
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions - GAC Preparation for Meeting with the ICANN Board
Thursday, October 15, 2020 - 12:00 to 13:30 CEST

SPEAKER: May I ask technical support team to start the recording, please.

GULTEN TEPE: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

Welcome to ICANN69 GAC preparation meeting for the Board scheduled Thursday 15th of October at 10UTC, I am Gulden Tepe from the GAC support team.

Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC representatives and delegates to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat to keep accurate attendance records as well as for comments and questions to be read out loud of the Zoom room is equipped with a chat feature at the bottom of your Zoom on the right. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment as noted in the chat. I will put occasional reminders of this request in the chat throughout the session.

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.

Interpretation for GAC sessions which will include all 6 U.N. language and Portuguese. And will be conducted using both Zoom and the remote simultaneous interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network. If you haven't already done so we encourage you to download the Congress Rental Network app following instructions in the Zoom chat or from the meeting details documents available on the GAC agenda website page.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitators, myself or Julia, calls upon your name please unmute yourself, and take the floor. Remember to state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speak ago language other than English. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation when speaking make sure to mute all other devices including the network application.

Finally the session is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will have to mute all participants this session is being recorded and both recording, and transcript will available on the ICANN69 meetings page.

It is now my pleasure to hand the floor to GAC chair, Manal Ismail. Over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Gulden, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GAC preparation for our bilateral meetings with the ICANN Board next week. We have prepared a few slides thanks to Rob to facilitate and structure our discussion, so I hope you managed to go through the slides and are ready to discuss and share your thoughts recording any modifications that need to be reflected.

As you may know by the end of our session today, we will be sharing the modified version with the Board. So for the benefit of everyone, and especially new GAC members I start by providing a quick background regarding the interaction at ICANN public meetings and we will review the GAC topics and questions to ICANN Board. So if we can go to the following slide please. And by a quick background, the Board GAC meetings are an important of course and regular feature of ICANN meetings. We used to have this bilateral during face-to-face meetings, and we maintain this even with the virtual set up. When GAC meetings were used to be closed this was one of the most attended meetings of the GAC and this one was kept open, and so the public could witness the community use to attend this one. And even after GAC sessions have become public the sessions have -- the GAC sessions with the Board have remained important and a point for regular interaction with the Board to provide a venue to highlight and emphasize areas that are likely

to be coming in future GAC advice or communications to the Board.

In recent years the meeting preparations have achieved more structure, a formal exchange of questions have become expected so that preparations can be made for the meeting. So we now go through this process of preparing our questions or topics that we would like to discuss with the Board, so that they can come prepared and can provide us with the answers we are looking for. Can I go to the following slide, so this is the agenda for our meeting with the Board. Quick introductions at the beginning and then discussion of GAC priority areas, and this includes new gTLD subsequent procedures. Registration data and WHOIS. ATRT final report and in specific suggestions that are impacting GAC and Board interactions and a newly added topic which is operation and design.

The following agenda item is the topic that is proposed by the Board for discussion with the GAC and this is enhancing the effectiveness of the multi stakeholder model. A key issues and opportunities for acceleration, and then the closing. So moving on to topics for GAC questions or statements to the Board, this is again the same list of topics that we identified as potential topics for a discussion with the Board. I will not repeat them again but maybe go directly to the first topic which is the new

gTLD subsequent procedures. So if we go to the following slide please this is what we have already shared with the Board, so let me go through this slowly and then we can stop to discuss and see if there are specific questions, and I can see we're going to have some input here. So as part of its meeting communication with the Board the GAC provided background text highlighting that the GAC had provided input on a number of specific topics in the draft final report. Those topics include a predictability framework and some concerns about the added value of the proposed SPIRT structure. Registry onto the commitments and public interest commitments enforceability and concerns regarding absence of policy recommendations on DNS abuse mitigation in the final report. Applicant support matters. Closed generics and reiteration that exclusive registry access serving a public interest pool. The value of GAC consensus advice and GAC early warnings over the value of objections to protect certain names and abbreviations. Importance of clarifying and improving dispute resolution procedures after delegation, community applications and improvement to the community priority evaluation process and guidelines and finally the options mechanisms of last resort. The private resolution of contention sets, to disincentivize... in the application resolution process.

