**ICANN Transcription**

**Joint GNSO/GAC Meeting**

**Thursday, 01 October 2020 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:     Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GAC-GNSO meeting on Thursday, 1st of October, 2020. All GAC and GNSO Council members have been promoted to panelists. They will, therefore, be able to activate their mics and type comments in the chat. This webinar is also open to observers—welcome—who will be able to listen in and read the content of the chat.

So, all GAC and GNSO members, please remember to adjust the chat settings to "all panelists and attendees" for all to be able to read your comments. This session is being recorded. We will be circulating the recordings shortly after the end of the call. GAC members/councilors, please remember, therefore, to state your name clearly when speaking for recording purposes. As a reminder,

*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.*

those who take part in the ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the expected standards of behavior. With this, I'll turn it over to you, Keith. Please begin.

KEITH DRAZEK:     Thank you very much, Natalie. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the joint GAC-GNSO Council meeting in and around ICANN69. Today is the 1st of October 2020. We have a quite busy agenda and 60 minutes for our meeting, so we should jump right in. I do want to note that on Tuesday this week we had a meeting of the GAC leadership and the GNSO Council leadership, along with our ICANN staff colleagues, to discuss the topic for our agenda this morning.

And so, I'll just go over quickly, very quickly, what's on the screen here. We have a brief welcome, and then, immediately, a joint discussion on the ePDP Phase 2 final report, which I think, as everybody knows, the GNSO Council voted to approve last week, September 24th. We can talk in more detail about that. And when we get to this session, and then the next session, I will turn to Rafik Dammak as the GNSO Council liaison and chair of the ePDP Phase 2 final report in its final stages for some assistance and detail.

Item number three is a joint discussion on the ePDP Phase 2(a), which is the term that we're using for the priority two items that were not addressed during the SSAD recommendation discussion. That would be topics such as legal versus natural and data accuracy.

Then we'll have a joint discussion on the IGO work track, the IGO Protections work track, which the GNSO Council will be soon be

initiating a call for volunteers and a call for a chair. We'll talk about that in more detail momentarily. Then a joint discussion on the Subsequent Procedures consensus input from the GAC and a joint discussion on DNS abuse.

So, with that as a review of the agenda, Manal, would you like to make any comments to open, or shall we move into the discussion on ePDP Phase 2 final report? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you very much, Keith. Just to welcome everyone to this bilateral meeting. It has been a while since we last had a GAC-wide bilateral. But as you mentioned, Keith, we have been coordinating as leadership closely throughout the previous meetings, even despite not holding GAC-GNSO bilaterals.

So, welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining this GAC-GNSO meeting. I know we have a long agenda so, without any further ado, I will hand it back to you, Keith, to get a start. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:          Thank you very much, Manal. Yes, I think, as we always say and indicate, that these joint sessions, these bilaterals between the GNSO Council and the GAC< are very important for our engagement in the ICANN community and for making sure that we're clearly understanding and aware of the views of the respective groups and the respective groups within our … Or respective entities within our groups.

So, we really do appreciate these engagements, even if they have to be virtual at this particular time. This is a very important conversation and we do look forward to this around each ICANN meeting. So, thank you very much.

Let's go ahead and get started. So, as I noted, the GNSO Council did approve, at its last meeting in September on the 24th, the ePDP Phase 2 final report. As, I think, some may be aware, the GNSO Council had three separate votes on the resolution related to the ePDP Phase 2 work.

The first was on the package of recommendations one through 18, related to the development of the SSAD, the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure. The second vote was related to the approval of some of the priority two items leftover from ePDP Phase 1, as well as Phase 2, that relate not specifically to the SSAD but to the implementation work around ePDP Phase 1 and replacing the Temporary Specification. And the third vote was an administrative vote related to the delivery and thanking the chairs and the members of the group, etc.

So, the GNSO Council did vote. It was a super-majority vote with two of the constituencies, the IPC and the BC, voting no, but the vote did actually receive super-majority support and those recommendations related to the SSAD will be forwarded to the board for their consideration.

So, that work is now moving forward. We did, importantly, as the GNSO Council, note in our first resolved clause—1(b), for specificity—that the GNSO Council is looking forward to further

engagement with the ICANN Board on questions of cost-benefit analysis and financial sustainability related to the SSAD.

