KOBE - GAC-GAC/Board Matters (1 of 2)
Monday, March 11, 2019 - 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

| | |
|---|---|
| CHAIR ISMAIL: | So welcome, everyone. I hope you have enjoyed your lunch and morning sessions. So we are now starting our session to prepare for our meeting with the Board tomorrow. This session is scheduled only for 45 minutes, so I hope we can utilize them efficiently. |
| | As you may recall, we have received a regular -- as we usually do every meeting, we have received an email from the Board asking what questions we have to discuss in our bilateral on Tuesday and also posing some questions to the different SOs and ACs, including the GAC, that they were expecting replies to. |
| | We have submitted very preliminary answers to those questions, but I think now we need to have a second look at the questions, reconfirm our answers, and maybe see in light of the discussions in the past three days whether we have more questions to the Board, whether we want to fine-tune or change or modify our questions to the Board. Okay, good. |
| | So yeah, the support staff has very helpfully compiled a slide deck, so if we can go to the second slide, please. |

So this is a quick background, the Board-GAC meetings, yeah, they happen every year face-to-face meeting. And yeah, I think I may have covered this slide as well, so maybe we can move to the following slide for the sake of time.

So this is a preliminary agenda to our meeting with the Board, a quick welcome and opening remarks, then report on the BGIG session which we will have immediately after this one, then the usual dialogue on GAC questions and topics that the Board would like to share with us, and GAC feedback on Board -- to the Board on the strategic matters which were actually the Board's question to the -- to the GAC. I hope you have attended the opening ceremony this morning. Cherine has already mentioned the strategic plan and there was a session, a cross -- high interest topic session also this morning thoroughly dedicated for the strategic plan. So those who were there may have feedback that we can incorporate, either in writing or even tomorrow when we meet the Board face-to-face. So can we move on, please?

Yeah, so those are the four topic areas that we have initially identified as areas where we can have a dialogue with the Board on. So the release of two-letter character codes to be used at the second level, IGO protections, data protection regulations, and the unified access model, and potential future new gTLD rounds. So those are the four high-level areas that were identified.

If we go to the following slide, so on the first topic, the release of the two-character codes at the second level. This is what we have already submitted to the Board, again subject to our discussion today and any fine-tuning that we can do. "So the GAC leadership acknowledges the Board's response to GAC advice in the recent scorecard document and the GAC discussions -- and GAC discussions of those matters will take place in Kobe. The GAC leadership appreciates development of the two-character tool and expects that GAC members will not only have an opportunity to see a demonstration of the tool but will have been able to begin using it prior to meeting with the Board at ICANN64."

So I'm sorry, Rob, if you can help me here, so is this background information for us or this is what we have submitted to the Board? I'm a bit confused. Sorry.

ROB HOGGARTH: Manal, this is the exact text that the leadership submitted to the Board.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Okay.

ROB HOGGARTH: And if I can just add, and as part of that, remember these were shared with the Board mid-February. So on this particular item, I think it anticipated that there would be a webinar that has already been -- taken place and the focus here is the -- the bolded area in which the expectation was that GAC members may share their experiences and further reactions at that time with the Board. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you, Rob. Yes, so this was a little bit earlier than when we had our discussions and when we held the webinar, so this was just a sort of initial flagging that this is a topic of interest to the GAC and that the GAC members may share their experiences and further reactions at the time when we meet with the Board.

So I'll stop here and first of all see if this is a topic that we would like to bring up with the Board, and second, whether there is a specific question or comment or -- at least there is one question to be answered which is, is this a topic of interest that we would like to bring up with the Board or -- yes, Kavouss, please. Iran.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. Good afternoon to you and to all distinguished colleagues. I think we had some presentation with respect to two

characters, if I'm not mistaken, by Thiago?  Is that same subject or different subject?  We have something, and we have discussed that with some comment from colleagues whether they represent the view of everybody or represent the view of global people.  Are we talking the same subject, two characters, and what is the tools -- I don't know what the tools means here and what we have to tell the Board about the tools.  Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:  So at the time when we sent this, we were just flagging the topics that are of interest to the GAC and we have a placeholder that we may come with more details.

In response to your question, Kavouss, yes, it's the same topic that Thiago presented earlier this week, and the status is that we have received detailed documents from the Board, from ICANN org on the topic.  They were also included in the Board's scorecard.

The tool is what we have been discussing a couple of meetings ago on track -- ability of members to track the two-character -- the registrations of their two-character codes at the second level, whether under ccTLDs or gTLDs.  So this tool is now in place.  We had a webinar on this tool immediately after -- before Kobe, and we have agreed to have the meeting in Montreal as our checkpoint and feedback from GAC colleagues on this tool.

So this is where we stand on the topic, and we concluded the session earlier this week that maybe colleagues need to go through the material that has been provided in the scorecard response of the Board because the documents are a little bit long and have some time to try the tool, maybe initial feedback in Marrakech and hopefully further feedback by Montreal. So this is a summary of where we stand and again, I'm asking whether is there a specific ask to the Board here or -- yes.

IRAN:                          No, I don't think we have a specific question to the Board. We just say first of all, thank you very much for the tools made available and we leave it to the GAC members to try to exercise that to see how they use, if there are any experience of that.

However, with respect to the letter that is two or three page of main letter and some lengthy annexes, as you mentioned, you tell them thank you very much, but we did not have time to go through that and we will look at that one and probably will reflect our results or our replies in the Marrakech meeting. I think that would be -- that would be that. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:                  Thank you, Kavouss. France, please.

