

---

ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General - GAC Wrap-Up  
Thursday, October 22, 2020 - 12:30 to 14:00 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN:

Welcome to the wrap-up section as 10:30 we will not be doing roll call. The GAC members attendance will be available in the GAC communique and minutes. I would like to remind GAC representatives to indicate presence by indicating... affiliation. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type it by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment to allow all participants to see your request. Interpretation for GAC sessions will be conducted using Zoom and the remote simultaneous platform. Instructions can be found in the Zoom chat pod. Your microphone will be muted for the duration of the session. Unless you get into the queue to speak. If you wish to speak please raise your hand and the Zoom room. When speaking please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly on at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Finally the session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behaviour. You will find the

---

*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.*

---

link in the chat. With that I would like to leave the floor the GAC chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Julia. And good morning good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the GAC wrap-up session. This is the last session of the GAC meeting week and it is scheduled for 90 minutes. And many thanks to rehab on also support staff involved in compiling a slide deck on the fly to structure our discussion today. If we can go to the I think the 4th slide. The wrap-up session will focus on 2 main discussion topics.

First, considering the GAC 2021 priorities and upcoming inter-sessional work and work plans and second planning for future ICANN and GAC public meetings. So, moving to the following slide, this is the GAC 2021 priorities and upcoming inter-sessional work. It's a wrap up of what we have discussed throughout the week, are but also things that you can expect shortly coming after the meeting week on the top of our priorities we have the and frankly they are not ordered in any specific order, but a substantial topic we have is the new gTLD subsequent procedure rounds. We have reviewed all recent

---

developments, and submitted collective GAC comments, and I think the co-chairs -- I'm sorry, the co-leads of this effort have been calling for volunteers to volunteer for specific issues, and to help progress this very broad topic as it has so many issues, and GAC members and observers are encouraged to volunteer for any topics of their interest, and please to do so you can directly contact the topic leads. Jorge Cancio or Luisa Paez, but let me also, Luisa and Jorge if you would like to add anything specific on the new gTLD topic, please let me know. And if not, the second topic that is forthcoming as well is okay it's on going and more work is on the way. It's registration and data protection matters. The GDPR implementation, so we have APDP phases 1 and 2 to follow up on. Phase 1 is under implementation, and Phase 2 the final report has just come out, and again, it will be under implementation and Phase 2A is the expected continuation of things that were not concluded during Phase 2 such as the legal versus natural, and this is expected to continue through Phase 2A, and also a new track, or a separate PDP is expected to be issued for the data accuracy. That said, we need 2 things. We need to work on the substance of both tracks, especially that we are part of the community that requested those discussions, so everybody will be looking at us to trigger

the discussion and provide some substance or material in that respect, but also to either re-confirm at least for Phase 2A to re-confirm the current GAC representatives, and to see how we are going to be represented on the data accuracy, and whether our current representatives would need more help, I would say we can increase the pool of volunteers working on this track. It's not only a significant topic but also more concentrated than even the previous phase so its scheduled for, I think 6 months to start with, and progress needs to be made within the 6 months. So, again, please, if you would like to join the group working on the EPDP and you can also start thinking about the data accuracy.

This is an interactive session. Feel free to just chime in and raise your hand, whether you would like to complement any of the topic leads, if you would like complement or even correct what I'm saying and GAC colleagues if you would like to express interest right away if there is any immediate reaction to this also please let me know. Next is the DNS abuse mitigation. And there is the foreseen SSAC report, and this I expect it to be an important report addressing the topic. I think we will need to read it thoroughly, and start thinking about what is in it, and also there is an expected survey that I

---

understand would also be conducted, so again, 2 things, 2 things to look for. In addition to an expected framework that would describe or explain the different tracks that we -- or the different mechanisms that could be used to discuss this topic, either PDP cross-community working group or a mix of both, but this framework paper is waiting to be informed by the SSAC report, and expected survey so again, this is a topic that we are bringing again to your attention. The GAC leadership, with the help of support staff, tried to compile this not so exhaustive list but quite a long one for everyone's kind attention. Next on the list is the IGOs, and as you already know, for the IGO work track the council agreed on its September call to issue a call for volunteers for both members and chair of the IGO curative rights protection mechanism, and the work is expected to start in the new year, and I think we already have Bryan from WIPO on this effort, and apologies if I missed mentioning our topic leads as well on the GDPR, Laureen, Chris, Georgios, who are leading us on the EPDP track. I'm mentioning the topic leads in specific so that if you're interested, please send to the GAC list, but also talk to the topic leads. One other thing that is expected under the IGOs is the proposed Board action on IGO and Red Cross acronyms, so the Board will be asked to

---

consider triggering a Board GAC consultation process on this topic at ICANN69 I assume during the public Board meeting later today. This consultation should take place prior to the Board vote on the issue. As the Board will be partially adopting, and thus partially rejecting GAC advice regarding a permanent notification mechanism for IGOs in respect of third party registrations of domains matching a protected IGO acronym. So, again, something that we should expect, and be ready for. And so far I see no hands up. No comments in the chat. I hope you're not already overwhelmed.