We, the council, certainly have noted the minority statements that were issued by a range of participants. Actually, almost all of the groups represented in the ePDP Phase 2 work submitted minority statements, and some of the concerns and questions raised about the value of and the financial sustainability of the recommendations.

And so, the GNSO Council indicated in our resolve clause 1(b) that we did want to offer ourselves up as the council and to engage with the ICANN Board on any questions it may have related to that topic, so that we have an ongoing and open dialog about the cost and value of the consensus policy recommendations, as forwarded to the board. And yes, Marie is noting that the IPC and the BC voted "no" on the SSAD aspects, but not on the other two resolved clauses. So, Marie, thank you for that clarity.

So, with that, Manal, if I could turn to Rafik to see if Rafik has anything that he would like to comment on here on the ePDP Phase 2 vote and recommendations? And then, I'm happy to open it up to questions or comments from my GAC colleagues. But Rafik, if I could hand it over to you for anything you'd like to add at this point?

RAFIK DAMMAK:          Thanks, Keith, and thanks to everyone who joined this meeting. Not so much to add, but I think, maybe, just about the steps before the voting, just to explain how we reached that conclusion. I mean, the GNSO Council received the final report on the 31st of July, and then

a revised version when all the later minority statements were submitted. So, we got that on the 24<sup>th</sup> of August.

For the GNSO Council, we had our first meeting on August to discuss more about the process and how we'll proceed further, and that's why we split into a separate packet for SSAD and for the priority two items. And we also had the webinar to go through the recommendation and explain to the GNSO Council, and that webinar was also open to the community.

So, I think there was enough time to consider the report recommendation and the minority statement. And so, as Keith explained then, in the last week's meeting we voted to approve the final report. So, just in terms of process. Yeah. That's it for me.

KEITH DRAZEK:    Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. Manal, if I could hand it over to you, if there are any comments, or questions, or observations from yourself or from GAC colleagues? I'm happy to open up the floor on this topic now.

MANAL ISMAIL:    Thank you very much, Keith and Rafik, for this informative update. It's good to know about the different steps and how you split the resolutions and you separated the SSAD resolution from the future discussions—again, the two tracks that are intended to discuss the pending issues separately, one on accuracy and one on the legal versus natural, and other topics.

It's also interesting to see you have asked for a consultation with the board prior to their decision, and we will follow closely the outcome of your discussion on sustainability and cost-benefit analysis. So, thanks again. Any comments or questions from my GAC colleagues? So, I see none. I think this was very informative and, obviously crystal clear. So, no questions. Thank you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:    Thank you very much, Manal. Yeah. And so, if anybody has some follow-up questions, we can always circle back. But I think, probably worth mentioning, the next steps … So, as under the ICANN bylaws and under GNSO operating procedure, now that the ePDP Phase 2 final report has been approved by the GNSO Council, it will go to the ICANN Board for consideration.

I know that the ePDP team did receive some initial estimates from ICANN Org about the possible cost of implementing the ePDP Phase 2 recommendations related to the SSAD. So, I expect that ICANN will be going through some additional—if they aren't already—analysis and providing some additional input to the ICANN Board about those questions so the ICANN Board can be fully informed prior to making its decision on the consensus policy recommendations.

But there is also the expectation that there will be an additional public comment period for this, prior to the board's final decision, and that there is a further opportunity for the community to engage to provide its views to the board. We have noted the minority statements from the various groups, and I am quite sure that the board will be considering those, as well.

I did want to note that we have taken note of the letter that was sent from ICANN's CEO, Göran Marby, to you, Manal, related to some of the points in the GAC's minority statement, and that we, of course, will be very interested to see the GAC's response to that letter, as well as any further discussion or consultations around that.

We obviously recognize that, at the end of the day, if the user groups who are interested in the SSAD don't find it sufficient, or a step forward, or an additional foundation, that's something that the board will need to take into consideration.

We look forward to further engagement with the board on that and to the GAC's response to the board's questions related to the minority statement. So, with that, we should probably move to item number three on our agenda, which is the ePDP Phase 2(a). Sorry, Manal. Did you want to get in?

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you, Keith. Actually, it's on ePDP Phase 2(a), so maybe I can wait.

