
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Session: GAC and ALAC
Thursday, March 10, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AST

JULIA CHARVOLEN: I ask the tech team start the recording, please. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

Welcome to the ICANN73 GAC meeting with the ALAC being held on Thursday 10th of March at 13:00 UTC. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you to type your name and affiliation in the participation pod. This is to keep accurate attendance records. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN multistakeholder model we ask that you sign in to the Zoom session using your full name. You may be removed from the session if do you not sign in using your full name.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment, as indicated in the chat.

Interpretation for GAC sessions includes all 6 U.N. languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by selecting on the interpretation ICANN in the Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, raise your hand. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will speak

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.

a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviour. In the case of disruption during the session our technical support team will mute all participants. The session is being recorded and all materials will be made available on the ICANN73 meetings page. With that I would like to leave the floor to the GAC Chair, Manal Ismail. Manal, over to you, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC Chair:

Thank you very much, Julia, and good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the ALAC GAC bilateral. Our meeting is scheduled for an hour and I would like to start by welcoming Maureen and all ALAC members who have joined us in the GAC Zoom room and also to thank Joanna and Shi Young for their inter-sessional coordination efforts to compile the agenda of today's meeting and also to identify topic leads from both constituencies.

As you can see the agenda highlights public policy matters of common interest to both governments and Internet end users.

I look forward to yet another interactive and fruitful dialogue, and before handing it over to Joanna and Shi Young I would like to first give

the floor to Maureen for opening remarks from the ALAC side. Over to you, Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Manal, and it is indeed a pleasure to be with the GAC members again for this first meeting of the year and I am looking forward to the discussions that we have today on these key issues of common concern to our members. And like yourself, thanks to Joanna and Shi Young for their organization of the session. So thank you so much, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC Chair: Thank you very much, Maureen, and with this shall I hand it over to you, Joanna, or Shi Young, please? Who is going to get us started?

JOANNA KULESZA: I'm happy to start us off. Thank you very much, Manal. I'm happy to share the floor with Shi Young as we progress, indeed, for our agenda today for this relatively brief session. We have agreed on four topics of shared interest, which include public interest processes, Universal Acceptance and IDNs, the SSAD [inaudible] advisory committees and the coordination at national level as previously agreed.

We have also agreed in our inter-sessional meeting to continue the discussions on pertinent topics including the DNS Abuse and SubPro processes as inter-sessional bilateral working groups proceedings and that will be planned in due course.

We would like to devote these 60 minutes to those four selected topics with speakers proposed by each constituency to discuss brief talking points on each of the issues and then hopefully seek consensus. Our agenda today also includes a very brief Q and A session where hopefully we will be able to link also on the issues touched upon during yesterday's GAC Communique Drafting Meeting and then summary.

With Shi Young's consent, I would like to hand you the floor and then we can move directly to our speakers. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:

Thank you, Joanna. Thank you, Manal and Maureen, and all the ICANN GAC and ALAC support team for coordinating the meeting. As Joanna said we have a lot of interesting topics to discuss. I hope we will get a lively discussion for these topics, and I hope this will be a good chance to discuss about the collaboration issue efforts for the issues discussed.

So I think we can start with the first agenda, and I would like to hand over to ALAC talking points to the topic leads of ALAC is -- would you take the floor?

JOANNA KULESZA:

I believe Marita is going to start us off. Marita, please go ahead.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:

Marita, go ahead. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: The floor is yours. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, everyone. Good morning, afternoon. I don't think it's evening for anyone. Happy to be here. Happy to talk about this -- it says public interest processes but really we're talking about the global public interest framework here because that was the subject of our public forum which started off ICANN73 pretty much.

There was a great deal of interest in this forum, as you can see our talking points are very open-ended. We went into this not having made -- not having drawn really any conclusions about this. It's a pilot. Hasn't really been utilized very much yet.

We understand -- everyone understands that it's well bounded to be within the articles of incorporation and Bylaws. Not just open-ended public interest and, of course, it is in our interest to make sure that the user interests are honored in this whole process.

