
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Discussion on ICANN Reviews of Reviews and Operating Principles Working Group Update
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:15 CEST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN86 GAC discussion on ICANN Review of Review Session followed by the GAC Operating Principles Working Group Update on Tuesday 9th of June at 10:00 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I will now leave the floor over to GAC chair, Nicolas Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much and welcome back, everyone. So this is basically the fourth session here in Seville for the GAC. So we'll

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.

start with the discussion on review of reviews, which will be running for 45 minutes. Right after that, we'll have the GOPE working group proposal. We'll be discussing that basically till 11:15, then coffee break, and then we will be discussing registration data issues. And right after that, we'll have the following session running till 1:15 p.m. and then lunch.

And I'll stop there for the sake of time. Without further ado, I'll give the floor to Tracy, who's going to be walking us through the agenda for this 45-minute session. Over to you, Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you very much, Nico. Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU here. I'm one of the representatives from the GAC as a member on the working group, along with my colleague, Manal Ismail, who is online. Hello, Manal. And we also have the two co-chairs on site, two of the co-chairs on site, Chris Disspain and Avri Doria. And Manal is actually a co-chair as well, and she is, as you know, online. So they will be walking you through the slide presentation, as you can see on the agenda.

We have a tight schedule, and just to let you know, at the end of this, we'll be doing a temperature check using Mentimeter, so keep that in mind to see if you kind of fully understand what's happening. We just have one question for you to address. So I'm going to hand over to, I believe it will be either Chris or Avri, and

they will also involve Manal in the discussion as well. So over to you guys.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Tracy. Good morning, everybody. I'm Chris Disspain, and to my right is my co-chair, Avri. And as Tracy said, Manal is with us online as well. We're going to take you through an overview of the review of reviews, a couple of slides, and then we're going to get to the list of questions that we have from you, although I imagine there may be other questions not just confined to that list. If I could have the next slide, please.

There's a little bit missing from this slide, which I will fill in, but it's not that important. I'll explain it to you as we go ahead. Just a very brief background. The board, after a long time of reviews not happening for various different reasons, things bumping into each other, a new review starting when the last one was still being implemented, etc., etc., made a decision to suspend all the reviews and to create this review of reviews committee working group, which is a cross-community working group. Every SO and AC is represented, and our job is to come up with a fresh, renewed review system that works, is simpler, and will be more effective than the old system.

We are currently, we're about to put a report out for public comment. It will go out within the next two weeks. This session and other sessions we've held here at ICANN are about us getting feedback, maybe to make some final tweaks to the document. The

document is already public. It's just not open for public comment yet, and it may change slightly. Hopefully, you've all got a link to that. If not, I'm sure the Secretariat can provide it to you.

Very briefly, we are suggesting the following. We're suggesting two cadenced reviews. Those are reviews that have a set cadence, an accountability and transparency review, and underneath in that empty box, it says, on my slides, every five years and deferrable. We'll talk about deferring later on in this brief presentation. There is a scoping process for that, and again, we'll talk more about the scoping process in two slides' time. A structural review, that is the review of ICANN structure. That is every 15 years. Again, that's deferrable.

Then we have non-cadence reviews, which we're calling on-demand reviews. Obviously, not having cadence, they don't have a fixed time. They can be called at any time, but they are split into three types. There's special topics, and the special topics are the topics that are currently the subject of some reviews in the bylaws. For example, in the bylaws at the moment, there's a bylaw that says every X years, there will be a security, stability and resilience review.

Our suggestion is that that moves to a special topic, which means that it can happen at any time. A security and stability and resiliency issue can at any time be brought into an on-demand review if there is a call in the community to do so. We'll talk a bit more about that.

But because they're special topics, we are suggesting that they are proactively asked. Every three years, for example, ICANN will write to the SO and AC chairs and say, is there any call in the community at the moment for there to be a review on some topics that would fit under security and stability or topics that would fit under consumer trust in the new gTLD process, for example? Again, obviously, with those, there'd be a scoping process, which we'll discuss.

The second type of on-demand review is emerging topics. Just to be very clear, this doesn't mean emerging topics in the sense of there's something out in the big wide world that may be emerging as a topic should ICANN review it. You only review stuff you're doing. But emerging topics means things bubbling up in the community. We're going to refine those words in the next iteration of the report so it's clearer.

But basically, things bubbling up in the community about which there needs to be a review. And the example I'm using, just to be very clear, is not a real example, is if some people in the community decided it might be a good idea for the ICANN staff to all wear uniforms, this might be something that is an emerging thing in the community and maybe we should have a look at it. Just to be clear, that's not real. Again, there'd be a scoping process.

