ICANN75 | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 5)
Wednesday, September 21 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

GULTEN TEPE: Hello, and welcome to the ICANN75 GAC Communique Drafting Session, on Wednesday, 21st of September, at 5:15 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During the session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. If you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone.

For those of you in the GAC room, please raise your hand in Zoom and when called upon unmute your table mic. For the benefit of our other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for the session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismail. Over to you Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Gulten, and welcome back, everyone. This is the second of five sessions dedicated to our communique drafting, and this session is scheduled for 75 minutes. And I hope in light of yesterday's discussions that pen holders and interested GAC members were able to get together, draft the relevant parts, and inserted them in the Google Doc, where we collaboratively

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.

compile the GAC communique. And also that the wider GAC membership had the chance to read through.

That said, we had a reporting back from working groups which we missed during the earlier session this week. So, Karel, would you like to use a couple of minutes now before we get to the communique drafting? Okay. So we will be receiving now a reporting from the Underserved Regions Working Group co-chair, Karel Douglas. Please, the floor is yours.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Good afternoon, or should I say good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everybody. This is Karel Douglas for the record from Trinidad and Tobago. One of the co-chairs for the Underserved Regions Working Group, the other co-chair being Pua Hunter from the Cook Islands who unfortunately is not here, but I'm sure she may be online. We also have Tracy Hackshaw, who's worked quite hard, and I would like to mention him and his efforts today as well.

So as you would know, the Underserved Regions Working Group held a capacity building workshop, or we call it the capacity building weekend on the 17th and the 18th of September, a day and a half of what I would consider as a capacity building extraordinaire workshop. For the two days or one and a half days, we had a lot of persons come who with the intention of ensuring

that persons were aware of what the GAC does, especially new members, understanding and underscoring the fact that we have, and I think the number is 189 new members as of maybe a few years now. And it's important to help those persons understand the work that we do ultimately so that they would be understanding the work and be able to contribute to the work of the GAC.

So having said that, the concept of the cross -- sorry, the community, sorry, capacity building workshop, I'm just going to say CBW from now on, apologies, came out from the ICANN74 meeting, where it was discussed and of course, the issue and the idea blossomed here. There were eight sessions of informational content, which is equates to nine hours of presentations.

As I did indicate over a day and a half. And the three main themes you would like to know. It was broken into three large themes, which is "How to GAC", describing the committee, the GAC that is, its operations, its place in the multistakeholder community. A lot of sub issues, what is advised and those very tricky issue. Sometimes it's hard to understand.

The other issue were the key GAC topics that we were discussing and you would have seen that over the past few days, we discussed things like the Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs, DNS abuse, and that was quite topical, I must say, and WHOIS and data

protection. The third major topic would have been an overview of the DNS with presentations and rules and responsibilities and operations of the ccTLDs and the gTLD registries and registrars. And I must say that was day two, and we got a lot of positive feedback that persons who were so grateful to have this breakdown of the gTLDs and how it works in the grand ecosystem.

All told, Manal and members, we had 30 speakers and that just is amazing. Nine of which were GAC subject matter experts, seven were ICANN org subject matter experts, and 14 community stakeholders' subject matter experts, including three ICANN board members and one current ICANN board member. For the day and a half, I'm pleased to say Manal that we had consistently 30 to 40 GAC attendees in-person and approximately 10 to 15 GAC members online for each session.

In addition to that, we had typically 25 to 35 non-GAC attendees in the face to face room here. And I did see quite a few people popping in and popping out. And those other members did indicate to me how grateful they were for this session. And of course, they thought it was something that they would want to see for their own communities.

We also did have, I must admit, we had two other sessions, which were social type of sessions, which was important because we

saw the need to have an informal gathering, where we get to know you, get to gel, get to find out who you are, where you're from, what are your interests.

So before the actual sessions, we had a little, I don't want to say it's toward a tub, but it was just a, who are you. And in one evening, I think we had correct me if I'm wrong, a meeting, if you want to call a social event off-site where members were happy to have those discussions of where they're from. And which of course will engender good for us to have a closer relationship with our members here.

Having said that, of course, I believe the feedback is quite positive. And certainly, by all indications, we would like to continue this in ICANN76 and beyond. And not only at ICANN76 on the margins of ICANN76, but also intercessional. Hopefully, we'll have some webinars and other types of workshops so that members could be kept in the loop and kept interested.

