
ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum - Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO
Wednesday, June 16, 2021 - 9:00 to 10:00 CEST

GULTEN TEPE:

Welcome to this ICANN71 GAC session, Meeting with the GNSO, on Wednesday the 16th of June at 07:00 UTC. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance, GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC representatives to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod to keep accurate attendance records.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat, the feature located on the bottom of your Zoom window, by starting and ending your sentence with <question> or <comment>, as indicated, in the chat.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six U.N. languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon located on the Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the facilitator calls upon you, unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak; in case you will be speaking a language other than English.

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.

Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.

Finally, this session, like all ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected Standards of Behavior. In the case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. This session is being recorded and all materials will be available on the ICANN71 meetings page.

With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden. And Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the GAC Zoom room. We always appreciate our joint meetings, and I would like to start by welcoming Philippe and Tatiana, Jeff, and all GNSO colleagues in the GAC Zoom room, with special thanks to Jeff Neuman, GNSO liaison to the GAC and -- for jointly facilitating the preparation of this meeting and working on compiling the agenda we see on the screen. But before getting started to discuss policy matters of interest to both constituencies, I would like to ask Philippe if you have any opening remarks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal, and good morning to you and to everyone, our GAC colleagues here. Very happy to meet you again, albeit in a virtual manner, hoping that will get back to normal at some point. We have quite a full agenda today. Happy to follow up with the meeting with the GAC leadership a couple of weeks ago and to benefit from the whole GAC membership so looking forward to this. Thank you. Manal, back to you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. So as we can see on the agenda, we have follow up to ICANN70 on the EPDP SSAD and Phase 2a on accuracy and on DNS abuse, and then the CCT Review and GNSO take on pending recommendations and subsequent procedures of new gTLDs and issues coming out of the GNSO Council, if any, and final, any other business. If we can go to the following slide, please on EPDP and SSAD.

So I will be introducing the topics, and I'm sure topic leads will have comments or additions after hearing your reactions, of course. So first on EPDP and SSAD, regarding the SSAD, the GAC awaits progress update from ICANN org on the ODP, regarding implementation of the policy recommendations adopted by the GNSO in Phase 1 of the EPDP, the GAC interested in the resumption of implementation of the privacy proxy accreditation

policy recommendation, the PPS AI, consistent with the GAC advice in the ICANN64 and ICANN 66 communiques. So I will stop here allowing for any reactions from the GNSO but also any additions from GAC colleagues.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Manal. If there's no addition at this point from GAC colleagues, I may take this up. And I'll use the privilege of speaking French, if I may, for a start since we don't have this opportunity that often, especially today for that matter. Please bear with me.

(Through interpreter) So as far as the implementation of the recommendations of Phase 1, the GNSO Council followed very quickly the different developments, especially in the context of the report, and the conclusion for us is that in the consideration of the reformation of the PPS AI, it would be useful to turn towards the team, the IRT team, to consider a number of points. And in particular, the availability of the team members.

As you know, the GNSO and the community as well as the GAC -- I don't know if we can talk about a resource issue, but it is a question because of the workload and the number of tasks that we have to take care of. So through the team we decided to evaluate the workload and consider restarting the work of this

IRT. This is something that we did during the last meeting of the council, and we are waiting for the feedback. This is something that we should receive this afternoon, European time, during the council meeting. So that is what I wanted to mention for now. I need to go back to the leadership of the council, and I don't know if there is someone who would like to add something, whether it is the council or the liaison, if you want to add something to this answer, that would be fine. Thank you very much for now.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. And indeed, the resources and workload is something that we can all feel, and this indicates the need for prioritization to the GAC, this is a priority and I hope our priorities align. I am also looking to see if there is any requests for the floor, whether from GAC colleagues or GNSO colleagues. I see Chris Lewis-Evans.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Philippe, thank you for that update and as Manal said, we will follow your meeting this afternoon with great interest. Just a small point on the resource issue. I know you said you want to [indiscernible] members of the IRT to look at interest in re -- within the GAC we have a fair amount of turnover, many new members, I am sure it's the case in our communities as well, and I know our representative on EPDP -- no longer with us, we would

certainly look to support any restart with another member from the GAC. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris. Seeing no other hands, then maybe we can move to the following topic on Phase 2a, noting that GAC representatives in the EPDP Phase 2a have raised several process observations following the recent publication of the initial report. First timeline constraints have not been helpful in supporting the EPDP's work. Second, there were too many substantive changes at the end of the drafting process of the initial report and not enough time for the EPDP team to review the proposed edits. Brand new questions and changes with short turnaround time before publication, as low as 24 hours, shouldn't be allowed.