So those are the topics identified and shared with ICANN Board. They are also the topics that were highlighted in our collective GAC input that was submitted to the PDP working group on subsequent procedures. So, if we can go to the following slide. On the topic of public interest commitments in a new gTLD contracts so in a recent correspondence -- this is the first question, I assume it's -- it has been coordinated with our topic leads and a lease and Jorge, and the question reads in a recent correspondence to the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group the ICANN Board expressed concerns about ICANN's ability to enter and enforce any content related issue regarding PICs or registry voluntary commitments. And PICs stands for public interest commitments. Due to limitations of ICANN's mission in the bylaws. Could the Board further explain these concerns? So this is the first question. Any comments on this question and if not any additional questions or comments that you would like to add on this topic? So I'll pause here. I was not keeping an eye on the chat I'm sorry, let me also check the chat. And thanks to Jeff for always being a keen participant to GAC meetings on the topic so I see no hands up, so this is the only question we would like to pose to the GAC? I'll take it as such.

Okay then we can move onto registration data and WHOIS. So as part of its meeting preparation communication with the

Board the GAC also provided background text highlighting the GAC's recent contributions to the work leading to the final report of the temporary specification for gTLD registration data Phase 2 expedited policy development process final report. The GAC also noted its recent minority statement regarding the final report and subsequent follow up including a letter from ICANN org. So, this is a quick introduction to the topic, and then if we go to the following slide, we already have a few questions. First the GNSO council resolve to have had forward to the ICANN Board several policy recommendations that did not achieve consensus in the EPDP team. Would the adoption of such recommendations by the ICANN Board be in the interest of the ICANN community? So this is the first question, and again I'm assuming that those questions came from, or at least have been coordinated with the topic leads as well? .

Second question is what are the possible outcomes of a cost benefit analysis of the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations as suggested by the GNSO in connection with the consultation it requested with the ICANN Board? I see no comments and no requests for the floor. So let me read all questions and then we can discuss. The third question should such a cost-benefit analysis be conducted would it be conducted before or after the ICANN Board formally considers the policy recommendations? And next should an operational design phase be considered for

the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendation. What impact would it have on the time-line to deliver a standardized system for access and disclosure. And finally now that EPDP Phase 2 policy development has completed, are there any remaining obstacle to resume implementation of the privacy proxy services accreditation policy recommendations? So I'll stop here again and ask for any questions or comments on this list of questions that are compiled to the Board. And I think it would be good also to have the topic leads provide maybe further clarification during the session with the Board after my presenting the questions just to have more details and more informed discussion. So if there are no comments on the questions -- any additional questions that we need to append to this list?

Okay. No requests for the floor I see Georgios. Yes, please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Georgios Tselentis, thank you. Maybe it would be helpful for the colleagues to know a bit better on the question for the operational design phase so maybe I don't know if Fabien is on the line maybe we can give a little bit more background what we are talking about higher. So give a little bit more information and what the concern is with this question and the time-line which is that we have probably some issues to be considered

that are related to the operations that may delay the implementation so just for the background I wanted to give what is behind this question and maybe we can have some more information. I don't know again if Fabien has something handy to give to the colleagues. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Georgios, and it's a fair point, so -- and we have added this as a topic also for discussion with the Board so this has been added as a 4th topic, but for now let me explain for the sake of this part of our discussion that this is a new phase that has been suggested to inserted before the Board makes a decision, and maybe even as soon as the recommendations are mature enough within a PDP to be adopted, so this phase -- and I have to say that the paper, the paper was circulated yesterday. I hope you had the chance to skim through it, but also, I have to highlight that the paper identifies 4 principles to be followed, so they state that the results of an operational design phase should maintain fidelity to the underlying policy recommendations and that if any policy recommendations are substantively impacted by the analysis these should be returned to the GNSO council and or relevant PDP working group for further consideration, so this is principle 1.

The second principle, that the operational design phase should not create delays in the overall time-line to both consideration, and this may speak a bit to one of our questions regarding the time-line and the delay. The third principle is that the work in the operational design phase does not replace the implementation work of ICANN org with the implementation review team, which occurs after the Board approves policy recommendations. And the 4th and last being affected stakeholders should have the ability to provide input to the work of the Board ICANN org and the community in their operational design phase. So those are the 4 principles, and this phase as I said, will be initiated by the Board, and it includes 2 tracks of activity, ICANN organizes assessment of the impact of proposed policy recommendations, and the opportunity for community feedback on such an assessment.