Ultimately, we do have a survey. We also want to hear from those who participated or who attended. And hopefully, that survey will guide us to even make in the future CBWs even more relevant to members. So I'd like to take this opportunity again to thank all members who came, includes GAC and non GAC attendees. A strong thank you to Rob, Julia and all the ICANN staff who did an amazing job in putting this thing together. And also, Tracy

Hackshaw and others who provided excellent contributions. So I want to thank you all, and this is the report. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you so much, Karel. Indeed, I would like to again reiterate my thanks again to yourself, Karel, Pua, Tracy, Julia and Rob, and everyone who contributed. As you have illustrated, we had board members, we had community members, we had GAC members. So really collaborative efforts and it indicates how timely this was and how needed it was. And I think it's great that you have already a survey. I was just going to ask, how can we gather input from colleagues for an upcoming one just to make sure we are addressing the topics they need in light of what they have already heard?

So it's great to see that you have already taken action and a survey is on the way and it will definitely give guidance to upcoming activities. And thank you also for the social side of the thing. I think, it's equally important to also break the ice and have everyone get introduced and it make a more collegial working environment for everyone. So I see Jaideep's hand up. So India, please?

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

JAIDEEP MISHRA: Thank you, Manal. And first of all, great complements to the entire team. I had the opportunity of participating in at least on a day on Sunday, and it was found to be extremely useful. My suggestion is that if to institutionalize it and content that was generated, while I'm sure it would be available for people to view, but if you could bundle it into something like induction program for all the new GAC members who are coming in at different periods of times. If we could make it into a complete video with all the sections and also that it's available in a package for somebody to start, I mean, listening to and taking advantage of the phenomenal inputs that are available in this entire exercise. A suggestion for you. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jaideep. Well noted, and I see Karel nodding. So we will look definitely into this. So with that, I think we're good to start our communique drafting and we already have the communique on the screen. And can we have it a little bit bigger in terms of size, please? The font size? Okay. Thank you. And so is this the first thing we have as new text from yesterday? Yesterday, we had a first reading of almost all sections that were more of administrative reporting. So now we will go through the text that was received between our session yesterday and now.

First, the reporting from the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group. And as we have just heard from Karel, but we also have written reporting and sorry, I got distracted by the chat and Jorge also supporting your idea, Jaideep.

So the text reads, The GAC held a well-attended capacity building weekend, on Saturday 17 and Sunday 18 September 2022, on a variety of topics such as: 1. Onboarding basics. Example describing the committee, its operations and its place in the multistakeholder community. 2. Key GAC topics. Example, Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs, DNS Abuse, and WHOIS. 3. Overview of the DNS. Example, introduction to ccTLD, gTLD Registries and Registrars' role and responsibilities.

The capacity building weekend was an opportunity for GAC participants to learn the basics or increase knowledge on aspects of the ICANN multistakeholder model, structure and operations, to become acquainted with the different community groups to facilitate future dialogue, and share experiences and best practices to enhance GAC internal collaboration on ICANN matters.

As part of the post capacity building weekend report, an evaluation survey will be issued to GAC participants to assess the pertinence and relevance of the sessions for future capacity building activities. Meanwhile, based on the strong positive

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

feedback already received at ICANN75, it is currently envisaged that topics covered at a high level during the capacity building weekend will be elaborated in the lead up to ICANN76. These efforts should commence with issues related to Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs and specifically on Applicant Support.

Anything else? Or can you please scroll down. Okay. That's it. So any comments on this? Karel, please go ahead.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Hi, Manal. I do want to apologize. This text was actually updated. So I don't know if it's possible, and I think it's now going to be updated. But at this point, this was one of the first drafts. Even though we could possibly live with it, there were some minor iterations to this. So what I'll probably do if it's okay with you or just if you allow me a couple of minutes just to sort out this so that we can make sure we have the right text for you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sure. No problem. Are you going to replace the whole text or edit in the text?

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yes. The entire text will be replaced.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. No problem. Sure. So if we can scroll down meanwhile and continue to see the new text we received under other sections. So the Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs. It's the same text we read yesterday just there is one suggestion to replace guided by informed suggestions coming from the US. I hope Jorge, sorry. If you are the pen holder, I hope this is okay with you and everyone. And meanwhile, if we can scroll down to see the rest of the new text.

