GNSO/GAC Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics
19 July 2023 Meeting Notes

During this meeting, Closed Generic (CG) Dialogue Participants discussed their approaches to reviewing and gathering more community feedback on their Draft Framework. Participants also discussed whether, given the feedback received, fundamental changes to the Draft Framework may be necessary.

Participants discussed the following:

- The Facilitated Dialogue moderator recapped the group's general agreements from their previous meeting. Beginning today, the group's call recordings and new mailing list archives will be made publicly available on the Closed Generics wiki page. If a participant believes there is a need to discuss a matter under the Chatham House rule, they will provide their request and explanation to the moderator, then the moderator will communicate on the open mailing list that such a request has been made. The group will then decide whether to discuss the matter in a closed space.
- ICANN staff next provided an overview of the Community Feedback Review Tool, developed for the CG Dialogue to organize the feedback received on their Draft Framework. This tool will be used to review the community's inputs and track the group's actions after consideration of each input.
- The group discussed whether there is a need to extend the feedback solicitation period to receive input from more community groups. It was proposed that participants could share the feedback received thus far with their community groups and indicate whether there is support (or not) from their group regarding another group's input.
- Some participants expressed concerns about the amount of time it would take community groups to submit substantive input or to review the inputs of others and indicate their support/non-support. It was suggested that the latter community "cross-checking" could be done incrementally as the participants gradually review the inputs already received.
- Some participants spoke at a high-level regarding the sentiments of their community groups concerning the Draft Framework. It was noted that some inputs imply the need for substantive changes to the Framework. Participants expressed concern about the amount of time to deliberate again on areas where difficult compromise was found.
- The group discussed whether making fundamental changes to the Framework is actionable or reasonable for this group to achieve timely, noting the importance of considering all feedback. It was suggested that this effort may be better for a policy development process, however some participants disagreed that the Draft Framework should proceed to a policy process in its current state or without substantive changes per community feedback.
- Participants proposed that the leaders of their community groups meet to discuss whether a final framework is possible given the inputs received, and if so, whether the Facilitated Dialogue is the most appropriate setting to do that work, noting that such work

will likely extend the efforts of this group beyond the current timeline.

Participants generally came to agreement on the following:

- Participants generally agreed that additional community input would be helpful, should community groups wish to indicate through their CG Dialogue representatives whether they support (or do not support) the inputs submitted by another group.
- The group broadly agreed to proceed with reviewing the six feedback submissions they received thus far rather than extend the period and await more submissions.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Participants to familiarize themselves with the Community Feedback Review Tool and the inputs submitted, identifying which issues may be fundamental to arriving at a final framework document.
- Staff to update the Community Feedback Review Tool with a new field to indicate whether a submitted input also has the support of other community groups.
- Staff to schedule a call between the GAC, GNSO Council, and ALAC leadership, ideally to take place within the next two weeks.