And moving on to the ICANN org operational design proposal, which is now I think it's becoming a hot topic also within the community. This is a proposal for a new operational design phase envisioned to take place between GNSO approval of policy recommendations and the Board vote. A concept paper was already circulated for input and feedback, so please, if you can take the time, go through the paper, and let us know your feedback, so that the GAC leadership is already informed about what the GAC thinks and can represent your views accurately. ICANN org plans a fuller community consultation after ICANN69, and also there is a suggestion within the proposal that they may need

---

representation of -- I mean they will form a community feedback group. Again its all in the making, so we're not sure about representation or how this group will be constituted, but at least we should be informed, and ready to react when the time comes. Next is the community representative group for independent review panel, and ICANN staff shared proposed terms of reference for the group of community representatives who will work with ICANN org, and external consultants who propose a slate of nominees to the IRP standing panel for Board confirmation. I'm sorry, Brian. I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM:

Thanks. Brian Beckham, for the record. Apologies I missed the order of the IGO presentation or I should say I raised my hand late but I wanted to mention I think there's there are some let's say philosophical questions about the original request GAC colleagues may recall the original request was that if someone seeks to register an IGO acronym in a new gTLD there would be an opportunity for the IGO to be apprised of that, and engage a pre registration dispute resolution process. And I believe that it was understood that that wasn't going to

---

be acceptable, so the decision was basically to move on from that. It's interesting to contrast what's been done for example in the .EU and .DK ccTLD space you but like I say that's somewhat more philosophical side of the coin. What I wanted to just make sure to get on your radar was that part of the conversation in agreeing to move past that notification challenge process was the need for a dispute resolution process for the event the name is registered and there's let's say a donor scam and the IGO wouldn't be able to invoke national court processes or the DRP due to some of the nuances relating to their status as international organizations. So just wanted to say however the dialogue with the Board unfolds I appreciate that practically speaking it may be a nonissue, but one thing to flag could be to say before a final decision is taken on the possible rejection of GAC advice on one aspect of this IGO topic would be an agreement that is satisfactory resolution was achieved on the other side namely the curative process. There will be as I understand a call for volunteers shortly and certainly the intention from the council was that that work would be taken at a little bit more of a rapid clip than normal PDP so like I say, practically in time-line terms it may be a nonissue but thought it worth raising. The desire to have the curative dispute resolution process agreed before any



---

final Board action rejecting GAC advice on the preventive side. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much BRIAN for providing more context and for sharing a balanced view on this. We always rely on your expertise on this longstanding topic, and thank you for the valuable addition. Any other comments on any of the previously mentioned topics? Okay if not, then let me start again with the community representative group for independent review panel. As I said, ICANN staff shared a proposed terms of reference for the group of community representatives who will work with ICANN org and the external consultant to propose a slate of nominees to the IRP standing panel. And this slate of nominees will be subject to Board confirmation. Community leaders are supposed to review the draft terms of reference and consult with their groups about constituting a community representatives group, including seeking feedback on a suggestion to have the 7 SO and AC chairs develop common criteria and make the final selection. A call for expression of interest for this potential group members will be out soon, so again, this is something you should be aware of, so this is a heads up

---

to those interested, and have the required skills and qualifications regarding the opportunity to participate in this community representative group, which is essentially will help select the new IRP standing panel. The following topic we would like to again include it in this one slide wrap up. Is the Work Stream 2 accountability implementation. Again, reminding everyone that GAC members were invited to test the GAC implementation tool, and provide feedback. Also, the human rights international law working group co-chairs, Suada and Lina are seeking volunteers to contribute to Work Stream 2 recommendations implementation. And also, to work with them on building an implementation tool on substantial areas of GAC concern. Again, please, if any of the topic leads would like to make any additions, or comments, please raise your hand. Just reading Denmark in the chat. The recommendations on choice of low, and the choice of venue provision are of specific interest for Denmark.

Not seems to happen if something happy -- happen on these issues I will be happy to be a volunteer. Thank you Finn for noting this. We will note it down, and thank you for volunteering on issues that would be of interest to Denmark. On the virtual public interest commitments

---

again there's proposed framework, and the registry stakeholders voluntary public interest commitment working group shared this proposed framework, which targets making changing in voluntary public interest commitments in registry agreements. The framework was not shared on the GAC mailing list yet. Frankly we are trying to streamline everything we share with you so that you're not overwhelmed by too many e-mails or too much information at the same time, but we will be sharing shortly after ICANN69, all the relevant material on the topic. They are seeking at this point in time, any red flags. They were looking forward to some feedback by November, mid-November, but frankly I'm trying to push this until December. I know people tend to slow down a little bit after an ICANN meeting, and take a well-deserved break, and there is also for those who participate at the IGF it's the first week of November so I'm trying to push the feedback a little bit further, hopefully by early December. Seeing no hands, and no comments, the following topic that the GAC leadership would like to bring to everyone's attention is GAC points of contact to other parts of the community, and those points of contact are really beneficial when it comes, especially when it comes to preparing for bilateral meetings, preparing for calls, working on agendas and