And finally, suggestion for a document management system that should be adopted to avoid too many documents being created too frequently the number of documents should be reduced and their access centralized. This is deemed to directly affect the effectiveness of the EPDP's teamwork. And again, GAC colleagues welcome to add and any reactions from the GNSO slides welcome as well. I see no requests for the floor.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Manal, and I just wanted to underscore, first of all, that although these are some constructive suggestions, we also want to applaud the vigorous efforts by the members of the team, the staff, and the leadership team as well for all their hard work, especially under these streamlined conditions. I think the combination of the streamlined conditions combined with the very substantive additions at the end created these particular challenges. And then that was compounded by some organizational challenges that the team experienced because there were so many versions of so many different documents. So these are really aimed as constructive suggestions for ground rules.

One additional point that I will raise is that there were some at least perceived just plain errors in the final report and requests for those to be corrected and there's been resistance to making any corrections. And I would just observe that perhaps a resistance to correcting errors, even though I know that creates some challenges of having to republish things and keeping others on board, nevertheless, I don't think the resistance is especially helpful, so want to share those observations.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Lauren. Kavouss, please.

IRAN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Thank you, Philippe, GNSO, and thank you to the EPDP team. I think with respect to question, or I would say type of comments made that there were too many substantive changes. Yeah, this is a problem. So either party should have a suggestions, it seems to me, at least, my personal view, that we don't have any suggestion for that. So do you have a suggestion, Philippe, to at least restore or at least reply to some of these concerns? Too many substantive, not enough time. So what is the next step? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I see Pam's hand up. Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Manal. I will just turn the video on. Hello everyone, it's wonderful to see everyone, our GAC colleagues, and I do sympathize with those of you who have to get up in it middle of your night. From someone who does a lot of 2:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. calls, I feel your pain. But thank you for joining us, and I wanted to touch a little bit on the title timeline Laureen spoke about, and this wasn't taken lightly, and we do appreciate very much the constructive feedback from our GAC colleagues,

especially those who participated in EPDP efforts throughout the last through years.

So the council, thinking about the three-month timeline at the time was really -- what we had in mind was these were topics that have already been discussed and these were just an extension. As you know, these other topics that didn't get enough time during Phase 2 and the council [indiscernible] after recommendations were created. So it was to allow the work to continue. And we thought really it wasn't a three-month drop-dead day that you must produce the output by that time; the instructions I believe was for the EPDP2a Chair to come back to the council after three months and let the council know whether there is likelihood of consensus.

And really, we knew these topics had been discussed and we felt there needed to be sort of a checkpoint to assess whether prospects of consensus, so that three months really a checkpoint. And when Keith Drazek came back to the Chair during our March meeting, Keith asked for more time because he felt the team was making progress and the target to issue the initial report around end of May and by that time, he would have a better sense of whether the team likely to reach consensus on some of the recommendations, the prospect of consensus recommendations, so Keith asked for two more months to produce the initial report.

And of course these are very challenging topics, we do appreciate that, so you feel constrained, and we apologize for that but also, we recognize trying to interject a sense of urgency, if you like, to get everyone really working towards a closure in a time bound manner so that's really the intention. But we understand your challenge and thank you for the feedback again. The council will be discussing EPDP 2a initial report in our meeting in a couple of hours, and we definitely would take this feedback back to the council and for future improvement. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Pam. And we look forward to the council's discussion. And thanks also to Keith for joining our meeting and being here with us; I note his attendance. I see no other hand up.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: If I may, Manal, add a couple of things to what Pam had just said. I think in our approach within council, we sort of try and strike a balance between what was originally a tight remit which was not a rehash but from Phase 2, hence the short time frame. I think from council's perspective, GAC, and I am sure you do, will appreciate that it was already extended from council's perspective, we discussed that and indeed as Pam said, the Chair considered that it was sort of worth extending the original timeline. That being said, on more substantive comment,

although we can't discuss substance as to Laureen's input, for instance, on how those substantive changes were made at the last hour. I think there's a number -- and I think that's what you said, Laureen, there are a number of reasons for that, the late start et cetera on all those, it seems the various positions emerged late within the process.

