

---

ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC  
Tuesday, March 10, 2020 – 14:45 to 15:45 CUN

GULTEN TEPE:

Hello, everyone, good morning, afternoon, and evening. This is Gulden Tepe from ICANN GAC support team. Welcome to the ICANN67 GAC meeting with the ICANN board session held on Tuesday, 10th of March, 2020 at 19:45 UTC, Zoom room audio in English. To access French or Spanish, please join the streaming links shared on the main ICANN67 website, agenda page on each session, as well as the calendar invites sent to you. We will not do a roll call today for sake the time but member attendance will be noted and available in the annex of the ICANN67 communique and the minutes. Recognizing these are public sessions and that other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance. GAC leadership and staff encourage all of you who are GAC representative and observers to update your participant name in the Zoom room by adding GAC into parentheses after your name. You may take the way I type my name as an example. This will help us to identify GAC session attendees, keep accurate attendance records and facilitate the queue for participant comments and questions during this session. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment in English French or Spanish, please type it in the chat by

---

*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.*

---

starting and ending your sentence with question or comment and please keep them short if possible. French or Spanish questions will be translated into English and read out loud by our remote participation manager, Julia Charvolen. Staff will put periodic reminders of the process in the Zoom room chat. If you are in the Zoom room and wish to speak, you may raise your hand and we will manage the queue. And please state your names not only for transportation purposes but for the interpreter to identify you on the audio streaming. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Finally, this session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the expected standards of behavior. I will put a link to those standards in the chat for your reference. I will hand the floor to GAC chair, Manal Ismail.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Gulden. And welcome back everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. We will now start the GAC's joint meeting with the board. This meeting is scheduled for an hour. And I would like to start by welcoming all board members who are joining us for this first ever remote meeting. This time we have a bit longer agenda than usual. So without any further ado, I will ask if there are any opening remarks from the board's side before we get started with our --

---

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Just to reemphasize our appreciation of the GAC and its work and also very happy that we found this way forward where we work together on improving interaction all the time. For that [indiscernible] shared by co-chair Becky and Manal. So with that, really looking forward to the interaction this opportunity gives us, not in person but remote but let's make the best of it. So happy to go to your first question, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maarten. And yes, we couldn't have our BGIG meeting at this time but looking forward to having something even inter-sessionally. With that said, can we move to the following slide, please so that we can start with GAC areas and topics of interest and I again, thank the board for their flexibility to start with the GAC questions and then time allows, we will be going to the board's questions.

So first topic is the PIR transaction. And as you all know, this topic has attracted a lot of attention from the GAC. We received the request to add this to the agenda of our meeting here, and we had a very interesting discussion yesterday and had members also attending the first public forum that was dedicated to this topic, and I grasped the opportunity to also thank Göran for the response letter also flagging the public forum to GAC colleagues. So the ICANN

---

organizational ability to demonstrate that considerations of the global public interest are carefully assessed and protected in the context of the proposed PIR transaction important to the organization. In evaluating the PIR transaction, ICANN must demonstrate its commitment to multi-stakeholder input from all parts of the community.

So with that in mind, the GAC would like to know how is ICANN going to take into account multi-stakeholder community input in the assessment of the transaction. And just let me ask whether I should read all the questions and then hand back to you or you want to take them one by one.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

However you prefer it. I can see the questions so I can even read them out for a constant flow. Thanks for these questions, ICANN, board, and [indiscernible] consistently and urge [indiscernible] to seek input from the org community. We do understand PIR has its own [indiscernible] open and it's on the future commitments the ICANN board and organization look forward to understanding PIR and taking those comments into consideration. The second question on what we are doing to safeguard the global public interest regarding this transaction in terms of affordability and freedom of expression and protection of privacy, just to say that we do consider the public interest as

---

part of every decision we take and the public interest involves is likely broader than the three terms the GAC raises here. [indiscernible] considering all aspects of the review of the request for change of control including to its additional questions for PIR, to the questions posed by me to the [indiscernible] board chair and the public forum dedicated from hearing to the community. As you just referred, all this input from the community is on record and in that way considered. So we also continue to encourage PIR to seek input from its community. Now are there any interim results of the diligence performed by ICANN that were referred to in the initial ICANN response to the GAC chair? There's no interim results. ICANN will consider the request based upon the totality of the information received and as GAC may be aware, just last week we received additional responses from PIR in response to additional questions on transaction and [indiscernible] evaluating that information currently along with all other information received. So no interim results but there will be a final result.

