

---

MONTREAL – GAC: New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion  
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT  
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So we now have our session on another important topic, the subsequent procedures and new rounds of new gTLDs. We have Jeff Neuman, co-chair of the subsequent procedures' PDP working group. Cheryl, unfortunately, has a conflict obligation so couldn't be with us, and of course we have Luisa, our lead on this topic. So without any further delay, I will hand over to Luisa to get us started. Over to you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Manal, good morning, GAC colleagues, today we have in the agenda what we would like to cover so hopefully can be efficient with our time. First, we have Jeff is one of the co-chairs of the PDP sub pro working group to give us an update in terms of timelines of this working group. And then he will also give us an update in terms of the deliberations or the calculate latest stats within the working group on topics importance to the GAC. We do have to just be mindful with the time. So we thought we could do the first two topics and then see how we're doing with time because we do want to have an

---

**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.**

---

opportunity to discuss among ourselves to see how then we organize within the GAC for the next steps of this focal group, so I will stop there and hand it over to Jeff. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you. Again, I want to thank foreign inviting us back. I don't know how many meetings in a row this has been but certainly been an honor and pleasure to come and present the current stats of our policy development process. I think within or full subsequent procedures working group including Work Track 5, we have tried a lot of innovative things in order to encourage participation from the entire community and hopefully the way our group has been operating presents some good examples for photograph policy development processes and PDP 3.0. So here to talk about subsequent procedures, which essentially describes the review of the 2012 round and discusses whether any changes need to be made to the policies and procedures so that we can launch the next round of new gTLDs.

We have been operating now for close to three years I think, and we produced an initial report out for public comment in 2018 along with a supplemental initial report with some issues we didn't include in the first initial report. All the comments were received and organized, reviewed by individual tracks within the working group and then brought back to the full working group,

---

and now in a position to focus on preparing final draft recommendations for a final report and through the developing of these draft final recommendations we have come across a few issues where either we have changed directions somewhat from the initial report or where there is a new idea that is gaining traction within the group. And because these are new and were not available for public comment in any of three or four public comment periods, we think we are likely to have another public comment period on those specific items shortly, and I will put up a timeline slide after this one.

But I do want to say that as many of you know and there was a presentation on this I think yesterday or the day before -- getting my days mixed -- Work Track 5 which dealt with the geographic names at the top level produced their final report and presented that to the full working group this past Saturday. And the full working group has now taken that report and put it on our agenda. Just to set expectations, although it does need to be approved by the full working group, the intention is that the discussion has already been had on these issues. We don't anticipate that these issues of geographic names at the top level be re-opened and that the recommendations from Work Track 5 will be in the final report where we will have to issue a consensus call of the entire working group on all of the recommendations including those from Work Track 5.

---

So this is the current timeline that we have for the policy work specifically. As you can see -- or hopefully can see, hopefully not too small, but essentially, we intend to wrap up our work by the end of the first quarter 2020. So what that means is delivering a final report to the GNSO council at that time. We're hoping to do a public comment period towards the end of this quarter or more likely early q1 on those issues that we were just talking about which may be new or were not previously out for public comment.

Once -- I know this is not on the next slide but to give a flavor, once the report is sent to the council, the council then considers that report and ultimately will recommend that to the ICANN board. The ICANN board as it does with all policies recommended by the GNSO will then have yet another public comment period on those recommendation, specifically getting feedback from the -- all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees like the GAC on the full report before the board considers that issue, which we would hope would be done within a quarter, so hopefully by the end of the second quarter, so June, July time frame 2020, so then commission the implementation work and that implementation work would then take the policies from the GNSO and put that into place in likely another applicant guidebook so that the rules of the road, if you will, could be set for the next run to begin. That process could take anywhere from six months to a year. So if you are just trying to think ahead as to

---

what that means for actual new gTLD, probably not until the end of 2021 or beginning of 2022. Sounds like far away to some; to others it's right around the corner so we have that to look forward to. I don't know if I want to stop and ask questions on this or go onto the topic.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, it's always important to get an update in terms of the timeline so thank you for that. And yes, I will give an opportunity, if there's any questions or comments focused on process for now or timelines? Switzerland please, thank you.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Luisa. And thank you, Jeff for this first part of your presentation. I just was wondering -- and you know where I'm aiming at probably -- is that we have the possibility of making meaningful GAC input on the draft final report before it crystallizes too much before you really have taken your decisions between the PDP working group. Because afterwards it gets more and more difficult.