So, I'll stop here and Fabien if you need to add to this or complement but I have -- or correct but for now I have Paul's hand up so U.K. please, Paul.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you Manal. And hello to everybody. I'm sorry to be late, but I wanted to suggest one additional question regarding subsequent procedures. I've put the suggestion in the chat. It is to ask the Board what assessment they have made regarding the

implementation of CCT review recommendations. Perhaps we can improve the wording to make it more specific to our Montreal advice, but I would just like to suggest one extra [inaudible] correction on the CCT review on the SubPro slides.

Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Paul. I'm sorry if I overlooked your additional question in the chat. I'm going through the chat again. I note also there is something from India but this is on WHOIS so if we can go back first to subsequent procedures, maybe add Paul's question, and see how we can fine tune the language as he suggested, if necessary. And then we can get back to the WHOIS and I note a question from India and a comment from Laureen in the chat as well so I'm reading the question from Paul in the chat. What assessment has the Board made regarding the implementation of CCT review recommendations? And thanks to whoever is reflecting this, so quickly on the slides, so thanks to support staff, and Jorge asking that we be specific. I'm identifying that -- or clarifying that this is regarding DNS abuse. So Jorge is the suggestion to say what assessment has the Board made regarding the implementation of CCT review recommendations related to DNS

abuse? Does this address your point? And I see your hand up Jorge so please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Yes. Hello. Do you see me? Do you hear me?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello Manal. Hello everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening for some of you. This is Jorge Cancio Switzerland for the record. I very much appreciate the proposal made by Paul from the U.K. At the same time, this is a bit of a more complex situation, or complex question. As you may recall, the GNSO PDP working group and subsequent procedures has considered that the CCT-RT recommendations on DNS abuse should be looked at in a holistic fashion, and has more or less given back the ball to GNSO council and the GNSO council, being very aware of the Montreal advice, and which we have recalled to them from the GAC leadership, I would say repeatedly, I think also through a letter, they are considering how to handle this. How they can look into DNS abuse, and into the implementation of those CCT-RT recommendations through a holistic effort,

being aware also of the time-line in the sense that according to the Montreal advice any improvements implementing those recommendations should be ready before any future round starts. And in essence, we are waiting, and we -- with we I mean the GAC, and also the community, we are waiting for the GNSO council to come up with a proposal and they've told us -- and Manal please correct me if I get something wrong -- that they are working on an options paper or a scoping paper in this regard and that they are very mindful of this situation.

So, long story short, if we ask the Board, the Board will very probably refer this back to the GNSO council, so my suggestion or my plea would be to try to give the question or the comment the right spin so that we really get an added value from the Board and not just something which we can already know today. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge, and yes, indeed, subsequent procedures working group, they already mentioned that they will not address the DNS abuse as the scope of anything that comes out of the subsequent procedures working group will be applied only on new gTLDs and not retroactively whereas DNS abuse needs to be looked at holistically and should apply equally to old and new gTLDs equally.

And as Jorge mentioned we already followed up with the GNSO council in that respect. They promised a framework paper that would identify the different options we have, whether cross-community working group or a PDP or a combination of both, but then they delayed this waiting for 2 complete actions. First, a survey that will be conducted for the community to complete so they would like to see the results of the survey first, and second, a report that is expected from the SSAC on the topic, and this is -- this should be coming out shortly. So, on our last leadership call between the GAC and the GNSO council they already said that pending the results of those 2 things, or not the results did you those 2 activities would definitely feed into whatever paper they would be getting out to the community.

So, that said, let me stop here, and see Paul, if you would like to keep the question or if we can fine tune it or does this address your point or we still need to raise this, and flag it with the Board. Paul, is this a new hand?