Is the ICANN board considering the possibility of [indiscernible] consent for transaction? At this moment all options remain open, we are open mind to taking all input into account before it is time for us to decide. What criteria will the ICANN board use to evaluate the PICs, the public interest commitments and how

---

will we apply those on criteria [indiscernible] to ensure they serve the public interest? We have been consistently and openly urging PIR to seek input from the org community on this, we understand PIR currently has its own public commitment forum open which includes a reference to this and the ICANN board looking forward to understanding how PIR is taking those comments into consideration and brings it back. Obviously the ultimate offer to us is still to be made. So I hope this answers the questions relating to PIR in somewhat deeper detail and we know [indiscernible] interest, and we appreciate that.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maarten and with that, let me open the floor if there are any follow-up comments from GAC colleagues? Okay. If not, then thank you again Maarten for the answers and we can now move to the following topic of interest. Which is the new gTLD subsequent procedures and if we can change the slides, please. And this has been prioritized for our agenda for this remote meeting and we have been having some excellent discussions within the GAC and also within the subsequent procedures working group and a special thanks to the co-chairs of the working group as well. So given the priority of this work to governments during ICANN67, the GAC's engagement on the topic combines the capacity building shop workshop, several plenary discussions and a pilot project to encourage GAC

---

participation in the subsequent procedures PDP virtual working sessions. During the meeting week in coordination with the GNSO SubPro PDP working group leadership, the GAC will review and discuss several priority new gTLD policy areas including closed generics, public interest commitments, the role of the GAC early warnings and advice, the Applicant Support Program, and community based applications. As a result of the SubPro PDP complexity and ongoing challenge the GAC to keep abreast of the extent and depth of policy discussions, the GAC welcomes the board's and ICANN org's sharing of their own preparations for the future round as it may assist the GAC with its own forward thinking and planning.

So if we go to the following slide. Can the board please provide an update on its and ICANN org's internal process of preparing for a future round of the new gTLD program and whether the board anticipates any specific or targeted activities related to board GAC interactions to ensure a smooth future round of the new gTLD program? And I will stop here for this question before we move to the next one.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I will hand it over to Becky who will take over the facilitation of the board side now.

---

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much and apologies for arriving late, I had technical difficulty getting in. Thank you very much for the questions. Avri is going to address the new gTLD policy work going on.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, thank you, Becky, we have actually gotten fairly active both in the board over the last year but even more so lately and in the organization. Basically within the board we have started basically reviewing the aspects, we sort of set ourselves up to have regular discussions on various issues, similar to the issues that you are looking at whether it's the closed generics, the applicant support and the other public interest type of issues. So we're going to be going through those over time. The board has assigned two liaisons to the sub pro and that's Becky and myself so we will follow them quite closely and in fact have been. I'm actually very happy to see the degree of work that the GAC is doing and the board is very appreciative of it, because the GAC members have become obviously very active participants in that and to see the work that you are doing behind the scenes is encouraging. So the board gets periodic briefings on the work being done in the organization to prepare on it work being done both on the financial preparation side and some of the application handling side. And I would really like Goran to --



---

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you very much. Based on a goal given to me by the board -- a governance structure to prepare an organization for operational readiness. -- decision making to ensure timely decisions and make sure the funding that will be given stays within the budget. So we are basically starting to prepare that. We have internal meetings already set up where we go through anything that could be opened and do sort of in advance of SubPro waiting for the policy set by the community. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Goran, and within the question, you were asking about the board and GAC activities. Becky, if you could explore that one a bit.