KEITH DRAZEK:          Okay. Thank you, Manal. Yeah. I was just going to tee it up and note that we have two … The GNSO Council has acknowledged that there is additional work that needs to take place related to some of the priority two items that were not deemed to be on the critical path for the SSAD, and those would be legal versus natural, data accuracy, and the use of unique identifiers.

The council had a small team that developed a plan for addressing these issues, and the council will be looking at its meeting in October to approve the path forward on the Phase 2(a) work. That includes two tracks, one on data accuracy and the other on legal versus natural and the other issues that came out of the ePDP Phase 2 priority two items.

And so, with that, I'm going to ask Rafik to jump in here again, and then, Manal, I'll hand it back over to you for questions on next steps related to the ePDP Phase 2(a). So Rafik, if I could hand it to you, please?

RAFIK DAMMAK:  Thanks, Keith. Okay. So, yeah. As the background, first, I think it's important to emphasize that many of the priority two items were covered in Phase 2, and we got recommendation of the final report. So, for what is remaining, the three items mentioned by Keith, one of them, regarding data accuracy … There was communication previously from the GNSO Council to the ePDP team that it's not within the scope, and that requires better scoping for future work.

So, for the other items, they were not possible to be done because they were not in the critical path and they were waiting for the study from the ICANN Org, and so that was not possible to get them in that phase.

However, the GNSO Council was aware about that in June and we started the work through several iterations to get a proposal for concrete next steps in how we can deal with those three topics and what should be the process for that.

As was mentioned, we have two separate tracks, the first track to cover the two items, legal versus natural and the feasibility of [unique contacts] to have uniform, anonymized e-mail address, and the other one for accuracy.

So, for the first one regarding the two items, what is proposed here is to [inaudible] the ePDP team to work on those two topics and to be able to … Let's say better planning, here. We would have two types of actions, like immediate action and the subsequent action.

For the immediate action for this track, first we'll communicate with all the groups presented in the ePDP team to confirm their representative, or to replace them. And also, we are asking those who expressed interest in those two topics to factor in the deliberation to date to work or develop a proposal for either of these topics. So, if we reconvene the ePDP team to be effective, we would like to have the different groups coming with a concrete proposal so we can keep up the deliberation in a more effective manner.

We also have … In terms of an immediate action, the council is to consider the leadership question. So, we'll need to appoint a new chair for that new phase, 2(a). After doing that, then we can move to the subsequent steps, for the council to confirm the go-ahead for the ePDP team to reconvene after we select the leadership.

When the ePDP are reconvened and start their deliberation, we give them three months to work on those two topics. After that, the working group … The ePDP team leadership will report back to GNSO Council on the status of the deliberation.

Based on that report, which is expected to include an update on the progress made … And, I think, quite important, the expected likelihood of consensus recommendation. Based on that, GNSO Council will decide on next steps, which can be providing additional time for the ePDP to finalize its recommendation or terminate the ePDP if it's clear there is no progress being made.

So, that's for the first track. We are already looking forward to have a concrete proposal to move forward, now that there was already some deliberation at Phase 2. But in order to give or enable success, we are keen to have a proposal from the different group.

For the second track, regarding the accuracy, since this is about working on the scoping and then initiating a proper PDP process, what we are recommending here is to [form a] scoping team which consists of volunteers from a GNSO stakeholder group/constituency, as well as interested advisory committees.

And so, the scoping team is following other scoping teams we had at GNSO, like the one in IDN or in the transfer policy. And so, we are asking, here, the scoping team to facilitate coming to the understanding of the issue, assist in scoping and defining the issue, gather support for request of an issue report, and also gather additional data or information before the request.

So, here, we are counting on the scoping team to [send their] existing input or material we have—also what we get as legal advice from Bird & Bird and, most important, I think, here, the substantive input provided on the topic during the public comment form in the addendum.

So, that's the [inaudible] that we will have the scoping team. So, what is seen here as immediate action is GNSO Council here will communicate with different groups, including the Advisory Committee, that take an interest in the topic to start thinking about the members that have their different knowledge and expertise to join the effort once the scoping team starts, and also to combine all relevant information and suggestions that will help for the discussion on that topic once the scoping team is formed.