---

topics of mutual interest, so it's really beneficial and it turned to be beneficial to have a point of contact especially with the constituencies that we are actively working with. So, for the GNSO, we used to have Olga, GAC representative of Argentina, and former GAC vice-chair, assuming this responsibility. Olga has now left, and she's now part of the GNSO council, so we are seeking volunteers who would like to participate in this liaising position, and we already -- I shared with you the information over e-mail that we now have the GNSO liaison to the GAC already being named, and this is Jeff Neumann, so excited to know Jeff will be the GNSO liaison to the GAC, and I think we already are collaborating and coordinating particularly on the subsequent procedures. He's one of the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures working group, as you all know, so happy to broaden our collaboration with him beyond the SubPro topic. Just looking at the chat -- definitely Maureen -- Lauren, I'm sorry, it's point 8 needs to be voluntary fix and not virtual fix thank you for noting this and flagging it. So everything tends to turn virtual these days, but this is definitely a voluntary fix. And thank you Jorge for noting this also. So apologies for the typo. The second point of contact is with the ALAC, and we used to have a... from Portugal as our point of contact with ALAC,

---

and the ALAC liaison to the GAC is JRIO has you already know so it would be good to have someone doing the great job that ANNA was doing before. Finally. The ccNSO we already have a pair in this assuming this responsibility, per GAC representative from NIUE. Not sure if he's on this call, but I hope he would re-confirm his availability -- I mean otherwise we can again seek your expression of interests on volunteering to this as well. So, I don't see anything on the list. Of course, support staff helpfully have put other priorities anticipated by GAC members, so this is for us all to brainstorm, if anything was overlooked we can definitely add to the list, so the slide deck is intended to just help us brainstorm and structure our thinking, but again, its -- we can even add to it as we go. Paul please. U.K. go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you Manal. And hello everybody. I just wanted to say that I think this is a really good summary of our priorities going forward. And I wanted to point out 2 particular ones. First on DNS abuse, many thanks to the U.S. for the text that they provided for our communique, and thanks to France and others who contributed to it. But it seems to us we need to develop now, a more

---

concrete and detailed agenda on DNS abuse. And I wonder if we could ask the PSWG to look at the SSAC report, and to develop some ideas for us to consider at our next meeting. If they could develop some specific next steps, and send those around in advance for colleagues to look at we could perhaps discuss them at our next meeting and develop something a little bit more concrete to keep this agenda moving forward. And the second comment was around the operational design phase. And I do hope that the GAC will be able to give a clear response to this proposal. We listened to Goran's comments and†-- but we need to make some points about how financial and implementation issues should be part of the PDP. We do need to raise some of the risks around delay and complexity, and volunteer fatigue and I hope we will be able to make some kind of a GAC response to those 2 issues. And finally I just wanted to say thank you to everybody for all the work that has gone into making this a really successful meeting. To you Manal the leadership, the secretariat. I know how many hours are spent preparing for those meetings and a big thank you to all of you. Thanks.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Paul, and I see Jorge also concurring with your point saying good points from Paul on both DNS abuse, and operational design phase, and also thank you for switching on your video. It becomes more interactive especially if we have new GAC members I believe the experience being I pity the experience being virtual from day 0 so let's try to be as interactive as possible. Laureen please. You go ahead first.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

First of all I want to thank Paul for his constructive suggestion and his ongoing support. The PSWG will take this as an action item, and indeed, my co-chair Christopher Lewis-Evans as you know I'm sure, has already been participating with the SSAC group that is crafting these recommendations, so this is already on our radar screen, but coming up with some concrete follow up on that is of course very useful, and we will take that as an action item for the next ICANN meeting. And ideally -- and I don't want to over promise -- we would be able to circulate something in advance of the meeting so that, so that the GAC has an opportunity to consider it before it is discussed. And then as an aside about your second point with operational design, I was listening to the public

---

forum which took place shortly before this session, and I will say the impression I had for what it's worth, even help to ICANN has asked for input on this operational design phase, people in leadership positions seem to be speaking of this as if it is a foregone conclusion, and that does concern me because it at least optically has the semblance of a fete accomplis. So that's an aside for what it's worth. I do hope there will be a real opportunity for input and feedback on this important issue because the GAC and many others stakeholders groups have raised issues about adding burdens and complexity to the process as well as the all important issue of volunteer and community burnout.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Lauren. I cannot agree more with you I think if we want to provide input we need to be quick to make sure this is reflected, and influence the shaping of the final decision. A quick catch up with the chat, so France, Vincent is saying plus one Paul on everything you said. And Paul you don't need to apologize for anything. This is just to encourage everyone to switch on their videos if they can, and if they're connectivity also allows. And if it helps let us