FRANCE:

Yeah, thank you, Chair. I'll make three points. Well, first, of course, I think it's a point of interest for the GAC and for the GAC board meeting. Three points. I think one of the matters we should discuss is still the matter of process, you know, has the Board when they took the decision, have they rejected implicitly advice or is there strong view among the GAC that they did, though it's not consensus. But a lot of countries think they did reject GAC advice implicitly by making decision to release the two other codes on the second level of the new gTLDs. So we can continue the discussion or obviously we have a disagreement with the Board.

Second point, you're right about the tool. Unfortunately, I think it's too early to already have had GAC member use it, so I think we can make a presentation, maybe have an update in the next ICANN meeting, the other one after, about, you know, how many countries use the tool, but that would come from another meeting.

And third point, I don't understand why we put including ccTLDs because our -- the issue is two-character codes has always been on the new gTLDs because it's on the new gTLDs that we had a mechanism to first ask the -- notify the governments. Legacy gTLDs and ccTLDs have never been part of the discussion. I know that ICANN CEO, at some point, brought that up, but I think it's really unrelated, so we should specifically focus the discussion on

the new gTLDs which is where the decision of the Board intervened to authorize the release. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, France. So to your last point first, I mentioned ccTLDs because they are part of the tool, so I was just describing what the tool can offer. If someone is interested to see what's under the second level of the ccTLDs this is an option. If not, fair enough. I mean, it's just a feature of the tool.

On your first point, I'm not sure I understood it fully. So you're asking that we check again with the Board if they have implicitly rejected our advice? Because I think this was the exact question we asked in our previous advice and in response we've got the two long documents that we didn't have the chance to read yet. So I'm just afraid to repeat the same question. We will be referred to the same documents. France, please.

FRANCE: No, you're right, Manal. I was just saying that this is still an outstanding question because obviously the disagreement between the Board response and the strong group of countries that first ask question, you know. There's still disagreement. I don't know if we want to continue discussion at this meeting or not because you're right, it's maybe too early. It was a very

lengthy response from the Board, so maybe we -- the members haven't had the time to read all the documents yet. It's possible that the question will be brought up by a GAC member during the meeting.

CHAIR ISMAIL: So if I may conclude, I think we don't have a concrete ask at the time, but I feel that it's still a topic of interest to the GAC. We can just keep it as an informational point during the board meeting, acknowledging that we have received the documents and that the tool is currently under trials, and that we will be back with feedback by Montreal.

Brazil, please.

BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Manal. Thiago speaking for the record.

If I can say a word related to the point raised by France. I think we could use the opportunity to speak to the Board on this issue to flag that there are two separate questions. There is one of procedure which relates to the question of whether the changes implemented were consistent with GAC advice, and the other relates to the substance.

So the responses that the Board gave to GAC advice so far, they should -- to be fully satisfactory to everyone, they should address the procedural issue and the substantive issue. The development of a tool to track the use of country codes at the second level may satisfy, if it does, the substantive issue, but it doesn't address the procedural issue. And the feeling among GAC members may vary depending whether we're talking about the first or the second issue.

In the brief we prepared previously, there was the sense that the concerns were more widely shared when it came to the procedural issue.

So I think when we speak to the Board tomorrow, we could present that there are two separate issues. And whenever the Board talks to the GAC about two-character code problem that it be aware that those two issues exist and that they should be addressed separately as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:    Thank you, Thiago. So shall I take this that this would be verbal intervention from the floor or do we have -- Because we're trying now to compile the list of questions that we want to share with the Board in preparation for tomorrow's meeting. So is there

something that we need to share in writing or just flag the issue from the floor?

BRAZIL:  Thank you, Manal.  We can think of some language to flag the issue.  It doesn't need to be a question.  If the GAC is able to come up with a question relating to the specific issue, we can present it to the Board.  But if we're unable to do so, we can just flack the issue and come up with some language to do this.  And we might propose some text if -- and would welcome anyone else to propose text on this issue, if there are someone interested in doing so.

CHAIR ISMAIL:  Okay.  So I hope we can do this sometime after our sessions today so that we can share them with the Board, I mean, as early as possible before our meeting tomorrow.

Any other -- Iran, please.  Go ahead.

IRAN:  Yes.  I don't know that when -- from when we have dropped our concerns for the use of the country code at the second level.  It's still questions and concerns.  I don't know what some people saying that we are just dealing with the gTLD.  We are dealing also

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

with the ccTLD use of the two-letter character of the country code at the second level, and -- but release of that, we still have some problems. Some countries, not all. So I don't know whether maybe France does not have any problem, but we have problems. And we want -- This is the main issue. I don't remember we raised the question about gTLD. But if some country has problem with gTLD two-character, I don't know, give me some example of two-character gTLD, but we have a concern about the ccTLD, two-character release at the second level, concerns some countries, 49 or 51 countries.

Thank you.


CHAIR ISMAIL:     Thank you, Kavouss.

So any other comments before we move on to the following question?

Okay. Can we please go to the following slide?

So is this topic 3? I think we covered only one topic, but anyway, let's...

Anyway, so the second topic is GDPR, if we can get the slide of the GDPR on the screen.

