

---

ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – GAC: Preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board  
Monday, March 09, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Manal, we can start now. Over to you to.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Gulden, and thank you everybody for the discussion on.org which we will continue as we start our discussion now on preparations for our meeting with the Board. So the earlier session I would say would take us nicely to this discussion, and if we can have the -- I think the .org is the first on the topics with the Board isn't it? On the slides and I'm sorry, Kavouss, you have your hand up go first.

IRAN: Excuse me. My comment is relating to previous session. I would like to reply to my dear friend Paul. Yes, I have noted that we should have a consensus advice, but we have no type of communications with the Board. We have advice, we have consensus advice. We have communication, we have some way of expressing our views as concerns and so on so for the so we should not lose this opportunity or miss this opportunity and remain silent. Yes you have to listen to everybody. But this is the time that at least you have to bring our voice to the ears of the ICANN Board saying that there is a concern that is some points that needs clarifications. Needs responses, need

---

***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.***

---

description and so on so forth. So I don't think that I -- explanation would be misinterpreted I am looking for the consensus advice. But we have to raise our hand. We have to express our concerns in one way or another. That's why I say even expressing concerns much even raising the questions with the Board at this very meeting that we have right now you have to say what is the exact questions or comments that we would like to take with the Board. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss, and I think this is exactly what we are going do do now. What are the questions that we would like to raise with the Board. We have already compiled the list of potential questions out of the discussions that already took place over e-mail, and I'm sorry to disturb the flow of the presentation but if we can go directly to the .org issue please.

OTHER SPEAKER: Manal I see Rob's hand is up.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Rob, go ahead, please.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Manal. Our careful orchestrations that we need to do is that Gulden is going to stop sharing the introductory materials here so that we can go to the actual document that, as I shared a couple of sessions ago we are going to try to edit live in front of you all in this

---

zoom room, what we are going to do is Gulden is going to show on her shared screen the Google document, and then Benedetta and I will be in the document trying to effect any edits that you all discuss as we go through the documents one of the things that you will see and this is a result of an e-mail from Vernita from the USA about an hour ago is that I've already incorporated Vernita's addition to the document and you will see this later when we get down to the bottom of it. And Gulden what you can do in in terms of the structure of this session if it you can scroll down to where Manal indicated we should start, we are going to skip the GAC responses to the ICANN Board chair interest and go down to the GAC topics proposed for the Board. And then we can just roll through. If you would like Manal you can -- because some people are not in the zoom room. If you can read through the suggested text and then Benedetta and I -- Benedetta primarily because she's much faster at this than I -- she will do the live editing as people share comments or suggestions so I will turn the microphone back over to you, Manal, to see how you'd like to proceed. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Rob, and thank you for putting everything in place so quick. So this is what we already compiled as potential questions on the topic of PIR to the Board. And the text reads "the ICANN organization's ability to demonstrate that considerations of the global public interest are carefully assessed and protected in the context of the proposed PIR transaction is important to the organization. In evaluating the PIR transaction ICANN must demonstrate its commitment to multistakeholder input from all parts of

---

the community" and the questions read one what are the steps taken by ICANN to safeguard the global public interest? 2, are there any interim results of the diligence performed by ICANN that were referred to in the initial ICANN response to the GAC chair? 3, is there -- is the ICANN Board considering the possibility of not giving the consent for the transaction? And 4, PICs are indicated in the correspondence as establishing the basis for addressing community concerns nevertheless it should be evaluated whether it is actually safeguarding public benefit, and are there any guarantees for such safeguarding foreseen. How the affordability of .org is further ensured. I'll stop here, and see whether those 4 questions address everything we want to discuss with the Board, whether we want to modify anything, add anything, and, Kavouss, the floor is yours.

IRAN:

Yes, thank you very much, the author of these 4 questions, I don't want to modify them at this stage but I have to say there is one principle question before all of that. What is motivation, and justifications of this changes? Then we said that how would this change be public interest will be better protected and served? So we have to have some reason why we do that. We change something for improvement, we change something for -- it is only motivation the commercial motivation, I am not against that but would like to know what is motivations.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So –

---

IRAN: Motivations with -- so we have to add one more question on that. Motivations and justification and whether this they serve really the interest of the community better than the previous case. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So, this is an important question though I'm not sure whether it's addressed to ICANN exactly.