For those of us who hadn't been involved in Phase 2a, we have to realize that at the beginning of drafting the initial report, there were I think as far as I can remember, 77 can't live with items. How can you possibly live under those conditions, as a stand-up comedian would put it? Do we call it a day and go back home and do nothing or we have substantive changes to Kavouss' comments, something has to give. We all appreciate it is crunch time, sometimes very little, 48 hours, to review the various positions, and we all appreciate the difficulty of doing that. I think from a distance, people need to understand that if at some point where we are resulted from of course months of debates and hard work, it's unlikely that an additional two months will change anything, at least that sort of reasoning is valid.

There's certainly room for improvement on the work methods. With such tight timelines, the number of the various documents that were shared -- and there were, again, valid reasons for doing that. Having rev marks on one single documents is virtually

impossible to manage, hence the number of documents that were issued during the PDP Phase 2a, along with restrictions on the tools themselves, Google forms, et cetera, don't want to go into the details but there's certainly room for improvement. We have to make do with what we have been it's a point well taken and worth recording here, going back to staff, so we must think about that if we want to be just as quick as we wish we had been.

I hope this is helpful to our GAC colleagues, Manal. We appreciate the hard work. Having been in other capacities as a liaison, I know it's been crunch time for virtually two, three weeks now, and it's very hard for those involved if you add to the first two phases, and it's also one of the reasons we are where we are, just adding a personal note. I hope that's useful. We could spend an hour on this, and we probably don't want to, but that's what I can offer, and we would be happy to follow up on questions you might have. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe and Pam, and also bringing to everyone's attention the active exchange in the chat room on the document management system. So next slide please. And on accuracy scoping effort, it should be noted that GAC concerns with accuracy of domain name information refer to the registration information itself and how it corresponds to the

registrant of the domain name and with the accuracy of that information for the purposes for which it is processed. In that context, the focus of further studies on this matter should concentrate on the accuracy of the domain name information. And again, pausing here to see if there are any reactions from GNSO our additions from GAC colleagues.

PAM LITTLE:

Hi Manal. If I may, I would just like to give our GAC colleagues a very brief update on where we are in this effort. Pam Little, for the record, sorry. So since the ICANN70, the council actually had an extraordinary meeting during which we considered the briefing paper from ICANN org on data accuracy. That far the council leadership based on the discussion at the council level, we proposed certain next steps to launch this accuracy scoping team effort at the end of April. We were hoping that the councilors would go along with our proposed next steps, but there were different views within the council as to the approach the council leadership had taken, also some of the instructions perhaps were not clear enough. So during the May council meeting, the council decided to actually form a second council small team on working on a more clear set of instructions for the accuracy scoping team. So we're diligently working on that document, and hopefully we can sort of progress that at a reasonable pace.

In terms of timeline, previously we were hoping to launch this effort while the EPDP Phase 2a team sort had a bit of a recess, if you like, during the initial report public comment period but didn't make it. So in terms of a timeline more realistically, it's probably likely August sometime, and I think that will also probably work well, coincides with when EPDP Phase 2a is wrapped up hopefully. So that is where we are. We will still let the accuracy scoping team scope the issue, not doing that for the scoping team, but we're trying to formulate a clear set of instructions to the scoping team, hopefully will make their tasks job a bit easier and what the deliverables are, the expectation, and hopefully the council will have something to consider at the July meeting but not at this meeting.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Pam, for the update. And the GAC looks forward to the launch of this effort and to contributing as needed. I see Olivier's hand up. Please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you. Olivier Bringer, for the record, and thank you to Pam for the update on the work undertaken in the GNSO, in the council in particular the important question of accuracy and the launch of a scoping exercise. So we would like to confirm that on our side we consider accuracy as a very important and also urgent issue.

We think this is not linked only to GDPR compliance but also to registry and registrar contractual obligations, something also mentioned in the SSR 2 report for example and also linked to the lack of accuracy on the capacities of different players such as law enforcement authorities, cyber security authorities, cyber security experts or API enforcers to mitigate DNS abuse and maintain a resilient secure DNS. So the scoping exercise contemplated by the GNSO should be started as soon as possible in a broad way to capture the different facets of the problem, and I know involving different stakeholder groups and you know as the GAC we would be very interested to participate in this exercise. Thank you.