---

know if you need a virtual background, an ICANN one. I think we can share this if people with like to have some privacy as well and you can turn it on only while speaking if this helps as well. And I see Jorge agreeing on the point made by Laureen on the operational design phase. And the U.S. thanking Paul for your thoughtful and concurring with your proposals Paul. Did I miss a hand up? If not, then again, this is an open invitation to GAC members to express availability and interest in any of the topics identified, and please let us know how we can facilitate your job, and your feedback. We try to streamline the required feedback as possible, so we don't send everything at the same time, but please let us know how we can do this better. On DNS abuse, I don't think the report is out yet, but definitely we look forward to PSWG expertise and help, but I would also invite GAC members to read the report. I don't know how long is the report, but normally SSAC they develop a short concise and to the point reports, so I think it would be good to read the report, and be ready to receive the highlights from the PSWG colleagues whenever its ready. So, that said, I have nothing more on this slide, and thank you all for your valuable feedback. So any other comments? Okay, if not, then the next topic which is scheduled until the

---

end of the session, is planning for future ICANN and GAC public meetings.

So we will, we will go first over the ICANN meeting survey questions, and if you have also any reactions from the community plenary that took place on the topic, and then we will have a discussion on more specific issues that is related to GAC meetings and time allows we will also be touching on a separate but relevant matter which is the next high-level governmental meeting. So, let's move onto the following slide. So first is the review of ICANN meeting survey questions. As was mentioned earlier, the survey -- this link is specifically for the GAC, as you can also see from the link itself. This is to compile GAC input on the issue, and we will be provided a summary of the GAC input after the deadline, which is the 5th of November, so I'll go now through the questions. If there are any immediate reactions, it would be helpful, it would also help others know how their colleagues think, and help them fill in the survey. I hope -- I mean the more GAC colleagues fills, the better, and the more indicative the output would be. So the first couple of questions were on identifying the group you're related to, and the region you're coming from, but questions 3 reads, how effective is the ICANN public meeting yearly structure?

---

With one community forum in March, one policy forum in June and one annual general meeting in October. So, let me know if there are any immediate reactions to this. Jorge.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you Manal. And thank you for giving me the floor. This is Jorge Cancio Switzerland. Also without a business suit, so don't be shy, and use your home office connection if it works. To connect videos and participate actively. I just wanted to comment on these first questions, that probably we need to rethink a little bit this meeting structure. It is a meeting structure that dates from I think more than ten years ago, although there have been adjustments of course but the idea of having 3 meetings a year might be something worth reconsidering, at least. And probably at least in my opinion, we should start not so much from the meeting structure, but from what we need. What is the objective or what are the objectives of the meetings from -- of ICANN. What is the use of these meetings for the community? And starting from that, we could then consider how many meetings, and in what format, be it virtual, be it face-to-face, whenever this is again possible,

---

or be it a combination should we need it so a little bit following the idea of form follows function instead of starting with a form that is more than ten years old, as the starting point. And at least my impression is that perhaps 3 meetings is already very much, and that we could probably live with less meetings, but this is very dependant on what we identify as community needs. And finally I would say that into this thinking we should factor in the fact that a lot of the work which is being done currently in ICANN is inter-sessional, so perhaps ten years ago, or even 17 years ago, when I first set my feet in a GAC meeting room, everything was done in the meetings, and very little was done inter-sessionally. And now I think that the balance has changed completely, and most of the, most of the actual work is being done inter-sessionally. So we should take that mostly into account for a number of meetings. And beyond that, of course we should consider things like work life balance, carbon footprint, and more general considerations also the costs implied by attending 3 meetings, and what effect that has on meaningful participation from those less resourced in time, and money, and other resources. So I leave it by this, and thank you very much Manal.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Jorge for sharing your input, and on the business attire just -- this is one of the advantages of the virtual meeting so let's enjoy it, and thanks Rob for sharing the survey link in the chat, and Gulten for highlighting that this is please for only GAC members to fill, as mentioned in the chat, each SOAC they have their separate survey links, essentially the same questions also as Rob mentioned. But it's intended to segregate the different constituencies so we can conclude at the end the views of each. Paul please go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Manal. And thank you to Jorge for his comments which I think are all very valid comments. And we can certainly understand why it's a good idea to look again at our meeting structure, but I think there are very good arguments still for having 3 physical meetings a year, if and when things get back to normal, because I think we need to recognize that most people in the GAC, most people across the ICANN community, have other jobs apart from ICANN business, and we have sometimes very limited time to spend on ICANN business, and in many ways it's sometimes easier to take one week out of the office, and focus on ICANN. At the moment we're