BECKY BURR: Yes, and as Avri mentioned, we are doing a series of discussions in the board. I'm sure and I know we have been following the GAC's work that you are exploring various issues through the board GAC working group, we can talk about ways in which we might facilitate exchanges of information and views and ensure that we are consulting activity throughout this process, Manal and I have been working closely together on this and I think we can use that as a vehicle to understand the best way in which we

---

can share our views and hear from the GAC as this work proceeds.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Becky, I think I would like to end this last part basically by saying as we go further, we're certainly very open to all suggestions of how we can sort of improve this preparation process as we go forward. We very much are trusting in the current schedule for the PDP, so we really are preparing in earnest for that [indiscernible] and will be active in doing a review of the draft final report when it comes out. So I will go back to -- I don't know what --

BECKY BURR: Yeah, thank you. Any questions on that?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, I can see Kavouss' hand up.

IRAN: Yes, thank you very much for the board. I hope Manal has conveyed our appreciation to you for the very wise decision that you have taken to convert the physical meeting to the virtual meeting for the safety of the entire community. We thank you

---

very, very much, that was very fundamental and crucial decision that you have made and we are thankful for that.

Now, with Maarten and Avri and Becky, let me share my thought with you. I was asked by people why GAC provides its question in the written form to ICANN board. And why ICANN board would not provide the answer in a written form in addition to what they provide in verbally. So may I seek your indulgence if it doesn't bother you, if it's not any problem for you, kindly provide to each of the questions that we have made a written answer even as short as we have made the question. Because in the communique we have the text saying the following questions raised with ICANN's board but we never had any reply to any of the questions to say that question, the board replied to the question but what reply was given, we don't know. This is something reciprocal. If you expect that we give our questions to you in written form, we also seek your indulgence and invite you to consider possibly to provide your answer to each of the questions even in the most summarized and most brief actions and forms.

So is it possible, Maarten, that you can advise the board members to provide the answer, whoever is replying to the questions, in a written form to us, it should be recorded in the communique when we say the following questions. I'm sorry, I

---

apologize for that, but that is something that's really missing. Everything in this world is reciprocal. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. Waiting to see if Maarten would like to respond.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sure, if Kavouss asks, I respond. Your point is well taken and fortunately, we do now even have a script of this session which will make it very easy to do so. So I think for this occasion we are happy to do it. And as we have also learned to appreciate our procedure with the scorecard, I think indeed next to speaking, the written record has value. So on this one, you will get them. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Maarten. I believe the second question that is asked here is whether the board has thoughts on how and when it will approach the task of determining whether CCT review recommendations in and previous GAC concerns have been adequately addressed in the subsequent procedures policy proposals. We have of course engaged with GAC on the advice from Montreal. We are following closely the subsequent procedures work including the many CCT recommendations that impact that work. Obviously we are not in a position to

---

prejudge the outcome, but I think that we will continue to follow this closely and engage interactively with the GAC on these issues and on this advice as issues are addressed and hopefully resolved by the subsequent procedures PDP. So the bottom line, we're watching closely. We can't prejudge but we are most aware of the GAC's advice on this.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Becky, and for your earlier offer to work with us through the BGIG you know the subsequent procedures in January. Anything else on subsequent procedures? Okay. If not and if okay with board members, I got a request for the floor from European Commission on .org. So if you don't mind if we can go back to the .org?

BECKY BURR: Please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Becky. Olivier, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you, Manal. Olivier Bringer for the European Commission, for the record. Thank you very much for the organization of the public forum yesterday, I think when we discussed the question

---

all intervention in the GAC pointed to this positive development. Also thank you very much for being transparent on the correspondence that you have with the pir and on the progress of your assessment. I find it reassuring that you confirmed that you will take into account the public interest in your assessment of the transaction and also that all the options are open as far as the results of the assessment. So I would have one specific question. Maarten, you have referred several times to PIR's own public consultation. In particular concerning the PICs, you have mentioned PIR and seeking input from the.org community on the PICs so I wanted to know, is it for you the primary channel to get input from the community or are you envisaging inside ICANN based on the public forum for example which took place during ICANN67 to have some continued dialogue, structured dialogue, during the time when you assess the transaction?