PAM LITTLE:

Manal, if I may, thank you. Pam Little, for the record. Hi, Olivier, thank you so much for your comment. And I think Jeff has already noted in the chat -- very able, observer to the GAC. And the GAC's perspective, concerns, and interest to participate in the yet to be formed accuracy scoping team are definitely noted by Jeff and taken into the consideration by the council small team, and I'm sure Jeff would also keep you informed of the progress in the council small team. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Olivier, for the comments, and Pam for your response. Seeing no further requests for the floor --

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: If I may, Manal, I am struggling to raise my hand, sorry. Thank you, and I will try and do that in French, if I may.

(Through interpreter) I just wanted to establish the relationship between the works of the GNSO and the work on data accuracy and relate that to the conversation we just had. I know that we always consider that the GNSO resources due to the nature of the organization are infinite, that we can have four or five tasks that we work on in parallel, including PDPs. However, that is not the reality. We do need to take into account the different tasks and the resources available to the community internally. And this is what we do in terms of accuracy and launching that phase. It is difficult for us to say that we will [indiscernible] indefinitely the current PDP, for example, Phase 2a, but at the same time we need to start as soon as possible.

You know, sometimes the people who are involved in the PDPs are the same in the different PDPs, so that's just to give you an idea of how we look at things at the council. The question of the resources is not evaluated in the same manner within ICANN and

an organization as the GNSO as it is valued at the level of a business, a company. It is a difficult question, but we need to be aware that in terms of resources, everything is related. The decision to end a PDP is related to the decision that we make with the beginning of another. We can't do everything at once, and you know that, Manal, working virtually is very complex, and working in parallel on different things is difficult because we have the different time zones and so forth. So in terms of launching the feasibility study and relate that to the previous question, Phase 2, is important. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. And indeed, the workload prioritization, the resources, they're all linked, and we need to work collaboratively on this. I see Kavouss' hands up. Please go ahead.

IRAN: Yes, Manal. Thank you very much. As long as I remember, since many, many, many years, always this accuracy has been one of the four or five topics that we discuss. May I request Philippe or Pam or anyone from the GNSO first, what is the inaccuracy percentage today? Two: What is the threshold that at least we plan to achieve that, 100 percent inaccuracy or 100 percent accuracy, nonacceptable, so there I think might be some

threshold. What is the threshold and what is the timeline that you achieve that threshold? However, I expect that you kindly reply to the first question, the inaccuracy percentage. I have heard many, many figures or many things from many people including Alan Greensburg and so on, so forth. Could you please reply, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Kavouss, for the question. I see Pam's hand. Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE: Hello, Kavouss, how are you? Good to hear your voice. I don't have the data at the top of my head, but ICANN org was using a WHOIS accuracy reporting system as a tool to measure and report on accuracy levels based on different criteria. One is about syntax accuracy. The other one is operability or operations, and the third is about identity, and the third phase didn't get written out. So I would ask maybe staff to come back to you with those reports.

And the other thing I wanted to add is that the briefing paper from ICANN org to the council did make a suggestion or recommendation that it might be beneficial to commission a study on how to measure accuracy. So that is now factored into

the instructions to the accuracy scoping team. That's all I would add. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thanks to you, Pam, thank you very much. So mindful of the time, let's move to DNS abuse. And the GAC would welcome an update from the GNSO about what community work it envisions to conduct on these issues in light of the recent SAC 115 report and SSR 2 review team recommendations.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello, Manal. Tatiana Tropina, I am the one who will address the topic of DNS abuse, and I want to welcome you all to The Hague. I am the one actually joining The Hague here, so very nice seeing you. Thank you for the question, Manal, and to GAC colleagues as to the council, and speaking on behalf of the council, there might be different, various opinions within the stakeholder groups but as a council, the council believes that it is very important to do some exercise on the level setting on the topic of DNS abuse.

And by level setting, we mean we need to understand quite a few things -- and I think we highlighted some already during our last meeting but to recap it, well, first of all, what are the various forms of DNS abuse; and secondly, what are the current means and who are the proper parties to implement and use these means and

tools to combat those various forms of DNS abuse? And based on this, what gaps exist in the toolkit to combat those forms of abuse, right? So identify the forms, the parties and measures and then what are the gaps?

So it's not like we're just doing some intellectual exercise. We do believe taking into account there is a significant amount of work being done already on this topic. We believe this level setting is very crucial to determine whether specific elements are appropriate for the policy development process. We cannot just start the process on whatever, need to scope it first. So we have done, we believe, quite some work on this. So as preliminary steps for this level setting exercise, we have been briefed repeatedly during our last meeting, first of all contracted party house DNS abuse work party and then the SSAC on 115.