I was wondering whether from here to the end of the year and before you have those decisions being taken, we could have a

---

look at the draft final report or at all the materials available of the draft final report. I'm seeing there in the graphic that you have a reference to a draft final report excerpts, perhaps that could be a good opportunity so that we could in let's say in a nonformal fashion anticipate a public -- not a public comment -- a comment by the GAC before you really wrap up your work. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks for that comment. So all of our documents are public so what I think we can do is have the great policy support team that we have and excellent support team that you have as well and we could work on trying to get collaboration so that the support team can make sure that the focal group and anyone else interested in those draft final recommendations as being developed are made known to you all and sent to you as you are interested in so that you can get an idea of where we are. My understanding is that there's a scorecard in development which I think will be very helpful which I believe is aimed at taking previous GAC advice and trying to compare that to where the group is leaning. And I say leaning because we haven't done any kind of consensus call on it so at this point all we can really know is the tendency of where the group is heading. So I think fleshing out that scorecard is a good exercise and I know that Cheryl and I

---

are more than happy to help the support teams in filling those out and making sure you are all aware of what is going on.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff. And thank you, Jorge. So wanted to clarify, from my understanding, in addition to the possibility of having a potential GAC input for the public comment period, the idea is perhaps even before the report goes out, -- so it would be before, right? I think, Jorge, that you were proposing? So before, and in terms of timelines, looking in terms of now and -- I guess we have a month or, just so we have a little more of granulated clarity.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure and all of the working documents are public so all out there on essentially Google drives so that's why I was saying we can now go through that and help to fill out that scorecard with the things that we know today. So your support team and the GAC focal group and anyone could get access to all of that. Those documents now are in good enough shape that you can see where we are leaning and where the draft final recommendations are likely to go. They are in a consistent format, a section that says high level agreement followed by -- actually it says the policy goals, background documentation and then high level

---

agreements. And that's from those things under high level agreement, those are the ones likely to become recommendations that are proposed. So it's all there now and I think where w some coordination, I think we can make sure that you are provided with access to it today. I mean, it's there now.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Perfect. Thank you. So if we can then go to the next slide. And if we could get an update on this important topic of GAC advice and early warning, Jeff, thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Okay. So I'm required to issue a caveat because again, these are high level -- had that we're calling high level agreement, really just an assessment from the leadership as to where we think the group is heading but we have not done any sort of formal consensus call so at the end of the day these may not get consensus but in order to progress the discussions and drafts some recommendations, this is our best guess as to where we are and what will or could likely happen.

So with respect to GAC advice specifically, there is a -- some of these are bullet points so don't necessarily look at the -- don't pay that much attention to the specific wording because we tried to



---

truncate it a little bit to fit on the slides but essentially the first bullet point is just reciting what is already in the bylaws with respect to GAC advice, essentially include the concepts of providing clearly articulated rationale, including national law upon it is based. It will be an exact quote when it goes into the recommendation, so that's the first one.

The second one is the working group would like to recommend that if there are going to be in the categories of top level domes like what essentially came out as sensitive strings or category one and then there was a category two for those who remember the 2012 round and the GAC advice, the hope is any advice related to classes of applications could be provided by the GAC prior to the application round. Of course after the application round opens and you see specific applications, of course advice can and should be filed against individual applications as they arise but again, if there's -- we now have enough experience under our belts we think that if there are classes of services highly regulated strings or had that not, then to the extent the GAC has advice on those to issue that prior to the window opening so applicants aware of what they should be including in their applications.

And then the last one on here is in recognition of the new bylaws that came into play in 2016 and that the bylaws essentially take precedence over anything this would be contained in an

---

applicant guidebook or anybody else that the working group discussed taking out the section where it says GAC advice will create a strong presumption for the ICANN board that the application shouldn't be approved, due to the changes in the bylaws and thresholds that have to be met by the board to overwrite that GAC advice and also a rendition that the statement in the guidebook that created the presumption that the top level domain would not be approved really hindered the discretion of the ICANN board to work with the applicant and the GAC to find a mutually acceptable solution other than just not proceeding with the application. So this is the hope that now there's more flexibility for all of the parties, impacted parties to come together and agree on what would satisfy the GAC advice other than just a blanket not proceeding.