So this is on Digital Inclusion and Internet Connectivity. And I believe this text has been submitted by Brazil. And the text reads, in the follow-up of capacity building sessions held on 17th and 18th September 2022-- Fabien, would you like to say something before I read this?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, Manal, sorry. Sorry to interrupt. We just noticed that there is a comment by Jorge in the chat regarding the previous section asking possibly Susan to elaborate on the edit. So I don't know if we want to address that now before we move on.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sure. Thank you. And thank you for bringing it to my attention. I'm sorry. Susan, would you like to elaborate? Please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes. Thank you, Chair. The modest amendment suggested reflects a procedural concern. I think that the GAC should not be bound by a previous, or this framework with fully understanding that the GAC has informed and participated in developing this framework. Should the GAC come to any sort of independent position following the closure of discussions on this framework, then that should be the consensus position of the GAC. We're not signaling any kind of substantive position at this time, but it's more of a procedural concern. So that's why we've offered this slide a moment.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Susan. Jorge, is this okay? Please, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everyone. Jorge Cancio. GAC, Switzerland for the record. Thank you very much, Susan for elaborating on this change. I don't have super strong feelings, but really the intention of the reference when sayings will be guided by set advice, the advice is referring to our Beijing advice, which we have been reinforcing, recalling, etc., for several occasions and never has been changed by the GAC in a different GAC consensus advice since then.

So that was really the reasoning behind using the word guided, which in itself, I don't think means being bound because we can,

of course, revisit our Beijing advice if we must a consensus on that. But for the time being and including the collective comment we made in 2021, that advice stands and I think is a good guidance for the six designated representatives to the facilitated dialogue.

So that's why now in URL operation, Susan, I didn't really fully understand whether you were referring to the Beijing advice as something that should just inform our participation in the facilitated dialogue because you made reference also to the possible framework between which could be the result of the dialogue, or the trialogue. And I think those are different issues. Of course, the framework will be something that will be developed as a result of this process, but isn't something that guides or informs us for the time being because it's still a working progress, of course. So I leave it by that. I don't know if you have any further remarks. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Switzerland. AND I have the US, and then Brazil afterwards. Thank you.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes, thank you so much Jorge for that explanation. And indeed, I was referring to the framework. I think this may have been an

oversight on my part. So I think I'm very happy to retract the edit actually.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Susan. So we are retaining the initial language. And I have Brazil next case. Go ahead.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal. And thanks very much for the US colleagues for these proposals, these text proposals. Our comment would be only in relation the very last paragraph in this first session of this Subsequent Rounds, which referred to the Applicant Support Program. And we were wondering whether we would need some contextualization in terms of how important this program was and what would be the actual goals and the rationale for us to be referring to this as a matter of priority to the GAC.

So we did work on some language that would stress the need to promote diversity and a balanced geographical engagement among the stakeholders as being the objective in the context of this Applicant Support Program. And if the rest of the group would be in agreement with that, we would actually start the paragraph with some language referring to stressing the need to promote diversity and a balanced geographical engagement amongst stakeholders, the GAC reaffirmed its continued interest

in the improvement of Applicant Support. And with your indulgence, we would include that in the Google Docs. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brazil. Can you repeat that, please, and speak closer to the mic?

BRAZIL: Thank you, Manal, and sorry for that. As a way to contextualize, we would propose the text that we have just included in the Google Docs, which would stress the need to promote diversity and a balanced geographical engagement among stakeholders. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brazil. So there is a proposal to add, stressing the need to promote diversity and a balance geographical engagement among stakeholders, the GAC reaffirmed its continued interest in the improvement of the Applicant Support for the next round of new gTLDs, and the rest of the text is the same. Any objections to this addition. Okay. Seeing none, then thank you again very much Brazil and thanks to Switzerland and the US. I think we're good to move now to the following section on digital inclusion and Internet connectivity.

And as said, this is a newly added text from yesterday proposed by Brazil and the text reads, in the follow-up of capacity building sessions held on 17 and 18 September 2022, the GAC took note of presented data and figures that indicate a high level of concentration of the global DNS industry in specific geographic regions.

While recognizing market concentration as a reflection of digital divides that must be addressed, the GAC encourages the ICANN Board and the community as a whole to explore new and additional actions with a view to contributing to bridge digital inequality within and among countries as well as to promoting a more balanced distribution of gTLD requests, registries and registrars among regions.