OTHER SPEAKER: To ICANN.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Exactly because motivation comes from those who did the action and those are not ICANN for sure. So although I agree would the question Kavouss. I don't see it -- a question for the Board. I hope you agree.

IRAN: Yes, I do -- not opposed to what you said but this question is valid. Whether... or anything. On this issue we need to know motivations. It is commercial motivation or is other motivation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Kavouss. And by the way, I think -- eye society are also doing a survey or something -- I can dig more information and

---

maybe share it with colleagues who may want to address some questions to the other party. I see Jorge in the chat and before that Rob thank you for this, and special thanks to the human rights and international group co-chairs LINA and Suada for their help in formulating those 4 questions. So thank you very much. Jorge is suggesting that maybe we can simplify question 4 a little bit, and I also agree since it didn't read well with me when I was reading it. And I have Olivier as hand up much of European Commission please go ahead.

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION:** I agree with Jorge that question 4 is a bit convoluted. In fact, what we should ask I think is how ICANN is going to take into account the PICs into their assessment and how they are going to engage possibly with, with ATOS to improve the PICs to ensure that they are ... to preserve the public interest. So I mean, maybe the question can be reformulated along these lines but I think all the elements are in the question and then I was wondering in the introduction paragraph we say that it's important to demonstrate commitment to the multi-stakeholder inputs.

**MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:** So Olivier, I'm sorry to interrupt. If you can just wait a second until Benedetta finishes. She's doing this on-line in realtime I mean so -- so are we good with the question now? I can see also in the chat question 4 should also cover human rights and data protection and privacy, not on-line affordability. And all -- giving a plus 1 to Jorge. Perhaps we

---

can ask what criteria will the Board use to evaluate the public interest, how will the Board apply those criteria? So on and so forth we have now proposed text for question 4 and what criteria will the Board use to evaluate the public interest, how will the Board apply those criteria, how is ICANN going to take into account PICs into their assessment and engage with ethos to improve the PICs to ensure your they serve the public interest? So let me ask if first whether question 4 is okay as it stands so Olivier I understand you still have comments on the text but Vernita if this is directly to the question please go ahead.

VERNITA HARRIS:

Yes, this is in relation to the question. I'm sorry can someone point me in the direction of where we have to find public interest? And that would be helpful, and then I'm not sure because then my next question may be answered because if we define public interest then there should be the criteria and what we're going to use for this already identified somewhere. And then I'm not sure that it if ICANN should be the engaging with ethos or if it should be the community, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Vernita. So any responses to the question before pea move onto the text? So I personally just checking the chat Kavouss I'm not sure if you can type your comments again I'm not sure I understand and Benedetta I asking to confirm the order of the questions. But first if there are responses to Vernita's questions I don't think there is an agreed definition of public interest at least nothing I

---

know of I'm trying to catch up with the chat as well, so Rob, GAC, whereas paragraph number 6 and the GAC operating principles much the GAC commits itself to implement efficient procedures in support of ICANN and to provide thorough and timely advice and analysis on relevant matters of concern with regard to government and public interests. Yeah, exactly. I don't think we have a definition for public interest, but I think we can still refer to it, and we have references but let me first -- sorry I kept you waiting Olivier -- I'll give you the floor, and then to Kavouss and then we maybe try to conclude on the exact questions and text so Olivier please you had some suggestions to the text before the questions.

OLIVIER BRINGER:

It's just in the introductory paragraph we talk about commitment to the multi stakeholder input so we might want to ask a question about it. I mean we have partly the reply. I mean we see that this meeting of ICANN there was discussion around the transaction with the public forum just earlier today, but they might want to explain more in -- I mean more in detail how they are going to take into account the multistakeholder input going forward because I don't see a question in the, in the 4 that we have now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Okay. Can you repeat the question for Benedetta to type, please? Is it the 5th question or you want to modify the text.

