

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC and GAC joint call on SubPro.

On the call today, we have Yrjö Lansipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Manal Ismail, Luisa Paez, Joanna Kulesza, and Maureen Hilyard.

From At-Large staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

On the GAC support, we have Robert Hoggarth, Benedetta Rossi, Gülten Tepe, and Julia Charvolen.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name for the transcript purposes and to please keep your microphone muted while not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you all very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you very much. Welcome, everybody, to this call, to this joint GAC-ALAC call specifically on SubPro issues. I welcome everybody. Thank you to the chairs of ALAC and GAC joining this call, Joanna, vice chair, and a special welcome to Shi Young Chang who is the GAC counterpart to me, the special liaison from GAC to ALAC.

I also want to note that Joanna Kulesza, who is the vice chair of ALAC, is also now the shadow liaison from the ALAC side to the GAC. That is to say, my successor from the next AGM meeting.

---

*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.*

---

We have a short agenda on a couple of substantive items, and AOB. Is this agenda acceptable? Any objections? If not, we can use this agenda. And on the AOB, I would propose that we say a few words about the next ICANN meeting, ICANN 70, and perhaps about issues that we could tackle between the ALAC and GAC at this meeting, apart from the sort of standing issues we have with SubPro and EPDP.

Okay, so without further ado, I think we can go to the first item, which is the At-Large brief for the Governmental Advisory Committee on subsequent procedures. And on this, of course, we especially wait for the replies, the answers from the GAC side to this brief, which was submitted by Justine about a month ago.

But perhaps, Justine, if you want to say a few words first about this document.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Yrjö. Just by way of summary, I guess, I hope that folks here have at least skimmed through this [particular] document. It is a brief which essentially contains the deliberations undertaken by the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group in deliberating on the subsequent procedures final report, and it summarizes the issues that the CPWG at that point in time when I wrote the draft was recommending to the ALAC to respond or make a statement to the SubPro final report in the form of submission of a minority statement according to GNSO PDP procedures.

And in fact, what has happened is the consensus call to the final report has taken place, and the consensus designations have been released as

---

of 15 of January, and we have proceeded to transform or transpose this brief to an ALAC statement that was submitted on the due date of 18th of January, and the actual copy of the ALAC statement, I believe Yrjö has circulated that, it also appears as a link in the agenda.

So, we were basically wanting to see, as Yrjö has pointed out, whether GAC or our counterparts at least have any responses to the particular areas and the corresponding submissions that we've made to those areas.

I'd just like to point out that in terms of the statement that went in for inclusion to the subsequent procedures final report, we have touched on eight issues, as you can see from pages one through four of this document. Moving forward, the ALAC is intending to submit advice or transmit advice to the Board. We're in fact in the process of crafting that particular advice, but that particular advice would include these eight issues that you see on page one to four, as well as two others, which are name collision and the CCT recommendations, the competition, consumer choice and consumer trust review team recommendations that were made in 2018.

And as I said, we're hoping to seek any input from GAC, any responses from GAC to these issues. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Justine. Now, perhaps we can take this brief, topic point by point and listen to the responses, if any, from the GAC side. So, can I ask to scroll the document so that we see the first one? Thank you. Which is

---

the DNS abuse mitigation. And any input, any comments and reactions from the GAC side, please?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yrjö, we have Jorge with his hand up.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello everybody. Happy new year from my side, from cold Switzerland. Very happy to be with you here in this call, and thanks so much to Justine for the introduction, to Yrjö and to all of you for the good cooperation. I'm not sure, but perhaps Manal and Luisa may correct me. If we are in a position to go item by item, if this makes sense, we can try and at least we can convey to you high-level idea of what is the status of our thinking, and I would also suggest that Luisa, if you want to chime in, of course, do correct e, do complement me, and so we can give some feedback to ALAC.

So, I don't know if that's a good way to proceed.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Jorge. As far as I'm concerned, that is fine. But if that is acceptable to the GAC, let's go ahead. Manal, please.

---

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Yjrö, and thanks, Jorge. Just to confirm, Jorge, we haven't discussed this within the GAC as Jorge hinted, so any views being shared today is where the GAC leadership discussion stands until we share this with GAC colleagues and then can come back with a more solid position on behalf of the GAC. But I think definitely, we can share where we're heading towards, at least from the GAC leadership perspective, if this is okay with you, Jorge and Luisa, as our [inaudible].

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Manal. I think we understand fully that perhaps not everything is agreed within the GAC, but I think that the views from you, from the leadership and the topic leads, will be enormously useful and important for Justine and from others, from outside, when we go through the next step, which is [getting] the advice to the Board.

So, who would like to start from the GAC side? Luisa, please.

LUISA PAEZ: Hello everyone. Just wanted to make sure my mic works. I'm happy to be here and wanted to echo Jorge's comment in regards to the excellent [inaudible] as well as the excellent work that Justine has done. As always, we appreciate the collaboration with the ALAC as well moving forward.

If you want, Jorge, you can go ahead and start. Not sure if we need to go item by item, but perhaps we can maybe start by prioritizing the items that are most important to the GAC. But happy to follow along as well.

---

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. So let's try to improvise some sort of reaction. The first thing, as Manal said, is that of course, we've seen the final form of the recommendations only on December 22nd, so you may imagine that although we have informed the GAC, it's really impossible mission to get GAC consensus reaction on this.

From the leadership, and as topic leads, have analyzed the recommendations and we tended not to file a minority statement, because we saw on one side, of course, the problem of the timing to get GAC position. We also saw that this was a bit decentivized by the PDP working group leadership. And finally, also, if we take a broader, more strategic perspective, although there re differences still between prior GAC positions, especially the GAC consensus input we filed on September 29th, there is a large degree of convergence with GAC positions overall, especially if we look back at the history and how different positions from GNSO and GAC were for instance during the first round. So that's as a way of introduction.

Regarding the specific topics, what we are doing for your information is updating the so-called GAC score card, which is a document which analyzes many of the areas of the final draft report of the final report now, and where we compare prior GAC positions with the final recommendations, and then we present some points for consideration of the GAC. And those points of consideration are oriented to facilitate a discussion in, let's say, two steps. First step is to consider whether on the areas where we find more divergence, GAC input to the GNSO council is merited, and this would be in the next weeks, probably, depending on how fast also the GNSO council will analyze and decide on the final report.

---

And as a second and probably more important step, we will also consider whether any advice to the Board is pertinent. And here, of course, we think that at least we will have the opportunity of the ICANN 70 meeting, and we will also have to consider and see what plans the ICANN Board has as soon as they receive the final report from the GNSO council, provided it is approved by the GNSO council, especially regarding a possible Operational Design Phase, which probably—and I'm just trying to make an educated guess—would mean that for some months, there would be some analysis of the whole final report before the ICANN Board takes any position. So that would give us probably the opportunity even to discuss the final report and perhaps aspects of the findings in the ODP phase even in ICANN 71.

So that's a bit the context, and as said, we are still finalizing our analysis of the issues, but if I can go over the briefing that you prepared on the final report and which has been extremely useful for us, also for our analysis and preparing the documentation we are working on. If we look at DNS abuse mitigation, your first point, and especially recommendation 9.15, of course, there is large convergence there.

What is not decided yet in the GAC or where we are still waiting to a certain extent is to see whether the holistic effort which the GNSO council was talking about last year is triggered or not, because at least for us, what is paramount or what is a red line to a certain extent, is that in the GAC advice from Montréal at the end of 2019, we said that DNS abuse recommendations coming from the CCTRT review have to be implemented before the next round starts. Whether this is done by the SubPro working group or by a different GNSO effort, it's something that we haven't taken too strong of an opinion, although in the GAC

---

---

consensus input from September, we expressed our concerns with the approach taken by the SubPro working group of not really making any recommendation on it.

So this would be the first issue. I don't know if there are any reactions.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you very much for this, Jorge. I ask if Justine or anybody else from the small group, from the ALAC side, would have a comment or a question. Meanwhile, there is a comment from Justine in the chat that final report is on the agenda of the GNSO council meeting tomorrow, but council isn't expected to vote on it until its February meeting.

The ALAC isn't rushing to transmit advice to the Board, but it's looking for transmission accordingly. But if there's no comment on the first point, I would like to ask Jorge to comment on the second one.

JORGE CANCIO:

Okay. Thank you so much, Yrjö, and I'll try to continue squeezing my brains, because I'm doing this off the cuff, so to say. And on enforceability and registry voluntary commitments, I think we have shared views. Let's say that the GAC consensus input from September which set more or less the bar of what are the GAC opinions went in a very similar direction of expressing concerns that the recommendations didn't provide all the necessary elements for having clear and enforceable public interest commitments in all cases. We have expressed that we welcome that at least the mandatory public interest commitments from the 2012 round were included as policy



---

recommendations but that there is still way to go also regarding affirmation 41 and recommendation [41 on] the compliance of these conditions.

So I think probably, we haven't gone so much into the detail, although in the GAC scorecard, we are trying to offer all the detail as possible to the GAC membership, and probably, we will certainly consider this as a high priority topic, and if we end up having an agreement in the GAC on inputs to the GNSO or to the Board, they will certainly go into a very similar direction as what you have in the briefing.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Any comments from the ALAC side? Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, so we can go further. Can we scroll to the next phase? And next one is closed generics. Yes.

JORGE CANCIO:

Yes. Closed generics, that's a great topic. Here, at least speaking personally in this case, I think that in the GAC input from September, which was a GAC consensus input on closed generics, we provided a lot of meat on the bones for this discussion, and at least personally, again, speaking on my own behalf, I was a bit dismayed and I expressed this in my response to the consensus call, that all the elements that the GAC had provided which were really adding more clarity to the Beijing advice on closed generics of 2013 I think, that all these elements hadn't been really discussed in depth in the working group, and that it was

---

apparently so difficult, so impossible to reach any sort of agreement or even a way forward in the working group.

So I guess that we don't have the solution either in our hands, because at least as we pointed to in the GAC consensus statement last September, we were of the opinion that really working out, fleshing out that consensus is a task for the working group, and we were providing some direction.

For instance, stating the support from GAC members to the proposals one and three, which had been proposed within the working group. So it wasn't an endorsement, but the opinion in the GAC was that both proposals went into the right direction, meaning the one with number one, the one where Alan Greenberg was part of the team, and number three, the one that had been proposed by Jeff Neuman in his personal capacity.

And the GAC also had been clear in excluding the possibility of accepting the second proposal, which was more or less for an open, free for all approach to closed generics.

So here, we might also consider very closely in GAC discussions what the effect is of not having a policy recommendation and what that means in terms of suspension or not of closed generics for subsequent rounds, and so on and so forth. I think there's also convergence there.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Justine, please.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Closed generics is one of those topics where there was extreme divergence within the positions within the SubPro PDP working group members. It's also one of the areas where the ICANN Board actually intervened in the last round.

So there's precedent for that. And because there's no recommendations coming up from the subsequent procedures- working group, which the Board asked for, I think there is good grounds for both our ACs to advise the Board to take proactive action to deal with closed generic applications in a way that addresses the public internet issue. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Justine. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We spent an awful lot of time on this, and we spent a lot of time talking about things like should we ban closed generics. And that of course got a visceral reaction from the people who wanted them. I think the wording we ended up with was quite appropriate, and we ended up going back to the words the GAC used in its Beijing advice to the Board, and that is focusing on global public interest. Domains that serve a global public interest.

One of the things that troubled us as we went along is it became obvious that one could have a TLD in the public interest but it served a very specific, targeted public interest and might be opposed to other public interest things. That was one of the problems with Jeff Neuman's

---

proposal that it could serve a public interest but you could find that there was competition for it bcc there were competing public interests in the same area.

And the wording the GAC originally used was global public interest. I think that was inspired, and that's why we ended up using that same term here. And again, we're not saying you can never have global public interest domains, but since the working group did not come up with a recommendation on how to do it, which is what the Board asked for, we're saying the Board really should have no choice but to suspend any closed generics until such time as a future working group comes up with advice as to how to implement TLDs that do serve the global public interest.

So I'm optimistic that GAC will reiterate its Beijing advice on this one and that will coincide virtually 100% with what we're saying. And hopefully, that'll be sufficient for the Board to take this kind of action. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. Any comments from GAC side on this? If not, let's go to the applicant support.

JORGE CANCIO:

I continue trying to offer you an educated information for where our thinking is. On applicant support, there is also a wealth of positions, of suggestions in our September input. We've seen some mixed reception of those suggestions in the final recommendation. Some of the

---

suggestions have been included in some way or the other in the new text, although there is, at least from how we see this preliminarily, something that is very clearly lacking or which we had advocated for is the question of ongoing registration fees, where we had advocated for reduction or elimination to expand the financial support available to eligible applicants under the applicant support program.

And this will be one of the pieces for consideration for the GAC, but of course, we will also look at the elements you mentioned in your minority statement.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Any comments from ALAC side? If not, let's scroll to the auctions and private resolution of contention sets here.

JORGE CANCIO:

This is another very tricky and very technical area of the recommendations, and we haven't gone into the same degree of detail and of depth you have in both your briefing and the minority statement, although if you look at our September input, which was, I think, full consensus on this part, there are different elements that have been always in GAC's thinking, for instance, that we shouldn't use private resolutions when for instance a community application and general application are in a contention set. Second, that private auctions should be very strongly decentivized. This is not a ban, or at least we didn't have a consensus on a ban, but it's very close—at least in my mind—to a ban or to limiting this to the maximum.

---

And we also expressed doubts that all the provisions about the bona fide commitments were really enough to meet the concerns that the ICANN Board had expressed. So we also have seen quite a mixed record in how these suggestions have percolated in the final recommendations, and this will be certainly a high priority issue which we will look at in the GAC.

And at least personally—and this is just for your information—I have cosigned a minority statement from Jim Prendergast and others, I think Alan is also on that one. So perhaps I also step aside a little bit if Luisa wants to chime in on this one.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes, Luisa, please.

LUISA PAEZ:

Thank you, Jorge. Thank you very much, and I think on this item, as Jorge mentioned, it's quite technical, complex, and I think it's a topic that we'll have to discuss meaningfully within the GAC and also be mindful of differences if there is within the GAC membership in regards to next steps, but it's a topic we are following closely. But nothing else to add at this point. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Luisa. There is, as Jorge said, a fresh minority statement on this issue, and from ALAC side, Alan and Christopher are among the cosigners. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you very much. This is an interesting one. When I look back on the number of discussions we had within the working group, they're interesting, but the really interesting thing is the consolidation within the top-level domain name industry that's happened in the last number of months. And given that we were worried at the beginning about some players would have vast amounts of money and would be putting in very large numbers of applications, and since then, there's been significant consolidation within the industry, so the problem, if anything, has gotten worse while we've been discussing it.

So I think anything that any of us can do to stop private auctions at the kind of huge amounts that we've seen before and the amount of leverage that companies have by winning it who can then bid in other auctions at outrageous amounts, I think this is one that I'm oping that we'll be effective at making sure there's an outcome where a small number of very rich players cannot abuse the whole situation and treat it as their private playground. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. Justine next.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. Yes, I totally agree with what Alan has just said in terms of the consolidation in the industry. It's also interesting that this particular topic drew some expressed concerns from the Board. Namely, two, if my memory serves me correctly, which was allowing the shuffling of

---

funds for applicants who can divert proceeds from one particular auction to fund another auction. That clearly would benefit or advantage large players who are able to submit multiple applications as opposed to niche players or applicant support who are requiring applicant support, for example, who are just applying for a single TLD. So that is a case that I think we should put forward to the Board to reiterate the concerns, and the fact that there is no solution in sight that would alleviate those concerns. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Justine. Christopher, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Hi. Good evening. Thank you, Yrjö. Thank you, GAC, for hearing from us. First, Jim Prendergast's paper which I've also cosigned, is very explicit and quite extensive, and it's most important for the whole procedure that dissenting statements are included in the final report.

Secondly, I have opposed the auction scenarios for nearly two years now. There is an entrenched interest group in the PDP of demanding the maintenance of auctions as an option, and private auctions.

All I would say to the GAC at this stage is just think about how the auction system would work if you have a GAC member proposing a public interest geographical TLD for part of your country, confronting a competing application from a brand company or some other commercial use of the name completely outside your country, and it goes to auction.



---

I think there would be a significant economic and political problem in that area, and I can foresee difficulties between GAC and ICANN in that context, because at the national level, most people and most sensible people would regard it as an outrage that the government should have to pay a substantial bid in an auction in order to retain the rights to use the geographical name which relates to their country, or indeed part of it, or a city.

