GNSO/GAC Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics
16 March 2023 Meeting Notes

At the request of Closed Generic (CG) Dialogue Participants, an ad-hoc meeting was held during ICANN76 in order for participants to make use of the opportunity to further discuss the CG framework face-to-face and virtually. Several participants were unable to attend this session, therefore the group agreed it would continue discussions but not make any decisions during this meeting.

Participants discussed the following:
- The facilitated dialogue moderator introduced the new Executive Summary of the Preliminary Framework Discussion Draft v2 document, containing a collection of the group's agreed framework elements thus far.

- Participants discussed some of the feedback they received from their communities at ICANN76, noting concerns about dependencies with the next round of new gTLDs, the timeline for delivering a workable framework, and the need for community consensus/buy-in after the framework is developed.

- The Board will likely request a timeline for CG policy work to be provided by ICANN77.

- After the CG framework is finalized by the facilitated dialogue group, it will undergo a GNSO policy process, which may or may not be a PDP. All options are currently open. Before the CG framework is finalized, participants have committed to sharing preliminary outputs with their communities for input.

- There were concerns noted that the framework being developed will not be practical from an applicant's standpoint, i.e. the rules and criteria will be so stringent that no CG applications will be able to qualify or succeed. While the group's framework will not be the final word on the topic of Closed Generics (as further refinement will occur during the subsequent GNSO policy process), the group should continue to strive for clarity, predictability, and practicality in its outputs.

- Participants discussed whether there are lessons to be learned from the SubPro Working Group's recommendations concerning community-based applications, several of which make it more possible to approve community-based applications.

- Participants discussed whether it should provide examples in its framework, to help mitigate concerns of vagueness or different interpretations. The CG applications from the 2012 round or the group's example use cases may be considered for this purpose.

ACTION ITEMS:
- Participants to review version 2 of the Preliminary Framework Discussion Draft and comment within the document if they disagree with any of the agreed (bolded) framework elements.