---

OLIVIER BRINGER: It would be a first or a second question, something along the line how is ICANN going to take into account multistakeholder put or engage with the multistakeholder community in the assessment of the transaction or continue to engage with the multistakeholder community.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So I was just going to say that in answer to this may be that we already have the public forum.

OLIVIER BRINGER: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: But now you say continue to –

OLIVIER BRINGER: Yeah, I hope it's not the only engagement because it was one-sided. So we had comments from the community but maybe there are more comments, and then it would be also interesting to have a dialogue with the Board.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So there is the first question now is how is ICANN going to take into account multistakeholder community input in the assessment of the transaction or continue to engage with the multistakeholder community on this topic? So okay all of you?

---

OLIVIER BRINGER: For me it's okay we could even -- could even keep only the first part of the question. But maybe others have views on that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So let's put starting from from all let's put in between square brackets for now and see how the discussion would go? Kavouss please? Anything else, Olivier, before we move.

OLIVIER BRINGER: No.

IRAN: I think the concluding paragraph is a mixture of statement and questions. If we need to maintain that concluding paragraph, we have to separate the statements town up to the end of the second line.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So let me just --

IRAN: And go to --

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: This was supposed to be question number 4 and we now replaced it with the other formulation, so this should be deleted.

IRAN: Yes. If there is no problem.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Excellent thank you Kavouss. So I'm also asking and Suada, Lina and Suada whether those address your points us what we've changed in your text so please I hope you can confirm this is okay. And Vernita please go ahead.

VERNITA HARRIS: And question number 2 it's we think is still way too broad. So we would recommend striking that question, and I do think that the question -- the other question is address address the concern that we've heard thus far but asking how ICANN plans to safeguard the global public interest when we haven't defined the public interest or we don't know what the criteria is I think is an unfair question. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Vernita. Noted. So any objections to this is everybody okay with deleting question number 2 based on the fact that other questions discussion of other questions may cover the point. And I

---

also see Jorge in the chat saying why not evaluate the PICs instead of evaluate the public interest? So does this.

UNITED STATES: This is Vernita Harris. I've made the edit in question 5 the proposed evaluate to evaluate the PICs instead of the public interest and the question is really question 5 and 6 should be should be one question, maybe they should be merged? Since they seem to overlap?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So we'll have another read, but after we hear from Kavouss. Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Yes, I think we may need question 2 because sort of what are the steps, maybe we combine question 2 in some other part when talking about the safeguard, and after that the safeguard and necessary steps or... steps to be taken into consideration, so I think part of the question 2 is important. You're talking about the steps and this is very important. It is not one lump sum action. There would be steps. Several steps so I think part of the question 2 is valid. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. Kavouss. So we have 2 proposals now. One to keep question number 2 because it asks about the steps which may be for the future and one to delete question number 2 since we don't have a concrete definition of the global public interest, but now -- as

---

everyone thinks about question number 2 let me just make sure we're okay with the rest of the questions, so 1, how is ICANN going to take into account multistakeholder community input in the assessment of the transaction? And then we have the rest of the question between brackets we need to decide whether or not to keep it and then question number 3 reads are there any interim results of the diligence performed by ICANN that were referred to in the initial ICANN response to the ... and 3 is the ICANN Board considering the possibility of not giving the consent for the transaction, and then we have questions 5 and 6 and there is a question as well whether they overlap. The first reads what criteria will the ICANN Board use to evaluate the PICs and apply those criteria and the second question reads how is ICANN going to take into account PICs into their assessment and engage with Ethos capital to improve the PICs to ensure they serve the public interest, and I agree, I really think maybe now, 5 is a subset of 6? So any, any comments on 5 and 6? Kavouss, please, and then Olivier.

IRAN:

Yes, I'm not sure in 5 if you are talking about evaluating the PICs or evaluating the PICs in this regard in regard to the PIR. We are not talking of the PIC in general how evaluate or not. That is not the question. The question is that evaluation in this specific case. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

So, Kavouss, you are in favor of keeping both questions?

---

IRAN: Yes, I have to -- to keep them but if you talk about the evaluation of PICs we should say PIC in this regard in regard of the PIR but we are not raising –

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Understood.