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Manal, and thank you to Jorge, I think you've both made very good points. My feeling is that it would still be useful to use the opportunity of the meeting with the Board simply to remind the Board that we care about this, and we are interested to know what is happening, and just to hear from the Board

directly what their latest thinking is, so personally I think it's still useful to have a question, but I'm obviously happy to go along with the consensus of the group as a whole, so I leave it in your hands Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Paul. So, maybe I can add it in the introductory part, not necessarily as a question, but maybe while going through the topics of interest to the GAC that comprise our collective GAC input I can flag that this remains a point of concern to the GAC. We have followed up with the GNSO. We got to know 1, 2, 3 and we're following closely, and looking forward to this being tackled before any new round. If this makes the point. Or should we keep it in the question part, and re-visit the language? Again I'm in your hands. Paul? I hope this is a new hand. No it's not. So, is it okay to have it mentioned as an introductory point to the questions? Jorge please Switzerland go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Yes be thank you again, Manal for giving me the floor. Jorge Cancio Switzerland. I think if we twist the language in the way that Paul suggested in his last intervention, I would leave it as a flag, as a flagging or as a reminding exercise at the end of, of our

topic on subsequent procedures so we can underline and highlight the importance of this point. So perhaps with some tweaks we can leave it as -- at -- under the questions, but more as a comment.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay are we able to do this now or you would like to have some time after the call, but maybe not so long as we need to share the final version with the Board shortly after the call, and I can see Rob already taking a stab on this.

So let me start reading what's on the screen. As her to point of interest to the GAC the GAC reminds the Board of its Montreal advice, not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until after the complete implementation of the recommendations in the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review that were identified as prerequisites or as a high priority. The GAC has been in touch with the GNSO to discuss these concerns and continues to closely monitor implementation of the CCT-RT review. Can the Board share any current views at this time regarding the implementation of CCT-RT review recommendations? And thanks, Rob, and Benedetta for this live reflection.

So any comments? Does this address both points? I mean that we remain concerned about this, and we know about the developments and we are interested to know anything further at this stage if there is any recent developments? I see Jorge and Paul agreeing, Rob reads our minds, and that sound good to me. This is from Paul. So I think we are good with this and also a comment from Jeff in the chat that for our info the discussion with the GNSO was just on a couple of recommendations and those related to DNS abuse and not all of the prerequisites identified in the CCT-RT report so thanks Jeff. Yes we understand this but maybe it should be clarified that we mean the DNS abuse, if we can also reflect this in the question on the screen so should we put the brackets here, or after prerequisites and high priority. I'm just thinking out loud. I'm sorry

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Manal this is Rob. I put it after the second sentence because the first references all of the recommendations and where I put the parenthetical refers nor what the specific concerns were. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Rob. Yeah. I got it re-reading the whole thing, and -- already a reference to everything that's prerequisite

and high priority. So I'm just scrolling back to see -- so anything else on subsequent procedures before we move onto the WHOIS? I see no hands and I see nothing related in the chat so if we can go to the following slide please and I'm just scrolling up in the chat as I saw a question from India, and the question says can't the funding on SSAD be done by ICANN? So is this a question to our topic leads here? Or is this a question you would like to add to -- and in all cases I think like we did before we should see if we have already the answer within the GAC or not before adding it to the list of questions. So if I may seek advice from our topic leads on question posed by India stating can't the funding on SSAD be done by ICANN? And... I see your hand up hang you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

The answer is unclear to that question. Indeed the whole issue of funding and how this can sustain itself and what cost the users of the system will need to bear is very unclear, so I think it's a valid question that we don't know the answer to although I suspect that the Board may not know the answer yet either but that doesn't mean we shouldn't ask it.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Laureen and thank you India, and so if we can -- so do you want to ask the question directly as such, or ask how the Board see the funding of the SSAD in general, whether through ICANN or otherwise?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that some of the existing questions, which ask about the cost-benefit analysis do touch on this issue, at least peripherally so perhaps it could be in addition to the proposed question about the Board explaining what the ramifications are of a cost-benefit analysis.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay so, if we can go to the following slide please, and try to also reflect this question? And, let me also try to read Laureen's comment in the chat, unless Laureen you would like to speak to what you have typed in the chat?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Briefly, this is just a small tweak to reflect that historically my understanding is that the GNSO typically passes on only recommendations that have received consensus to the Board. In this case, many of the EPDP recommendations did not achieve consensus as its defined under the GNSO procedures, but all the

recommendations were passed onto the Board, so this question really gets at how does the Board weigh the lack of consensus on concern considerations, concern recommendations in its consideration of whether adoption of such recommendations would be by the ICANN Board would be in the interest of the ICANN community?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Laureen, and again, thanks to Rob, and Benedetta for quickly reflecting this on the screen. Let me read what we have now on the screen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And I think we need to delete by the ICANN Board just so the sentence flows.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay so now first question reads GNSO council resolve to have had forward to the ICANN Board several policy recommendations that did not achieve consensus in the EPDP team. How does the Board weigh the lack of consensus on certain recommendations in its consideration of whether adoption of such recommendations would be in the interest of the ICANN community? This is the first question.