So this is what we have already submitted as an initial response to the Board. GAC members are closely following the GNSO EPDP effort, the ICANN's Technical Study Group on Access to Nonpublic Registration Data and are interested in an update on efforts by ICANN org to engage with Data Protection Authorities. In light of the Board's acknowledgment of the ICANN62 Panama GAC advice to take all steps necessary to ensure the development and implementation of a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication, access, and accountability, and applies to all contracted parties as quickly as possible, and the recognition of the European Data Protection Board that ICANN should develop a WHOIS model that will enable uses by relevant stakeholders, such as law enforcement, could the ICANN Board share its overall assessment of outcomes to date in the EPDP, the TSG, and engagement of ICANN org with Data Protection Authorities, and what plans it currently has to ensure these efforts meet the needs of the global public interest?

So again, this is what we have initially submitted to the Board subject to confirmation here at this meeting. I understand it's a topic of interest. Does this accurately reflect our ask to the Board? Do we need to change anything in light of discussions that happened so far?

Kavouss, please. Iran.

IRAN: Yes, thank you. In light of discussions happened so far, we need to know now that we are on the phase two, at the beginning of phase two. And we need, as we have mentioned two times before, at least to have some target date for the availability of this tool for government, for GAC, for various reasons or various application, including law enforcement. And it seems that currently no date is to be given and saying that it is not clear because the volume of the work is not available. But in our view, for any project, for any objectives, you need to have a date of implementations or date of availability. If the date, exact date, is not possible, at least we should have some idea of the target date, and it should not be open-ended. That is an important issue that also we will raise in the cross-community discussions.

And our question to the Board would be this one: What is the target date of the availability of these tools for use?

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: I see your point that phase two is not mentioned in our initial submission, and it's of special interest to the GAC so we need to highlight this, but I'm not sure the Board will be in a position to answer with a concrete date, target date. But we can surely make a point that we need phase two in place as quickly as possible

with concrete time frames and concrete deadlines. I mean, this is a comment that we can do. But -- Kavouss, you need to respond?

IRAN:                          Yes. I don't think that we could ask the Board to give us a target date. It should give the result of our discussion yesterday with GNSO that this is that no target date could be made available. And this is not acceptable. There should be some target date. Not now, but in some time there should be some target date, that we know that where we are, how long we have to wait, because it seems that it may be subject to more than a year or several years. And I don't know within these several years what the people could do if they don't have any unified access model to have access to the nonpublic information data. That is the question that we have to ask the Board. And similarly, the Board will discuss it with the GNSO. They have their regular meeting and say that this is something that is required.

We, GAC, are among those constituencies that are very much concerns and involved about the availability of this tool.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:                Thank you. Yes, please, go ahead.

GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. For the record, (saying name), Germany, Federal Ministry of the Interior.

I agree to your proposal to avoid the term "target date." It might be a little bit aggressive. We could form it -- formulate it more diplomatically and ask for a time frame. In the end, it's very clear that we need concrete dates, but I think the Board will not be in the position to set a target date. And so I think it's just about the wording.

It's very clear that we want to see progress speeding up, and that should be clear. But for the wording, I think we could be a little bit more flexible.

Thank you.


CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Germany.

U.S.


UNITED STATES: Thank you. Hi, this is Ashley with the U.S.

Just following up on the last two comments, which I think sound fairly in line, and to support what Kavouss is saying, perhaps a way we could phrase it that we, as the GAC, have discussed this and we see the vital importance of having a conclusion deadline

for the conversations.  And perhaps we could pose the question to the Board as to whether they support that -- that kind of a notion and an idea and see where we go from there.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:          Thank you.

So again, if there is a concrete formulation that could be shared, it would be very helpful because we need to share those questions by -- before the end of today for the Board to get ready by tomorrow.  And as always, I will present the question.  We will hear from the Board, but GAC colleagues who have specific interest can also chime in during the session, of course.

U.S., please.

UNITED STATES:          Thank you.  This is kind of a funny question, but without Tom Dale, it's not clear.  Who do I send -- do I send it to Rob Hoggarth in terms of an actual question?

CHAIR ISMAIL:          Yes, please.  Thank you for asking.  And please, yeah, to those who will be helping to draft -- to fine-tune our questions to the Board,

if you can share them with Rob and maybe keep me cc'd as well, it would be great Kavouss.


IRAN:                           Yes, I tend to agree to some extent with Germany, but we could say time frame together with a target date as indicative.  I put it as indicative.  That means time frame with some indicative target, not precise target.  So we have the steps.  Time frame.  In the time frame, an indicative target date.  Then we have target date.  Then we have definitive date.  And (indiscernible) of the word will show us how we should clarify the situation from these various steps.  Indicative target date, target date, and definitive date.  But we should formulate it in that sense.

Thank you.


CHAIR ISMAIL:                   Thank you, Kavouss.

So we will be drafting -- I mean, work on the wordsmithing and drafting shortly after the session.  So maybe for the sake of time, we can move on, if there are no other comments on GDPR.

Yeah, we can move on to the third topic.  Yeah.  Potential future new gTLD rounds.

So again, this is what has been submitted to the Board in Barcelona. The Board indicated it was prepared to react and respond very quickly when the GNSO completes its new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. Could the ICANN Board share its current consideration or perspective on the extent to which the various criteria established in the Helsinki GAC advice, accepted by the Board, will be addressed prior to initiation of any new rounds of applications?

Kavouss.

IRAN:                           Thank you. Subject to comments from distinguished colleagues, I don't think it is a question anymore. We have yesterday reply from the GNSO when we have this presentation, and we have heard different dates: 2021, 2022, and various aspects of that, end of the 2019 for the final report and for public comments, whether we should have two public comments.