The GAC further noted remarks made by the ICANN Board chair and the ICANN president about existing gaps in global Internet access and connectivity. The GAC acknowledges that addressing these gaps and bridging digital divides should stand a priority for broader Internet community.

Building on the experience gained with the unprecedented provision of financial support for Internet access in Ukraine, the GAC urges ICANN Board to elaborate a more comprehensive framework for the provision of financial, technical and capacity building support to promote Internet access and connectivity in

developing and underserved regions, as well in countries in particular situations of vulnerability or distress. The GAC anticipated to the ICANN Board its interesting getting closely involved in the early design of the next strategic planning cycle, for the period 2026-2030, as a more effective means of influencing the process in line with its main priorities.

So thank you very much, Brazil, for the text. And I see already a comment in the Google Doc, whether requests here was meant to say applications as Jorge or Switzerland mentioned in the comments. So is it okay? I see nodding. So thank you Jorge, and then we can replace request by applications. Any comments? Yes, US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: We support the replacement of the word requests with applications. And we have some slight amendments that we would like to suggest to the second sentence as well.

MANAL ISMAIL: Are you ready on the suggestion? Please go ahead. If you can, yes, in a dictation speed so that we can capture it. Thank you.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Sure. Just to provide some rationale. First, we'd like to provide some red lines in recognition of the fact that addressing market concentration is not the role of ICANN, but also to note that digital divides very plainly exist within, well, all around the world and including in the specific geographic regions intended by the statement.

So we would suggest deleting the word while, and then adding the text some GAC members expressed the view that, then deleting the word recognizing aftermarket concentration, changing the word as to is, deleting the words that must be addressed, adding in the word and after the comma, deleting the words, the GAC, and then changing the word encourages to the past tense, encouraged. And those are proposed amendments. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, US. Any other suggestions before we do a second reading? And I see Brazil?

BRAZIL: Thank you. No, of course, that changed completely the rationale for the paragraph. And of course, some members in this case obviously include Brazil. But I think it would be interesting to understand if that's perceived perception of other GAC members

or not. Of course, if there's no consensus on the-- we don't have problems with redrafting aspects of the text. We understand that something new in a certain way. But I think it's different to say that there is overall perception among GAC members. And another thing is to say that a few or some GAC members expressed that view. So I think that's a crucial distinction.

So while I don't have any, Brazil is not heavy, does not take issue with specific aspects of the text, we would be, of course, more than happy to perfection it, the text, of course. I think that's essential difference, to understand who is making this recommendation as a suggestion, is Brazil and a few other members that are encouraging the ICANN Board and community to explore these actions, or if it's a more broader view of the GAC as a whole.

So I think that's something that we should perhaps discuss and understand. Of course, if one member of the GAC has a very strong view on this perspective and is not in a position to endorse it, it would be difficult to say that it's a GAC proposition. But I think we should perhaps let the opportunity of other countries to mention how they feel about this, the proposal itself. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brazil. And I have Argentina next. Thank you.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

ARGENTINA: Thank you, chair. In Argentina shares the market concentration. In fact, we observed that in the capacity building weekend. So it is a fact for me. We observed this data in the registrars and in the registries. And I'm not sure if it is a reflection of digital device, but market concentration within ICANN market is a fact for Argentina, for our country.

And also the idea that in ICANN bylaws in many parts mentioned the promotion of the competition in consumer protection, which is I think the same in saying that we will need a geographical equally distribution or more equally distribution in the next rounds. And for me, this is related to the Applicant Support Program that was mentioned in the previous paragraph that we were discussing before. And so Argentina supports the Brazilian position. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Argentina. I have European Commission and Egypt, assuming that US's hand is an old one, I believe. So are you seeking the floor? There's a hand up in the Zoom room. I'm sorry.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes. So my hands up, but I'm happy to, of course, to have to hear other colleagues first. But would just like to come back with a clarifying question afterwards.

MANAL ISMAIL: So if European Commission and Egypt is on the same point. We can take them first and then we can give the floor to US. European Commission. Please go ahead, Velimira.

VELIMIRA GRAU: Yes. Thank you, Manal. And thanks to Susan for having given the floor to other colleagues on the same--

MANAL ISMAIL: Can you speak closer to the mic?