Second, what are the possible outcomes of a cost-benefit analysis of the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations? As suggested by the GNSO in connection with the consultation it requested with the ICANN Board? How does the Board view the potential funding of the SSAD? Can the funding of the SSAD be done by ICANN? And third question remains as is. Should such a cost-benefit analysis be conducted, would it be conducted before or after the ICANN Board formally considers the policy recommendations? 4th should an operational design phase be considered for the EPDP Phase 2 -- I'm sorry, should an operational design phase be considered for the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendation? What impact would it have on the time-line to deliver a standardized system for access and disclosure?

And the last question, now that EPDP Phase 2 policy development has completed, are there any remaining obstacle to resume -- are there any remaining obstacles yes please to resume implementation of the privacy proxy services accreditation policy recommendations? Any further comments on the registration data and WHOIS part? Okay anything I have overlooked in the chat, whether related to subsequent procedures or WHOIS? Okay I'm just checking, and and thank you India for confirming what we have now on the screen.

So I think we are good to move on. So this is for 90 minutes, right? Just checking the time

GULTAN TEPE: Correct Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So now and ATRT3 final report, and just reading first what is on the screen, as part of its meeting prep communication with the Board, the GAC noted that ATRT3 final report suggestions impacting the Board and the GAC were briefly discussed during a recent BCIG meeting. During that meeting a number of Board and GAC member recognized valuable relationship forged between the Board and the GAC and the importance of sharing recent improvements with the rest of the community as well as exploring additional ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of collaborative exchanges between the 2 entities.

So also by way of background in the ATRT3 final report, they concluded from the survey results that ICANN structures, like the SOs and ACs are quite aware of the improved working methods between the GAC and the Board, but this same knowledge is not within the individual community members, so they feel that community members should be made aware of those developments and those enhancements in our joint working

methods with the Board. And that this could be done through joint messaging between the GAC and the Board addressed to the community. And this was a suggestion from ATRT3 final report. Again with the caveat that the Board haven't yet adapted ATRT3 recommendations or the final report, but this is just flagging something that was addressed to the GAC and the Board. Should the Board adopt the final report and its recommendations and suggestions then we will need to work on this jointly. So any specific questions or comments on ATRT3? Okay seeing none, then this will be just flagging, and willingness of operation and the matter should this be adopted.

Then now moving on to ICANN operational design phase proposal, and as we mentioned this is a new development, and was added here as an additional topic that was not discussed before, so let me first go through the background slide and then we can get to the questions. So, ICANN circulated to the SOAC leaders a proposal for a few operational design phases relating to the implementation of approved gTLD policies. The objective for an additional design phase is to allow the Board to obtain relevant information about any operational and resourcing issues associated with certain policy implementation efforts. Operational design phase is envisioned to take place prior to Board action on GNSO approved policy recommendations initiated through a Board request to ICANN org. The expectation

is that operational design phase will likely not be needed for complex -- I'm sorry, will likely only be needed for complex costly or other large scale implementation efforts. So it's not part of any, any PDP at all, but if it is a complex costly thing, something like subsequent procedures, and maybe that EPDP Phase 2 as well that has had implementation. The CEO asked leaders to circulate the paper to their community groups for review and further discussion. And I hope you have all received the paper attached to Rob's e-mails circulated yes ICANN org will continue to refine the paper and after ICANN69 plans to conduct a fuller community conversation on the gTLD policy lifecycle to include an updated version of the paper and to gather community feedback on improvements to the he have case and efficiency of the policy making processed so this is just background on the topic and I hope you did have the time to skim through the paper as well. So that said, if we go to the following slide please we have discussed or at least we have quickly discussed the paper on the GAC leadership mailing list, and from an initial review of the proposal, so the proposal seems to call for an expansion in concern cases of the GNSO PDP in a substantial way. The GAC's initial concern is the potential impact on community resources. Are community resources ample enough to address any additional phase in the already complex GNSO PDP? And is there a -- is there a real need and

added value of such a heavy†-- especially with the envisaged design feedback group?