IRAN: How the PICs will be evaluated thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you of Olivier please.  
European Commission go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Could not instead of referring to the global public interest if we could not refer to the interest of the .org community including non-commercial stakeholders because this is the peculiarity of the .org registrant community that they have a certain number of not-for-profit or noncommercial organizations that use the domain name and in the we want to safeguard their interests and some of them serve the public interest.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you for the suggestion Olivier. So the suggestion is to replace the public interest -- global public interest by the community or the .org community.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Uh-huh.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And I see Vincent. Vincent, please go ahead and I'm just also throwing food for thought whether this would now be a question to ICANN or to Ethos and PIR. I'm just thinking out loud, so Vincent please.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Hello, can you hear me?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Okay, great. Yes, I would like to develop on the issue of the definition. Definition of global public interest. I personally think that we really need to keep this formula. I believe it is -- it is an essential point an essential question, and if I were to try and propose a raw definition right now I think that it would rest on 3 pillar. The first being before the ... especially for NGOs and the organizations that have formed the core of .org users so far, the second pillar being potential of privacy and freedom of speech, and the third pillar being the development of

---

the .org gTLD of its services, and the expansion of its community. Ethos promised its acquisition of PIR. Would ensure the development but we have to make sure it is indeed the case because I believe that it would be part of the global public interest that the .org gTLD can keep its development and thrive as owe Ethos promise so a definition of public interest would rest on these 3 pillars. I hope I'm being clear.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Vincent. I have could have use next.

IRAN: Yes, I don't understand why we have to take out global public interest. Half an hour ago in closed generic we discussed public interest and we referred to the GAC Beijing communique. What is the problem with that? So I think we have to maintain that. That is something that we have, we have seen in the ICANN missions public interest several times. This is number 2 not a specific problem but I don't think that we have to refer to a specific category of stakeholder. Commercial or noncommercial so on so forth. That remains global and generic but not going to a specific category of the stakeholder, so I may not be in favor of putting our finger so in particular category of the stakeholder. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. And there are also commence in the chat that I'm trying to catch up with, I'm sorry. So Jorge is suggesting let's spell the

---

interests out. Prize stability. Freedom of expression and privacy protection inter alia. What are the steps taken by ICANN to safeguard the global public interest regarding this transaction inter alia in terms of affordability. Price stability. Freedom of expression and protection of privacy. So Vernita, would this be a way out? And I see Kavouss's hand, is this a new hand Kavouss?

IRAN: Yes, I think the meeting with the Board if it is 6 -- to have 6 question. Each question ten minutes is more than what we have. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

I have to say this is one of several topics. So this is not the only topic. And I agree with you, we have only 60 minutes. So we might not be able to cover everything I'm sure. So do we want to park this for now and maybe move on to the rest of the questions and pry prioritize and see what we want to keep and maybe prioritize or reorder our questions again? Any objections to moving on for now? We have consumed more than half the time, and as Kavouss mentioned we only have 60 minutes during the discussion with the Board, so we may need to prioritize our questions so I see agreement from from Brian in the chat so let's try to skim through the other questions now in order to agree what we would like to keep and what we would like to -- can we scroll down please? So we have the new gTLD subsequent procedures. I'm not sure if I need to read the introductory text but the questions read, can the Board please provide an update on its and ICANN org's internal process of preparing for a future round of new gTLD program? And second, does the Board anticipate any specific or

---

targeted activities related to Board GAC interactions that should be undertaken to ensure a smooth future round of new gTLD programs? So any comments on those questions? And do we all agree to keep them? With special thanks to Luisa, of course, our topic lead Gulden Gulden we have could have use next.

IRAN: The next question is do we need both questions update on each and ICANN org internal process. What we expect from them. This is a question, very critical that we ask to give us update? We have been given update several times, and so could we limit that to one question only? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And you're proposing leaving the second question you mean?