---

seeing much more inter-sessional work. We are seeing the ICANN meeting becoming more spread across various weeks, and at the same time there seems to be less participation, and fewer people able to do the work, so from our point of view, having more focussed meetings, 3 times a year does have some very good arguments for it. Another benefit of the physical meetings is the opportunity for networking, for getting to know people. Learning from other parts of the community and discovering unexpected things. And without physical meetings there is much less of that. I think in terms of the improvements that could be made to physical meetings, it's all ... good to have space in the schedule for people to go to listen to other parts of the community that they wouldn't normally be able to see. I'm glad we've had the opportunity to go to plenary sessions that we've created some space in the GAC schedule, but the more that the meeting -- the ICANN meeting as a whole it able to allow for that kind of networking. That kind of space, the more it will help us I think come together as a community and understand one another's points of view. And so, I did understand why we need to look at this but let's not forget there are some good advantages to having 3 physical meetings if and when let's hope things get back to normal. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Paul, for sharing your thoughts as well. I would invite other GAC colleagues to do so, and I think we are already covering the first 3 questions, so how effective is the ICANN public meeting yearly structure? But also -- and if you selected ineffective or very effective please explain how the yearly format could be improved. Then we have how many ICANN public meetings should be held each year? One, two or three? And I think Jorge and Paul already commented on this question, and I see Finn agreeing with Paul. I believe on the need for physical meetings, and the importance of face-to-face meetings. And the last question on the slide is regarding what aspects of ICANN public meetings should we focus on improving? And let me just read the selection from the survey itself, but of course the survey is open for any additional aspects, but the listed aspects are capacity building, networking, outreach to newcomers, policy development work, none, and other. So, if there are any immediate reactions, I see also Suada, and -- from Bosnia and her and... Netherlands agreeing with Paul. Reading Jorge in the chat all fair points and needs and functions covered by face-to-face meetings. I agree on those. On the other hand the shift to inter-sessional seems quite unstoppable. And Lauren saying to Paul that's an excellent point about permitting

---

space in the schedule to join other community sessions because of simultaneous scheduling it's often hard to do that based on PSWG members's experiences this cross-community interaction and engagement is beneficial.

So, again, I agree with you on the need to free space on the schedule for attendance of community sessions, but we will come to this point later when we talk about GAC specifics, but I'm flagging it now because if we want to free space then we needless GAC sessions, and at the same time, we -- so we need to move -- is it okay to move the bilaterals for example off the meeting week as we are doing right now? Or just a few thoughts on how can we free the schedule so that we are able to attend other community sessions? But again, as I said this question is coming later, and I'm just flagging it now. I'm not sure, someone having difficulty with the audio I believe? So if there are any -- no further comments in the -- on this slide, we can move onto the following questions. Again, this is just a brainstorming on the survey questions, but please take a few minutes to fill in the survey. So the following question reads how effective is the virtual format to accomplishing your meeting goals? And if you selected very ineffective or ineffective please explain how



---

the virtual format could be improved to accomplish your meeting goals. Then a question saying select which virtual public meeting features or platforms need improvement? And for this question, I see the options and you can do the same through the link that was shared in the chat, it says interpretation availability, interpretation platform remote simultaneous interpretation networking activities, public meeting newsletters, registration platform usability, schedule platform usability, time zone of meeting schedule, Zoom platform, and none or others. So I'll continue with the other questions on the slide. Please if you have any comments just raise your hand, and Jorge in the chat is saying that virtual format has important shortcomings regarding consensus building, networking, and spontaneous meet ups and presents special challenges for onboarding of newcomers. Thank you Jorge. I fully agree. Just trying to see where I stopped. For the individual sessions at ICANN virtual public meeting, rank the features that are most important to you from one to -- one as most important, and 9 as least important. And going quickly through the features that are already imbedded in the survey, first ability to interact with other participants, Zoom meeting room versus Zoom webinar room, second is interaction between presenters and

---

participants, organized participant queue. Presentation slides and other materials made available to participants. Q and A feature, unmoderated chat feature. Use of video to see participants, and use of video to see presenters, and I think the last listed option here is visibility of other participants names and number of participants attending. So, this was question 10. Question 11 reads how would you characterize the number of sessions scheduled for each of the following ICANN virtual public meetings? And the options here says too many correct number of sessions. Too few sessions, and not applicable. Following is regarding the ideal lens of an individual session, and selections provided are 60 minutes, 75 minutes, 90 minutes, 120 minutes, or other. And you can specify. And apologies for the ringing. I cannot stop it so it will stop shortly. So as you can see, during this meeting, and I think the previous one as well, we have -- we try to scheduled shorter -- I'm sorry, just a second -- so we tried to schedule shorter meetings in terms of length, and more frequent breaks and a little bit longer breaks so no 15 minute breaks anymore.