And this sort of relates to the one of the other topics, not necessarily on this one -- actually, it is on this one -- on one of the future slides -- but unlike 2012 where no changes are allowed to applications once submitted, the working group does recognize that changes to applications should be allowed if the changes are to address early warnings, GAC advice, objections filed, public comments, et cetera, that we shall not have the very harsh rule of no changes to applications. And again, if there are changes to applications, the working group believes that of course those should go out for public comment and reflect to make sure that

---

those changes are in line with the expectations of those that follow -- those that gave the advice or filed the objection, et cetera. So that's on the GAC advice and early warnings. Did you want to stop in between or go to next topic? Fine either way.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, of course this is a key, key issue for the GAC, and we will be discussing it and so everyone knows, we will be sharing the slides because there's obviously a lot in here for us to really take into account, but perhaps -- I mean, I might stop but I'm just looking at the at the time, so we have at least a moment to present GAC early warnings but I guess we can stop and perhaps have a question. Thank you.

BRAZIL:

Thank you, Luisa. Brazil, for the record. The language we see in the slide right now, it's a powerful argument for taking into account Jorge's consideration that we must have sustained [indiscernible] in GAC about this the working group, track is one thing, technical level then when it comes to GAC, there are many governments that only follow it in the GAC. And that the direction I see the language right now understood perfectly, just a draft, nothing agreed, et cetera, but for instance just to give you an example, the first one, GAC advice must include national,

---

international law, that's not the only thing that could sustain GAC advice, it could be a public policy concern not written in any law. Internet of things, sometimes they're not still frozen into law, international or national, so it could be a strong public policy concern that would be the basis for GAC advice, [indiscernible] forbidden under a specific code of law in some country or region. And the third bullet I think extremely complicated, it would probably push the GAC from the position of -- not sure I can qualify exactly what is the position of the GAC, but it would weaken it and we would risk being more of a debate club that has to rubber stamp what is approved elsewhere. It weakens the role of the GAC and has unintended consequences, and I think we should take a long hard look on what is written there and [indiscernible] should be a sustained debate about it when the time comes. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Brazil. Absolutely.

That's what the GAC focal group was created and we will discuss this later in terms of how we can organize ourselves to have a meaningful and substantive discussion within the GAC. So I will pass to Jeff to give us update on early warnings.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Actually, there is more on this slide too, but we can go onto closed generics. So on the issue of closed generics. Which essentially the shorthand way of saying the exclusive use of a generic string by one registrant. So brands for example are closed top level domains, not closed generics, and this would be in cases where someone were to apply for a generic type word or string that but proposed to keep it for itself. In the 2012 round -- and this is where it gets a little bit tricky by the way because of what happened, so in the 2012 round there was no prohibition in the initial guidebook on applying for and proposing this type of use for a top level domain. However, through public comment and advice from the GAC and discussions within the community, subsequently after applications received, the ICANN board passed a resolution that said for the 2012 round closed generics would not be allowed. However, it sent the issue to the GNSO to work out the policy issues.

The GAC advice on this topic wasn't that closed generics should be banned completely, but that anyone applied for a closed generic should have a public -- be supported by a public policy -- and I'm not quoting that exactly correct, but something to that effect that there should be some public policy justification for proposing a closed generic. But because that was difficult to figure out at the time and required policy development the board said in 2012 not going to allow it for that round. So it was

---

essentially punted or kicked over to us. So a number of options that we could have taken with this issue. We could in the future say no, we have discussed this, it should always be allowed, we could say no, never should be allowed like in 2012 or somewhere in the middle we could try to define what might be public acceptable public policy reasons to allow closed generics to go forward. This is a very contentious public debate as in 2013 and 2014 and at this point in time, I don't think the group will come to consensus in either direction. There are certainly very strong opinions that closed generics shouldn't be allowed. Strong opinions it should be allowed. We use the example -- and I know Stefan here from the Red Cross, if the Red Cross let's say wanted to apply for dot disaster and was going to use that top level domain any time there was an emergency and for fundraising so you knew anything that ended in dot disaster, for example soliciting funds for that global disaster, was from the Red Cross, technically a closed generic but one could make a public policy case why something like that should be allowed. But on the other hand, there are those that just don't believe that would ever be a case. So although there are options and something dramatic could happen, my expectation is that there's not going to be consensus one way or the other. Ultimately it will be up to the board to decide what to do on that if we cannot figure out a consensus based solution.