VELIMIRA GRAU: Do you hear me now?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, much better.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

VELIMIRA GRAU: So I said thanks Manal and many thanks to Susan for having let other colleagues, including me to first come with the observations before she continues her investigation on the issue. So on the State of the European Commission, actually, I wanted to make two remarks and also I had one question to our colleague Susan in relation to some of the changes.

So first on the market concentration, I can only confirm that on the site of the European Commission, we have observed throughout studies that we have carried out. Also market concentration across at least our market, but also more globally speaking. And we are thinking in different strategies of the European Commission what might be the consequences of this and how those can be overcome. So from that perspective, I can only share actually, the perspective of our colleagues from Brazil and Argentina.

And then on the digital divide point, also I wanted to make one remark. I thank in the chat our Brazilian colleague for having put this, not only because this puts this into global perspective, but because I think it gives more weight to the entire discussion that we have in the GAC in particular, but also throughout ICANN especially today in order to know how to make ICANN more visible in terms of consequences in many other parts.

And I do believe that in different discussions, we are talking about the inclusiveness and how to ensure that we have a real multistakeholder model in ICANN. And I believe that if we do not contribute to bridging the digital divide, this would be just impossible. So I do think that this is very much reinforcing the entire multistakeholder model.

And I think that even If it is not probably to the ICANN to finance everything, there are many countries that have put into action many projects. And it is worth exploring those with ICANN given their technical experience and capacity to provide input and knowledge in terms of project engineering, in terms of digital divide.

And now I come with my question. Actually, I observed throughout probably the two last meetings that our US colleague is often coming back with this remark that it should not be read in issues of concern the GAC, but some member states. I do appreciate the fact that procedurally speaking, if we do not have a full consensus, then of course, we cannot say the GAC. I also find that there are many points on which basically our US colleagues has concerns, often our issues, let's say, of concern. A

nd I'm a little bit also mindful of the fact that this is on a regular basis undermining the position of the GAC in a situation where we see we already have some difficulties in terms of communicating

sometimes with other parts of the ICANN. So in light of this, I just wanted to kindly ask our US colleague to express the concern that she has with the different topics that we cover. Here it's that particular one. But I would be really very interested. And I think I can speak also in mind of my institution European Commission. What is the precise concern of the US delegation? Many thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, European Commission. I have Egypt next, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you, Chair. I'm wondering if we can maybe in the text proposed by the US take out the word some and then talk specifically about, instead of market concentration, talk about geographical concentration in gTLD applications from the previous round, keep the digital divide or not. I don't know if it's actually a reflection of the digital divide only.

But maybe if we say and I'm going to try to dictate to that text, if okay, that GAC members expressed the view that the previous round of gTLD applications had geographical concentrations as a reflection of digital divides. I don't know if that would actually bridge between both views.

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Christine, for the constructive suggestion. Meanwhile, US, please, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes, I think some of the concerns that inspired are suggested were addressed both in the interventions from Argentina and Egypt just now relating to the connection of the market concentration and the digital divides. Also the original the red lines are gone now, which is fine. But one of the original points was I wasn't sure when it said that these issues must be addressed. It appeared that it was by the ICANN Board. So that was probably that was some of the reason behind offering those edits. But with all of that said, I'm very much in support of Christine's proposal? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Egypt and US. I have UK, and I have Iran, and then I'll get back to Brazil to see whether the proposal is okay as well with them. UK, please, Nigel, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Manal. And good morning again and sorry for joining this session a bit late. Nigel Hickson UK. I mean, really, it's difficult being remote and trying to draft on the fly. I mean, I could obviously edit the document, but I think it's unfair

for me to edit it remotely while these discussions are taking place. So really, I just want to do echoes of thoughts. So what I was going to say is not original. So I echoed the thoughts of Egypt who I think put it very well.

I think in terms of a construct and I think we always have to reflect that in this section on issues of importance to the GAC. We're not expressing a consensus view. We're not here in this part of the communique to reflect that everyone thought that the sky should be green or whatever.

We're here to express some concerns, some views, some opinions, and therefore, we can we can do that hopefully in a way where we say that there were some facts presented, and as a reflection of those facts some concerns were raised, that this might be as a result of market concentration and therefore the ICANN board were asked to take appropriate action or whatever.