Again to accommodate this virtual set up. And the following question is on the time zone. So what should drive the time zone of each virtual public meeting? And it

---

says there are selections. I'm just checking the selections. We have 3 options in addition to others, of course. First, reads consistent time zone for all virtual public meetings, original -- the second option original public meeting location time zone pre-COVID-19 pandemic, and the third option reads rotating time zone between the 5 ICANN regions. So whether the time zone should be fixed, should be the time zone of the host country, or should be rotating between the 5 ICANN regions. The question number 14 reads rank by importance which activities should take place during ICANN virtual public meetings? One as most important, and 7 as least important. And the activities listed are capacity building, decision making, information sharing, issue reporting, networking, outreach, and policy making. And last question on the slide which of the following session types, if any, do you think should take place outside the official dates of an ICANN virtual public meeting? And you can select more than one option, and the option reads, nominating committee meetings regional meetings, review team meetings, working group meetings, none, and others. So I'll pause here. I think quite a list of questions, and I'm sure you would have some thoughts to add, so time zone of the meetings. Length of the sessions, any specific features that needs

---

improvement? Any comments at this point in time? And Annaliese please.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you. Sorry, I was on mute. Thank you, Manal. I just wanted to make a couple of comments about question 13 what should drive the time zone of each virtual public meeting. I just wanted to make the observation we know from previous experience that there isn't any time zone that will suit everybody. I think we need to be mindful that whatever is decided is inclusive of all regions so you know I know it's sort of tempting to conclude that the best option is to pick the one that sort of suits the greatest number of participants but I think we as the GAC should at least give some consideration to not creating sort of further barriers to participation for people from regions that may already be underrepresented. Thanks. I don't have a sort of a preference for which one yet, but I think it's something that we do need to keep in mind. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Annaliese, and indeed a very good point, and a very challenging parameter of the meeting

---

planning, the time zone that of course is not perfect to everyone, but at least during relatively human hours to everyone, so -- and I think nothing in the options -- I mean there was no option saying that it should accommodate the majority, but rather, the options are consistent time zone for all virtual public meetings, and I believe by this we mean finding a reasonable block of hours that could be suitable to again not suitable, but at least relatively reasonable to everyone. The second is rotating with the location and the third is rotating between the zones -- the regions I mean, I'm sorry. So, again, let's voice our views and try to try to make what benefits participation within the GAC. Annaliese, is it a follow-up or old hand. Any other comments? And I see Pua agreeing with you Annaliese. And, Vernita please U.S. go ahead.

UNITED STATES:

Hi Manal. Good afternoon good morning everyone, good evening. So I wanted to agree with Annaliese's assessment. That's comments were timely and we support them and perhaps a question that we could ask is if the ICANN staff could take a look at the world clock, and see where there would be the most optimal time to

---

have GAC meetings for everyone, and so -- I think that that would really address our inclusivity of making sure that all the of the GAC members are able to participate. Also, is it possible to even to look at what other organizations have done on addressing this issue of their constituents and stakeholder being in different time zones, and perhaps the staff could report that back to the GAC. Also, in relation to having a set time, maybe -- I know some organizations cap meetings at 4 hours and those 4 hours is when you will have your discussions, and it's all -- it's concurrent and not different times. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Vernita. All very sensible and fair points. Just noting that if we go by the 4 hours, I believe this would mean longer meetings, so we need to see how we would like to strike the right balance. Again, I personally have no preference, I'm just brainstorming, and putting all the information at hand, so either shorter days and longer period, or the more intense week but then difficult time zones for some of the participants or maybe half the participants. During the community session some people said we can bear with difficult

---

hours, but not for 3 weeks, as this meeting was a little bit longer. But again, so it is a full range of options that we need to weigh. So if we can move to the following slide, I can see we have less than half an hour. And we are still with the survey, so let me read the remaining questions, and see if there are any reactions. Then we can move to the GAC part. So in returning to in person meeting questions rank the inputs by importance that should govern ICANN Board's decision-making process on whether to hold a public meeting in person, or virtually? And the options here, 3 options, ability of majority of people world-wide to travel freely, community input, health and safety. Those are the 3 options that needs to be prioritized. Under what circumstances would you choose do participate in person at an ICANN public meeting? And you can select one or more options of the following. Adequate ventilation of meeting facilities. Availability of travel assurance. Majority of world-wide COVID-19 travel restrictions lifted. Return to normal pre-COVID-19 living and working conditions. Vaccine widely available, unsure. And other. Next select the requirements below that you would agree to follow to attend an ICANN public meeting in person, and again you can choose more than one option from maintain physical distance throughout the meeting, share personally in

---

health information, submit to daily health screenings before entry to meeting facility. Wear mask throughout the meeting. None of the above, and unsure. And the last question reads please share any feedback you have about ICANN public meetings, the virtual meeting format, or returning to in person meetings.