---

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff. Of course another key, key topic for the GAC which we will need to meaningfully consider within the GAC, I want to stop to see if there's a question on this topic for Jeff but then I would like for Jeff, if you could, go over the GAC early warning slide. I think it's important for the GAC, but we can just take one minute here to see if there are any questions and again, these slides will be -- are being or will be circulated within the GAC. So I know there's a lot of key information here. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure, and I apologize, I skipped a slide specifically on the early warnings, early warnings, for those that may not have participated in the process in 2012, were the ability for individual GAC members to file I will say concerns about a string or about an application where it had some specific issues that either individual government or in some cases multiple governments believed needed to be addressed by the applicant before that government was comfortable with the application moving forward. It was also there to warn an applicant that GAC advice could be coming on that particular string or category of strings at some point in time. So it was basically to help an applicant understand what the thinking was of individual governments or even a group of governments or the GAC.

---

The early warnings were supposed to be filed I think within 90 days. There were 1200 applications -- sorry, 1390 applications -- and because of the number of applications and the complexity this was the first time it was being done, it took significantly longer than that but the recommendations, the GNSO, the working group is recommending that there should be a specific defined time period for those early warnings and of course that when an early warning it should include the rationale and the basis for the action. Then we believe that unlike in 2012 -- or I should say it differently. In 2012 round, because no changes allowed to the applications, there were no real direct dialogue between governments that filed these early warnings and the applicants themselves, no way that they could communicate with each other to see if the basis of the warnings could be worked out. We're hoping that by recommending that there should be a mechanism to allow that dialogue and also to change applications to address the concerns that that will be a good improvement for the next round of new gTLDs. So I think it's a positive development, at least that's the way it is intended. So I would love to hear if there are concerns or support. Either way.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, we will be having a discussion in a moment but if there are any preliminary questions



---

or comments direct today Jeff, this would be a good opportunity or clarity, thank you. Yes, Olga, please.

OLGA CAVALLI, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Jeff. The idea of having a dialogue and some flexibility is sounds very interesting because we have been trying to have this kind of approach in between parties to diminish any conflicts and the evolving of the application. My memories from the GAC advice time, it was not clear for the GAC the procedure in how to file it. So that I remember was not clear how to do it within, without the GAC and the GNSO, so if that process also can be clarified in the rules, that could be very helpful for the GAC.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Olga. Important to have more clarity and predictability in the process. Just looking at the room. If there's any more questions. And I'm just going to check here with Benedetta on timing, just want to ensure we have time within the GAC to discuss our next steps. Okay. So we have, we're able to cover one more slide and topic. I believe it's the public comment interest commitment if you could take us to the next slide. Perfect. Yes. Thank you, Jeff.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure. Will follow along on my slide here, hard to read that over there. Okay, so there is a topic -- overall topic we have called the global public interest which has we all know is very broad. But specifically we use that topic to discuss what is known as the public interest commitment. So those include the mandatory public interest commitments that are reflected in the registry agreement for those of you familiar, it is in specification 11, clause number 3, and those include the one clause related to the 3b, the requirement for registries to produce a technical assessment of security risks and to keep those reports and deliver those, we've had a lot of discussion on DNS abuse, primary section in one of the mandatory picks. Another to only use 2013 credited registrars, I think that could be reworded to say the current version of the RAA, although 2013 the most current, who knows by that time what will be the most current but then a whole section on voluntary commitments. It says voluntary commitments and not voluntary picks for a reason. There were some concerned within the working group that calling every commitment a public interest commitment raised some flags in that some of the commitments are not necessarily related to what some would consider public interest but might only be related to their own application. There was no test. So although we're changing the name or might change the name to voluntary commitments, in effect it's the same thing, something that would go into the registry agreement that would be enforceable, that

---

would be part of compliance's job to make sure registries complying with it as well as subject to the dispute resolution policy that could be invoked what is now called the pic dispute resolution policy would also apply to something like this.

One of the recommendations is when a registry does make a voluntary commitment that it should make sure that it's got a rationale in there, also indicate whether that commitment is limited in time and basically provide all of the information that would be essential for someone to comment on in or object to it or file advice, essentially to make sure there is more transparency and of course making sure that those commitments put into an application or that are made let's say in a change because there was an early warning and let's say there's an early warning from a government, applicant says you are right, I will make this commitment and then the government says okay I think that solves the issue, that needs to be documented in the actual agreement to make sure that that commitment is firm and followed through. So essentially that's the main recommendations with respect to the public interest commitment the. We hope it's a positive development and one that certainly will have an improvement.

---

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff. Again, any initial questions or comments or reactions from the GAC or further clarification? Okay. Thank you. We do have -- the next slide is important; I believe it's the applicant support program. So I guess this will be a last update we get from Jeff and then we have a good 30 minutes to discuss within the GAC how do we organize ourselves on next steps. Thank you. Thank you, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Sure, no problem. I'm here however long you want me and whatever questions you want, I am making myself available to answer anything. So on applicant support, the working group believes that this is a really important program, that of course we should continue that program for future runs, some of the recommendations we think will come out, that the application program should continue to be open to applicants regardless of where they are in the world. Talk about whether it's in the global south -- it just didn't make sense if you met other criteria why you couldn't apply for applicant support being anywhere in the world. So also important to not only target the global south but the middle applicant, struggling regions further along in development compared to underserved or developed regions, there should be longer lead times to ensure enough awareness created and outreach so that we can bring in more of those

---

applicants, that was something that was disappointing from the last round, that there were so few applicants for the support program and only one that qualified for it.

So we want to make sure that we draw on the expertise of regional org organizations and leverage tools and the expertise to evaluate the applicant business cases. We believe that the working group is likely to recommend that there should be additional support other than or including financial support for the application fee which is really all that the 2012 applicant support addressed. We think there should be more -- additional fees available for paying consultants to do the application, helping to cover ICANN registry related fees, but also even though not in the bullet, there are a number of other recommendations for additional in kind support, not necessarily financial but support from consultants to draft application, technical operators to ensure the back-end registry can run. Provide additional DNS needs around the world to ensure it's robust, we think this should be included in the support program and not just application fee.

And we recommended a change, if you applied to applicant support in 2012 support and denied applicant support, your application then was thrown out. Even if you could in some way try raise funds to keep your application in play, the only remedy

---

for failing applicant support was to throughout the throw out the application and we think that was not fair, so we do believe that applicants who don't meet the requirements of an applicant support program should nonetheless be provided with some limited time period to see if it could raise the required fees to keep its application in the system and to proceed on. Again, this is, what would seem very logical and should have been in the 2012 round but certainly one we hope will be accepted community by the community and board for the subsequent round going forward.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, and I think the improvements to this program will hopefully go a long way for not only how the [indiscernible] global south but also the underserved regions. Any initial comments here? Yes, Olga, thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thanks to you, and welcome for the slide very much, GAC has spoken about this so many times and there were so few applications from Latin America that I think this is very welcome a question about legal advice because not only the fee or money or some patience around the application but the

---

documentations and the legal complexity of the application and even the applicant guidebook itself for countries where English is not the language, it becomes really complex, so it's not only having fees for some staff dedicated to that but some orientation in relation with thousand handle documents, the legal advice related to the documents itself from ICANN. Thank you. That's the question.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Absolutely. Thank you, Olga. So if there's no other questions for Jeff, thank you very -- Jorge, thank you.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Luisa. And it's a straightforward question, I hope. In the CCT recommendations, there are some recommendations on the applicants support program. And to what extent have you considered them or do you have any, I don't know, scorecard or anyplace where this is recorded, to how you have included that? Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. So the short answer is yes, we've certainly included the recommendations in here, this is one slide and obviously a bigger

---

topic. I think the hardest one, to be honest, is that the CCT review team said that we should try to come up with a target, a goal for the number of applications or basically what would define success of the program, and that's a very difficult question because there are plenty of ideas but to come up with what we would think is successful, I mean, some might say if there is one applicant from an underserved region that makes it and has an application and supports their community, I mean, that's certainly success for that one applicant. To come up with a criteria of what is the measurement of success for an entire program, it's really difficult. So to be honest, that might be one of those recommendations that will be difficult to follow through on.

But the other recommendations, I think you will find have all been incorporated, either because already discussed by us even before those recommendations or because we have looked at those recommendations and put them in here. I don't think you will find any divergence from the report other than being difficult to come up with agreement -- if you have ideas on a goal, would love to hear it, a target.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, and Switzerland for the question. So we're going to -- again, thank you, Jeff, for your



---

time. Welcome to stay. We want to focus now in terms of how we can organize ourselves within the GAC for next steps as time is of essence. So if we can go to the next slide, please.

I just wanted to provide a quick background for the benefit of new GAC members. The GAC working group on subsequent rounds was created in Kobe but it met for the first time in ICANN 65 in Marrakech then after that there have been some biweekly calls, mainly focused on building capacity and understanding the five key topics here, GAC early warns, advice, closed generic, public interest commitment, applicant support, and there was actually inter-sessional call between the underserved regions working group and the GAC focal group where there was exchanges about input on the CCT review recommendations 30 and 31 in the implementation plans so this was really a good example of those two groups working together.