So I don't think we should have any more information than those was given by Jeff Neuman yesterday. So I don't think that this is a question, but it is up to other colleagues that whether -- but I don't think that we hear more than what Jeff Neuman yesterday mentioned. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:                   Thank you, Kavouss.

So there is a proposal here that we simply delete this because there is nothing more to hear other than what we have already heard from Jeff yesterday.

Any reactions?  Switzerland, all right, please.


SWITZERLAND:                   Thank you, Manal, and hello, everybody.

Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record.

While I -- I understand what Kavouss is saying, because Jeff gave us his perspective of this point, at the same time, the Helsinki advice was directed to the board, and the board is looking at a wider array of information than Jeff has to look in his capacity of PDP Working Group co-chair.  So I think that the question is still valid, although this is still a long way until the next round or the next expansion really can happen.

But as of the Helsinki advice, if I recall correctly, also was in a way making implicit reference to what would be the result of the CCT review and of other reviews that are really directed to the board and not so much directed to the PDP working group, where Jeff is co-chair, perhaps, let's say, an interim assessment from the board could be useful in this sense.

I hope this is clear.  Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:          Thank you, Jorge.

Iran, please.

IRAN:                  Thank you.  When I commented, I said the subject of views of other distinguished colleagues.  But I don't think the question as it is now is to be raised.  We should reformulate the questions.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:          So, Jorge, would you be interested to help us reformulate?

And, Kavouss, do you have a specific formulation in mind?

IRAN:                  No.  The specific formulation was given by Jorge.

CHAIR ISMAIL:          Okay.

IRAN:                  If he wants to reformulate that, I have no problem.

Thank you.


CHAIR ISMAIL: Jorge, can you -- I mean, repeat what you said maybe in writing and share it with Rob and --


SWITZERLAND: Well, perhaps I'm too jet-lagged. But I don't recall having reformulated the question.

But if there is anything in my statement that is in the transcription that can be used to address the concerns and the comments from Kavouss, I think that our able staff support can help in that.


CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Jorge.

So I think we still have one more topic to cover. And we have ten minutes, or we should start now? I'm a little bit confused. I thought this is a 45-minute session.

Yes. I'm -- just a quick time check.

So I have Canada. I have Switzerland, and I have European Commission. No? I'm sorry. Canada, then.

CANADA:　　　　　　　Thank you, Manal.  It's Luisa Paez for the Canadian government.

I just wanted -- in terms of being mindful of the time, I'll be happy to work with my dear colleague Jorge, from Switzerland, and with Kavouss offline to reformulate or re-enhance better the question on new gTLDs.  I would support the comment from Switzerland that it would be good to get sort of a strategic vision or strategic comments from the board at this point that perhaps the Jeff -- that the co-chairs of the PDP would not be able to provide.  Yeah, so I just wanted to offer to my help.  Thank you.  We could do it offline.

CHAIR ISMAIL:　　　　Thank you very much, Louisa.  This is very helpful.

Jorge, please.

SWITZERLAND:　　　　Thank you, Manal, and sorry for coming back to Switzerland.

For the record, it's just a clarification question, because in the other topics we are presenting to the board, I saw four topics, but we jumped over the IGOs.  Or was this intentional?

CHAIR ISMAIL:　　　　I'm not familiar with the slides.  I'm aware that there is one topic missing.  I'm not sure if it's the numbering issue or it's --

ROB HOGGARTH: It's on that slide right there at the bottom.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Okay. So, sorry, my mistake. It was after the two-character codes. So we'll be back to it.

So just a second.

So if we can address our last point quickly, and then we can proceed with the BGIG meeting. And if we finish early, maybe we can get to the board questions to the GAC.

So I think we're done with the subsequent procedures.

Brazil, please.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal.

In the meeting with the board -- it's not a question, but it would be useful to have an opportunity for -- to make a statement on the .AMAZON issue. I think many countries that are not Amazon countries are interested in the developments and would like to have the opportunity to react to the latest developments and put forth our position. So it would be nice to have a few minutes for that.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Achilles. Noted. Yes. I was going to ask, actually, at the end whether this is a topic that we need to add.

So one final thing before we conclude is the IGO protections. And, again, this is what we have initially submitted to the board.

The GAC leadership appreciates the board's response to GAC advice in the recent scorecard document and has engaged with the GNSO Council leadership to understand the status of current GNSO policy development efforts.

GAC members are interested in the board's understanding of where this issue currently stands.

So I'll pause here to see if there are any comments.

Yes, Switzerland, then Iran.


SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Manal.

Jorge Cancio with Switzerland, for the record.

I was asking because yesterday, I think we had a very fruitful discussion with the GNSO Council on this question of the IGO protections. And maybe there we could build in some comment on that or giving some orientation to the board that, in principle, it seems that we are on a constructive way in order to find possibilities how to restart that PDP under conditions that are

amenable to everyone.  But this is, of course, subject to a decision also by the GNSO Council.

But I don't know if that could be conveyed in some manner.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:       Okay.  Then, again, let's try maybe after this session to try to formulate the question in light of the discussions that happened earlier this week.

So, Iran, please.