We can use these words to express the concerns that some people have without hopefully saying some members, some GAC members thought this and some GAC members thought that because I agree with the commentary of others. And I think the European Commission that we don't want to try in these paragraphs of issues and importance to say some GAC members thought this and some GAC members said that. We can just say some concerns were raised, some issues were expressed. We can

we can be more generic on this. Yeah. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Nigel. This is very helpful. So we're between either the suggestions as proposed by Egypt or using a passive voice to try to avoid using some. I have Iran, and then I have Argentina. So Iran, please, Hossein go ahead.

HOSSEIN MIRZAPOUR: Yes. Thank you, Manal, and all parties involved in such an interesting and hard debate. I don't want to repeat everything. Most of my thoughts are already expressed by Brazil, Argentina and Egypt. Just one phrase. First of all, I think as well, market is the best system so far we know to allocate all those scare things such as domains. I do believe so as well.

But as it was brought up at the end of last session, planarization, Internet fragmentation, sometimes some companies they are excluded of some opportunities just based on their homeland countries. It's kind of another discrimination we have seen under ICANN control and the mandate.

So just an idea to bring everybody closer and probably to be more constructive we can add the phrase of GAC proposed or suggest to ICANN Board to make sure that those opportunities are shared

equally, some phrase like that. The idea of making sure that opportunities are shared equally could help in this regard. And I hope that everybody agrees on that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. So the meaning is understood if there is a concrete proposal to edit as well, please we can take this on this screen. And I have Argentina next, and then I'll go to Brazil to see if they are okay with the text. Please, Argentina.

ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Just I would like to ask because I'm pretty new. Maybe I'm not sure about this in regarding if ICANN with the first with the original Applicant Support Program, the intention was to expand the DNS market to other regions.

And if so, we will need to know if there is an evaluation in how this program worked or not to see in this revising or improvement of the program we can tackle the weaknesses. And if so, I mean, in this new round of new gTLDs the intention with this program is also to expand and to have a more equally distributed DNS market. And this relates to this a sentence that we are discussing now. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Argentina. And yes, just to confirm indeed the Applicant Support Program was part of the first round. There were only three applicants, if my memory serves me, two of which did not qualify. So only one applicant benefited from the Applicant Support Program. And that's why the trial to review and even start promoting the program earlier so that it can bear its fruits. I hope this is useful. And just checking the queue. And having no further requests for the floor, Brazil, would you like to comment on the text?

BRAZIL: Manal, frankly, a bit of a loss here because I'm not sure you have one clear proposal. There are different suggestions. I thank your colleague for presenting them. I think it's not a problem. I understand Nigel's point that we don't have to be, let's say, very assertive in the sense that, let's say, who exactly is expressing those views. We can push this impassive voice for, say, GAC members. I think it's not that important.

What we think is important somehow and we can find perhaps a softer phrasing. We think it's important to connect the notion of the market concentration with the idea of digital divine. I think that's important. We can perhaps rephrase this in a way that is less blunt perhaps. But I think that's a point that we rather keep in the text.

As for the suggestion of Egypt, I thank my colleague for presenting. The fact is the previous round of gTLDs had geographical concentration. That's a fact. I think we shouldn't present this as a view, because that's a fact. That's something that happened. I think it's not a matter of opinion. So in the sense, perhaps I would prefer a different text in relation to this point because there's a recognition that there was this concentration.

I think the question is, which implications we derive from this? And what kind of suggestion we make or not to the board or the community or whatever in relation to this point. I know perhaps to say that GAC members as was before that GAC members expressed a view that market concentration as an illustration of prevailing digital divides, something along those lines.

MANAL ISMAIL: So Brazil, if you would like more time to digest and propose.

BRAZIL: Yes. We need more time to try and to go around this somehow.

MANAL ISMAIL: So let me let me propose -- and US, this is a new hand. Okay. I'll give the US the floor. And then we can read the remaining new

text we received just to see if there is any other contentions. And then we will break for coffee. Maybe we can take a little bit longer break for everyone to get together and try to agree on text. So on this part, I can see US, Brazil, Egypt, Argentina, maybe if you'd like to get together, Iran. I mean, interested GAC members could try to draft something over coffee. I'm sorry, US first and then I.

Okay. So we identified the controversy here. So let's leave this now and move on to the remaining part that we have not read on WHOIS disclosure system. And the text reads, the GAC who welcomes the publication of ICANN org's design paper for the WHOIS Disclosure System, referred to as the system afterwards, a single point of entry for fielding domain name registration data request and distributing those requests to registrars and greatly appreciates ICANN staff's efforts on this work.