As I said, it was very well attended. There was an awful lot of interest in that forum. I haven't had a chance to really go back and listen to the whole session, but the outcome of the session really was among the people who were involved, Avri, well Ergys from staff but on the community side it was Justine Chew and Velimera Grau and Paul McGrady from GNSO, Velimira from GAC.

And everyone pretty much agreed that it's a worthwhile project, that we need to keep on our radar, that we need to watch the way it's being applied, that there's still a lot of bugs to be worked out with it, but that it's a worthwhile project, and it should keep on going forward.

Some of the comments that our representative, Justine, who had already worked with it a little bit in trying to apply the framework to some of the work she was doing or responses to some questions from the Board on the SubPro issues, she saw that it was a practical tool, that could be used without too much problem, but some of her questions were around whether or not it was going to be easy for -- whether it was incentive for the community to use it.

Whether or not some of the decisions that there was an evaluation process, so collect data on how this was working, how it was happening. And the essential process of balancing different considerations from different communities as we go forward, so that's pretty much a quick report on what happened there.

So, community groups will strive to go forward to further integrate the framework. The question is can the community use this in its work going forward? And I'll pass the floor to Velimira.

VELIMIRA GRAU:

Thank you, thank you very much, Marita, and good afternoon, good evening, and probably good morning to some colleagues.

Marita, thank you very much for this overview. It was quite exhaustive. On my side for today I wanted rather to focus possibly to what is an ambitious question which is how to ensure that the GPI framework is effectively addressed. I don't know to what extent -- so start with actually I'm not quite sure about this question where we popped up from, but probably I'll give my lens of reflection on the discussions that we had and how I do approach the GPI framework.

For me, what appeared in the discussions is that there were several points and aspects on which there was somewhat consideration and similar interest from the speakers. In the end they believed that this was really in the -- how the global public interest is effectively addressed, and for me this is little bit more focused, I would say, question as compared to the framework itself.

So for me the question that would make sense, I think from the perspectives of GAC and, I hope also from ALAC, is to see and to think on the question, how to achieve that the GPI framework does effectively contribute to addressing the public interest?

And here I allow myself to share with you actually how I have approached this question. For me it was a question of exploring three aspects mainly, basically who should be working -- sorry, who should be applying and using the framework? When precisely, and at what stage the framework should be used? And then how it should be applied in the ICANN community?

So as already said -- and I hope I made it clear also at the ICANN plenary -- we are still very much also discovering the framework within the GAC. And here I'm exposing my personal view, and I don't know what -- do not want to pretend that we have a common view yet in how we approach these questions. But what I think appeared also from some discussions we had already yesterday with different ICANN, ICANN bodies, it seems to me that what might be a challenge and where we might need to need to contribute and to reflect a bit is actually how to reconcile, you know, the multistakeholder consensus with an effective consideration of the global public interest.

And I think here this very much goes into the direction that Marita mentioned, which is basically balancing of the different interests and the different perspectives that are given to the global public interest considerations. So, I do not have the pretension to have the response to this question but it seemed to me that there is some scope for reflection, how precisely with the interest, which is those of the end users and the public interest in mind, we can help the GPA framework to evolve and to contribute to the reflection which is going on the pilot itself.

And probably just to close or to open the discussion -- I don't know exactly how our colleagues have decided to go about it -- but personally I think that there might be a marriage of going for a tool that is applicable by everybody in the community because I believe this is the only way where actually even those constituencies which probably are less concerned about the public interest, may be incentivized, you

know to look into these aspects and I believe this is what would allow us still to come up from a bottom-up perspective, and give a full overview of the different considerations of the global public interest such as perceived by the different parts of the ICANN community.

Thank you. This is what I had to share.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Velimira. My understanding is -- and I'm happy to stand corrected -- that we would probably want to compare the notes so to speak and then, time permitting, we might want to continue either exchanging ideas on the specific themes or as has been the case with DNS Abuse and SubPro, identify these as specific topics of interest on which we might want to work further. Shi Young, does that sound more or less correct?