IRAN:       Yes.  Along the same line as Jorge mentioned, the question still is valid, but we could add to that that after our meeting with GNSO, which also we understand we could categorize as very helpful, fruitful, or whatever positive, we understood that the GNSO, considering the four options, and very probably, maybe EPDP, probably EPDP.  And what we would like to add, that in the view of GAC, there should be some time line for the completion of the work.  That is something that yesterday was not mentioned by GNSO, but we mentioned that, and we would like to have a time line to complete this work.  That is something we could add.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran.

So maybe after the BGIG working group meeting, if we can -- those who spoke to certain points, if we can get together quickly, I mean, fine-tune our submission, and then we can circulate it to the whole GAC and submit it to the board.

So I can see that board members have already arrived. So apologies to keep you waiting. I was under the impression that we are starting at quarter past. But I'm sorry. So....

Anything else that we have overlooked or anything else that needs to be added apart from .AMAZON?

Okay. Great.

Then thank you very much. We will move immediately to the Board-GAC interactions group meeting. And just a quick alert that at 2:46, we will be observing a moment of silence in remembrance of those who lost their lives in a major earthquake here in Japan. So this is just a heads-up so that when we pause the session, you know what's going on.

Maarten.

As I said, this is the Board-GAC interactions group meeting, cochaired by Maarten Botterman from the board side and myself.

So, Maarten, over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes.  Thank you very much, Manal.  And thank you, everybody, for staying in this, because this makes you part of the Board-GAC interaction group.

This Board-GAC interaction group thanks its name to Kavouss.  All honors to you for suggesting that.

It is the continuation, in a way, of much of the work of the BGRI that some of you may be more familiar with.  And the same here is really to talk about how we can better communicate together, how we can better interact together.

So we will not discuss so much substantive issues as how we've dealt with issues and how we'll deal with issues together in the future to have the best possible collaboration.

So with that, I think it's wise to tell a little bit about, as you can see, the agenda.

So how we dealt with the Barcelona scorecard.

There was some interaction on two-character.  Many of you have been part of an introduction to the two-character tool, and all of you have been -- have given access to the briefing materials to put on the record what has been expired and how things came to be.

As usual, we'd love to share with you the schedule for addressing the advice of the communique we expect you to have at the end

of this week. I know that's your favorite. And for sure that means that we present it, and if there are concerns, or we need to adapt it, this is a good place to discuss that.

And another issue was, so how do we deal with the deferred advice? And this is useful to discuss together how we deal with that.

And that is basically what we want to cover up to 3:00 o'clock. Right?

CHAIR ISMAIL: That's right.

So, yeah, thank you very much, Maarten. And also thanks to Leon and Matthew for joining us here from the board as well.

So shall I pass to you, David and Christine. And thank you also for being there and helping us with the...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I will -- was there no slide for the Barcelona communique?

Okay. Well, you've received the response to the Barcelona communique. Maybe the best thing to say on that is we've been able to deliver as we promised in Barcelona. And I think it's been well received. Is that right?

CHAIR ISMAIL: Yes. This is to acknowledge that we have received the board response. And thank you for the response, and thank you for the time line and the predictable time frame that we have set and has been following so far. It's very helpful. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. And then the two-character discussion has been subject to a lot of debate over the years. And I think it was important to have the dialogue in Barcelona triggered by documentation from your side as well to be very clear on where things came from and how we came to where we are today.

We also had the pleasure of finally being ready with the tool that no longer requires you to ask, first off, which countries of which domains are using the two characters that are liaised to your country code for a report. But you can actually look at any time online now. This online information is provided and updated daily. And if you haven't been able to join the call with the org yet, then I'm sure there will be other opportunities to get you online and to get you support with that.

What I hear is that the overall impression was this is a useful tool and it responds to some of the concerns and was helpful that way. I think it may be worth our while to at some point in the future look back and just repeat the question. So if you've been using it,

then how was it for you? Have you been following up with concerns, and if so, did that go well?

With that, yeah, I open the floor if there's any specific questions to that. Do we want to present the tool right now? I don't think so. So any specific questions related to the two-character codes tool or documentation? Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Yes, Maarten, thank you for coming here and having discussed the different aspects. At least we have not yet exercised that tool, so we need time to look at that one and to see whether this is a way to navigate but it does not resolve the problem. Just navigates where we are. Identify where we are but does not reply -- at least does not reply to all concerns. And also, we said before you come in, we have received the letter, two-page or three-page letter plus some 16 pages of additional material that we need time to look at that one to analyze whether your reply is satisfactory or still requires further clarification or for some cases may, may, may not be satisfied. So we need time. So that is that. So it is early, but we have not yet -- at least Iran has not yet done that exercise. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss. And yeah, we have just been discussing this a while ago. So thank you for the documents. They are well received. We haven't gone through all the documents yet. They are quite lengthy. So we'll be looking into the documents and also the tool. We had a webinar on the tool and for those who were not able to join the webinar, it's recorded so please make sure to -- to listen to the recordings and provide feedback. We will be receiving feedback between now and Mouriel (phonetic) and that is our checkpoint where we will collect our feedback and see if there is anything that needs to be improved. So any -- anything else? Okay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Then I think it's good to move towards the next slide which shows our planning based on the principles that we've been using for the last years for responses to the communique, the publishing and the responses to the communique. Christine, would you like to take us through that.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you, Maarten. Christine Willett, icann.org. This slide reflects the timeline with which the Board intends to consider and take action on the GACs communique coming out of Kobe. The first date is the expectation of publishing the communique this week, followed by a Board-GAC meeting, a teleconference call, to

discuss clarifying questions typically held within a month following the publication of the communique. We would anticipate that to occur by 16 of April, schedules and calendars permitting.

