. So the auctions of last resort are part of the, this subsequent procedure recommendations, and they've been around for a long time. And so I guess it's not a surprise that they still exist at the end of all this. I think what, I guess, the genius of the idea behind the second-string option is that the goal is to reduce the number of those. And the reason to reduce the number of those is just because of what you've raised, Jorge, which is there are applicants with different levels of ability to compete in those auctions, right?

And so, while not perfect, because auctions won't go away entirely, I suppose, if we can reduce the number of auctions and let more strings

through and more innovation through as a result, I think that that's an improvement. I would love to see a perfect solution, but I think speaking personally, I view this as an incremental improvement. I will say that though, as a council, we've not dug in at that level. So everything I just said is just from Paul, if that's helpful. But I think that it is sort of as an umbrella issue. Whenever you have a board that's trying to think up solutions, I think that's usually a good thing for the community. Thanks.

JEFF NEUMAN:

So this is Jeff Neuman, just to kind of take it up a level. The GNSO council, and Greg can expand on this, has been talking about how to improve and get more communication from the Board into the policy development processes.

So these issues which have come up very late, because we're all trying to meet a deadline to launch a new gTLD program, will hopefully not occur again, that these can be thought through during the policy process, and we can engage in meaningful dialogue and not all be shocked at something that just comes out from a board workshop because it's too late in the process. So taking it up that level, I think the GNSO community does share the procedural concerns and hopes that through its efforts on board readiness and through its contributions to the ODP community consultation and other things like that that are going on, we hope that in the future we won't have this procedural crunch that we have now.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Jeff. Paul, would you like to add anything?

PAUL MCGRADY:

So this, we have two more topics under the next round. Should I dive into those? Okay. And I'll just try to knock them both out and then maybe give room for questions on both.

The next topic has to do with the applicant support program and the GACs concern that resulted in wanting to create a 12-month window for those applications to be gathered. And the board's response that they had concerns about that in terms of process and what it would do to the timelines and such. We understand that the GAC and the board had been working towards the middle ground solution, and I think that the GAC would like, wanted to hear from the council about its reaction to that middle ground.

This one's sort of straightforward because the council hasn't had a chance to discuss this and come to a formal position on it, but at a very high level, it doesn't seem to contradict or dilute the outcomes from the GGP on this particular issue. And initial reactions is that it seems like it's a reasonable path forward and hopefully addressing enough of the GACs concerns on this particular issue. I will say that we would love for this to be wrapped up in plenty of time to make sure that the applicant support process goes forward on time. I understand there's some short timeframes and that kind of thing. And so again, speaking personally on that, also speaking personally, the GGP that we did on the applicant support program was our first GGP ever.

And so we're hoping that it turns out to be helpful at the end of the day, and that the recommendations that came back are helpful and implementable and that the board and the GAC can find their middle ground on this particular issue. But again, no formal position by the council, but those are just-- sometimes I think initial thoughts are okay. Hopefully I didn't overstate anything there. And then the last remaining issue that came up on the next round is that the GAC submitted some comments on the proposed language of draft sections of the applicant guidebook.

And I think that there were some questions about whether or not the council had any further issues to flag from those topics that were covered by the draft sections. As you know, the council relies on liaisons of the IRT to monitor and bring back issues to us. Those liaisons have not raised any major issues or concerns that haven't been addressed so far. And so the council does not have any particular concerns to raise in this forum. And we are continued to be very happy that the GAC is participating in the open IRT model, and we appreciate that you're doing so, and yeah, so thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Paul. And I have the UK. Go ahead please, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. Just very briefly, and thank you, Paul. We have been discussing today as you may know or some members may know, the issues of the Applicant's Support Program and contention

sets auctions, so to speak. We looked at the proposals from the ICANN Board including, of course, what you've mentioned, alternative strings and the banning of private auctions, and we will in time be responding, of course.