IRAN: Yeah, maybe second question or combination of first and second. One single question but not -- updated -- they don't add anything we have heard. We have heard from the group that this is the update. Much what update we have to hear from them on the repetition of the previous so what do we really have to here on the subsequent. I am not sure we need a question or not. What question we really want to take. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think given that this was a priority topic we thought maybe to ask the Board on, on an update on the topic from their side, and whether there is anything specific that's needed in relation to the GAC and the Board interactions. But I'm happy to defer to Luisa. If we need both questions can we merge them?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Hi Manal. This is Luisa.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes I can hear you several times. There is a little bit of echo, but please go ahead.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: A bit of echoing. Can you hear me now clearly?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, Luisa, thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: So I think for this question we will what we thought by providing the explanatory text before that mentions that it's an ongoing challenge for GAC to keep abreast of the extent and depth of policy discussions so we really -- I think I think we still need to urge the Board to let us know how they are preparing as well as ICANN org's internal process. I know in the past -- there continues to be an I think it's called the implementation assumptions document so I think, I think we can

---

encourage them to give us at that sense of where they are at, and I know Manal as well in your interactions with them, they obviously seem interested in giving us hopefully further details on that. But perhaps I mean I'll need to just take a few minutes to see if I can combine it into one question, in the interests of time but I do feel that this is an important topic that, yeah, so for now I prefer to leave both, but I will take some -- just a few minutes Manal you can continue with the other topic if there's no other comments here, and then I'll get back to you on this one. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Okay. Thank you, Luisa. We will be back to see the merge. One simple option would be perhaps could the Board please provide an update and blah-blah-blah and then -- and whether the Board anticipates any specific activities related to Board GAC interaction, but this is just one quick formulation, so until we hear from Luisa let's move onto WorkStream 2 implementation, and I'm just trying to -- yes thank you for scrolling up because the captioning was hiding the text. So WorkStream 2 implementation the quarterbacks GAC is beginnings SOAC. The GAC is interested in understanding what progress ICANN org is making on this matter and what the Board is doing to encourage those efforts. Is everybody okay with the topic and the question? I see no requests for the floor so I'll assume that everybody is okay so moving to the following section on RDS Hoys to review the GAC notes the boards recent actions on the RDS WHOIS 2 much the topic covered by the review remain a strong area of interest for the GAC which it will continue to follow closely especially with respect to WHOIS accuracy

---

and privacy. Accreditation and compliance enforcement of relevant contractual provisions in ICANN contracts much the GAC welcomes the Board's adoption of the recommendations relating to monitoring. Can we scroll up a bit I'm sorry. The GAC welcomes the Board's adoption of the recommendations relating to monitoring the efficacy in the case of WHOIS access for low enforcement and associated services so this is more after comment indicating the importance of the topic but it's not a question per se. So let's move on and then agree on the order of the sections as well. Can we scroll down please? So we have 2 more sections, one on CCT review follow up, and this reads the GAC appreciates the Board's follow up and correspondence with the GAC on the committee's Montreal communique advice regarding the relationship between the CCT review implementation and the next round of new gTLDs. Can the Board share its thoughts regarding how and when it will approach the task of determining whether CCT review recommendations and previous GAC concerns have been adequately addressed in the upcoming GNSO subsequent procedures policy proposals. So this is a follow-up to our question, to our exchange of letters and clarification regarding the Montreal communique, do we want to again in the interests of time, do we want to include this question with the subsequent procedures and delete this section? Or we want to keep it as a separate section? So Paul saying it's a good question, and Jorge, could we move D to the end if it is just a comment, what key aspect for E is how the Board intend to involve the GAC in such a determination. And Brian, what is the question for the Board on WHOIS? Again it's more of a comment there is no specific question, and I think this is what Jorge is suggesting to move to the

---

end since its just a comment. So Jorge are you suggesting the specific language for E, or you're okay with the current draft? Okay. Jorge is saying we can elaborate orally. So let me ask the same question again do we want to move question E as part of the subsequent procedures or do we want it as a separate section? Kavouss, please go ahead?