BECKY BURR: I will have Maarten to respond.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Olivier. We look forward to the results of the PIR consultation, which no doubt they will take into account when they come with their final proposal to this. But to maybe JJ can help on this one to further explain how this works.

---

GÖRAN MARBY: This is not JJ, for the record. If there would be contractual provisions added to the contract with PIR, we would typically go out to do public consultation on those changes to the contract.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for that addition. Back to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. I can see Paul's hand up, Paul from UK, please.

PAUL BLAKER: Yes, thank you, Manal. I wanted to come back to the question about the CCT review if that's okay.

BECKY BURR: Absolutely.

PAUL BLAKER: Thank you for your answer there. And I understand of course that the board cannot prejudge the outcome of the subsequent procedures PDP. But I think our question is about whether we know the outcome, so when we know the outcome how will the board come to a view about whether or not the CCT review

---

recommendations have been implemented or properly addressed? That's really the question we're asking. And I think our concern about this comes from the fact that the subsequent procedures PDP itself is discussing whether or not it really has responsibility for some of those recommendations. So when you said that you hoped that the sub pro PDP would hopefully resolve these things, we're slightly worried there is a miscommunication here and we would quite like to know what can we do to avoid problems further down the line. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. Let me just say I think that one of the challenges that we noted and discussed with you, one of the challenges on the Montreal advice was we think that there are probably a variety of ways to address some of the issues. And it's entirely possible -- I mean everything that the policy has been formally referred to the relevant policy development processes. And we know for example that the subsequent procedures PDP group has gone through the CCT recommendations and is looking at those that are within that are policy development issues. One of the difficulties of course is that the CCT has identified one set of solutions to a problem. It may be in the course of policy development that the PDP will fully acknowledge the importance of the issue but identify a different approach or solution to that. And so at that point we will have to -- I think we



---

will have to have a conversation regarding whether the issues have been addressed. But the fundamental position that we are in is that we cannot assess the outcome of the policy development process until the policy development process is complete and at that point we have to wind up that output with the input from the CCT and understand collectively whether those issues have been addressed. Does anybody else -- Avri, I see your hand.

AVRI DORIA:

Just a little bit. Thank you. This is Avri speaking again. One of the things is that in taking the CCT policy related issues, they were passed onto the GNSO council and it was the GNSO council that passed them onto SubPro. Now we will be reviewing the SubPro draft final report for how they handled the CCT issues. I expect also that the GNSO council will look at them, and I think that those that aren't handled in the SubPro may still need to be handled by the GNSO council in a different way. So -- and there will be a discussion between the GNSO council and SubPro as to where exactly these issues belong. But in passing on the policy issues, they were passed on not directly to SubPro but to the GNSO council who is the manager for the policy process. That was the bit I wanted to add. Thanks.

---

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Avri and Becky.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The GAC beginning its SO/AC work stream implementation work. And interested in understanding what progress ICANN is making on this matter and what the board is doing to encourage those efforts.

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much, and I believe Avri and perhaps Theresa are going to speak to this question.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, sorry, am I not heard? Okay. I thought I was unmuted, sorry. So thanks. As you know, we have approved the WS 2 implementation -- I mean, we have the WS 2 results and passed them into implementation. The other thing we have done is renewed interaction with the WS 2 implementation team in terms of it continuing to be available as a resource to the organization as it's doing the implementation work. The organization is basically currently going through looking at the implementation, looking at what is necessary, looking at the work that's already ongoing and the work that needs to get budgeted for continued implementation. And basically we're anticipating an update on that effort in April. It's only been very

---

few months since it all got approved and the ball got rolling again. But we're definitely tracking it very closely now and the organization is working on it. Goran, and Theresa, I don't know if there's anything you would like to add to what I said.

SPEAKER: Thank you, that sums up the overview and also coordinating closely with David's [indiscernible] obviously in coordination with the community and [indiscernible].