In terms of the Applicant Support Program, we've also discussed that in detail and you'll be pleased to know that we are having a good relationship if you see what I mean, with ICANN Org. We had excellent presentations in the last day or so about what they're doing on the Applicant Support Program. I'm sure they're briefing the GNSO as well, the outreach activities, et cetera, and we're engaging with the Org on a number of activities.

And just finally on the IRT issues of mutual concern, I mean, I think it's - and I'll be very, very short, I think it's an excellent example of what Jeff Neuman was talking about earlier, this cooperative work. Perhaps in the GAC, we're not always the experts, we're not always completely on top of everything, like some people are, but we hope we bring something to the IRT process and it's been a really collaborative process. And I mean, I'm not talking about it in the past because there's a lot to go forward with.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, UK. Any other comment or question? Ah, sorry. I have Susan Payne. Please go ahead.

SUSAN PAYNE: Thanks, Nico. Hi, it's Susan Payne. I'm one of the liaisons to that SubPro group. Just really quickly, and you may have heard this update from staff already, but the original plan was that there would be three public comment periods on parts of the guidebook, and then one final comment next year on sort of the whole guidebook when it's all been pulled together. The IRT has learned quite recently but I think are supportive with the idea that probably there will actually be four before the final one. So there'll be a public comment in December on some more sections of the AGB, probably not too many of them, and then a further one in about January. So just thought it would be worth noting that for the GAC.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Susan. And I have India. Go ahead, please.

T. SANTHOSH: Thank you, chair. This is Santhosh for the record. So in India, we had this application support program consultation with various stakeholders. So the question which was raised is what according to is the category of non-governmental organization because it varies region to region. So what is the criteria for NGU? Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'll volunteer to take the microphone and say that I'm afraid to get it wrong, but I will go back and I will bring that back to you and to the GAC that we have a precise definition. But I don't want to state it off of memory. I'm not a young man anymore, but I'll bring it back.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Paul. Thank you, India, for the question. I don't see any other hand up, so let's move on to the next slide, diacritics. Over to you, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Nico. So our update here is we are going to vote on the initiation of a PDP on Latin discritics during this meeting. We're expecting that vote to pass. Other interesting background as there was a good response from the public comment period from the community on this proposal, there are 41 public comments overwhelmingly supporting initiation of a PDP for more inclusive internet in line with universal acceptance. So just an update, we'll be voting on that on Wednesday and expect that to proceed and hopefully close that gap in policy.

NICO CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you. Questions, thoughts, comments in the room or online? And again, I don't see-- sorry, sorry, there's a hand in the room, but I can't get to see. So please go ahead. Ah, sorry. Sorry. Netherlands, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, Marco thank you for that update and confirming that the PDP is starting. I wonder for the colleagues in the

room as well, what you can elaborate on what you think or expect from the GAC involvement in that PDP or what methods are.

GREG DIBIASE:

So we are gonna be developed talking about the charter in this upcoming meeting. And so maybe that's a question that we can take back in that charter conversation and make sure that we've heard that and have a mechanism to get GAC feedback because obviously this is an issue of importance for the GAC. So we'll take that as an item to discuss as we develop the charter for this project. Jeff, Paul, I mean, yeah.

NICO CABALLERO:

Thank you, Greg. Thank you, Netherlands, for the question. I have the European Commission and Canada. European Commission.

MARTINA BARBERO:

Thank you very much, Chair. Martina Barbero, European Commission, for the records. Just if you could elaborate a bit on the scope of the PDP and exactly what do you expect it to be the timeline considering the new gTLD round, that would be super useful. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE:

I'm not sure we have the timeline yet. In regards to scope, it's relatively narrow on the issue of Latin diacritics accent over Latin characters. So we're hoping that that narrow scope can mean the work is expeditious.

But I do not think we have a timeline we can share at this point, unless Paul, Jeff. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN: I think the only thing to add to that would be that it is not a gating item for the next round. I know that as Greg said, the council or the community will be working as expeditiously as possible. And I think the quicker that this group can work, the sooner it can be implemented, and it is narrow. So I think it is possible.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Jeff. I have Canada next.