IRAN:

Yes, I think it is better to be combined with the subsequent procedures, and then once you finish that we have to put order of treatment of this because some of them are more important than the others to be addressed by... to the nonpublic information and WHOIS and the first one which you have this -- so we have to categorize that in the order because I think most of the team will be spent on the first key questions and the last 2 or 3 ones remain just ten minutes so it is better the organize it the way that the more important question has priority questions will be answered first or will be described first so we have to come back to this question thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. So yes, for the sake of time, let's -- we are going to merge the 2 subsequent procedure questions in one, and then move the CCT question into the subsequent procedures and remove the CCT section, and then on final part access to nonpublic gTLD registration data, requested place holder, yeah, so the -- if we have a requested place holder for the topic but I understand we now have text so if we can scroll down a bit, and the text reads, in its Montreal communique the GAC advised, among other things, that

---

ICANN should make available a standard request form for access to a nonpublic information in response the ICANN Board noted that it could notable debate the contracted parties to use a standard form but that it could corroborate with registries and registrars to develop and make available such a form because the EPDP ... on on the criteria and content of requests for access to nonpublic registration data. Between brackets see preliminary recommendation 3. Reasonable access to nonpublic registration remains a high priority for the GAC especially in this interim period before final system is developed and implemented. A period which may take several years to complete. Might the Board explain what action it is has taken or intend to take to work with contracted parties to develop a standard form based on the EPDP recommendation 3 that can be used in the interim by requestors. So any comments on this question? Can we please have an enter before the question just again to separate the question from the introductory text? So if everybody is okay with this question, and thank you Benedetta already moved the RDS WHOIS review comment at the very end. So done with P those 2 can we move up again please? So I think we now need to finalize the .org and the subsequent procedures. So, again, back to the .org, and we have less than ten minutes remaining, and I feel like its the communique already. And we started losing people as well. So I'm just checking if I missed anything related to this part of the questions in the chat, I see none. So back again. So I think again for shortness we can 4 question one delete the text between brackets if everybody is okay any objections? Okay then let's delete this text between brackets, and it now reads how is ICANN going to take into account multistakeholder community input in the

---

assessment of the transaction, and then the question 2 what are the steps taken by ICANN to safeguard the global interest and as an alternate text and to further explain what's meant by global public interest there was a suggestion to have the question read what are the steps taken by ICANN to safeguard the global public interest regarding this transaction inter alia in terms of affordability. Price stability. Freedom of expression and protection of privacy I have Kavouss, please, go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you, Manal. Rather than going to the questions and read them perhaps you ask if any one have any problem with question 3, 4, 5 and 6. And then go to the categorizations thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. So any objections to questions 3, 4, 5 or 6? I see none. Any objections to questions 1 and 2 as they stand on the screen? But I this I we need to decide on 2 because we have 2 alternatives.

SPEAKER: In the chat box saying... should be removed.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you... Finn, and thank you Gulden. Is everybody okay with deleting price stability? Okay. I see no objections so let's delete it Benedetta, please so with we new delete the first al interpretive. Yes thank you Benedetta. Yes any objections. Okay let's delete it, and

---

delete alternate -- yes please. Thank you Benedetta. Is everybody okay with the 6 questions on .org as they stand on the screen right now? I see European Commission. Olivier please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Olivier, we cannot hear you if you're speaking. You may proceed, your microphone is activated now.

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, I propose we provide the dialogue dial up to Olivia.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Any other comments on questions 1 to 6? I see none, so we will be back to this section when we can reach Olivia. Can we please scroll down to the subsequent procedures? So we now have two questions. Can the Board please provide an update on its and ICANN org's internal process of preparing for a future round of the new gTLDs and whether the Board anticipates any specific or targeted activities related to the GAC Board, Board GAC interactions. To ensure a smooth future round of new gTLDs. And the second question now that was moved is from the CCT review section. Any comments here I see none. Anything pending in the other sections before we get back to .org? Can we please scroll down? So are you okay with the order of the sections before I get back to Olivia and the .org? So we now have .org, then the subsequent procedures, then WorkStream 2 implementation, and then can we please scroll down?