In addition to that, that's [when] asking the groups, we are requesting ICANN organization to develop a briefing document to outline the accuracy requirement and programs and the impact that GDPR had on the implementing and enforcing those requirements.

And for GNSO Council, it will be about considering the context of the Action/Decision Radar, which is the new tool used by the council, to plan the activities, and so to factor that, this new initiative or this scoping team, against other projects in the timeline.

So then, the last steps will be, when we confirm all the previous three immediate actions, for the council to launch the call for volunteers to form the scoping team and to kick it off, and also determine a deadline by which the scoping team is expected to deliver its finding/recommendation to the GNSO Council.

So, [I went in] a little bit too much detail to explain the tracks, but what I want, again, to highlight … So, we have immediate actions to emphasize or stress that we are taking clear steps to move forward on those topics. And so, to do all their preliminary work, to start them, reconvening the ePDP team or in shaping the scoping team … So, I will be happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:    Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. Manal, I'll hand it back to you momentarily, but I just want to make the point that the GNSO Council clearly heard from the GAC and from other interested parties that there was additional discussion and consideration that needed to take place on a few issues, including legal versus natural and data accuracy—two topics that were discussed during the ePDP Phase 1 and Phase 2 work but that required some additional time and some additional input, including the study that Rafik mentioned earlier that came in after the finalization of the SSAD recommendations.

And so, as we indicated previously, including in our last bilateral meeting and during our conversations over the earlier parts of this year, the council has committed and is going to deliver on initiating this follow-on work, and that we look forward to the engagement of the various GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies, but also the other SOs and ACs that have expressed interest. So, with that, Manal, I'll hand it back to you for any comment, or questions, or anything else that you'd like to add on this point. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:    Thank you very much, Keith, and thanks, Rafik. I think Rafik covered all that I wanted to ask for. I was going to ask about how the two tracks will be triggered, what's the process, and what are the steps, and what should we expect next? And I think Rafik covered this quite extensively, so thank you, Rafik. Any questions or comments from GAC colleagues? Yes. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:    Yes. Thank you very much, Manal. A question for you, Keith. I noted in one of your last council meetings there was a discussion amongst your members around the interest in the data accuracy side and the need for a timely solution. And I think there was some discussion around how you were going to meet the needs of the different stakeholders to approach this in a timely solution. I just wonder if any more discussion has gone around how this is going to be broken up and the timescales of it. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:    Yeah. Thank you, Chris. Thanks for the question. And Rafik, I'll turn to you in a moment if you'd like to add anything to what I'm about to say. I think the expectation here is that, as Rafik summarized a moment ago, there will be, really, two tracks looking at these issues.

One, primarily legal versus natural, was certainly in scope for the ePDP. It was included in the charter as a topic for discussion, and there is the expectation that we will be moving to reconvene the ePDP team for this work focused on legal versus natural and the unique identifier question.

So, we're going to need to give the community/participants the opportunity to either confirm their existing members or to appoint new members if there is going to be a need for a recast of the ePDP team. But that is actually, probably, an easier effort/work track to kick off.

There has been previous discussion on the topic. I think that it's well-established. There is an opportunity for the ePDP team to

come back together to finalize its work on legal versus natural and the other related issues.

On the focus on data accuracy, there is also a recognition that this is a bit more complex, that there are different moving parts to this topic. And while there were specific questions related to data accuracy coming out of ePDP Phase 1 and Phase 2 related to GDPR, the topic of data accuracy related to RDDS, or Registration Data Directory Services, is a bit more complex.

There are some other moving parts, including ICANN Org's responsibility around the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System, the ARS, and there needs to be some additional scoping work taking place to ensure that we're setting up this topic of data accuracy to be handled a bit more holistically to make sure that we have got the group focused in the right way, because I think the topic is broader than simply the question that came out of the ePDP work related to GDPR and whether data accuracy is specific to the data subject or whether there are third party expectations and rights, etc. It's a topic that's broader than that simple question.

And so, Rafik, if I could hand it back to you? If you'd like to add anything or correct anything that I've said then please do. And then, I see that Georgios has his hand up, as well. But Rafik, to you first. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:     I don't have so much to add. So, looking forward to hear from Georgios [mainly, and the ICANN floor].

KEITH DRAZEK:              Okay. Thank you, Rafik. Georgios, over to you.

GEORGIOS TSELENTIS:       Thank you, Keith and Rafik. I don't want to repeat all of the debate
                          that we had, and I think the position of the GAC is quite consistent
                          in the issues of accuracy and whether it is within the scope. I think
                          our concern was a concern of compliance toward the GDPR, which
                          was the exercise of the ePDP.

                          But there is another issue and, to a certain extent, it a little bit
                          puzzles me with the two different approaches that we have within
                          legal versus natural and accuracy. Because at the end of the day,
                          the question of liability, which stems from the division between legal
                          versus natural, is also a question of, how can we count on that data
                          and if that data is accurate?

                          So, I see your point, Keith, that these are issues that are complex
                          and we have to bring, also, considerations that are happening in
                          other efforts within ICANN Org, like the ARS, but I cannot help
                          myself by observing that those two issues are also connected. So,
                          maybe we will have a problem and, also, maybe we will have a
                          problem with compliance with GDPR, and we consistently, as I said,
                          highlighted that. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:              Okay. Thank you very much, Georgios. That's very helpful. I think
                          it's a signal to the GNSO Council as the manager of the policy
                          development processes and this follow-on work to ensure that both
                          efforts in these two separate tracks, as we have envisioned, need
                          to make sure that they are informing one another and that there is

an ongoing effort to ensure that the work of each group is informed and, to your point, that, if there are dependencies or inter-relation, those are acknowledged. So, thank you very much for that comment. Manal, if I could hand it back to you? Any additional comments or questions on this, or any other GAC colleagues like to weigh in?

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you very much, Keith and Rafik, and thanks to Nathalie and Berry, as well, in the chat, for sharing the GNSO Council Action Decision Radar and highlighting that it gets updated monthly. I think this is very useful. I don't see any additional hands up, and I don't have any other questions or comments, so I think we're good to move on.

KEITH DRAZEK:          Okay. Thank you very much, Manal. Of course, we look forward to continued and further engagement of GAC colleagues in these efforts and this follow-on work that has been clearly identified as important and necessary for the ongoing policy development work.

So, with that, let's move. We have just 25 minutes left, but I think we have covered some of the more detailed issues. It's worth noting on our agenda item number four, which is the discussion on the next steps on the IGO work track, that, previously, the GNSO Council had approved the charter for the work related to the IGO protections coming out of the Curative Rights Protections effort, and that we are now initiating the call for expressions of interest for a chair for this work track, and also for members.

I know that, in our previous engagement, we had reached out to GAC colleagues, GAC leadership, and IGO representatives to confirm that you were available and ready to initiate this work, and available to participate in the effort. And so, we're pleased to report that we're finally getting to the point where we're going to initiate the call for volunteers and the call for the chair.

So, we look forward to initiating the work on the IGO protections under the umbrella of the RPM PDP Working Group, as we have discussed previously. So you will, in the next week or so, see that formal call for volunteers and for the chair, and we very much look forward to the engagement of GAC colleagues and IGO colleagues in that work once it initiates. So, thank you. Manal, if I could hand it over to you?

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you very much, Keith. Thank you for this informative update, and thanks for the good news. I'm glad to hear that you'll be calling for the members and the chair shortly. So, this is excellent progress. Any comments from my GAC colleagues? I see none. So, again, thanking you again, and we remain committed to the progress of this work, and happy to work closely with the GNSO on this. So, thanks. Back to you.

KEITH DRAZEK:          Thank you very much, Manal. Yeah. So, we look forward to getting this work initiated—obviously, important work that needs to take place—and some other additional consensus policy recommendations that are pending with the ICANN Board right now

are very much interrelated and associated with this question of IGO protections.

And so, we're looking forward to moving this forward expeditiously and to allowing the group to start its work anew. So, thank you for that. Let's move on, then, to next item, which is a joint discussion on Subsequent Procedures PDP consensus input. Manal, this was a topic that, during our planning call, you raised, or GAC colleagues raised, as something to discuss.

So, I'll hand this one back to you, but I also wanted to note that I think, just yesterday, the Subsequent Procedures group received some communication from ICANN Org and also ICANN Board in terms of its ongoing work.

So, just for everybody's benefit, the Subsequent Procedures PDP is currently expecting to deliver its final report by the end of this year. And so, there is a public comment period open. Obviously, happy to hear anything that you and GAC colleagues have to say on Subsequent Procedures at this point. So, I'll stop here and hand it back to you, Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:     Thank you very much, Keith. We already have our topic leads with us on the call, but let me start by saying that I think we have worked very closely and collaboratively, with many thanks to the co-chairs of the PDP Working Group. They were very helpful throughout the process. They kept us informed. We tried to engage within the working group, as well.

And with the help of our topic leads and support staff, thanks to everyone, we managed to submit a collective GAC consensus input on this broad subject by the deadline. We received comments and remarks from around ten members and observers.

Again, I thank everyone for this collaborative effort among the GAC, within the leadership team, and support staff, but also specifically from the co-chairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. So, thanks to everyone. I'll stop here. Any comments or remarks from my GAC colleagues, or our topic leads? Yes. Jorge, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:          Hello, everyone. Do you hear me okay?

MANAL ISMAIL:          Yes, Jorge. Loud and clear.

JORGE CANCIO:          Hello. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Jorge Cancio from Switzerland. I have been together with Luisa Paez from Canada, with support from, especially, Benedetta Rossi from staff. We have been the topic leads on this issue and I just wanted to take this opportunity to say that we are, of course, open to continue our exchanges and to look into further improvements to the recommendations of the final draft.

You will see that, in a number of issues, we tend to request the working group to get a little bit further, so I think you will be seeing

this in the working group when you analyze our input. I hope that we can also take the opportunity during ICANN69 to exchange on any issues where we may diverge to a certain extent. So, I leave it by that and I join, of course, Manal in thanking the GNSO, especially Jeff, and Cheryl, and GAC, and GNSO support staff for being always so cooperative with us in this endeavor. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:         Thank you very much, Jorge. Good to see you. It has been a while. And thank you, Keith, also, for highlighting the board communication and [our] communication, as well. I think we will need to read them thoroughly and compare notes, as well. We have this topic on our agenda with the ALAC, as well, so it's an ongoing discussion within the GAC. So, I see no further hands. I think I can hand it back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:         Okay. Thank you very much, Manal. I'll just note that Cheryl Langdon-Orr is here as our ALAC liaison to GNSO and Jeff Neuman has joined the call as an attendee. So, I just wanted to note that both the co-chairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group are with us here on this call and thank you very much for the comments from Jorge and yourself.

I think the involvement, and the participation, and the contributions of GAC colleagues to the Subsequent Procedures effort is a critical thing. It's very important to the process, to the engagement, and for the development of GNSO policy for the next round of new gTLDs to make sure that the views of the GAC are contributed and

engaged, and that we have full participation from governments in this very important endeavor.

So, thank you very much for all of the work that has gone into this, including Work Track 5, but not limited to Work Track 5, of course, on geographic names, but the broader set of recommendations that are under development. The involvement of the GAC is very important, so thank you for that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Keith. I have to admit we were very concerned about the timeframe and the regular public comment period. But with the significant help of the PDP co-chairs and with the wise planning of our topic leads, we managed to submit the comments by the due date. So, thanks for everyone.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you very much, Manal, and thanks, again, to Jeff, and Cheryl, and to everybody that contributed to that effort collaboratively. So, I think a great example of making sure that community groups are working together toward a common goal of meeting our deadlines and also making sure that the substantive issues are addressed fully.

So, with that, unless there are any other questions or comments on Subsequent Procedures, we can move to the next item, which is a discussion on DNS abuse. I'll tee this one up and then open it up, or hand it back to you, Manal.

On the topic of DNS abuse, I think we all recognize that, for the last two years, this has been a topic of significant interest across the ICANN community—that there have been several panel discussions and high-interest topic sessions or plenary sessions, and some … Not plenary sessions, but there have been quite a number of conversations taking place around DNS abuse.

The GNSO Council is very much aware of the GAC advice that exists on this topic related to the CCTRT recommendations that were referred to the Subsequent Procedures group. I think as you all know, the SubPro Working Group leadership referred the topic, referred those recommendations, back to the GNSO Council a few months ago, noting that, if we're going to consider policy recommendations on the topic of DNS abuse, it should be applied to, or focused on, all gTLDs, rather than just the next round of gTLDs.