So the contracted party house briefing reinforced and reintroduced the notion that the industry -- and you know the industry has massive efforts, voluntary and substantial work they're doing on DNS abuse and to mitigate it, and the SSAC 115 briefing again, reinforced the council and the wide spectrum of DNS abuse, so the wide spectrum of DNS abuse, multitude of parties, not only contracted party house which are best positioned to address these various forms of DNS abuse. So there are a multitude of issues, stakeholders, so we do believe that if we

are to initiate the policy development on DNS abuse, we must do it with great care. We must ensure that only those elements which are within the remit of the GNSO policy making, I include it in this [indiscernible] so it is essential to scope all this.

So we do welcome any ideas on how we as a community can reach these common levels of understanding of which specific areas of DNS abuse are the most problematic and can be tackled by the council, first of all, and then can be tackled in the ICANN context, because the ICANN has a narrow remit. So for example as SSAC 115 knows that the problem space is much broader than just ICANN, and we have to see what we can address at the ICANN level and then for us on the GNSO level. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tatiana, for your thorough response, and indeed, it is a complex issue, several factors to consider. The GAC is just looking forward to launching cross community discussion on this. Any comments or follow up from GAC colleagues? If not, then --

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: If I may, Manal, I had a couple of things on what Tatiana just said in terms of next steps. In addition to SSAC 115 within council, we also have a briefing from our contractual parties' colleagues, and

the conclusion is really to -- the next steps, I mean, and we will probably have a dedicated session on this. Just to be clear, we wanted to have that initially during our informal session earlier this week but given the topic and its importance, we deemed it appropriate to [indiscernible] to a full session and see how the building blocks fit together, especially also with something like the DNS abuse institute, for example, there are many parties I think around and building blocks potentially. And as Tatiana said, all suggestions are certainly welcome. But between now and this meeting and the next council meeting next month, we will have a dedicated mission on this on concretely how we can move forward with this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Philippe. In the absence of any other comments on the topic, we can move to CCT Review. And apologies for the long narrative, but it provides context to our discussion. While the GAC found the feedback from the GNSO interesting and in places constructive, it is not that clear how it takes us forward with respect to the key concerns elucidated in the GAC communique from ICANN70, in particular on the issue of CCT Review and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the GNSO seemed to reiterate previous GNSO Council positions and did not address the substantive issues clearly identified by the GAC's

advice in terms of the adoptions of relevant CCT Review recommendations ahead of the next round of new gTLDs.

So the first question is, given decisions not to address certain relevant issues in the SubPro work, does the GNSO intend to opine on those recommendations that might require PDP processes, especially given the duration of such?

And the second question, the GAC asked the Board in its ICANN70 communique for a tracking tool that identifies the status of each recommendation in terms of who is taking it forward, how it will be implemented, and when it is expected to be completed, particularly in regard to recommendations attributed to the organization and the ICANN community in addition to the Board, of course. Would the GNSO Council agree on such a tool being made available to ICANN org on CCT Review recommendations and possibly also other review team recommendations?

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Manal, for these questions. Again, Tatiana Tropina for the record, and I will take these two. To the level and then maybe Pam, Philippe, or other colleagues might add something. With regards to the first question, thank you very much for this, because it gives us an opportunity to also provide additional clarification about the distinction the council makes

between addressing recommendations and adopting them. And this particularly goes to CCT RT recommendations, and we believe the distinction between addressing and adopting is very much consistent with that of the ICANN Board, that for any CCT RT recommendations passed through to the council or directly being gone through two PDPs, the requirement is that they are duly [indiscernible] addressed. The council and the GNSO working groups post development process are not required to adopt them, they are required to address and consider them.