SPEAKER: I know it opens up more --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: There's a follow-up question in the chat from Suada. It says please can you give us more information about the timing --

BECKY BURR: I think that's part of what we will be able to answer better after the April update. I don't have that information. Theresa, I don't know if there's anything you would like to add.

THERESA SWINEHART: With regards to recommendations that coordinate with work currently underway versus recommendations that will need to

---

be incorporated into the future operating planning and so that determined then the --

BECKY BURR: Thank you. I hope that answers --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Avri, and Theresa. If there are no further requests for the floor, maybe we can move to the following top level pick. Access to non public gTLD registration data.

[reading] [refer to slide]

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So with that in mind, might the board explain what actions it has taken or intends to take to work with contracted parties to implement a standard form based on the EPDP recommendation that could be used in the interim by requesters?

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much, Manal. Chris will address this.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Becky, as noted in [indiscernible] following the Montreal communique, it's important that we're clear we can't

---

obligate the contracted parties to use a particular form but we can collaborate with registries and registrars to develop and make available a voluntary standard form that could be used to request access and actively make that form available for people to be used once approved by the registries and registrars. So we actively considered this advice from the Montreal communique in January and accepted that we should launch a collaboration effort. That hasn't started yet but we are happy to facilitate that subject to the contracted parties being prepared to come to the table to discuss it, and we will keep you updated on the relevant work, thanks, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chris. So any follow-up on this?

BECKY BURR: I would point out that Graham [indiscernible] from the registrars stakeholder group guidance with respect minimum required information for closed data request so that's a step in the direction of bringing this together.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Becky. And I would also bring to the attention of everyone, Jeff Neuman's comments in the chat as well regarding the same topic. So please make sure to read the

---

comments in the chat. So the following area is the (distorted audio) present actions on [reading] [refer to slide] the GAC welcomes the board's adoption of the recommendations relating to monitoring the efficacy of WHOIS access for law enforcement and associated services. So this is just a statement. Any follow-up from my GAC colleagues or any reactions from the board or shall we move on?

BECKY BURR: Unless Chris wants to react, I think we're fine from the board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, I think that's fine. I don't have anything to add, thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. Then I think this concluded the GAC's questions to the board. Anything I have overlooked, I invite GAC colleagues to add. If not, then we can provide our feedback on the questions posed by the board to the constituencies.

So -- I'm sorry, just checking the chat. So first question is key priorities for action of ICANN constituencies in 2020, and the GAC has four measure policy priorities for 2020, and those are subsequent ounce of new gTLD. As mentioned earlier, working on this with all parts of the community, with the PDP working

---

group, its co-chairs, support staff, -- government engagement and ALAC as well and thanks to the efforts of our topic leads, Luisa and Jorge and co-chairs of the underserved regions working group, Pua and Karel, excellent capacity building workshop this time dedicated for subsequent procedures and again, special thanks to the co-chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP working group. The second topic is WHOIS and data protection policy. Again, we're preparing GAC input on the initial report despite the tight time frame as was indicated by my GAC colleagues in the earlier session. We have already provided GAC accreditation principles and also received a list of authorities that EU member states consider legitimate users for WHOIS registration data that was shared with us by the European Commission. So this is the second topic. The third is DNS abuse mitigation. And we're also pass discussions among GAC and other parts of the community although not on our agenda for this meeting but remains a topic of high interest to the GAC. And finally, the IGO names protections and we are working closely with the GNSO on this topic, preparing for the work of the new Work Track created specifically for this purpose. So I will stop here before moving on to more priorities. If there are any comments by my GAC colleagues or any remarks by board members?

---

BECKY BURR: No, thank you very much. From the board's perspective we appreciate this input.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Becky. So moving on to other issues of importance as well, so ATRT3 review remains an important review for the GAC as you all know, it already has a separate section on the GAC and the GAC relationship with the board, so it has special interest to the GAC. Universal acceptance and IDN readiness. We have already launched a GAC working group that will be led by India. The group was supposed to meet the first face-to-face in Cancun but since we reduced our sessions, this has been canceled for this meeting. The empowered community processes and administration. We we're fine tuning GAC mechanisms currently in place. We already have mechanisms in place but with some interim settings, so we're looking again into our current mechanisms.