And so, the GNSO Council has an action item before it to consider next steps related to those recommendations and to try to figure out how we move forward on this issue of DNS abuse if there is a need for gTLD policy development work on the topic.

And so, I just wanted to note that this is obviously an important issue for the community, it's an important issue for the industry, and the GNSO Council will be considering next steps on this.

One of the issues that we have identified is the need to better understand and to make sure that there's a common understanding of the topic of DNS abuse as it relates to ICANN's role, ICANN's remit, ICANN's bylaws.

But generally speaking, we need to make sure that the community is aligned on the question in terms of scoping—there is going to be a very important scoping exercise for the GNSO as it relates to gTLD Registry and Registrar Agreements, to the extent new consensus policy might be needed—and to really make sure that the community understands what is within ICANN's remit and what is outside of ICANN's remit, but that this is a very important topic.

And so, I think the next efforts within the GNSO Council will be to try to identify a plan moving forward, but making sure that we have established a baseline of understanding so that the community can contribute to any efforts that take place in the gTLD space. So, with that, let me stop there, Manal. If I could hand it back to you? Of course, if anybody on the call, GNSO Councilors or GAC members, would like to weigh-in, now is your opportunity. Manal, back to you. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you very much, Keith. Thank you for sharing with us your thinking as the GNSO on the next steps. Actually, the DNS abuse was put on the agenda here for us to follow up on the framework that was promised by the GNSO, again to the community, to start a discussion among interested community members. So, we were putting this here by way of a follow-up on this framework paper, which I understand now is pending other activities to be informed, and that they would feed into this process before having this paper out.

KEITH DRAZEK:     Thanks, Manal. Yes. I think one of the items that we have acknowledged is that the SSAC is preparing to issue its report from the DNS Abuse Work Party that was initiated and announced several months ago, and that, once the SSAC releases its paper, the GNSO Council will consider that, and then try to, having been informed by the work of the SSAC, ensure that we have outlined possible next steps in terms of the framework of how the community can take next steps on this topic.

And again, I think the key here is to note that, if there is a question of development of so-called "best practices," then perhaps a GNSO PDP is not necessary. But if there is an expectation, or the goal is to update gTLD registry and registrar agreements, then perhaps a PDP would be necessary.

And I think the key here is for us as a community to agree on what the goals are for next steps on the topic of DNS abuse. And once we're in alignment on what those goals are, what the desired outcome is, we'll have a better sense as to what the right procedural approach is to follow. And I think we're certainly looking forward to the SSAC Work Party paper on that, and that will help inform discussion around next steps.


MANAL ISMAIL:     Definitely. Thank you, Keith. We'll be looking forward, also, to the SSAC report. Also, reading Jorge in the chat, the GAC consensus input regarding Subsequent Procedures also includes relevant points on DNS abuse and the need to address this swiftly before any new round starts. So, this is also an important element for the GAC.

KEITH DRAZEK:     Yeah. Thank you, Manal. Understood, Jorge, and thank you for calling that out. The GNSO Council is fully aware of the GAC advice on this topic, including the consensus input that you have just described. I think there is an awareness that the GNSO Council needs to move expeditiously in initiating this follow-on work, to the extent there is any, as it relates to the CCTRT recommendations, GAC advice, and now the GAC consensus input that this is an important topic to be addressed prior to the launch of the next round of new gTLDs. So, thank you for that.

MANAL ISMAIL:     Thank you very much, Keith. I see no hands up. I think there are no more requests for the floor. Oh, I'm sorry. Pam, go ahead, please.

PAM LITTLE:     No problem, Manal. Hi. Please just finish if you would like to wrap it up. I just have an AOB, if I may, when you finish. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK:     Okay. Thank you, Pam, and thank you, Manal. Would anybody else like to get in-queue? We have about six minutes left on our call. If anybody has anything they'd like to say or add, now is a great time to do it. Otherwise, Manal, we can perhaps move to AOB and hand it back to Pam.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you, Keith. Thanks, Manal. Hi. Manal and GAC colleagues, I just have a kind of small announcement I'd like to make as we wrap up this call. As you know, we are having this GAC-GNSO engagement or bilateral a bit earlier for ICANN meeting, basically because of the virtual meeting format. Otherwise, we would be seeing you face-to-face in about three weeks' time.