The system is a necessary first step towards building more comprehensive solution as envisioned by EPDP Phase 2. It should facilitate the collection of useful data in a quicker and more cost-effective manner, and ideally shed light on usage rates, timelines for responses and percentages of requests granted or denied. Such data would assist the ICANN Board with its considerations of the EPDP Phase 2 and allow work to continue towards, sorry, maybe I can read from my screen, continue towards effective and timely implementation of the EPDP recommendations.

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

The GAC highlights the importance of engaging in education and outreach with potential requesters, so that these requesters learn of the system's ability. In line with the "Temporary Specification for gTLD registration data," which requires both gTLD registries and registrars to provide reasonable access to personal data in registration data, the GAC invites ICANN to consider the participation in the system of registry operators as well as exploring incentives for both registries and registrars to participate given that participation is voluntary.

As currently designed, any communications beyond the request itself take place outside the system. Information about approvals or denials of requests, timing of the response and reasons for denial would be logged at the election of the registrar. The GAC finds it very important to log this data in a proper manner as this will help to ensure the system is generating robust and useful data to inform future work.

The GAC also finds that even if a request relates to a registrar, can we scroll down a bit, relates to a registrar that chooses not to participate in the framework, logging such information would also provide useful data. The framework should therefore include such functionality. Finally, the GAC stresses the importance of including a mechanism to allow for confidential law enforcement requests in line with the Phase 2 recommendations.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

So I'll stop here and I see a US hand up. Please, Susan.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Yes, thank you, Chair. We just wanted to offer some words on the proposal to encourage that registry operators be included within the WHOIS Disclosure System design. So the primary goal of the design was to create a low cost pilot that could be built upon over time to take the community and the direct of the SSAD. Registrars are authoritative for their customers or the registrants' data.

So in the interest of building a solid foundation for future work, it makes sense to go directly to the source of the data at this point. There has been a desire within the community, including the small team to minimize duplicate requests for the same data, both to registrars and registries, particularly at this stage, the pilot phase.

Finally, pending legislation should make -- Actually, you know what? I'm just going to rest on those two points, but I think mainly we're looking at a pilot that is poised to go forward. So with that said, I do think there was a lot of really constructive, well, there was a constructive exchange on this topic during the Board GAC session.

And I believe one of the Board members had made some useful -- well, the same issue was presented, and so there could be some

opportunity for moving forward on this. So we're happy to have the text remain, but we did want to express that the purpose of the pilot, we thought the disclosure system met the purpose of the pilot. And so with that said, it was just some comments for context. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Susan. And I have one more request for the floor and we're past the scheduled end time. So please very briefly, and then we'll go to our break. Canada, please.

CHARLES NOIR: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Just a quick question. Sorry, for the record Charles Noir from Canada. Just want to make sure and I think we're all on the same page here, but just double checking that when the EC is proposing registries we are not talking about ccTLDs in being included. Can we just confirm that? And then we can think about moving forward with the text, but just a confirmation. I'm not sure if it needs to be plain in the text if we eventually get there, but certainly that's a consideration for Canada. Thank you.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you very much, Canada. And yeah, ccTLDs are not meant here to be part of this. Velimira. Okay. But really brief then we are going to take a longer break to allow people to finalize the draft.

VELIMIRA GRAU: Yes. Now I just wanted to confirm what our Canadian colleague said. We are here in the context of the gTLDs. And we are discussing on the basis of discussions that we had in the context of the projects. And what I wanted also to say is that very quickly for the sake of broadening also the knowledge of those colleagues who had not been involved so far in this, we had a number of explanations why we think that might be considered without [01:02:41 - inaudible] at this stage. And I'm happy to share this in the chat while the colleagues are in both.

I also wanted to thank the United States for having taken into consideration the overall exchanges among just certain parts of the community, but who are more involved in the discussion. And I just wanted to understand. Apologies, Susan. I received a Skype message, I got a little bit concentrated. So you're not proposing any changes to this wording or you need some time to have a look into this. Many thanks, just to repeat for me. Apologies for this.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

MANAL ISMAIL: I think we need to stop now and maybe continue the discussion offline because we need to have the break. So it's 19 past. And may I propose we meet at the hour, or do you need more time? So let's reconvene at the hour and check if more time is needed we can allow for, but check on the progress and see where we are. So please, for those online as well, we will be reconvening at the hour. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR