ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GAC: Subsequent Rounds Discussions (2/3)
Tuesday, June 22, 2020 – 15:00 to 16:00 MYT

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to the virtual meeting with the GAC Subsequent Rounds discussion session on Tuesday 23rd of June at 7UTC. we will not be doing a roll call for the sake of time but attendance will be noted and available in the annex of the GAC communique understand the GAC minutes of this ICANN68 meeting. Due to unfortunate Zoom bombing incidents which happened on the first day of the meeting, ICANN68 sessions will be switching to webinar Zoom rooms and not regular ones for the remainder of the meeting. In a Zoom webinar in order for a GAC member to speak you need to be identified as a panelist. In order for Zoom to do this automatically GAC members need either log in the Zoom room with their GAC mailing list email address, or join the Zoom room with an individual link that was sent to them via email from ICANN RP. Please check your inboxes on refer to the email shared with you by ICANN RP with the title analysts for ICANN68 GAC sessions. Please attend the GAC sessions via the click here to join tab as a panelist directly. My colleague Julia Charvolen is displaying that e mail on the screen.

In case a GAC member does not have the ability to raise hand or see the names of other panelists, he or she may need to leave the room and join again using this individual link sent via e mail. When recognized as panelists in the Zoom room GAC members will experience much of the information and functionality they have seen

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.

in a regular Zoom room but the ability to rename themselves for the attendance records by entering their participant name, surname, country or delegation. If you have used a different email address you will not be promoted, and be able to speak, if you would like to ask a question or make a comment please type it in the Q and A pod by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment to allow all participants to see your request. And please keep them short, if possible. Interpretation for GAC sessions which will include all 6 U.N. language and Portuguese. And will be conducted using both Zoom and the remote simultaneous interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network. Attendees are encouraged to download the application following instructions in the Zoom chat or from the meeting details available on the GAC agenda website page. Your microphone will be muted for the duration of the session unless you get into the queue to speak. If you wish to speak please raise your hand in the Zoom room. When called upon by the session lead you will be given permission to unmute your microphone. Kindly unmute your microphone at this time and take the floor. When speaking make sure to mute all of your other devices including the Congress Rental Network application. State your name for the record, and the language you will speak if speak ago language other than English. Please also speak clearly, and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. This session includes realtime transcription, to view the realtime transcription, please click on the closed caption button on the Zoom tool bar.

Finally this session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the

ICANN expected standards of behavior. You will find the link in the chat for your reference. With that I would like to leave the floor to GAC chair, Manal Ismail. Over to you Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Gulten. Our session leads are Jorge Cancio and Luisa Paez but I believe we will be joined by SubPro co-chairs Jeff Neuman and Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will update us on the meeting earlier today. With that, I will hand it over to our topic leads. Jorge and Luisa. I believe you will be starting? Can we unmute Luisa, please?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Hello, Manal. Can you hear me now? It's Luisa Paez.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Yes, loud and clear. Can you hear me, Luisa?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: So today as Manal mentioned, we will be joined by Jeff and Cheryl. Co-chairs of the SubPro PDP Working Group. Here we have a few agenda items for today's session and really we would like to focus on having the opportunity really understand on the one hand where the current status of the draft recommendations in the SubPro PDP working group are in relation to our five priority topics. So that's why we have invited the co-chairs to help us understand what are the

latest recommendations which we know the working group has been working very hard and diligently having listened to a few of their sessions.

Also a focus of this session will also be to get a sense of the -- at least at a high level and summarize the GAC individual input that was conducted in April and submitted to the SubPro PDP working group, and this will give us a sense of where GAC members are in relation to these five priority topics, see where there are areas of agreement or perhaps less agreement that we can discuss further amongst the GAC members.

So we will start with the first agenda item which is to provide an update from the co-chairs in relation to what was discussed in today's SubPro PDP working group session. Thank you, Benedetta. And then we can have a discussion to see if there's any questions from the GAC membership. And as I mentioned before, then we will go over the -- each topic of the five priority topics to get a sense of again, where the draft recommendations are in relation to any previous GAC advice and also getting a sense of where GAC members views are in relation to these priority topics. So I will pass the baton and welcome co-chairs Jeff and Cheryl and thank you for joining us today.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, hi, thank you, hopefully you all can hear me. Thank you again as always for inviting us, at least I can speak for myself. I know when this

is done I will be missing working with you all on these issues but once we get through the policy there's still implementation, so this is just the first step of the lengthy process. I'm not going to go through all of the slides we went through because I think that would take a long time but hopefully just give you a summary of the issues we discussed today and where I believe we are with respect to those two issues.

So if we can go to -- skip the background slides and go straight to the private resolution. So again, we discussed the background yesterday at the session we had where this topic is talking about the applicant guidebook section which in the 2012 round which dealt with strings where you had multiple applicants apply for that same string and the guidebook encouraged an opportunity to work out contentions amongst themselves before going to the next step which would be an ICANN auction. So the goal was to reduce the amount of auctions that -- ICANN auctions that you had and hopefully get an opportunitie to drop out so you were left with only one applicant without having to do that final auction. At the end of the day because of a number of the reasons, including the fact that you couldn't update your application, make material changes, there was really nothing for applicants to do to resolve these situations apart from figuring out a way to get other applicants out of the mix, and the most common way that was used in the 2012 round was through a private auction where rather than ICANN getting the fund, the winning bidder essentially paid all of the losing an cants for the privilege of them withdrawing their applications. And we got a number of comments through the various public comment period that there were concerns about -- in 2012

there were anecdotes and stories told about applicants that by the end of the round were rather than just dropping their applications, they were trying to gain financially from leaving their applications in and the ICANN board also noted in a letter to the working group that they were concerned that in the next round applicants would be participating in -- or applying for a string without a bona fide intent to actually use or operate the registry. There were other working groups that also agreed and thought that it would not send a good message for applicants to apply for the sole purpose of trying to make some money without real intent to use the string.

So in the working group while there were these concerns expressed by the ICANN board to members of the working group, other members of the working group expressed the position that they thought it was best to not interfere with the way that applicants resolve their contentions sets, that these private auctions were all voluntary, they couldn't force applicants to do a private auction so at the end of the day if applicants wanted to go to ICANN auction they certainly could do that and of course these working group members were also concern that had if we outlawed these private auctions, didn't allow them -- that would be really just moving the money all to ICANN as opposed having the applicants divide the fund themselves.

So amongst all these divergent interests, there were proposals developed within the working group to try to compromise and allow some forms of private resolution including the creation of joint ventures or having applicants join together in some other way to

mutually benefit in running the top level domain together and looking for other creative ways other than having an auction or the losing applicants benefit financially.

So where we I think ended up -- and we asked these questions during our session -- and hate to use the term the term frivolous -- if we see applicants apply to strings without intention to -- and that's an assumption -- could we mitigate that practice and also are there benefits of private auctions and other forms of private resolution consistent with ICANN bylaws. And I think today's discussion really was indicative of the conversations that we have had at the working group level, meaning that there are certainly members of the community that do not wish to have private auctions or applicants financially benefit from withdrawing their applications but equally there are also other members of the community that still believe that we shouldn't interfere with the ways in which these contention sets could be resolved privately and we shouldn't necessarily be encouraging all of these to go to an ICANN auction.

So it's fair to say that the discussion today really reflected the similar discussions that we have had within the working group. But that said, I do think there is certainly agreement within the community members today in today's discussion that seem to agree with the notion that we should not -- that applicants should when they apply for a string, have an intent to actually use that string. They should have the intent if they apply for a string to actually one day become the registry operator. So if we put in several guard rails in the process to make

sure that applicants have what is called a bona fide intent to operate the registry, then that may be as far as we can get in terms of a compromise.

So while I'm not ruling out either of the extremes of either banning private auctions or the other extreme of encouraging private auctions, I do think there is common ground in wanting to ensure that all applicants have a good faith intent to operate the string. And so there's going to be a little bit of work after the ICANN meeting to see how we can memorialize that concept in writing.

So I think I'm going to stop there and see if there are questions or other areas of discussion. So I will turn it over to Luisa to manage the queue, I guess?

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jeff. Yes, happy to manage the queue and of course support staff, please feel free to chime in as well and let me know if someone has raised their hand as it can sometimes be challenging to follow all the functions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: We already have a hand from Kavouss, Luisa.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Wonderful, thank you, Manal. Go ahead, Kavouss.

IRAN: Thank you. Do you hear me? You know. I am a simple person. I was criticized in the previous session by one participant. It was not GAC participant but also [indiscernible] why I am commenting. The reason I'm commenting is to give initiative for discussions. I have no other reason or interest. I do not agree with line up the ICANN pocket. The ICANN does not have pocket. The money goes to the specific fund and currently there was been a cross community working group under the chairmanship of distinguished board members [indiscernible] and they work a lot to have arrangement of how to use these funds. So it is not correct to say ICANN's pocket; it's a fund and that fund will be managed in an appropriate manner.

Number two, I think we should avoid any type of fake use or intention for gTLD. I don't think we should do that one, that would not be correct that people talk about speculation, and so on, so forth, so we should avoid this private and I'm bothered about this term initiatives, innovative. I don't personally believe that this private [indiscernible] in favor of the public interest. So we should avoid that. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you. Kavouss. Can everyone hear me well? I might have some problems with my mic. Okay. Thank you. Gulten and Kavouss, for always your insights and making sure we have more substantive and

EN

meaningful discussions within the GAC which I know it can be a challenge not only given the virtual setting but also being able to follow this complex SubPro PDP. There is a lot to follow. So I do appreciate those comments --

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Luisa, just to let you know, we have Jorge's hand up and we have a question in the Q&A pod from Annaliese.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge, do you want to go first and then we can read Annaliese's question. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you so much, Luisa. Actually, my intervention was going a little bit in the direction of Annaliese's question in the sense that most of the discussion in the chat room and let's say the voice discussion during the session we had six hour ago in SubPro went in the direction of trying to determine, trying to establish those guard rails for avoiding frivolous applications, so applications that in the end try to benefit from some sort of gaming, be it the private auctions of the last round or some other system. At the same time, it appeared to me that there were many interventions trying to safeguard somehow the private auctions system, although not directly but it didn't -- it wasn't very clear to me why those interventions were being made.

And I also found it a little bit difficult that when others like me brought into the discussion other systems of resolving such conflict sets, they were dismissed very quickly in the discussion also by some of those same participants who were apparently trying to safeguard the private auctions solution.

So I was wondering whether this discussion is already closed in the sense that in any case there will be some sort of auctions or whether there is still a chance to consider other resolution systems like drawing lots which is used in other kind of economic decisions where you have to -- two equally valid applicants or other systems that may radically disincentive such gaming behavior because I remind ourselves of prior GAC input on these issues where basically we were quite critical of private auctions. So I leave it by that and thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge, just providing an opportunity for Jeff and Cheryl if you want to provide a response or any thoughts, thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, this is Jeff Neuman and I just heard from Cheryl, she sent her apologies because there's another session going on at the exact same time within ALAC dealing with applicant support and community, so she's covering that meeting while I'm here covering this one so she send her apologies.

So both of these questions -- I should say all three of the comments present an excellent question. I think with respect to Jorge Cancio's question, we have been discussing the issue of contention sets and mechanisms for last resort for a number of years and not everyone has been around for all of those discussions over the last five years but early on we asked through public comment periods for comments on the different mechanisms for resolving contention sets and where that came out was -- and we presented options like Jorge, the one you had mentioned -- but drawing lots or randomization. We also offered the options of sort of like a request for proposal to subjectively judge applications. There were a number of different mechanisms that we put out for public comment even well before the initial report and also asked some questions about that for the initial report and it just didn't seem there was any consensus within the community to change the mechanism of last resort to an ICANN public auction.

So unfortunately, I would say for now that issue is closed but I will as I said in the session Jorge, send you links to all of those materials that were discussed for a number of months. And I wouldn't ever say anything is completely closed because it is certainly possible for the community to come around and their their mind. At this point we just didn't see any chance of getting consensus on a different mechanism ultimately than than an ICANN auction.

With respect to question from Annaliese which is a great question and one that we just started discussions on, which is how do we determine whether an application is -- or applicant has applied for with a bona

fide or good faith attempt or intent to operate the TLD. There were members of the community that respond today that very question drawing analogy to at least in the United States you had to filing a trademark application where you have to certificate you have a good faith or bona fide attempt to use that trademark in connection with goods or services and if the patent and trademark examiner's office aren't convinced that that intent, they have the option of asking follow-up questions, which we think could be done here -- obviously not the patent and trademark office but evaluators of applications could ask follow-up questions to see whether that is intent to operate the string. But this discussion is just starting on that. I think we will have additional discussions on this subject after the ICANN meeting and this will likely be an area where we will draw attention in the draft final report to get additional comments from the community including the GAC. So I hope that answers those questions.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jeff, for those comprehensive responses and just mindful of our time, I do want to give you an opportunity to give us an update in terms of other topic, I think discussing in the today's PDP session was the predictable framework.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sure, and I will try too make this one shorter, I apologize no taking up so much time. On this next issue really dealt with how are changes to the program, the new gTLD program, introduced in a predictable

manner that ensures not only that we have ICANN org considering these changes but also considering the changes within the community and making sure that what had in the 2012 round really was each new issue that arose after the publication of the guidebook was handled in a different manner. Some took a number of years to resolve and other processes were made up as we went along. Hopefully we can address most of the issues that we think will arise in the next round through all of the work we have been doing but realistically know there will always be new issues that will come up. So we discussed in the session of creation of what we're calling the SPIRT Team -- sorry, we can go on in the slides probably a couple slides in. I apologize, we can go one more slide. Back one.

So the SPIRT Team would be comprised of members from the community, the role would really be to vet issues as they come in to make sure that thank knowing the appropriate place to be resolved. So if it is a policy issue, for example, then the SPIRT Team would refer that issue so the GNSO council to use one of its processes to try to figure out a solution to that issue. If it involved something that was purely an ICANN org internal procedure, let's say changing for example changing a system that is used to accept comments or changing the software used to collect those comments and display those, those types of things to make sure we're providing flexibility to ICANN org to make these necessary changes but also ensuring there is mechanism for input from the community.

So it's important to note that this team would never be used to make

the policy itself or circumvent the policy process, that this SPIRT Team would always be subordinate to the GNSO council, to make sure it sticks to its remit and also to make sure that it was able to bring in experts as different issues arise to get the appropriate advice.

So the questions we had during this session were really some of the concerns that had been expressed within the working group which is how do we really make sure this SPIRT Team is not used to make policy, that it's not another organization that applicants or the community can lobby to get a decision that it wants? How do we also ensure that ICANN org has the flexibility it needs to administer the process and not have the community get too far into the weeds and also how does the SPIRT Team actually determine whether the issue is one that should be referred to the GNSO or some other process that should apply. So those were really the issues that we were discussing during the session today.

I think from my read of how of discussion turned out, I think there's support within the community to have more predictability around these issues. I think there's support for some kind of standing panel that could serve in this function, and I think we're down to some of the finer issues or really the what we will call down into the weeds on how this group actually operates and how we can ensure that it involves participation from the community and doesn't make things too overly complicated.

So I will stop there and see if there are any questions at this point. I do

see one in the chat, if that's okay -- or sorry, in the Q&A pod, but it's not from a GAC member so Luisa, I want to defer to you and to Manal on moving forward.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jeff and as always, appreciate your engagement with the GAC in providing a brief update on the latest status of those two items in regards private auctions but also the predictability framework. And again, I can attest that the working group has been working very hard and dedicating a lot of time to find a balanced recommendations moving forward. But still, lots of moving pieces, and so as we would like to give priority to GAC members' questions or comments, so just waiting a few more minutes to see if there's any questions and comments of GAC members in relation to the predictability framework. Back up if not, happy to take Jonathan Robertson's question.

GULTEN TEPE: We have a hand up from Jorge.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Perfect. Thank you. Jorge, please go ahead.

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

JORGE CANCIO, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Luisa. As nobody from the GAC is taking the floor, just two short comments. First, I think we are all for predictability. The question is whether the new instrument compensates the added complexity with a clear added value, and this is a call for the working group. And the second piece of my comment is to of course if there is any instrument, I think it's important that GAC is well represented there. So that's from my part. Thank you.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jorge. And just, again, trying to wrap up this item so we can take Jonathan's question. And he says is the SPIRT Team would remove the need for the previous [indiscernible] program committee or likely to need a new gTLD [indiscernible] again? Jeff, are you able to provide any insights to that question or do you need further clarification?

JEFF NEUMAN: No problem. So thanks, Jonathan for the question. So ultimately issues are -- or solutions are always going to be -- going to need ICANN board approval, I should say most cases. So this would not remove the need for a committee of the board or the board as a whole from ultimately resolving the issue but hopefully through the SPIRT Team through its collaboration with ICANN board and its representativeness of the community and collaboration of the community that that will provide the ICANN board with useful information to solve the issues that they can then instead of having the board do all of the work,

hopefully it would be vetted to a particular place to help the ICANN board make its ultimate decision.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you, Jeff, and thank you for the questions. I believe Vincent from France has his hand up. If you do, if you could please unmute yourself. Thank you. We still can't hear you.