So Vernita is this a new hand or -- so if there are any reactions to any of those 4 questions, any immediate reactions, if not I hope that this breaks the ice, and encourage more GAC members and observers to fill the survey, and let's move now to the GAC part. Yeah, and before the GAC part, if there are any reactions from the community panel, please share it. Just raise your hand, and I'll give you the floor, and Jorge the deadline for filling the survey is the 5th of November. So, not much time remaining. If we can go to the part on the GAC please and just to -- and I think the community plenary is a good session to listen to as well, and know what other parts of the community think. It was divided in 3 blocks, one on key objectives of, and main deliverables from ICANN community groups at the public meetings. The second regarding lessons learned, and the third on community views on effectiveness of having 3 public meetings a year. So please listen to the recording. It was



---

a very interesting discussion. Now, on the GAC specifics, first the meeting lens does the GAC want a shorter meeting in terms of days or a longer one with less meeting hours? There have generally been fewer GAC sessions at ICANN virtual meetings but not less inter-sessional work. How does the GAC feel about this work load shifting? Is it better? Is it worse? Also concentrated working hours but short one week or more -- I'm sorry concentrated working hours but short, which means around one week, or more relaxed working hours over a longer period of time, something around 2 weeks. So again, exactly what we were discussing but we need more concrete input to help our planning for ICANN70 for the GAC meetings on the margins of ICANN70. On the meeting time, again same, time zone is adapting to the host country time zone fair, rotating to share the pain or a fixed block of hours? Again this is along your suggestion Vernita. A fixed block of hours relatively reasonable to everyone. And there was a third option by ICANN which was rotating between the 5 regions of ICANN, the time zone of the 5 regions of ICANN. So any, any comments? Any initial thoughts? Immediate reactions? I see Jorge in the chat. One working week of around 4 hour a day should be enough. So if there are any thoughts, please feel free to raise your hand. Can we

---

move onto the following slide? And Paul agreeing with Jorge. Next on the communique, and I see Spain also Maria agreeing with Jorge. On the communique, we have the communique substance and the communique process on substance. Whether there is preference to continue without advice having advice -- leaving advice to intersessional students through exchange of correspondence, or start thinking of how to include GAC advice in communique given that the current virtual situation may be continuing for some time. And on the process which again I believe would be dependant on when we decide or not to include GAC advice, good to continue with the current process which allows 48 hours for review finalization? So any immediate reactions to the communique part? Vincent please France go ahead.

FRANCE:

Thank you very much Manal. Can you hear me okay?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Loud and clear Vincent, thank you.

---

FRANCE:

Perfect. Thank you thank you very much Manal. I will speak in French so change your channel, I give you a few seconds thanks. For starters I would like to say that my comments are newcomers as you know I've only been at the GAC for one year so I do not mean that I have the experience, and everything you've been through, I haven't been here as long as you so this is my opinion, and not specific proposals. It is my point of view but I think this might come in useful. The way we have worked over the past few months in terms of negotiating communiques, has served us well so far. I think it could be baptized the unlocked door model so this is going back to what Paul was saying, and I thought it was a very good way of putting it. So during ICANN68 and ICANN69 we didn't have to deal with any emergencies or any sudden evolutions requiring the immediate adoption of consensus advice so -- however it needs to be said that it was an intermediary solution -- provisional solution and we need to find more sustainable rules enabling you to adapt to the new normal.

So thank you Manal for the discussion we are currently having, and I think it must absolutely be had. As for the next stages of work on some of the main work streams, I think we may need to have consensus advice for those

---

such as the final position on the SubPro final report will be adopted by the GNSO council at the end of September. The France favors that we resume our negotiations of consensus advice in the future, but things will no longer go back to being what they used to be. And negotiating because this is an advice exclusively at ICANN meetings seems difficult to us so negotiating on discussing will have to take a hybrid mode through Zoom and through omission procedures. Silent procedures. At the next ICANN meeting we could imagine that consensus advice proposals be is sent at the latest 7 days before a GAC session. And then following that, we could have a true silent procedures, assignment process, a period during which we could ask that something be negotiated or the proposal be retired as is done elsewhere, at ICANN I think we could also have, more, consensus advice with you would have us share the work burden over a longer period. And when we have some of the main reports we could dedicate more time to assessing them, as we did for the SubPro PDP in the past few weeks but I don't think we should exclusively tend towards negotiating advices outside our meetings, and we are far from being able to replace our in-person meetings to discuss and negotiate all of that. So I think all communications to be had outside ICANN to adopt consensus advice should be

---

put to benefit put but we should also try and sees every ICANN meeting to propose our advice and to do so following the open-door model and not the unlocked door model if Paul agrees with me. I'm sorry for having taken a bit too long I fear, but everything I just said is open to discussion. It is far from being a definitive position. It is just something to add to the fire of the discussion we've been having, which is very productive and very fruitful, and I hope we can go on discussing these important subjects. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

It's always good to have a fresh eye, and your views are very valuable, and it's worth looking at the hybrid model you suggested. So I go to Jorge and meanwhile I'm looking at the chat so Jorge please go ahead.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, thank you Manal. Jorge Cancio Switzerland for the record. On this question, on consensus advice, at least my understanding of our common position during these last 3 meetings, especially during ICANN68 and now ICANN69 was actually that the possibility was there, the possibility of having new GAC consensus advice, but