So this is just the quick overview in terms of what the focal group has focused but again, the main objective for now has been to build that capacity, there hasn't been yet any discussions in terms of the substance which is what we wanted to discuss here. I also wanted to mention that with the GAC support staff, it has been made at the disposal of GAC focal group members the documentation in terms of high level agreement, that's all part and linked very nicely in the work plan, internal work plan of the

---

GAC focal group, so if anyone is interested, there is the documents are easily available because of course we know it is very challenge to go navigate the PDP working group documents, so that's why we create with GAC support staff the work plan where it links very easily regarding topics of interest to the GAC documentation that happen the PDP working group has been -- the latest status. If we can go to the next slide.

So now the important question for us today is to review and determine next steps for the focal group so does the GAC wish to move from capacity going to discussing and developing and updating previous GAC positions? And if so, we would need more GAC members' participation to ensure a collaborative effort. So I will stop here and just give everyone a moment to see what is the best use or objective of the GAC focal group at this time. I just really want to ensure we give all GAC members an opportunity. Just going to see here in the room.

So I guess the idea is to, if we are to move to really updating GAC positions, we thought an idea could be to [indiscernible] have volunteers to look at this priority top focus for the GAC. Obviously if there are other ones, more than welcome to included them. But again, just wanted to stop here and see if there are any questions regarding the objective of the GAC focal group and as I mentioned before, the idea was focused on building capacity between GAC

---

members and helping GAC members navigate this process as I mentioned, a lot of new GAC members, and it is a very complex process to follow, in particular the PDP sub pro working group that Jeff is chairing. So I just wanted to stop here and see if there's any initial questions or comments. Thank you. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa, and thanks for Jeff as well and everyone involved. I think your proposed approach is sensible, that it's time to move from capacity building to discussing and developing GAC positions on this so that we're able to provide the timely input to the process. And as has been explained, they are all very important topics and of interest to GAC colleagues here. And I think it would be a good opportunity -- in fact involvement of all GAC members and not just specific volunteers, I think it's time that new GAC members would be aware of the topics, aware of the positions and aware of where this is heading and at least not objecting to this. And for GAC members who have been participating for quite some time, again, we need their views and where does this stand from previous GAC positions and whether we're heading in the right direction. So I would call for involvement of as many GAC members as we can and even those who are not having the time to share the workload, at least make sure you are aware of the progress and at least let us know that

---

you are okay with where this is heading, because I think it's important and it says afterwards for some time, it's going to be there for some time and we need to provide input before it's late. Thank you, again, Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Manal. So we can pass to the next slide to give you a clear sense of when -- yeah, we can pass to the next one. As mentioned by Jeff, the GAC focal group with the immense support from the GAC support staff as created a GAC scorecard, so that was like a quick screenshot which we have presented as well as in Marrakech, again, a work in progress, at the disposal of all GAC members which identifies GAC key topics and then compares them with the status of the deliberations of the PDP working group.

But in terms of the timeliness for the next opportunity for a GAC input, as Jeff mentioned, it seems in the next three months we have two opportunities to participate in the PDP working group calls. Info some of us we tried to in the beginning -- again, it's hard to follow -- but my sense is that now with the high level agreements and starting to really craft recommendations, perhaps it would be easier for individual GAC members to participate in the PDP working group. So again, there is this option.

---

The other options preparing potential GAC input for the public comment period. We do know from Jeff mentioned it seems that there's just certain topics that will be included in the report. And so it seems the timeline for now, it's December 2019, January 2020, that's the latest information we have. So this is again a call to all GAC members that it seems this is the next opportunity for GAC members to provide input and so as Manal mentioned, we thought in order to make this a collaborative effort and share the workload that perhaps we could start notionally identifying GAC volunteer, obviously there's the support of GAC support staff and we're all in it together so don't feel that you have to lead on one specific topic and obviously we have a few members helping on the topics we just mentioned. It would be greatly appreciated. And if you can join the GAC focal group, that would be very important. So I will stop here and get any questions, reactions, or comments from GAC members. Thank you. Portugal, thank you.

PORTUGAL: Good morning, and thank you very much for all of this presentation. I have a question for Jeff. I would like to know if you could be so kind and provide us with good examples where the gTLD have been a good impact on the consumer, on the citizen, I think that this information would be very useful. Thank you.