The Board then anticipates considering the full scorecard and adopting resolution on that communique by the end of May, which would be four weeks in advance of ICANN65. This aligns with the timing that we have been following for the last nearly two years now in terms of processing of GAC advice.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So any questions or remarks? And please, open -- I'm very much aware that with the wealth of countries being represented here, there's also new people coming in the room every time. So allowing you also to raise your hand, if and when needed, happy to explain anything. This meeting is really to facilitate and not to -- so much to discuss. So the floor is really open to any questions.

CHAIR ISMAIL: I don't see any questions, so I think it's -- it's a clear timeline and again, it's the usual timeline after every meeting which is very helpful and helps us predict and know when to expect the Board response to the GAC communique and also the very useful facility

clarification calls that we have after, post-communique. So I think we can move on, yeah?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. The next slide, please, which is on -- as Manal raised and we discussed would be good to talk about here. So we've now got this category of deferred advice. Advice that we said neither yes or no but because of processes going on in this multistakeholder model that we're working in, it was just not the right time for the Board to give an advice. So they're more or less parked. So next slide is on that, I think? Can we get the next slide? Good. Can you help us with that, Christine? Don't try to read it, she'll tell you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Christine Willett again. Yes, this slide is very dense in terms of words. This slide reflects the five items of deferred advice coming out of the scorecard adopted by the Board in January of 2019. So it reflects that there are five remaining items of deferred advice. The first four on GDPR and WHOIS, advice coming out of the San Juan communique, and the fifth item being advice from the San Juan communique on IGO reserved acronyms.

The second column titled "Advice Text" reflects the advice from the GAC communique and the column entitled "Board Response

on Barcelona Scorecard" reflects the most current Board response on those items.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So as you know, the GNSO Council adopted it's EPDP but it's still open for public comments until early April, I think, which means that only at that time there will be a definite EPDP at which time we'll make sure that the confusion about, for instance, the two-character discussion in Helsinki will not be repeated and will be very clear whatever the Board does with the EPDP, takes the GAC advice, that is currently deferred, explicitly into account.

As for the IGO, I think I heard the discussion you had preparation of Tuesday, but it's clear that process is still pending the interaction between the GAC and the GNSO at this moment.

So I think that's the status of the deferred advice, and for us, for the Board, it means this is stuff that we don't forget. We keep it on our mettle and at the time we make sure it's addressed. So that seems to be the best way forward at the moment. And open to any suggestions, questions, or whatever on that.

CHAIR ISMAIL: So any questions from GAC colleagues first? So if not, I have a quick question. I mean, in terms of the platform itself, when we -- when we provide a follow-up on previous GAC advice, how was

this reflected in the platform? I mean, is it a new entry that is marked again and we need to follow up on or does it reflect again on the same entry? I mean, in terms of the platform. Sometimes we follow up on previous GAC advice.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Christine Willett. As far as the tool and the org tracking of this, we do record the follow-up items coming from the GAC communique and we correlate them to the original advice items and the status of those. And those follow-up items from the Barcelona communique were considered by the Board in their scorecard which was the first item on your agenda and were commented on and responded to by the -- by the Board in that scorecard.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And I think with follow-up advice, it's also very good if you would consider whether it's really like the last advice plus a little bit or whether it's really new advice in which case I would really say explicitly refer back to the previous advice on this and be explicitly clear on what's the question or the request to the Board is at this moment in time. So -- and I've seen both things. I've seen follow-up advice that's last advice plus a little bit, so that's clear. And if it's actually new advice, please make it clear that it's new advice. Iran.

IRAN: Yes, clarification. I did not react on time. With the first item relating to the WHOIS you mentioned that yesterday, EPDP output is now on the public comment so 42 days or 40 days or whatever, whether it's been 2 or 40 or 42. And after that comes to the Board and the Board would consider that, analyze that, and approve that, hopefully, but that would not fully reply to the advice because you need the model and model will be phase two. So GAC advice would continue off of that, and I don't think that main part of our advice was not about the EPDP itself. It was about the model of the access. So this access will not be available and then you will talk about it with the Board on the other day about the -- some time frame on the model. So this should not be closed in, I don't know April, May, June. It should be later on. And how long, I don't know. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, and I'm looking whether there's other work leads to. But on this it's for sure, you're right. And it's not likely closing everything after the EPDP and taking your advice that has been deferred so far in account that ultimately everything closes. No, I'm with you. Very parts -- various parts will go on for a next phase, and we're very cognizant of that. It might be good if we work together so also the Marrakech communique would be explicit in that. So we'll find a way, but we make sure no things fall through the cracks.

CHAIR ISMAIL:     Thank you, Maarten.  Any other questions?  Anything else on our agenda?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Any other business?  Kavouss?

IRAN:     Yes, thank you very much.  This Board-GAC BGIG is now in --

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     You know the name.