So this is initial feedback on the paper, so despite the understanding and the good intentions there is a bit of concern in terms of the further complicating the process and overloading the already loaded community via design feedback group, but I have to say that the principles listed in the paper promise no delays, but again, the devil is in the details and we need to see how this goes in terms of implementation. I thought I saw a hand up, but I don't see any hands now. So apologies if I missed anyone's hand, but I'm pausing here, and any questions, comments? Jorge please go ahead

JORGE CANCIO:

Yes. Thank you, Manal. Jorge Cancio from Switzerland for the record.

It's more a question than a comment. The question is whether my recollection is correct that this additional operational design phase, which is being proposed would be formally outside of the GNSO PDP? So if that is the case, perhaps we should be rephrasing the bullets because at least in bullet one and 2 we are we are giving the impression that our understanding is that it would be an additional phase within the PDP, and at least I think

that yeah, I -- my question is not for the Board. My question is for ourselves, so that we pose the right questions to the Board, and so assuming that the additional phase is outside of the PDP itself, I would -- proposal I would suggest the phrase the bullets an accordingly at least the first one because it implies, as it is worded right now, that it's a phase within the PDP. So I hope this is clear. It's just a formal point but its best that the Board sees that we have understood what the paper is proposing.

And as to substance, this morning we had an interesting discussion organized by URALO on the European at large structure, and I made the point, but I think it was shared by many others, that complexity really kills participation, so complexity should only be added if there's very clear and focused added value. Otherwise we should actually go in the opposite direction of simplifying procedures in order to regain active participation by more people because as we see, as we witness also, especially in this virtual context, levels of participation, active participation are probably diminishing, and that is a cause of concern. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much Jorge, and very valid points, and again to my understanding it's not part of the GNSO PDP, and its not a permanent step in any PDP. It's a parallel overlapping with the

very final stages of PDP that would do some necessary work to inform the Board decision, and also seek feedback from the community before such, before final submission to the Board. That said, I agree with your point, and we should modify the bullets accordingly. So this proposal -- the bullet says this proposal would seem to call for an expansion of the GNSO PDP. This may not be accurate. The paper says this -- this paper proposes an operational design phase that is to become part of the policy and implementation lifecycle so maybe the confusion came from here but it is definitely not a step within the GNSO PDP. So while we try to take care of this on the screen -- I see your hands up so sorry to keep you waiting.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Manal. We've only just seen this briefly. We don't have a final view, but I think we agree with the points that Jorge made. We also think there may be potential concerns that this could cause delay to implementation, unnecessary delay, a concern that it might undo agreed policy positions or cause questions around delicately agreed policy positions, and a feeling that actually operational considerations should be part of the PDP process, not something which is added on afterwards. And perhaps we could list some of those additional

concerns and invite the Board to respond to them as well.
Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Paul. And again, and I'm reading from the paper, the paper mentions that the operational design phase should not create delays in the overall time-line to Board consideration, and reading further down, it also I can't find the exact part now but it also suggests that this may start even earlier than the completion of the PDP, but of course not before the recommendations are shaping up and are mature enough to be discussed. I mean, one example of this, and thank you Julf for confirming in the chat that this is the operational design phase is not part of the PDP. Thanks for that confirmation of the GNSO PDP. So, I think one thing the Board now may be concerned with how much would the SSAD cost and above the cost-benefit analysis and things like that that needs to be worked out before the Board can decide and this may and this may be causing delays more than what an operational design phase in the way it's proposed in the paper may pose. But again, again happy to have this discussion with the Board and hear from them, and their expectations and their rationale behind this phase.

Let me try to read what we have now on the screen. So this proposal would seem to call for an expansion of the ICANN

policy development lifecycle in a substantial way. Frankly I don't think it's substantial as it seems to be running in parallel with the final stages of the PDP, so any objection to deleting substantial way? I see no objections so maybe, yeah we can keep it until lifecycle, and then the GAC is concerned that operational implementation considerations should be a fundamental part of the PDP effort. The GAC's initial concern is the potential impact on community resources. Are community resources ample in you have to address an additional phase in the already complex GNSO PDP? And is there a real need, and value added of such heavy mechanism especially with the envisaged design feedback group? I'm just wondering whether the last 2 bullets, do they refer to the same thing, which is basically the design feedback group? Right? Or -- I mean when we flag a concern regarding the community resources this is also regarding the design feedback group right? I'm just trying to see whether we need 2 different bullets on the same point, or we can merge both in one bullet.