But I just want to let you know that our GNSO Council chair, Keith, and the vice-chair, Rafik, their term actually ends after ICANN69. So, I just wanted to invite our GAC colleagues to join me and the council to thank their services in leading the council over the years in all the engagement with the GAC.

I'm sure the new council leadership would be looking forward to our continuing engagement with the GAC, along with the SubPro leadership and other working group leadership, perhaps. But I just want to mention that so you know this will be Keith and Rafik's last engagement with you. I'm sure they will be sticking around some way at ICANN and, hopefully, we can see them in the very near future face-to-face and you can say a proper goodbye. On that note, I'll pause. Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Rafik. Thanks, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Pam, for flagging this. Thank you very much, Keith and Rafik. We really enjoyed working with you. Thank you for being so helpful for the GAC. I see overwhelming thanks in the chat. I'm sure you'll take note of them.

But we wish you all the best. We would have wished to have this face-to-face, of course, as Pam mentioned. We would have liked to

cheer you there. But again, thanks for your service with the GNSO and your cooperation with the wider community. We look forward, of course, to working with the new leadership team. So, I'll stop here. So, the term ends after ICANN69?

KEITH DRAZEK:        Thank you very much, Manal, and thank you, Pam, for your kind words. And of course, thanks to Rafik for all of his service in both the GNSO Council leadership team, as well as in the ePDP Phase 1 and Phase 2. It has been a very busy time. Rafik has really been fantastic on the council leadership, as well as engaging with the ePDP and the broader community. So, I just wanted to note that in particular.

But yeah, as Pam noted, there is going to be quite some turnover and some transition, even coming out of the last Annual Global Meeting. I think we had a transition of six councilors from the GNSO, and now we have additional turnover.

The Annual Global Meeting is an important time for that transition and, as Pam noted, two of the three council leadership roles will be turning over. But fortunately, Pam will continue on the council and, hopefully, as part of the leadership team, and you'll be able to continue to work with her and the rest of the GNSO colleagues.

So, thanks for the kind words. I do feel, just speaking personally, that the GNSO Council/GNSO community engagement with the GAC and GAC colleagues is in a very positive place and I look forward to that continuing for many ICANN meetings and years to come.

This is a critical engagement in the development of GNSO and gTLD policy work, and the role of the GAC is clearly very, very important to ICANN and to the ICANN community, and making sure that our policy development work is well-informed. So, thank you for all of that.

I also want to note that our GNSO liaison to the GAC, Julf Helsingius, has given indication, or has given notice, that he is preparing to step down in that role. So, I'd like to thank Julf for his role and his service as the GNSO's liaison to the GAC, and to note that we're going through a process now of identifying the replacements and that, come our October meeting, we expect to have a new liaison that we will announce at that point. So, Manal, back to you for any last words. I think we can probably move to wrap up.

MANAL ISMAIL:          Thank you very much, Keith. Many thanks to Julf, as well, for doing a tough job, facilitating between the GAC and the GNSO. So, thank you very much, Julf. Also, catching up with the chat, I saw that other councilors are ending their terms, as well—I think James and Michele.

So thanks, everyone, for those who are ending their terms. I hope we will still see everyone around. Looking forward to work with the new leadership and looking forward to the new GNSO liaison to the GAC, as well. So, thanks, Keith. Back to you to end the call.

KEITH DRAZEK:            Thank you very much, Manal, and thanks to everybody for joining today. I would also like to acknowledge and congratulate Manal for her reappointment as the chair of the GAC, and also to all of the GAC leadership and vice-chairs for their service and continued contribution. So, with that, I think we can move to wrap up the call.

So, thanks to everybody for joining today. We look forward to engaging further in and around our virtual ICANN69 sessions. As always, the GNSO Council very much appreciates the work of the GAC and contributions to our policy development work. So, with that, let's move to wrap up the call today. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL:            Thanks, everyone. Stay safe. Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:    Thank you, everyone, for joining today's call. This concludes it. You may now disconnect your lines and have a great rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**