This is completely wrong, and as I think has already been made clear, the whole auction scenario of privileges of the most well-financed applications which almost certainly will not usually be either community applications or geographical applications, something has to be done about that. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Christopher. So this is another very [fertile] area for our cooperation. Okay, we have 15 minutes more. So we have a few items. Let's scroll to community priority evaluation, CPE. Jorge, please, your comments on this.

JORGE CANCIO:

Sure. Thank you, Yrjö. Just on auctions, SSAD, there's a longstanding positioning from the GAC being quite critical to the use of private auctions and as said, also having community-based applications and generic applications in auction contention sets. So I think that's quite a standing position.

---

On community-based applications, I think we also delivered a lot of input in our consensus input from September. We've seen some elements—or rather, many—being included in the recommendations and in the affirmations. There are still some parts which are probably missing, so I tend to think that the omissions you highlight in your minority statements will be certainly part of the thinking or of the food for thought we will present to the GAC for consideration an input to GNSO, to the Board.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Yrjö. Many of the recommendations and implementation guidance included in the final report on community priority evaluation arose from discussions that took place after the public comment for the draft final report was completed. So, many of these recommendations may not have seen the light of day in terms of public viewing up until now when the final report is out.

So, I think there are grounds for us to consider if the GAC has opinions on anything that has been omitted. The At-Large worked very hard on this to push the envelope to get a lot of recommendations included into the final report, considering that the original recommendation was quite very high level, didn't include much detail when it came out in the draft final report. So we would appreciate if GAC had any items to share that they think had been omitted from the recommendations herein. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Justine. Any comments? Yes, please, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO: Yeah, from my side, just reacting to Justine, she's absolutely right. A lot of the details come only after the public consultation which finalized in September, and at least I appreciate very much, I'm very thankful for the fact that at least a lot of the thinking that was in the GAC consensus input from September which came from GAC members who have had experience with this process and the 2012 round have now found their place in the final recommendations. But of course, as said, we will look into the omissions. And for sure, the minority statement from ALAC will help us in that.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you. Okay. We go then to the next, which is of course geographical names, and all that.

JORGE CANCIO: I have to laugh a little bit, or at least smile, because I was one of those who spent endless hours in the Work Track 5 sending hundreds of emails on this. So let's say that I have very strong personal views and national views on this matter. At the same time, putting my GAC leadership topic lead hat on, our conclusion as the GAC, at least in the GAC consensus input in September and also before, is, okay, Work Track 5 didn't please all people, but it struck more or less an acceptable balance. That's why we didn't identify this really as a high priority, and

---

---

in the GAC consensus input, we included the suggestion from some GAC members of establishing some kind of notification tool for GAC members whenever there is a TLD application with a geographic significance or connotation.

And I have to smile of course because this is something I proposed in Work Track 5 itself where we were about to find the consensus with even people from the IPC, but in the last mile, it was really impossible to find a consensus. So here, bearing in mind the different views within the GAC, I doubt very much that we will intervene too forcefully.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Jorge. Like you, and like Justine, I also have my memories from Work Track 5, and this of course, what we have here on the screen, is something that the ALAC has been giving support to those members of the GAC who wanted to have a notification tool and wanted to have more preventive protection. But anyway, this is there and it may not go through, it may not be realizable in the end, but that's, anyway, what we have here on the ALAC. Justine, yes please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Yrjö. Just very quickly, yeah, we definitely support GAC in asking for a notification tool. The one that Jorge has mentioned already. Also, I should say that we appreciate the fact that the implementation for geographic names that took place in the 2012 round has now been adopted as consensus policy, so that is at least a win as far as we're concerned. Unfortunately, it didn't go as far as we would have liked, and we just want to make the point to the ICANN Board in particular to be

---

aware of situations that arise from the lacunae of noncapital city names not receiving preventive protection, and also, the non-expansion of non-AGB terms. There could be difficulties, challenges in the next round, should there be application for those, and we've seen such challenges in the 2012 round. So we just want the Board to be aware of the possibility of those happening again, because there isn't sufficient preventive protection for those kind of strings or for the ones that are not considered as AGB terms. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Any more comments on this? Yes, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you. I just wanted to add to the discussion two further points for future reference. Analyzing the difficulties that we've had to get any common sense out of the PDP, I would say that the first problem, right up at the front end of this long before my time on the Work Track 5, GAC and the ALAC—and others—seem to have accepted the proposition that geographical names are generic. They're not.