---

SPEAKER: Manal. Olivia is asking for the floor again before we move on.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay. Yeah. I was just trying to conclude on this before -- let's go to .org and Olivia please I'm sorry, go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. In fact, it was not on .org. It was on the –

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I'm sorry okay commission economies on the WHOIS part. On the access to registration data. The of a fact that following the Montreal communique, ICANN org is supposed to work with contracted parties on the form for access to registration data. I think we asked ICANN org how they are going to develop the form, I'm just wondering if we could not also ask how they are going to develop and implement the form? Because -- okay, if we -- if we can just scroll down to the part Olivier is referring to?

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Because my worry, can you hear me.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes.

---

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Because in a way we launched this process to facilitate access whilst the full access model is being designed but we need to arrive at results quickly so it's not that we take you know, a lot of time now to develop a form it. We need to have better access quickly so that's why I think we should also ask about the implementation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: I thought develop means implement but if it adds I'm fine.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: No, I'm fine. If you think that develop is also implementation -- on how it's going to be used I'm fine.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Or if we feel it's redundant we can leave... unless there are objections.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: For me this is fine as well. Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay any. Objections to replacing the develop with implement? Okay. Then let's delete the develop, and keep implement. And thank you Olivier. Anything else on this part? I'm trying also to catch up with the chat I'm sorry, question 6 should be engaged with -- can we go back to .org part, please? So Suada says in the chat question 6 should be engaged with the community, not engage with Ethos. Of, how is ICANN going to take into account PICs? Into their assessment and

---

engage with Ethos capital to improve the PICs to ensure they serve the public interest? I think it's, it's meant here to be Ethos if I'm not mistaken. Right? Kavouss please.

IRAN: I think we could not only say replacing Ethos by the... community we could put both. Engage with both of them. Yeah thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Kavouss. So engage with Ethos capital, and ICANN community?

IRAN: And the community, yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: And the wider community. To improve the PICs to ensure they serve the public interest. So again, just confirming whether 5 and 6 are overlapping, and this is the last thing before we conclude. We are already 5 minutes after the hour. So do we see 5 and 6 overlapping? And there is a suggestion from Suada to erase 6, any objections to -- Kavouss, please, I'm sorry is this a new hand.

IRAN: At least one part of the 6 which is engagement with... and the community important it could be included in the 5 because it's

---

important to engage with the owe Ethos capital and the wider community. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay so, and how will it apply those criteria, and engage with Ethos capital and the wider community to improve the PICs to ensure they serve the public interest?

IRAN: Yes that would be one option which serves both ideas, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Can we do this Benedetta on the screen please? If we can take, and engage from question number 6, we take and engage until the end. Yes, cut it from here and put it in question 5. And then we will delete 6. Any objections? Kavouss, this is an old hand? So I thank everyone we are 6 minutes after the time. I do apologize for exceeding the time. I thank you for your patience. Benedetta. Will we be able to circulate this please with everyone on the mailing list? So that we are all on the same page for tomorrow's meeting. Rob please go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. Manal. Yes. We will circulate these updated changes to the GAC mailing list. Additionally as you all know I traditionally after this session also packaged this all in the slides for the Board meeting and share it with the Board support team for sharing with the Board. Like to get this information in as quickly as possible so the GAC

---

members have an opportunity to consider some of these questions ahead of time. Thanks very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Rob. And Jorge, in the chats saying this feels almost like a real GAC meeting sadly without seeing you face-to-face. Yeah it sounds like a communique drafting session but I'm glad we reached an agreed list at the end. Thank you everyone. Thank you for your engagement, and for your patience. And tomorrow, we will be starting at –

GULTEN TEPE: 13:30[inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden, so we will be starting at 13:30 UTC and please try to attend the GNSO sessions on subsequent procedures, and EPDP whenever possible. And Gulden shared the zoom link in the chat room as well. So see you all tomorrow. Rob is this a new hand? Okay, thank you everyone. Have a good rest of the day. And or good night or wherever you are. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you all join for the sessions today. That links to the session transcripts and recordings will be posted on the appropriate ICANN meeting and GAC website pages. We will continue with the GAC internal discussion session updated tomorrow at 1330UTC and using another zoom room for that session. I will just shared it in the chat box

---

and you have that calendar invitations. You may find the zoom room links in those calendar invites. This meeting is now adjourned. We will disconnect all the lines. Thank you. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**