Implementation of work stream 2 recommendations and monitoring [indiscernible] -- and finally, the ongoing task we're doing on improving onboarding and capacity building capabilities and resources for governmental participants in ICANN. So I will stop here. I see Kavouss' hand up, please.



---

IRAN:

Yes, my hand is up to first of all allow me -- I'm a simple person, Maarten. I would like to express really my very deep pleasure to have you as the chairman of the board and Leon Sanchez as vice chair of the board. Now, I have a question. Excuse me, at the meeting and now we are talking of global public interest and we are talking of public interest. Is it possible we ask you to kindly provide GAC with what is your understanding, the board's understanding of the public interest and global public interest. We don't request you to define what is that but we would like to know what is your understanding. This has been also in several areas, even if the mission of the ICANN and Becky knows very well when we have that in the past called the [indiscernible] it is public interest, so it would be very interesting to know what is the view of our 16 wise people. In Switzerland, the country I am living, there are seven ministers, they call them seven wise people. Now we have 16 in the ICANN. So we would like to know, what is the views of 16 wise people with respect to the public interest or global public interest. We don't quote that, we don't want to take anything from that, and we don't want to misuse that but we want to understand that what are the views of these 16 high-level people? Is it possible that you provide that to us? That would help us in many areas that is we have, in particular in relation with the closed generic terms. Thank you.

---

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Maarten, I believe that your name was invoked. And I also believe Avri, who has been working on this issue leading the board on this issue, will have something to say as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thanks, Kavouss for the nice words. Actually, we were 20 and I don't want to make a split between who is wise and who isn't on those 20. Also, our liaisons doing an amazing job helping us have a balanced debate. With that, the public interest is indeed part of our bylaws and how do we define it? Well actually we set up a [indiscernible] and Avri is leading that. Can you tell a little bit more.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, okay. So we have set up a project and the project takes its space, takes its root from the statements about global public interest both in our articles of incorporation which states that when the global public interest needs to be understood, it's based upon the bottom of multi-stakeholder processes that we have. Then it is based upon many statements in the bylaws that relate to those. So what we have been working on doing is as opposed to picking one definition that is the ICANN definition of global public interest for now and evermore, we have been working with the community and been putting together a

---

framework and hopefully you will see -- it came out I think at ICANN 66, working on a revision of it now and there will be one that comes out after ICANN67. But basically it basically says how do we appraise the work that's being done -- and perhaps even motivate some of the work being done, but specifically how do we apprise the work being done with global public interest. You have probably notice that had in all of the board's resolutions of late within the rationale, we discuss global public interest. We take that not only from bylaws and articles but from the arguments made by the recommendations, by the things said in the recommendations, and by comments and responses to them, put all that together, map it against our bylaws and the article statements and say yes, within our mission this corresponds to the gpi because it pertains to this bylaw, that bylaw or the other.

Now, this went through review, it got some good reviews, also got some concern. So we have done a partial reworking of it and what we are proposing now is that the board will use this as a pilot over the next year probably starting with the next fiscal year and do this pilot in a way that informs the public and includes the community, and such and basically takes some of the examples through the year as case histories sort of or case studies of how is this working. And at the end of that year we will then see whether the framework is fit for purpose, whether

---

the community accepts it, buys into it, or whether we need to keep working. We do have people that recommend specific definitions of gpi. And if IRP to speak of wisdom, I would speak of all of those being very wise contributions to the study of global public interest. But people don't agree on those. People view them differently. People are looking for what is the global public interest with respect a particular issue or problem that's being worked on. So this is very much a project, more than happy to talk about it some more, to get GAC opinions on this framework and how it can work and to get your participation. Because one of the things -- and this is where I'll stop -- one of the things that we have done on this is invite others to test the framework if they wish. It's not anything that the board is imposing on anyone. But basically while we're testing it we're putting it out there and saying feel free to test and use it too and if we get recommendation and is advice that discuss things within that framework, we will be able to use it more easily. And I will turn it back to Becky, thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you very much, Avri.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Avri and Becky. I see a question from Jorge in the chat asking is there documentation on this process and its latest status? And also a hand from Kavouss.