---

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thank you for the question. Some I think there are a number of examples of top level domains that have been introduced that have provided the community with -- or consumers with choice, innovation, and I think unfortunately in this ICANN world we tend to focus on the negatives. There are certainly are a couple of them that are known for not the greatest of reasons. There are a very few TLDs that have abuse and get the attention but the reality, there are hundreds of brands that have their top level domains, and a number running live, don't necessarily make big flashes but you all of a sudden see them. Great examples, whether Audi, Barclays -- individual marketing campaigns, internal sites, whether looking for careers or looking for applicants for their jobs, it provides at least with respect to brands which is personally something I deal with on a day-to-day basis, provides them with more secure resource that they do not have to fuss about can I find that name? Is it available in a generic top level domain and also gives them complete control so they don't necessarily have to register in every single carry where they operate, they can just do that internally and have global consumers go to their brand.

One example, KPMG, a global consulting company that has transitioned from.com over to dot KPMG completely, and even top level generic domains, I see [indiscernible] just saying what I see but all this to say that I think it would be great to have a

---

presentation at the next GAC meeting on some of how new TLDs actually being used. I think we spend far too much time on the very few that are the outliers that are not necessarily the way that we all as a community would want, but there are hundreds of others that are exactly what was intended. And if you look at the CCT review team recommendations, one of their findings was that the n gTLD program did bring competition. I think that would be helpful because we kind of get bogged down in DNS abuse and really only applied to a couple TLDs, it's important and need to address that but I think you would find 99.9 percent of the CCTs are not those examples. Thanks.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jeff. Yes, Portugal, please.

PORTUGAL: I would just like your opinion about the apps. How do you think that the gTLDs compete with apps? We have market for all these sites.

JEFF NEUMAN: I will give a personal opinion, but you would probably get lots of personal opinions on this and mine not necessarily more expert than others. I don't actually see them as competing. At the end

---

of the day when on an app and you want more information about the app, whether frequently asked questions or if you want any other information or who to send things to, at the end of the day, they have to which to have a domain name, email address, personally I see them at compliment complementary as opposed to competition and at this point in order to be on the Internet, you still need to have a domain name.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Jeff, I know we have a few GAC members for some questions, just being mindful of the time, 15 minutes to ensure we get a clear understanding of how to organize ourselves in terms of next steps and wanted to mention there is a GAC focal group, it has had limited participation, so in order for its existence to continue, it really depends on participation from GAC members. And of course it's open to all GAC members, not only for those that are part of the focal group. I will stop here, and I will start with Burkina Faso.

BURKINA FASO:

I represent Burkina Faso, and I am very pleased to see the level of collaboration between the working group, the underserved regions working group, and these other working groups in order to take into account the realities of these regions that are indeed



---

underserved. Going forward, I would like to see further stress on the different competencies and capacity. We need capacity building in our countries so that we can integrate people from the underserved regions. It is important to understand things before moving forward. May I take this opportunity to remind you that we circulated an email to the Africa GAC members inviting them to a member to be held on November 7th in room 157a at 1500 hours local time. In this meeting we will be informing about the policy development process. Because as I wanted, capacity building is indeed very important, and we will also be talking about the strategy for the Africa region. So this is my comment. Thank you very much for your attention.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

[through interpreter] thank you very much for your comment. And your comment is well received, and we will make sure that we will continue cooperating between different working groups.

SPEAKER:

How we organize our work within the GAC. So I don't want to [indiscernible] if you want to have other members who want to ask questions for Jeff, first, if they can speak first, I can reserve my intervention for later.

---

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

No, please go ahead, we are focusing now -- Jeff is at our disposal if any question comes but we should focus on now organize ourselves internally.

CHINA:

So thank you, Luisa, I want to thank Jeff for your availability and your presentation here and actually in terms of how we can organize our discussion in the way forward, I actually have two point of suggestions. One is I would suggest we could have a reasonable work plan for the focal group for the new gTLDs, as well as for the GAC before the finalization of the subsequent procedure report and I think if we could have such a plan that you give us a picture of our future work in about a year or so in the future.

So my second suggestion would be regarding the working [indiscernible] of the following discussion about the subsequent procedure. We might want to have or create a list or a scorecard of the specific issues and the overarching issues such as the GAC advice, early warning, closed generic and applicant support, so on and so on, and might want to break those overarching issues into some specific issues. So it would be a question [indiscernible] so with that, I think we can better organize our discussion, internal discussion of this issue. Thank you very much.

---

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, China, for those two ideas. The good news is that we already have a GAC scorecard, because obviously that is important for us to prioritize our work. So we will be definitely sharing that where it identifies more than those topics, and it starts with previous GAC input and then has a column that shows us the status of the deliberations of the PDP working group, so absolutely, that is key document that will be shared shortly and just be mindful that it's a work in progress as at the same time the discussions and deliberations of the PDP working group are happening in parallel. So this would be at everyone's disposal to review and discuss. And regarding work plan, we do have a work plan as well internally, and we were focusing more on biweekly calls about these topics. However, moving forward if we have some volunteers, it would be then easier, and we could then update that internal work plan. Because I agree, it will be very key in terms of continuing to organize the work of the focal group.