SHI YOUNG CHANG:

Thank you, Joanna, yes, I think you got the right point and as this is the process to get the bottom up and multistakeholder approach from -- to the community I think we need to discuss more deeply to get more collaborative ideas and issues through this session. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Indeed. So I would understand we might be willing and able to move on with our agenda to the next, this time GAC speaker to discuss the next issue, allowing time for the Q and A and possible

discussion including actionable output on specific topics if that would be appropriate.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Yes, I agree with you so –

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Please go ahead.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you so much. So shall we move to the next topic, with is the Universal Acceptance and IDN topic leads from -- oh, from the ALAC, which is Satish Babu. Please take the floor. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: This is Satish, for the record. Good day to everybody. At the outset I would like to thank both the GAC and ALAC for this opportunity. Since I have to talk about two distinct aspects, that is UA and Universal Acceptance and IDNs, I have eight quick points and let me jump straight in.

One, there is a significant alignment of interest between GAC and ALAC vis-à-vis Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names or IDNs, both these topics are vital to enhancing digital inclusion and for bringing the next billion people onto the Internet. Number two, the benefits of closing the UA gap are many. For instance, a UA-ready Internet will facilitate the worldwide adoption of new domain names,

provide the ability to engage with new nontraditional audiences, provide opportunities for growth, and enhance end user satisfaction and trust. UA readiness has been improving ever since the UA initiative started in 2015. There have been marked improvements in some areas, for example the Universal Acceptance of IDNs, but gaps do still exist, for example, in e-mail address internationalization or languages, platforms and languages.

For ALAC the remediation and mitigation of gaps is a priority. ALAC has been actively engaged in the promotion of UA in all our five regions through our regional At Large organizations or RALOs. It's worth mentioning that our RALOS have organized initiatives that seek to provide information, training and capacity building programs, and collaborative technical services for their communities.

This year AFRALO will launch the AFRALO UA project, which is a joint effort between AFRALO, ICANN GSE, and the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. And this program is designed to increase UA awareness across the African region and to engage directly with technical stakeholders.

At the ALAC level we are planning a survey this year which seeks to collect and analyze the perspectives of end users in the Hindi language in selective regions of India. This will providing us with insights on how certain linguistic communities view the importance of Universal Acceptance and IDNs for purposes of their inclusion on the Internet

using their languages.

Number six, it's a fact that Universal Acceptance and internationalized domains go hand-in-hand. While our ongoing efforts to expand adoption of Universal Acceptance proceeds forward we also need to ensure that ICANN has in place policies which promote the ability and use of IDNs where appropriate to ensure consistency in the end-user experience. Specifically on the ICANN policy development front the ALAC is actively engaging in the GNSO expedited policy development process, the EPDP on IDNs. As this EPDP is tasked with building and harmonizing about two decades worth of policy making impacting the ability and management of IDN and the variants at the top level and second level, we are engaging to help produce consensus policies for achieving the security and stability goals of variant labels in a stable manner.

Finally, given the alignment of interests between the GAC and ALAC, as seen in Universal Acceptance initiatives as well as in the ongoing work of the EPDP on IDNs, on which both which Nigel who is speaking after me and I are members, I would like propose that we explore the possibility of a collaborative initiative and UA and IDNs, which may include specific activities such as, for instance, coordinated messaging, national capacity building programs, outreach to open source communities as [inaudible] specific industry, and inter-sessional collaborations for considering policies in development.

That initiative has the potential to work as a force multiplier that could

help advance not only the message of digital inclusion through Universal Acceptance of domain names and email addresses but also their usability. Thank you very much again for the opportunity.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you, Satish, for these helpful comments and questions. Could Nigel Hickson take the floor from U.K.?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, and thank you much indeed, Shi, and thanks, Satish, for your introduction to this topic. And it's -- I must say it's a real pleasure working with you on the IDN EPDP. This is a very important piece of work which I don't think has got as much prominence as it perhaps should in our respective communities. It's a very technical piece of work but it's also very important.