DAVID BEDARD: Thank you, Nico. And this is David Bedard from Canada, for the record. Just to iterate our support for the PDP and going forward, we were really happy to see the issue report and to see this work being done and glad to hear about this scope and hopefully the expedited process for the PDP and that it won't be a gating issue for the next round. So we're really happy for the progress of this work. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Canada, for that. The floor is still open. Okay, so seeing no hands, let's move on to the next topic, which is privacy and proxy work. Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: I'm gonna give this to Paul, who is the GNSO liaison for this work.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Paul McGrady. So I'm one of the two GNSO council liaisons to this work. Stephanie Perrin is the other. Stephanie was not able to make this trip, so I'm gonna handle this for both of us. The PPSAI IRT had its kickoff meeting at ICANN80, and it's been holding biweekly meetings since July.

As part of the preliminary work from the regular meetings, ICANN Org asked the IRT to carefully reread the 21 policy recommendations from the final report on this. They've been around for a bit and asked the IRT members to identify questions with regard to those recommendations. And we've spent quite a bit of time in our meetings dedicated to going over those questions and responses. As the council liaison, I've encouraged the IRT team not to attempt to re-litigate issues lost, but to raise issues that may come back to council that are based on changes to law, technology, or ICANN policy since the passing of the initial policies.

So we want to keep the train on the track. The IRT is going to be holding its public meeting, another one here in ICANN81, which will be open to observers. That session will be mostly dealing with IRT volunteers sharing their business practices in relationship to privacy and proxy services. So we'll get a sort of an up-to-date glance about how those services, what they're used for, how they work in 2024 in this new context. So the bottom line is that there is work being done and there's work to do, but we're underway, and so far so good. So thank you.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you again, Paul. Any further questions regarding privacy and proxy work in the room, online? I don't see any hand online. Are we okay to move on? So, next slide, please, Daniel. So I can't believe we got to the AOB section. This is kind of like a miracle, but. So we're gonna be dealing with urgent requests, and for that, let me handle the floor again to Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank, Nico. So this is an issue we've been discussing for a while. If you recall, the board raised some concerns about a recommendation specific to urgent requests, noting that urgent requests measured in business days may not be fit for purpose, while also recognizing that any requests would need to be authenticated by a registrar, contracted party, and that would likely take time. So more work was needed on this topic. We have received the letter from the GAC that acknowledges kind of the concerns that the board and I think the GNSO share and have proposed a potential path forward. We're going to be discussing that letter this week, I think in our wrap up session and start to gather questions or concerns about the GACs proposed approach, and we'll go from there and try to make progress on this issue.

NICO CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you so much for that, Greg. Before I open the floor again for questions, a specific question we have is, "When could we schedule

the board's requested trilateral discussion on this issue? " Do you have any idea at this point or any of you?

GREG DIBIASE: So we did have the meeting before with leadership or as the question of -- oh.

NICO CABALLERO: The trilateral, the board, the GAC and the GNSO council. If you happen to have any idea at this point. If not, I mean--

GREG DIBIASE: I don't have an idea. I think it'd probably be more productive for the GNSO to take back the letter, get their thoughts in order. I would assume the board has some thinking to do it too, and then we'll go from there with scheduling.

NICO CABALLERO: Thank you, Greg. The floor is still open. Any further questions, comments? I don't see any hand there. There are no hands online, which means that we're eight minutes ahead of schedule. Unbelievable. Unbelievable.

JEFF NEUMAN: Great way to end my term.

NICO CABALLERO:

Great job. Great job. Thank you so much. So we need to wrap up the session. No need to artificially extend with more questions about Jupiter or, I don't know, life on Mars or whatever. Thank you so very much, Paul, Nacho Jeff, Greg, and of course, Nigel and Jorge for being the shepherds of the session. Thank you so much, and you're always welcome. You'll be missed, Jeff, and welcome, Sebastien. Thank you so much. Enjoy your coffee. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]