The starting point from the GNSO point of view is that all these geographical names are generic, therefore they do not have any intrinsic protection at all and are free for the taking, and everything else has been about restricting little bits of that set of generic geographical names. This was unnecessary. There was no need whatsoever to allow the geographical names to be assimilated with generic words.

---

The second point—and I speak in a personal capacity, of course, but as you know, as ex member of the GAC and ex secretary of the GAC, there are a number of people in the PDP and in GNSO who will try and grant—reluctantly—protection to names that have protected in local law. Very few countries have done anything about protecting their geographical names in their domestic law.

This is an enormous weakness in any negotiation. From my point of view, since there is a strong move to get some geographical names which are popular and commercializable, it is urgent for governments to issue a simple law that says that the use of geographical names in the annex are protected in national law.

On that basis, the whole negotiation shifts to a completely different plane. And the annex can be short or long. It can be the whole of the [inaudible] of an atlas, if you like. But the essential thing is governments and all GAC members should decide which names they wish to protect and pass domestic legislation which would achieve that end.

Local law is enough, because the European Union in 1998 demanded that ICANN should respect applicable local law.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Christopher, I'm very sorry to break in, but we are actually out of time right now.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

I finished.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. And we still have a couple of points here. Point eight is really an ALAC thing, ALAC wants to have a standing in community objections. And this was actually what was included in the ALAC statement, and there are a couple of more points which we really don't have time to talk much about. Can you scroll so that we see the rest of the paper? That is to say, number nine, name collision and competition, consumer choice and consumer trust review team.

I think that since we are out of time, we have to ask the GAC side to comment on this by e-mail or whatever, because I really want to have finished this call in time, or more or less in time. I also note that the next point on the agenda, which was preparing the eventual advice to the Board, we really have—what we have been talking about is really the stuff that both sides could use in preparing for the advice to the Board.

And so final comments, I think from Jorge and Justine, and then we go to AOB and that's it. Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO:

What can I say? Thank you very much for this briefing. Thank you very much for the work you're doing, also in the minority statement, in different interventions in the subsequent procedures area. We will, as said before, try to finalize the two documents we are preparing for the GAC. We are taking into account very closely what is in your documents. And then we will see what the appetite in the GAC for an input to GNSO council and later for the ICANN Board is. But we have to be mindful, as said before, that we will still have some months before the

---

recommendations are adopted by the ICANN Board. So there's still some area for discussing and for aligning our ships as much as possible.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you very much, Jorge. And Justine, any final words?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thank you. I totally 100% agree with what Jorge has said. I think there's still scope for collaboration. I would thank GAC members here for this call and for agreeing to continue speaking to us.

Obviously, there's still time. There is no rush to get advice, either from ALAC or GAC out to the ICANN Board, because there's still time. And we should definitely continue this conversation. And again, anytime the GAC wants to pass over issues for the ALAC to consider, including in our advice, then please, by all means, we welcome that. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you very much, Justine. AOB. There is obviously next point, cooperation, is to start planning for the ICANN 70, and for the topics of the ALAC and GAC session there. Just to note that perhaps the ODP, the Operational Design Phase, and how it is construed, might be one topic for us to discuss in virtual Cancun.

Okay, we are out of time, so if there are no other points, I just want to thank everybody very much, and I really think that we have brought forward a good cooperation of ALAC and GAC. Final words from Alan.



ALAN GREENBERG:

I just wanted to make a quick comment on the ODP, the Operational Design Phase. The ALAC is very concerned with the version two of the paper that came out, because it took away completely the ability of the community to interact with staff on the design of whatever they're designing and put it all back into the GNSO. So I think they have lost something really important, and if it goes ahead as is, it will not be able to do its job properly. For instance, in the case of the SSAD, there's no opportunity for law enforcement and cybersecurity people to get involved in that design phase, unless the GNSO happens to be willing to ask them in, but there's no guarantee at all.

So if you haven't looked at that version two document and listened to the webinar that there was last week, then it's something that certainly warrants some attention. Thank you.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. And I think we are finished. I thank you, everybody, once more, and we can finish this call. Thank you.

YESIM NAZHLAR:

Thank you all for joining. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---