So I'm just going to make two or three points on this because I think you know we need time for debate as well.

The first point I would make is that this is just such an important issue. If we are really passionate, if we are really concerned about having a multilingual Internet, if we're really concerned as we are as an organization at ICANN in ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to access the Internet, the multilingualism and have Universal Acceptance are just key to this, and the work of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group since 2015, as Satish has said, has been fundamental in taking issue this forward. I think it's very important work indeed.

We had an excellent session on Tuesday, a cross-community session on Universal Acceptance where a number of us spoke about why we thought it was important. We heard an update from the Universal Acceptance steering group, and Dr. Ajay gave us an update on the progress made, and you know as I said great progress has been made, but more needs to be done, and that really is my second and concluding point or perhaps my third point -- is governments need to do more. Let's be honest about this.

We all ought -- we all need to do more in our different communities, and it's really excellent that ALAC are taking forward these different initiatives. And I think there is a real scope for joint work between ALAC and GAC on this collaborative proposal that we've just heard because clearly what we need to hear in governments, what we should be needing to hear anyway is where our users, where our multilingual users, where our users are coming to us to access sub services or get information or transact with government using non-Latin script, e-mails, etc. are having issues. And there ought to be this collaboration with governments to say, "Look, we need to do something about this," either in procurement or the provision of public services we need to adapt our systems.

So I'll stop there, but it's really a pleasure to be involved in this work. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Nigel. Indeed, I am seeing discussion in the chat which is quite lovely. I would indicate our participants to consider raising these very pragmatic further steps in the dedicated Q and A time slot and all of the points that are being made by the dedicated speakers are duly considered.

With this in mind I would ask the SSAD speakers on behalf of both parties to take us further with regards to the perspectives of individual constituencies on the system, with the GAC speaker kindly starting us off and it is going to be Laureen Kapin and Melina Strougni. I'm not sure how the actions there have been distributed. And then we will move to Alan Greenberg, who will speak on behalf of the ALAC. Laureen, optionally Melina, you have the floor. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I'm happy to kick us off. I will confess I thought that Alan was going to start. So, but I'm happy to, I'm happy to start.

I think as we signaled during our presentation to the GAC earlier in the week, the ODA I think perhaps raises more questions than it answers. I know Alan has done some very useful analysis regarding costs, which I'm looking forward to hearing him discuss. But I think if I were going to give abroad overview, there's a lot of uncertainties raised by the analysis in terms of the number of users which has a direct impact on cost, and also questions about whether this system, in fact, will serve the interests of its users because of some of the challenges created by the restrictions and responsibilities that the GDPR sets forth. And when

I say that I mean more specifically the decision whether to disclose data at the end of the day is typically the responsibility of the registrar.

Sometimes there may be exceptions if there's going to be something falling into a very slim category of an automated response. In some cases this may fall to the registry, but for the lion's share this is going to be with the registrars and they are going to have to make that assessment. And so we have a system where many thousands of registrars are going to be making their decisions, and it's uncertain, in fact, whether those decisions are going to actually disclose the data that is needed.

Why is that? In part, the viability rests with them so they need to make that decision, and if you're faced liability that drives incentives towards a conservative decision. Also, there are some uncertainties that are pointed out in the ODA, particularly restrictions on the ability to transfer data across borders, so that means that organizations, governments, individuals who are requesting data from one jurisdiction but the data is in another jurisdiction, also may not be able to get access to that data.

So you have a package of uncertainties which leads to questions about costs, and questions about number of users and questions about satisfying the needs of the users.

This is all separate and apart from the amount of time that is estimated for this system to take, which I believe would be in the nature of three

or four years to develop and then it would be implemented and if we are basing this on perhaps the time it's taken Phase 1 to be implemented, we are looking at another two years.