FRANCE: This is Vincent Gouillart, French Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the record. Thank you very much Jeff for this useful and clear presentation and since I have short and technical question for Jeff I will not speak in French at this time, it will be easier to ask it straight in English. My question is if such a system, if the SPIRT system were put in place, how would GAC refer to it and raise new issues? Because if I remember well, the session at the beginning of the day, your definition of community would enclose GAC while all the AC and SO's, if I remember well, and the working group vision, could GAC refer to the SPIRT through GAC advice or would it be through simple notification from the GAC leadership or should GAC define its own procedure? Do all of vision you have a vision on this? Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. It's a great question. At this point because this is a PDP within the generic name supporting organization, the SPIRT Team

would take its ultimate direction from the GNSO but we have provided for mechanisms to issues to be introduced by ICANN org and the ICANN board. So if the GAC has issued advice to the board, we presume that the board would then direct the issue to the SPIRT Team. And again, the SPIRT Team is envisioned to have members from different supporting organizations and advisory committees to help and serve on the team to help resolve these issues.

So at this point, absent I guess the GAC saying it would like to refer issues directly to the SPIRT Team, the only thing we could say as our group is that we would take issues from the GNSO council and the ICANN board and ICANN org. Hopefully that helps.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you, Jeff. I do see in the queue a question from Kavouss. Please, Kavouss, go ahead.

IRAN: Do you hear me, please.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Loud and clear.

IRAN: Thank you. I think we should avoid ramification in the ICANN organization and ICANN community and so on, so forth, creating review team, implementation team, oversight team, all of these teams, we don't know who is doing what, who is responsible for what. We have spent about two years to have accountability but now with the creation of all these things we don't know what is the area of responsibility, of obligation, who reports to whom, who decides for whom, it is very, very difficult.

I don't think that GAC advice should go from the ICANN to the SPIRT Team and so on, so forth, we don't have that, currently we have one single channel, GAC to ICANN board. That's all. If there is anything, people go to the ICANN board, it would be creating another intermediate so we don't know where we are and we're lost. I don't think the idea is in favor of the GAC. Thank you, this is my personal view.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Kavouss. So this new mechanism is not intended to take anything away from the GAC or GAC advice. In fact it's really just a tool that we see that could help vet these issues and help rather than just relying on the ICANN board who is not necessarily experts in all of these things and certainly has a lot of other concerns on its plate, this really is a mechanism to try to help the ICANN board understand the issues -- actually to help the GNSO council to understand these issues and to help do some of the preliminary work so that when it does get

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

to the ICANN board level the board is much more informed about the issues. So this is in no way trying to take anything away from the GAC or any of its [indiscernible] as exists today. It's really meant as a tool to help.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you, Jeff, and I'm glad we're having an engaged discussion. I know there's a lot of issues to consider and sometimes challenging to follow. Just making sure we have no other questions or comments from GAC members or parts of the community. Just checking here quickly. If not, we can go -- can continue the presentation. And thank you Jeff again for make yourself available. We will be focusing more on the GAC input that was submitted on the five priority topics but at the same time reviewing the current status of the recommendations so Jeff, we will continue to need your expertise in terms of the latest status of recommendations as we know there's a lot of moving pieces. But thank you again for your time. So we can pass to the next slide please.

Wonderful. So we wanted -- and again, mindful of the time but we can always continue the discussions in tomorrow's session. But we wanted to ensure the GAC members were aware of the individual GAC input, again to get a sense of where there's more alignment or less alignment and also get a sense of where the status of recommendations regarding the GAC priority topics are at in the SubPro PDP. So we will be reviewing and providing -- again, high level

ICANN68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

summary, we encourage GAC members if you want to get a sense of more detailed GAC individual member responses to go to the GAC compilation posted in the GAC website but providing more of a high level sense and also we will switch back and review the GAC scorecard to answer any questions, to review and get a better sense of the latest status of the recommendations in regards to this priority topic. So I will start with the applicant support. So individual GAC members mostly supported all the draft recommendations, so they were aligned with previous GAC advice, some GAC members supported expanding, made emphasis on expanding outreach and [indiscernible] targeted regions beyond the global south. Also the GAC mentioned that there should be further policy development appropriation of activities in the finding of underserved regions, capacity building outreach and funding mechanisms and also input in relation to defining clear measurable goals and indicators for the applications and the importance of an evaluation to assess success.

So again, that's just to give you a high level overview of what the GAC individual members submitted. And if we can switch to the GAC scorecard because now we will get a better sense of where the current status related to the applicant support program is and I think here -- so this is the GAC scorecard which in addition to providing a summary of previous GAC input and a summary of the current status of the deliberation and is draft recommendations in the PDP working group, GAC support has been working closely with the GNSO support staff and also in a way to prioritize, we have created a color coding to get a sense of where we should be focusing a bit more our attention. But

again, this is all subject to conversation with the whole GAC membership and subject to change.