---

that we would use it only if needed, and apparently, or coincidentally, we have been very conservative in assessing this need of having new GAC consensus advice, and both on the EPDP issues, and other issues, which have been coming up, we had very good agreed language from the past which we could refer to in both communique language, or in inter-sessional products and outputs of the GAC. But as Vincent was saying, and maybe in the coming months, and maybe in ICANN70 we may be in a situation where important topic leads are before the Board and that is when GAC consensus advice to the Board of course becomes relevant, and we may really need to take recourse to this most important way of expressing GAC opinions in the ICANN environment, so I think that maybe the door is not open but it's not closed, if that's a good formulation, so we can open it at need, if there is really a need to do so. And probably we will have to in the next months. So, I think this is an important discussion, maybe inter-sessionally we may devote one specific session of the GAC to discussing how we could proceed. Perhaps we can prepare this with a proposal from the leadership that could be a possibility or a proposal from volunteers, which of course in my view would be much more preferable, in my own interest of course. But anyway, I think that the procedure we have

---

been following for the GAC communique is a robust procedure. In the end the communique language is consensus language although it hasn't the character of GAC consensus advice, but it is -- it follows consensus procedure, so maybe with some additional tweaks or some additions to the procedure, we could transform this communique building procedure into a GAC consensus advice one, and I could imagine that after the 48 hours deadline we are using as a sort of silence procedure, we could always foresee day or -- at least some hours of GAC virtual meetings in case that something needs to be imperiously renegotiated so it would be only triggered if there is a formal objection, but we would have it in place and we would be prepared to assemble again if such a formal objection comes through during the 48 hour deadline, and we would use that additional sessions only to renegotiate that specific point. That could be one possible approach, and of course if we can anticipate as much as possible before the corresponding ICANN meeting that there is the intention of negotiating GAC consensus advice during that meeting.

This may also trigger an increased participation from all GAC members, and avoid that the negotiation is done only by a few or a subset of the GAC. So perhaps a

---

pre warning of 2 weeks or ten days before the meeting starts could help in that regard. So these are some initial thoughts. I think that we have to maintain this door open, and ready to be opened if need be but I agree that we have to build in some additional, some additional elements to the way we are already have for the communique drafting. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Jorge for your valuable thoughts. In the remaining couple of minutes I'll read Lauren and give the floor to Paul and we will conclude. Lauren concurring with you Jorge and mentioning Board decisions on important issues such as including the EPDP registration data services recommendations and the ccT review team recommendations. Now over to you Paul and then we will conclude go ahead.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you Manal. I would agree with previous speakers that the door is not closed to going consensus advice in the communique. I don't think the slide summarizes the current position exactly right torch says continue without advice. Well, in fact, the door is open but I do think we



---

need to be cautious. Having virtual meetings does lead to problems with people's ability to participate, and we've seen that today in the chat. GAC communiques go out in the name of all the members of the GAC so we need to be conscious of that. We also need to be aware it's difficult to find consensus informally and difficult topics in virtual environment. So for us we think we should use going advice where it's really necessary, where there is genuine consensus, and in the last few meetings it hasn't been absolutely necessary, and we've been able to use other tools to express our views. But I agree there will be occasions in the future when we need to have GAC advice, and we need to make sure that it's based on genuine consensus. We would be cautious about establishing lots of new procedures and systems for developing GAC advice in advance. We already know that we are under a lot of time pressure with extra intersessional work, with the meeting spreading out over many weeks. We would also be cautious about concluding advice before we've had an opportunity to listen to the issues and discuss them in the GAC meeting. But I think the current process has worked okay and when the time comes that we do need to have GAC advice as it will in the future, we will be able to use the

---

existing process to find areas where there is genuine consensus. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR:

Thank you very much Paul, and thank you everyone for this interactive discussion. Again, apologies for not being able to go through the whole slide deck. I urge everyone to go through the points and the questions. We will continue the discussion on the GAC part over e-mail, I urge everyone to respond to the survey when it comes to the general part, but for the GAC part, we will surely continue our discussion, and maybe hold a call if we feel necessary, if there is a need just let me know. And also, the part on the high-level governmental meeting that we did not cover.

For now, we need to conclude. So thank you very much for this interactive discussion. And for those interested, the public Board meeting is yet to start after a 30 minute break, but before concluding, I would like to thank all of you, and a special thanks to my GAC leadership colleagues for their help and guidance throughout this meeting. , and due thanks to all topic leads, and work group chairs and support staff for the significant time and tireless efforts they all devoted to prepare for and run

---

this meeting. And as always the big thank you to our amazing GAC support team, Benedetta, Fabian, Gulten, Julia and Rob for working around the clock to facilitate the smooth and seamless meeting for everyone and special thanks to the IT and language services teams supporting us also from remote during such exceptional times and promptly attending to and resolving all issues behind the scenes. And last but never least, due thanks to our wonderful interpreters and scribes who are also supporting us from remote, as always you are all instrumental to our discussions. We'll continue to engage inter-sessionally, and if we're not still able to meet face-to-face in Cancun I will be looking forward to meeting you all virtually at ICANN70 community forum. So thanks again everyone, the meeting is adjourned. Thanks.

**[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]**