So, again, my headline is, ODA raises many important questions, but perhaps does not give the Board the guidance and certainty it may have hoped for.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Lauren. Apologies for putting you on the spot like that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no.

JOANNA KULESZA: You guys agree with Alan. I apologize. It's totally my fault. Thank you for bearing with me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No worries. We are all friends.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much. So, Alan, the floor is yours with apologies. Please go ahead, sir.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I guess the first statement to make is the -- there's a strong correlation between the GAC positions and our positions. In going through the ODA we each targeted and found things that were of particular interest to us, but I don't think we disagree on pretty much any of the positions that we have taken during the development of the SSAD specs or the analysis of the ODA.

I put a fair amount of time into trying to understand the financial analysis because it at first looked exceedingly confusing, and as presented by the ODP team, the number -- the range of costs ranged from -- I don't remember. 15 million to 105 million, which seems to be a rather large change. What became obvious on looking at it is the vast bulk of the costs as presented were really not costs of running the system, but costs of providing service to individual users and they paid for those. It was pass through money.

There's still -- that being said there were still some numbers there that I suspect they simply got wrong, but without any detailed analysis to back up things like the number of people who would be accredited, which turns out it be a very large percentage over the numbers. It's hard to tell.

There were 2 cost issues that I think are quite interesting. The first is the PDP recommendations allowed the development costs to be absorbed fully by ICANN, and not charged back to the users. That was not provided as an option to the Board and I think clearly that's a Board decision whether to recover the money or accept it out of your

own -- out of ICANN's own resources.

And the report also allowed ICANN to subsidize some of the operational costs, and again, that wasn't done. Both of those would change very significantly some of the costs presented to users, and I think should have been something that was there very clearly.

The other major thing I found was that one of the few benefits that was built into the SSAD design is that accreditation would allow the future requesters to make certain assertions. They could say, "I am an intellectual property attorney and I will only use any information I get in pursuit of IP tests, and IP pursuits."

All of those were not done by the -- not addressed by the ODA team which took away one of the real potential benefits that is giving information to contracted parties which might make them feel more comfortable in releasing data.

So, there's a lot more I won't go into. This is a big report and a lot of things in it. Interestingly, although most of my points if they had been addressed would have made the SSAD more attractive. From our perspective it's still a no-brainer, this is simply not something that should not be pursued. It will take too long to deploy. My estimate is six years at best.

There's still a huge amount of work to be done by the implementation review team that is to fill out -- fill in the gaps, gaps largely that the EPDP

team couldn't agree on but someone else is going to have to agree on them going forward and then the actual deployment so we are going to take -- we are not going on produce anything for five to six years and we will of course have had to survive between now and then. The question is when we finally get this SSAD does anyone even want it? We don't think it's going to release sufficient information to justify its use by the users.

And lastly, it's not going to be agile enough to adapt to now regulations and laws as they evolve. The bottom line is our position has not changed on whether we should go ahead with the SSAD as designed. We certainly believe that if we had designed a standardized system for access and disclosure, which this is not -- the only standardization is the word in the title -- then it might have been a useful thing but as designed it certainly wasn't.

So, no, that doesn't change from our original position. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And also, I neglected to identify myself for the record last time. So my name is Laureen Kapin, and I'm speaking in my capacity as a member of the GAC EPDP small group.

I wanted to add that there is mention in the ODA and issues deserving

further consideration -- I'm paraphrasing there but that's the general thrust of the heading -- the suggestion that consideration could be given to a pilot program some sort of prototype, which would fall under the category of do something smaller, gather information, and learn.

So that is something that several members of the GAC small group -- several stakeholder groups of the GAC small group looking at the ODA, at the request of the Board and the GNSO -- have picked up in their feedback on the ODA, and I did want to make sure that that gets mentioned.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to respond to that -- it's Alan speaking -- I find the idea intriguing but for the life of me I can't figure out how one could do something on a short term at a lower cost and still really generate any enough benefit to decide what to do further. Other people may well have a better picture in their mind than I do. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Great. Thank you very much, both Alan and Laureen. And for our next agenda item I'd like to hand the floor to Shi Young. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:

Thank you, Joanna. My next agenda is GAC and ALAC cooperation at national level. So Yrjo, could you take the floor from the ALAC side?