And partly -- obviously it's a challenge if we think about the next potential opportunity for GAC input is in December where we don't have an in-person meeting, this creates a challenge. But hopefully through calls, through email exchanges, we can start reviewing previous GAC advice and see if it needs update.

---

A lot of previous GAC advice was delivered in the past and we just want to make sure it is still relevant for all of us, so that's part of the exercise. But again, that's like our starting point and we will be receiving a GAC support for this exercise. But again, the challenge is that we don't have that in person meeting, but hopefully through calls, through email exchanges, we can start reviewing previous GAC input on these key topics, in particular, GAC advice, early warnings, closed generics and see if we could be able to have some potential input. Of course if there's agreement within the GAC mailing list, to send to the PDP public comment period. So I will stop there to see if there are any other questions or anyone that would be notionally interested. And again, this is a collaborative effort and you will receive support from GAC support staff. Thank you. But again, to see if there are any other questions or reactions from GAC members. Yes, Jorge. Thank you for waiting, sorry.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you, Luisa, perhaps you had overlooked my hand before. I think it would be very important be mindful that the rules for the next expansion of the top level domain space are being finalized. They are being finalized as we speak. So Cancun will be too late. So I say it again. Cancun will be too late. If we want to intervene now and make our voice heard in this process and not have later

---

on lots of trouble and lots of potential conflict, we have to organize ourselves now. So I just wanted to stress that first point.

Second point is we have a draft scorecard. It is meant to be comprehensive once top updated and checked document where we compare the different issues that these new regulations for the future rounds will include from applicants support, this means that also underserved regions can participate really in the next expansion or public interest obligations which were the subject of so many discussions in the previous rounds, or geographic terms as top domains, or security expects, all of that being decided, finalized now. So we have to be really aware of that.

And the scorecard will try to sum that up so that we are all at the same level of speed and of knowledge so what I think has to be made clear also is that we only will be able to make those inputs from here in the coming weeks. If people participate actively in the focal group because that is the channel, we have to do this. And as Luisa was asking, I'm happy to participate, continue participating there. And for instance, I would see the question of GAC advice and GAC earlier warnings as something where I could lead the effort, of course with the valuable help of Benedetta and Fabien and cooperating closely with Jeff and Cheryl and their team. So again, we need take action now and we really have to

---

put ourselves to work, because in Cancun, this train will have passed, it will be a completely different situation. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Switzerland, very, very much for your continued participation, commitment, and we are taking note of helping us lead in these efforts. And again, hopefully the more GAC members we have the better we can share the workload and there is GAC support staff.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES:

Even though an observer on the GAC, we can facilitate dissemination of information the focal group folk would come up and [indiscernible] I would want to offer that through our reach that the GAC could be available to disseminate urgent information through the member states consideration and participation if they are able to.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Thank you, Organization of American States for that suggestion. And we will make sure just that this is okay with the focal group as that is a work in progress but depending on that decision, happy to then see how we can facilitate that, thank you. And someone else, thank you.

---

NIGERIA:

I would like to align my thoughts with Burkina Faso, coming from that perhaps we need to review and reassess what the value of the capacity building has been so far. And if you recall, conversations especially yesterday of new GAC members, or ones left and all of that, I believe the capacity building is a living project. Irrespective of focal group especially the underserved, underdeveloped nations, so if I may, I would propose that we continue or if possible, to have the capacity building simultaneously with the focal group. We should probably from time to time reassess or reevaluate the impact of the capacity building, peer-to-peer reviews, because if you like it or not, others will always be ahead while some would be doing catch-up. But if you want full, active participation, most committees or groups, we need to continuously build each other. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR:

Absolutely, thank you, and apologies if it was misinterpreted as no longer capacity building, because absolutely, we agree that is living objective. I think of the GAC in general. So absolutely, wanted to stress our commitment to that. So it was just more to ensure that now there is a timeliness. So at the same time we will continue to build capacity for underserved regions for new GAC members, need at the same time to ensure we are preparing ourselves for some potential

---

input, so really appreciate that intervention. Oh, yes, and looking at the time, I think we will have to close the session. So thank you for everyone's participation and comments. So the session will be closed. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. And thank you. Please try to be back in the room at half past. Thank you.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]