IRAN:     Yes, is in good shape.  I think we should continue and further promote, improve that.  And I think very effective the first fruit coming out now.  I think we have a better relation and we thank you very much for the attention you have given and the follow-up functions and the meeting conference call between the two GAC -- sorry, clarification and GAC advice.  So that's expressing, if the colleagues allow me, our collective appreciation to the Board for this item.  Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Yes, thank you for that.  It's appreciated, and I think even now we didn't use a lot of time, it's been worthwhile to have it and to keep

it on the agenda of meetings. I think we'll give you back some time to better prepare for our meeting on Tuesday in which we will be able and willing to address also content issues. So thank you very much for your hospitality. I'm wishing you a very good day. Manal.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Maarten. And thanks to Chris, Nigel, Matthew, and Leon as well. Thank you all for taking the time. And yeah, we have been very efficient. I hope that GAC colleagues will stay in the room so that we can finalize our preparations for tomorrow's meeting. So thank you.

So, we're now back to the slide deck. We're done with the four areas that we need to ask the Board questions on. We will fine-tune the questions shortly after we finish our discussion now. But this is to quickly go through the Board's question to the GAC and other SOs and ACs as well.

So the draft ICANN strategic plan for fiscal year 2021-2015 -- 2021-2025 is based on five primary trends, identified by the ICANN community, that present challenges and opportunities. The draft strategic plan reflects those challenges in five strategic goals. And those are strengthening the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS root server system, improving the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance,

evolving the unique identifier systems to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base, addressing geopolitical issues impacting ICANN's mission to ensure a single and globally interoperable Internet, and ensuring ICANN's long-term financial sustainability.

So those are the five strategic goals. As I mentioned earlier, they were mentioned by ICANN chairman of the board during the opening ceremony speech and there was a whole session on the five goals earlier today. Can we go to the following slide, please?

So in an effort to begin to address the five strategic goals, ICANN is embarking on four major project areas including the draft strategic plan '21-25, and this was published in December. The first consultation paper on a two-year budgeting process that was also published in December, and the draft fiscal year '21-25 operating plan and financial projections which likely will be posted mid-2019.

In addition, based on community feedback and discussions at ICANN63, the Board intended to begin a consultation here in Kobe on the status of ICANN's governance model, including whether and how it should evolve to continue to serve the global ICANN community.

And as noted here, the -- this session will take place on Thursday at 1:30 at the main hall.

So if we go to the next slide for, I believe, the specific questions that we have received.

So in January, ICANN board chair shared the five key areas of challenge and the four key planning projects and asked ICANN SOs and ACs are we ready? Do we, for example, collectively have the leadership, skills, resources, knowledge, and commitment required to implement these plans successfully over the next five years? We need your help for this.

So the SOs and ACs were asked specifically for high-level input on what the Board, ICANN org, and the community should be doing now to prepare for the successful implementation of these plans. And the concrete ask is please make three suggestions, as concrete as possible, providing one each for the Board, ICANN org, and the community.

And the intent of the previous slides was just to put things into context because, I mean, the question is directly related to what we have just mentioned.

So the second question is while the success of these plans lies primarily within ICANN, we all know that ICANN does not operate in a vacuum and alliances and partnerships are important to our success. How can we increase the likelihood that important allies and partners in the space are on the same page and working together to achieve common/agreed upon goals?

Again, the question is please provide one suggestion of something that could be done externally to improve trust and collaboration.

So those are the two questions we have received from the Board. I'm not sure if there are immediate reactions to this or comments. And, frankly speaking, we haven't even provided any preliminary submissions on those questions, so...

So I'm just sharing them for you again to bring them again to your attention. Of course they were shared over email. And again, to brainstorm here, if you wish. Sleep over them and then maybe be more ready tomorrow to discuss with the Board if -- if they ask the same questions tomorrow during the session.

Kavouss, please. Iran, yes.

IRAN:                          Yes. We or I may comment on the financial stability tomorrow along the line of the following: That we have mission, we have vision, we have strategy goal, and then we have activities and we have output. We translate the strategic plan into the operational plan activities, and then we use financial possibility to implement that. So what you may say that, first of all, this should be a mapping between the operational plan activities and outcome or output, with the strategic goal to knowing which action and

which output relate to what goal. And, second, there should be a linkage between the strategic plan, financial plan, and operational plan.

Otherwise, this (indiscernible) will not be maintained. So this is something that -- in fact, I wanted to make it at the end of today's general presentation, but the time was limited, but perhaps we may raise it tomorrow that it is one of the important elements.

This mapping is quite necessary that people know that what activity is related to which goal and to what financial possibility. So this mapping is something that would help the people to understand the situation. And also, we could say also that the five years' plan is general, after presentation, presentation of each, there might be a need for some small or whatever necessary adjustment in order to be updated. So this sort of the annual adjustment is something, whether is included in the financial plan or operational or strategic plan or not, that is something in every organization they do that.

The five years is overall, but every year they have to have some adjustment to make it possible to respond to the requirement and environment.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Yeah, this would be very helpful.

So I can just acknowledge receiving the -- both questions of the Board and then maybe ask if there are any immediate reactions to those questions. So, Kavouss, you can then make your intervention. If there are any other interventions, they would be most welcomed. If not, it only makes sense that we still need to go through the material, digest the session of today, listen to the session of Thursday, and then maybe come back later with more comments if we're not ready to get into a deep discussion here. Or maybe even hear from the Board more around topics of specific interest to us, like the pillar of the multistakeholder model, governance model of ICANN.

I know this is a topic of interest to the GAC, I guess, and I'm sure we will have comments as soon as we understand the topic under discussion. And again, as I said, there is a whole session on Thursday facilitated by Brian Cute, who is a longstanding community member, has been the chair of ATRT1 and ATRT2.

So, I mean, I understand if there are no immediate reactions, but I'm just bringing to your attention also this important pillar that we may want to follow closely.