So we can scroll down and go to applicant support program. So this one we categorized it color coding green so this will give you a sense if we look at the status of the PDP working group deliberations, the scope of the program has been extended beyond only the common use classified by the UN as least developed countries, so I think this was aligned with previous GAC advice, also the expansion of the scope of financial support to cover costs such as application writing fees, attorney fees related to the whole application process, also ICANN org to continue facilitating nonfinancial assistance, this was also in alignment with previous GAC advice in relation to pro bono assistance and also important improvements in the applicant program in relation to outreach and communications and awareness raising activities before the program is launched.

So again, this is just to bring everyone more or less on the same page and up to speed in regards to the latest status of recommendations in relation to applicant supported program. So I will stop hear to see if any questions and also Jeff if you want to provide any further clarification or updates, they're always welcome. Again, it's hard to keep track of all the moving pieces. But I will stop there and see if there are any questions or further comments from GAC members. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: So this is Jeff, I guess while waiting for people to raise hair hands. I can say that the comments from the GAC members on this issue were very helpful and I think they were very much aligned with the way that the working group was heading anyway. So I think that this subject in particular is one that the GAC should be happy with and certainly aligned. So this is one of -- although a complicated subject, this is one of the areas that the GAC seemed to be well aligned with the working group.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Wonderful, Jeff, thank you. That's really good news. We do know the working group has been very diligent in terms of enhancing and then sugar future success of this program -- ensuring future success of this program. If we could go to the next topic please.

So the next GAC priority topic is closed generics. And so in relation to the GAC compilation of individual input, majority of GAC members continue to support previously articulated GAC advice which is included in the GAC 2013 Beijing advice. And so it read: Exclusive registry -- (no audio).

GULTEN TEPE: Luisa, this is Gulten speaking. I think we just lost you -- okay, you are back.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Sorry, Gulten, were you able to hear me in relation to a quick update on the closed generics?

GULTEN TEPE: We missed your -- Benedetta, go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: We lost you right before you were about to mention the exclusive registry access.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Perfect. And I was just reminding everyone of what the GAC Beijing advice said, in relation to closed generics, should serve public interest goal and note some individual members also noted that public interest could or should be defined and also noting that when the GAC consultation took place it was in April, May, so there are I know a few moving pieces that have been taking place in relation to this topic in the working group. So if we go to the GAC scorecard to get a sense of the latest developments in relation to closed generics in the SubPro PDP working group.

So -- and here I will also ask Jeff for clarification to ensure I'm explaining this topic well. But our understanding is that the working group after a lot of debate and discussions, there has been no agreement in terms of next steps in relation to closed generics. And so

I'm just reviewing here the GAC scorecard. But I believe -- I mean, before I will ask Jeff for further clarification and the latest status on closed generics. Challenges of the discussions included how do you define closed generics. Defining public interest and goals, evaluating whether public interest may be served, perhaps developing a framework [indiscernible] perceived benefits and harms of closed generics. But again, I will ask Jeff to give us quick update on the latest developments in regards to the closed generics. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Luisa. And I think this summarizes it fairly well. While there are certainly working group members that would like to find a way of allowing closed generics if they serve a public interest goal, it's been very difficult within the working group to agree on what that actually means and how that would be evaluated. So at this point we don't have any agreement within the working group to allow the closed generics and I think we will see in the draft final report that reflected. So I'm not hugely optimistic working group will find a final solution, at least for the draft report it will most likely say there's been no agreement but it will review the different areas discussed.

LUISA PAEZ, GAC VICE-CHAIR: Thank you, Jeff, and again, we do know that this has been an ongoing and outstanding issues and there has been lots of meaningful discussions within the working group. So we will monitor when the final report comes out in July to see what will be included in relation

to the closed generics. But thank you for confirming that to date there has been no agreement.

And so I am mindful of the time so I do want to check with Manal whether we still have a few minutes for introducing the next topic or do you think it's best to continue the presentation of the other three topics, three or four -- I think it's three, in tomorrow's session, Manal. Thank you, or Jorge, as well, just I'm being mindful of the time.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Luisa. I agree with you, we only have two minutes left so I doubt we will be able to get into a discussion of the two remaining topics -- three, sorry. So that said, I thank you very much, everyone, and thank you for the good discussion and the active engagement. This concludes this session on subsequent procedures. We still have another session tomorrow. It's now time for a 30-minute break and please be back in the Zoom room at half past. We will be starting or DNS abuse mitigation discussion. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]