So my suggestion, and I stand to be corrected -- if we can just join both bullets because I think they are related, and we would receive -- same response for both I would say. Just reading Jorge in the chat, such considerations should be part and parcel of any PDP, any policy development inside and outside ICANN, should include an impact assessment which also covers

operational aspects, the last bullet is general. So any objection to joining both bullets in one question? Which now reads the GAC's initial concern is the potential impact on community resources. Are community resources Sam ample enough to address an additional phase or parallel effort in the ICANN policy development lifecycle especially with the envisaged design feedback group? Sorry, reading the chat again. We should leave the point on added value and real need. Okay point noted, Jorge. I hope the final language on the screen is satisfactory.

So any further comments before moving on? I see a suggestion to add the words a substantial before expansion in the first bullet, and deleting the word AN. Again, do we see it as substantial expansion? Let me put it this way. Any objections then to adding a substantial explanation? I'm flexible. Frankly I didn't feel it was substantial, but this is the way GAC colleagues feel we can leave it. Any preference? So if there is no preference, I'm in favor of deleting it until we are move solid about our concerns. And I hope you will have the time to read the document and go through it thoroughly so that we can have a good discussion with the Board on our concerns. I know it was just circulated yesterday, and apologies for the short notice, at least for this meeting but I hope by the time we meet the Board you will have more time to go through the paper. Then I see a possible in case of substantial. So I'd rather go without any

adjectives at this point in time because possible is even weaker than mere expansion. It's a possible expansion and substantial is far on the other side of the scale, so I see that we are not there yet. So maybe another read of the paper would help us better identify our concerns. So let's leave it at this for the moment, and maybe thank you for confirming in the chat. Appreciate it. Many so let's move onto the topic suggested by the Board, which is enhancing the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. So Board overview of the topic and why it was race raised for discussion at ICANN69 and this is a link to the recent GAC views. We have already submitted comments on the enhancing the effectiveness of the -- ICANN's multistakeholder model. So we are pointing out a few points here from the GAC submission.

The GAC was pleased to provide comments on the June 2020 paper entitled enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. Next steps refer to afterwards the next steps paper. The GAC appreciates how the next steps paper thoroughly identify identifies existing work efforts that are consistent with the multistakeholder model evolution. It is appropriate to recognize that relevant parts of the community will continue to engage in their current work efforts, which holistically lend themselves to addressing each of the priorities. The GAC agrees with the ICANN Board assessment that by limiting immediate next steps to 3 priorities work areas, and

leveraging existing work efforts, a necessary workload balance can be achieved that will result in incremental evolutionary enhancements and improved efficiencies to the multistakeholder model. Will benefit everyone's future work.

Next -- the next slide as well before pausing for comments. The GAC agrees that the actions proposed in the next steps paper should not unduly burden the community and could have a materially positive impact on evolving the multistakeholder model. The GAC supports the 3 priorities work areas identified in the next steps paper as prioritization of work and efficient use of resources, precision in scoping the work, consensus representation and inclusivity. And finally the GAC has independently embarked on developing its own implementation of those Work Stream 2 accountability recommendations and ATRT3 final report suggestions that impact its operation. I pause here, and ask if you have any additional comments, if you have any questions or observations or any points you would like to flag on this topic at our meeting with the Board. Again, first of all, I hope you agree to the identified points, and again, they are from our submission to this process, so they are already agreed points, and thanks Rob again for helping to compile those points. And then ask if there are any additional -- any comments? So, I see no requests for the floor, and no comments in the chat, so I think we're good to share this with the Board. I

don't think we have anything additional on the slides. I see more slides, but I think those are empty slides for -- yes okay so nothing more to discuss. If there are no final comments or further requests for the floor then I wish you all have a good rest of the day, remain safe and in good health, and be ready for our GAC meetings next week. I hope we will have fruitful discussions and thank you everyone. You will be notified when we share this final version with the Board. So thanks everyone and have a very good rest of the day. Bye.

GULTAN TEPE:

Thank you Manal. Thank you, everyone. The meeting is adjourned. All remaining lines will be disconnected.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]