YRJO LANISPURO:

Thank you, Shi. There's been discussion at many previous meetings of the At Large and GAC on how to extend this good cooperation we have on the global level to the regional and local level, and At Large on the GAC have their feet on the ground in a large number of countries. And the question has been whether we would benefit from this sort of grassroots cooperation between local at large structures, ALSes, and those government people that are engaged in ICANN issues and who come to the ICANN meetings

So, one could argue that multistakeholder model begins at home, and in some countries it does. So a few possible frameworks for At Large - GAC contacts at the country level would be like national multistakeholder bodies.

Now, I'm using the example of Finland, and we have since WSIS a multistakeholder committee to discuss Internet government issues including those related to the ICANN mandate, and when it comes to issues like -- and questions about comments from Finland, for instance, concerning the digital cooperation roadmap proposed by the Secretary General of U.N. -- comments from Finland emanate from this committee in the name of the whole Finnish Internet multistakeholder committee.

So national and regional IGFs are another possible framework, and finally, leveraging expertise available at ALSes. Again, taking an example from Finland, the Finnish ALS, which is also the local chapter of the Internet society, is invited to participate, for instance, in the national preparation for meetings like ITU Plenipot, and to make

comments to relevant legislative projects.

So, of course, countries are different, and the relationships between ALSes and governments are different, but what I hope, what I would suggest, is that the best practices of this sort of local cooperation would be collected on both sides and combined and compared at future meetings of the ALSes of At Large and with the GAC either inter-sessional or at the ICANN74. Thank you very much.

SHI YOUNG CHANG:

Thank you, Yrjo, for showing the good points and especially I'm interested about the Finland example about the multistakeholder model for international level. So let me start my points and before I start reading my questions, I just want to share my experience from the Republic of Korea's case about the multistakeholder [portion].

So could Gulden share the presentation please, the slide? Gulden or Julia, could you share the speaking slides? Did you get the -- my presentation slides? I think I just sought to share the experience of the good practice of the South Koreans Act on the region of the Internet Resource Address Act because, you know, just -- I think as there is no presentation so I'd like to share the brief experience [through wording].

So in recently the Republic of Korea's Internet Resource Address Act has been revised to take the position of the multistakeholder so we have like the individual national committee to make advice to the Internet

Resource Address Act before the act is act is revised so like. Every group such as government agencies and the -- NGOs and corporate agency they all participate as a multistakeholder approach to make a revision for the role about Internet resources in South Korea. And through the revision, they are the one who made the cooperation and before that, they were just the advisor to make policy decision, but at the revision of the law they are the one who not only make up advice but they made a resolution to the policy making process of our Internet Resource Act in South Korea.

I just want to share the case of the revision act as one of the example of the multistakeholder approach in South Korea, so maybe I think I can share the presentation slide later on. So my question to the all floor and to ALAC is that are there any good practice of enhancing multistakeholder cooperation. So public, private partnership [inaudible] such as one of the example can be seen in the revision act of South Korea.

And the second one is what are the difficulties or challenges for making collaborative efforts in policy making process among various stakeholders at national level? And finally, if there are difficulties or challenges, how can we address the cooperation among different stakeholders at the national level? Are there any recommendation? Those are my questions. So is there any like -- you know, I think you know we can get a lot of, you know, any comments or questions for the issue. Thank you, and that's all from my side.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Shi Young. All of these insights have been appreciated.

(Audio interruption).

JOANNA KULESZA: We do still have a few moments. I am noting the comments in the chat and attempting to summarize what has been said thus far. It seems as if we have areas of cooperation for this cooperation is very aligned, we share the same opinions, and clearly this comes with the tremendous input from representatives from both communities.