So we as a council believe that the recommendations went through the PDPs and that they were addressed sufficiently, with some being adopted and others not, to varying degrees, but we can assure you and we believe they have been addressed, meant considered. So this is a question, maybe someone can elaborate on this. I understand the [indiscernible] a concern here for back but we believe we addressed this. As to the question 2, the council is absolutely not opposed to additional clarity on how the community recommendations are being managed, especially because we have so many recommendations from the recent specific reviews, so such a tool would be very, very helpful for the community and apparently for us, not opposing it. I will stop here and ask Philippe, Pam, or anybody else if anything to add, especially with CCT RT.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Not much to add really. I just want to react on some exchanges within the chat relative to having a registry of sorts to sort of list and describe the status of all these CCT -- there have -- within our project management tool, there are a number of elements we already have, and we appreciate this might not be straightforward for everyone. And again, and maybe this situation of the virtual environment just highlighted the improvements that we can make on these things in terms of tools and work methods and making sure that even though the information is available to us and it can be improved -- I was about to say to the outside world, but to those who may not have direct information to council's, what we do is public but it's a matter of looking in the right place, I guess. So just on the discussion we had on the tools, there are certainly things that we can do and take the opportunity of this situation to improve this moving forward. Thank you, Manal, and I see there are other hands as well.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Indeed. So thanks very much, Tatiana, for addressing both questions, and for Philippe, for keeping an eye on the active chat. I fail to keep up with the active exchange in the chat. Pam and then Kavouss.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Manal. I would just like to echo what Philippe just said. From my own reading, these CCT review was the first review of this kind, and I guess we all can benefit from sort of lessons learned. And from council's perspective, my personal perspective, the pass through recommendations from community groups, we need to talk about how we can do this better and how communication would be done and tracking. The council received passes, through email, and the council did provide a response to ICANN Board on those five recommendations. But according to ICANN org there were 14 recommendations passed through to GNSO but some of those really were not directed at GNSO or within council's remit, maybe directed toward the PDP Working Groups. We didn't know there were 14 directed to us, but in my count just before the meeting there were 12 because recommendation 19 was passed through to future CCT Reviews, and recommendation 20 had just been recently adopted in October 2020 so that wasn't even passed through to GNSO.

So there is this kind of learning curve, if you like. We need to do this better. It's not just only for the community's benefit that we keep an eye on how these recommendations are tracking, and I definitely personally support the tracking tool the GAC colleagues are suggesting, but also for the benefit of org to track all those

pass-through recommendations. And I think I heard Goran say during a presentation or earlier this week, they don't track those. But I think they should be tracked. Even if there were no response from the recipient of that recommendation of the community group, it should be noted it has been passed through but no reaction or response -- so we don't just erase those recommendations. The community members worked heart and soul to come up with those recommendations. They should not just disappear, they should be tracked and kept as a record even though the community groups may decide not to take up actions on those recommendations. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Pam. I see a queue forming, and we have only four minutes left. Kavouss and then Nigel.

IRAN: Yes, just a simple comment on the question, so I understood that Tatiana said the GNSO also agrees with the tracking tool. Do you support that or raise that with the ICANN Board? Because we raised it in the meeting with the Board. Do you also raise and support that firmly? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I hope you noted Kavouss' question. I will take Nigel's as well, and then I see Tatiana. Nigel, please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, good morning, good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, UK GAC. Thank you so much, Tatiana, for your overview on the different recommendations and Pam as well, passed to the GNSO, and of course we have had excellent cooperation with the GNSO through the SubPro work as well. There were some recommendations which were understandably noted sort of aimed at GNSO because there were potential policy recommendations that weren't taken up in the SubPro work because it was felt perhaps generic, not gTLD but legacy ones as well, and those we would like to focus on as well as we go forward on this.

So just to -- I won't discuss it now, but recommendations 9 and 12 I think are relevant here, 9 being about cost for defensive registrations and 12 been incentive costs for the work of registries and registrars in exemplary fashion. And then 14 and 15 regarding potential contractual amendments to the contracts which in the Board response to the GAC advice they identified as pending and needing further discussion amongst the community. So perhaps we could take that up at some point. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigel. I see Tatiana's hand up. I hope everyone doesn't mind going a couple of minutes after the hour.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, I will be very brief. Thanks to Kavouss for his note about bringing this to the discussion. Definitely we as leadership and as the council will take note of this and discuss whether it should be brought into the discussion with the Board. And with this, I will hand it back to Manal and Philippe. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Tatiana. Any other reactions from GNSO side on this topic? Okay. If not, then if we go to the following slide, it was just a point of information, the GAC drawing attention of the GNSO Council to the input we filed in the recently finalized public comment period that was opened by the Board. So just for information. And if we can to the last slide on any other business. So any other business? I see none.

So with that, I reiterate my thanks to everyone. Thank you very much, Philippe, Tatiana, Pam, Jeff, and everyone. And special thanks to Jeff and Jorge for their preparation for this meeting and to my GAC colleagues for their active participation. We look

forward to next steps. And to GAC colleagues, after the 30-minute break we have two back-to-back sessions on IGO protections and SubPro, so please be back in the room at 8:30 UTC.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]