IRAN: Yes, Avri, thank you very much. Everyone remember that [indiscernible] adding bylaw, the human rights. Difficult to say what is human rights. We had framework for interpretation of human rights. And that is worked out by some colleagues including Goran and other people, Greg [indiscernible] so on, so forth. Is it possible that we have some title called framework of interpretation of public interest of global public interest. It is just a framework of interpretation. It's not a definition, it's a difficult to define but we could have some framework. It could be very worthy and useful for all of us in many areas that we have in the future to have this -- how you do that, whether you establish a small group, whether you do some other things, whether that should be in the GAC or should be in the GNSO or whatever, I would be very much appreciate if you would consider the possibility of a small group to have this framework of interpretation of public interest or global public interest. You know that I am engineer by nature but I have also some background in law so this too would help me to have a wide region around these things. Is it possible that you would consider this if your future work? Thank you.

---

BECKY BURR: Avri, could you speak to how this process is unfolding and framework being developed? Avri, not hearing you.

AVRI DORIA: So sorry, I was double unmuted. Two questions here. Let me answer them separately. In the first question, there is a draft of the first document out that went out for consultation with the community. It wasn't a public comment but it was consultation and people were invited to comment on it. We will sometime after 67 we're going to have a board discussion of the revised one that is taking into account the comments we have had and then we will put that out, I don't have a specific date but it won't be all that long after this meeting. And as the draft already exists, there just hasn't been time for the board to review it.

In terms of the framework of interpretation for human rights, that's a very important piece of the ongoing work. It is mentioned in the framework for gpi but it is also part of the WS 2 implementation work that is ongoing. And it's interesting document and we will see more in April because it requires work done in a lot of places. So really getting that framework of implementation up and available for use is an ongoing effort but certainly as that comes on, the global public interest work and analyses will take it into account because the process, as I said,

---

is to look at the issue, at the bylaws and the articles and the bylaws include by reference the articles of interpretation. So it will all be part of it and we will welcome consultation with you, Kavouss and others in the GAC as we move forward with it. Because it really is a complex thing that we're trying to put together that takes into account the specificity of issues, of our mission and commitment, and the times we're in. So I'm hoping for collaboration with you as we move on.

If I can just hit one question that came up in the chat -- and not even sure -- there had been a question about the membership on the implementation team because some people had left. Now, that implementation team had been specified in the WS 2 recommendations, and it's a really good question. I do not have the answer for. I will take it back and work with org and the implementation team to discover what the answer is to it to it, but I thank you for the question and I will have to follow up. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, everyone. Thank you Avri. We have arrived at the end time of our session. And respecting our time, I would ask that board members read our final comments which are thoughts on what may need to be addressed when updating the ICANN's strategic plan. And for now, I would like to thank

---

everyone. Any final remarks from the board side before we conclude?

BECKY BURR:

Thank you for this important discussion and for your participation and input into this virtual meeting. Org has worked very hard to put this together in short order and I think we're all learning a lot of interesting things from this. We're getting input on a daily basis and refining things as they go along but we really appreciate the great spirit that the community has brought to this experiment. And that of course includes the GAC and we're grateful for your participation and understand the challenges that a remote meeting like this brings.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Becky. And thanks to all board members who joined us today and to my GAC colleagues for the interactive discussion and to our community members who joined the GAC Zoom room. Sorry we couldn't read everything but there were interesting comments in the chat. So this concludes our meeting with the board. And to my GAC colleagues, we now have a 15-minute break and please be back in the Zoom room at 2100 UTC, 1600 Cancun time, to start



---

planning for our virtual Cancun communique. Thank you, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**