Some new issues seem to have also been identified. I have been following very closely the comment session, and before I open the floor to any potential Q and A, I wanted to see if our speakers who have taken the floor thus far would like to add anything with the intended aim of us potentially identifying threats of intersessional communications which might be useful.

Let me remind everyone we have agreed to work inter-sessionally with regards to DNS Abuse and SubPro. These topics have not been lost but what we have tried to do here is see if there is more areas for consensus building between the 2 communities.

My notes tell me that we're very closely aligned on SSAD. Shi Young's

and Yrjo's intervention tells me there is a lot more work to be done with connecting the people on the ground so to speak, and also noting Jorge's intervention in the chat. I'm curious if our speakers would like to give us any brief feedback of whether it might be useful to further initiate advancing the collaboration between the 2 communities on the two other items we have talked about public interest processes, Universal Acceptance.

I am aware that there are different tracks within the community where these issues are discussed but I'm curious if our speakers who have taken the floor thus far would like to add anything at this point before we open the floor for discussion? Marita, please go ahead.

Marita, if you are speaking you are muted. We cannot hear you. We see your hand but the microphone seems muted.

MARITA MOLL:

I'm sorry. My screen went completely bananas right then. I just wanted to say that on the subject of the Global Public Interest Framework, we at At-Large haven't had a lot of time to think about where this might go next. I'm sure that there are points of cooperation with the GAC and there's certainly a way for us to look at it together, how it can be designed that the community, our communities anyways, can use it in the best way.

I think that was one of the things that came out of the discussion that it was designed by the Board for the use of the Board, and will it work for

the rest of us, and how can it be -- if we want to use it how can it be made most accessible? So I guess that's just a way we could work together. It's early days on this thing but we do have to keep it on our radar I would say. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Brilliant. Thank you very much. I'm curious if anyone else would like to take the floor and indicate whether there is a need for us to continue discussing specific topics and I am noting the rich exchange of good practice examples in the chat. These are all being noted. I would be inclined to think that there might be an opportunity for us to work closer with regards to aligning these good national practices, hopefully with Yrjo and Shi Young taking us forward there.

I am not seeing any hands raised immediately from our speakers. We have a few minutes for the Q and A before we move into that part of our agenda. Please let me note two indications announcements we have received from the GAC side. Vanda Scartezini indicated the extension of the NomCom deadline which I am noting here, as well. And during yesterday's session we did receive input from Oksana as well as the input -- during the GAC Communique drafting session Oksana did share her comments with the At Large.

And please just let me note that there is a Communique -- or statement that was produced by the EURALO. It did receive some support from the At-Large community. So if that reference might be useful to the drafting of the GAC Communique, we would be more than willing to share it.

And with this, I would be inclined to open the floor for discussion. If anyone wishes to take the floor please feel free to raise your hand. I'm seeing Vanda's microphone is unmuted. Vanda, is that a request for the floor?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay, I don't want to waste your precious time in this interesting meeting that I'm following. Just to inform you that we finalized the application period and I believe everybody knows that we need leadership for the ICANN, for the Board, for the PTI -- that's the year where we are open for the PTI, so it's quite interesting opportunity for the GAC members that are interested to apply for those positions.

So if you have -- we don't have much more time because we will finish this when this meeting is over next week, so please, if you just want to apply, go spread the message. There is still time to apply and have the opportunity for this participation in the leadership positions in ICANN. I don't want to waste --

JOANNA KULESZA:

Wonderful.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

-- your time. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Vanda. I see three requests from the floor and a question from Roberto in the chat. I would like to start with reading out the question from Roberto and then go to our speakers. Marita, Manal and Dai who have raised their hands for the sake of time I would be inclined to close the queue up with these four questions.

Roberto asks I wonder whether the GAC has issued any Communique or motion as, for instance, in the U.N. General Assembly about the current events in Ukraine? If so, can you share it with us. If not, why? I'm going to leave that question pending looking forward to the GAC responding.