So anything else?

Kavouss, please.

IRAN:                    Yes.  I have mentioned in B, but perhaps we should emphasize again today, tomorrow, or whatever time, the need to foster collaboration with international organizations, including ITU for certain aspect.  For instance, today there was discussion of the deployment of IPv6, and I think this is something that is carried out in ITU, and there is a need of collaboration because ITU might not have all possibilities.  So assisting countries for the deployment or some people call the migrations or transition, whatever name you are given to that, from IPv4 to IPv6.  The know-how may not exist.  The capacity building needs to be increased.  And there should be some sort of an emphasis on that collaboration, international organizations including ITU.  That is something that we could add.  Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:            Thank you, Iran.  And this is also something that falls within the response to the second question.  This is specifically, I believe, what they would like to hear from us.  So thank you, Kavouss.

                        Switzerland, Jorge.

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

                        This is more than a -- more than an answer to these points.  It's more also a question or a -- or a suggestion to the GAC leadership

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

to you also. And, for instance, I was recalling with these questions that we submitted an answer to the Board on our priorities for 2019 some months ago, and I see that there is useful material, and of course perhaps GAC leadership, together with the help of support staff, could cover some of that material because it's still valid. And, for instance, there was mention that we need to rebalance process and outputs to find more efficiency in the -- in the processes we have. And there are also other general ideas which I think that after -- as the questions are very broad in scope, we can use that and work on that basis.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Switzerland, for the helpful suggestion. We'll try to take this.

And sorry for the mobile ringing. This was the alarm for the time that we need to observe the moment of silence. So allow me first to read a statement and then we will observe this moment of silence.

So on 11th March 2011 at 2:46 p.m. local time, a 9.1 magnitude earthquake struck in the Pacific Ocean of the northeast coast of Japan's Honshu Island. The earthquake known as The Great East Japan Earthquake triggered a massive tsunami with waves that rose to heights up to 40 meters and traveled up to ten kilometer inland. This was the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

Japan and the fourth most powerful earthquake in the world. An estimated 20,000 people were lost, and close to 500,000 people were forced to evacuate.

So in remembrance of the lives lost and affected by the great east Japan earthquake, we will now observe a moment of silence. I think maybe we need to wait a few more seconds.

[ Moment of silence ]

Thank you, everyone. Thank you.

So thanks, again, Jorge, for the suggestion. We'll try to take the material. I think it's useful, it's relevant, and it will help, again, refresh our minds and trigger the discussion.

Any other immediate re- -- yes, Peter, please.


>>                    Thank you, Manal.

Just a follow-up to what Kavouss said about cooperation with international organizations, including the ITU. I think you have mentioned that ICANN has applied to be a sector member of ITU-D. Probably it would be a good idea to extend the membership of ICANN in other sectors, for instance, in ITU-T. So it may be a suggestion as well.

Thank you.

| CHAIR ISMAIL: | Thank you, Peter. |
| --- | --- |
| | Yes, Kavouss. |

| IRAN: | Yes.  Thank Peter. |
| --- | --- |

In fact, I also intended to raise that question, saying that we are very happy that the ICANN became now a member of the ITU-D. However, in ITU-T, at least there are three study groups that are working more or less in line with the ICANN activity, the (indiscernible) 17 on the security, a study group, (indiscernible) two on the issue of the more or less Internet and some other study group.  So perhaps we should request that ICANN consider to be membership of the ITU-T at least, and also because of the transport of the many of the activities of Internet infusion with mobile and the 5G, it comes into operation end of 2019.  And in 2020 after the WRC19 becomes operational, and many countries will embark on the 5G prospects.  And perhaps ITU-T, in -- they studying also beyond 5G, in fact, they are talking about some things like G -- 6G and so on, so forth.  So that is something they also need to be member of the ITU-R.  So we encourage ICANN to be a member of the three sectors.

Manal, we made in 2010 based on the proposal from one country in North America to extend our collaboration with ICANN.  And we

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

were successful. And we have amended resolution 101, 102, 103 -- sorry -- 133, in order to put one resolves that mutual collaboration with ICANN is necessary and we have to foster this collaboration. And yesterday, it was also discussed between the GNSO members the need for these promotions of collaborations and which is quite essential at this stage. And we need to also emphasize on that (indiscernible) sometime this membership for the two other sectors.

And thanks, Peter, bringing that.

Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:   Thank you very much. This is very helpful, and I think the board would appreciate to hear those interventions tomorrow from the floor.

Anything else before we conclude?

Okay. If not, then this would conclude this session and our GAC sessions for today.

But I would like to bring to your attention that after a 15-minute break -- I mean, at 3:15, there will be the cross-community session on next steps on ICANN's response to the GDPR, to which, again,

the GAC is participating. And this is a topic of interest to the GAC, of course.

And then there will be the first part of the public forum. And as you all know, this is just to remind you that tonight also there is the gala dinner. There will be shuttles leaving from the venue here. I believe Julia will be sending an email to the GAC. So if you can check Julia's email, you will know the exact timing of the shuttles. And there will be also shuttles back from the gala back to the official hotels.

We will be reconvening our GAC meetings tomorrow morning starting 8:30 with the GAC Public Safety Working Group meeting.

So see you at the gala and see you tomorrow morning.

And, again, thanks for -- everyone, for this fruitful discussion. Thanks to support staff, IT team, and the interpreters. Thank you very much.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019