I see Marita's hand has gone down, so if that is indeed the case and it's not a glitch I would be inclined to go to Manal first, and then Dai, please. Manal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC Chair:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Joanna, and Roberto. Thank you for the question. And this was not the intention for my hand up, but let me respond to your question first.

So, we had in the Communique reference to the statements that have been made during the GAC Opening Plenary, so we received the request from Ukraine for an urgent meeting, and we had the meeting coming up anyway, so we -- the GAC leadership met urgently, and we decided to allow the Opening Plenary that we allow as much time as needed for interventions during the session.

There is a link to the transcripts of the Opening Plenary to the Communique. All the statements will be attached to the meeting Minutes, but the Minutes, they come out a little bit later.

But as for the Communique, there is a reference, and there is a link to the transcripts. I hope this answers the question, and to what Oksana mentioned yesterday it would be difficult to reference something in the Communique that has not been discussed within the GAC, so, so far I think it will be only for the statements that were provided.

I think we had eight statements, if my memory serves me. Of course, starting with the Ukrainian statement.

JOANNA KULESZA: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Manal. Dai, the floor is yours.

DAI MORISHITA: Thank you, Joanna. Can you hear me? Okay, thank you, thank you for the opportunity to speak. Let me ask a question about on DNS Abuse. At ICANN72 meeting with the ALAC I remember the GAC and the ALAC agreed on making a joint small group to discuss DNS Abuse. So could you share the current status with us because we expressed to the small group's activities? Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Dai. I believe to be equipped today answer that question relatively briefly and then move forward to Shi Young for a brief

summary.

We have agreed to move the DNS Abuse discussion to inter-sessional meetings. The small group has been formed on behalf of the At Large. I understand there is also work within the GAC. The DNS Abuse study issued by the European Commission seems to be an interesting item for both parties to analyze and then we can proceed with further meetings once the work load connected with the general meeting is managed. So that would be the brief answer.

The work is happening. We are focusing on the DNS Abuse study but we too have members of the -- of both working groups here present in the room. So I'm happy to share the floor with them unless you would be willing and able to take any further issues offline and we would be happy to answer these per e-mails as well.

If that works for you, Dai, and for the members of the small working team, then I would be inclined to hand the floor over to Shi Young for a summary. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you very much.

DAI MORISHITA: Yes.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Dai, do you want to say words or not?

DAI MORISHITA: Okay, thank you very much.

SHI YOUNG CHANG: Thank you so much, Dai, and as I've seen no hands for each side I think we had a lively discussion about interesting issues which includes all the important stuff, and I think we had some brief lively discussion about those important issues from the different committees and I think this will be very interesting session, and I hope we can have a more interesting discussion to inter-sessionally, and at the next ICANN meeting too.

And especially about the last collaboration about -- from multistakeholder from both sides. I think we can share all those good example from each side at the next meeting so that we can have more approach for the national level and international level for the collaborative efforts so that we can have more like, you know, examples and we can share the vision for the collaboration.

And I think as I see no hands then I think we can have -- finish two minutes earlier the meeting, if there's any word from Manal or Maureen, do you have any words for the last word? Manal or Maureen?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC Chair: So just to thank everyone very much. Thank you very much, Joanna, Shi Young and Maureen, of course, and thanks to all speakers who have spoken during today's session. So sincere thanks to Marita, Velimira, Satish, Nigel, Alan, Laureen, and Yjro, so we look forward to our continued cooperation with ALAC, of course, and for GAC colleagues we are meeting back here at 10:30 San Juan, 14:30 UTC for finalizing the Communique and starting our wrap-up session.

With that, Maureen, any final remarks from your end?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just to say thank you so much, Manal. I hope you can hear me. I've taken my head-set off. But, no, we've really appreciated the dialoguing. I think this has just been a really great session and, yeah, more to come. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC Chair: Thank you. Bye.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]