And then the third type of on-demand review is consequential effects. And that is a very specific review that happens in very specific circumstances. So if the GNSO, for example, decided to

review its own structure, which it can do itself at any time, and to change its structure, there may very well be consequential effects for the rest of the community in the structure of ICANN. And rather than waiting for the next structural review, which could be 10 years away, we would deal with those with a consequential effects review.

And then finally, there's a one-time review for the Continuous Improvement Program, and that's simply this. The current Continuous Improvement Program is a pilot. And the idea always was that it would be reviewed. So we're saying, yes, it should be reviewed after three or four years. And that review should look obviously both at, is the Continuous Improvement Program working? Is it fit for purposes? It may be too over-engineered in typical ICANN style. Could it be more streamlined, etc.? But also review how the outputs from the Continuous Improvement Process should be fed into the review process, structural review process, on demand and so on. So that's down the line.

So that's a very quick overview. We are going to go into a little bit more detail now. Avri's going to do that. And then we'll talk a little bit about the Scoping Committee, and then we'll do the questions. Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Chris. Okay, so I'm basically going to go through those same reviews again and adding a few little details to them as I go

on. And this is on this next slide, please. You'll see all of these reviews listed again. The top two are those with a cadence.

In terms of the Accountability and Transparency Review, and this is a question that comes up a lot, is it similar to the ATRT with two very essential differences. One of them is that it isn't self-scoping. The current ATRT starts out with a process of figuring out the scope for this instance of the ATRT. So that will be done by the scoping group beforehand. And part of the reason it's done by the scoping group beforehand is, A, to make sure that everybody agrees with the scope that is going to be reviewed, and B, to make sure that each of the SOs, ACs, etc., that are contributing members to it can contribute members that have a certain expertise, knowledge, whatever, in the issues that are scoped as being included.

The other difference is that one of the tasks of the current bylaws defined ATRT is to do a mini version of the review of reviews in each of its iterations. So in each iteration, it would go through all the reviews that had happened since the previous review, and did it work out? Were the recommendations valid? Have they been fulfilled?

In this case, the ATRT won't necessarily be doing that, though it can look at any of the issues that arose, but it won't be doing that step-by-step review of reviews. As you see, the review of reviews is among those that can be put on a demand basis, that we have a similar to a review of reviews that we're doing now, or it could be a smaller review of reviews than what we're engaged in at the

moment. But it is basically fashioned off of the review of review that's currently ongoing.

The structural review comes basically in three parts. And the structural review is the one that happens every once in a great while. We are still discussing what a great while is. Is it five years? Is it seven years? Is it 15 years? Is it 20 years? All of those numbers have been mentioned at some point. That hasn't been determined yet, but it has three phases as currently planned.

The first one is external landscape. Look at the world around us. Look at the world that ICANN is interacting with. Is there anything that has changed since we last looked at our structure? At this point, it's been, what, 15, 20 years since we last looked at our structure that really dictates a change. Anything from this division into SOs and ACs really doesn't work anymore. Or we need more SOs and ACs. Or we need a third kind of it. Any of those kinds of things that people have speculated about and discussed over the years, maybe it would be better if.

But basically, it's looking at its relation to the world. Later, it comes into, okay, we've seen what the world is looking like now. How do we internally deal with that? How do we internally deal with who we are and how we do our work?

One of the notions of the structural review is everything is supposed to be open to be reviewed if needed. It's not that everything will be reviewed in each instance. But if needed, anything can be reviewed and can be recast with the community's

consensus, etc. Then, basically, once they've looked at that, then they look at what are the consequences.

In other words, we've decided we need different SO/AC mix. How does that affect the board? How does that affect NomCom? Do those need to be changed? Are there consequences in what we do in how we are actually structured that need to change based upon what the review indicates needs to be done? That phase three implications of proposed changes is very similar to what we'll see later with the consequential on-demand review.

The ATR is very similar to the current. That bylaw needs to be changed, but a new bylaw isn't needed. Structural review probably requires a new bylaw. I won't go into it in any depth at the moment, but there is a basic notion that for a review to have institutional validity, institutional stability, it needs to be somehow anchored in the bylaws. We have not looked at all about what that means to bylaw language yet. That comes later.

On special topics, those are essentially the bylaws reviews that we have now. There'll still be bylaws about them, whether it's the security stability and resiliency or the registry directory service or the post-GLT round review. All reviews that various people have said those are important. They must not go away. There, the only difference will be now when you go through one of those, every five years you do a full review of everything to do with security, stability, and resiliency. Yes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Avri, sorry to interrupt. There's a question on this topic, on this specific topic. Switzerland, please.

AVRI DORIA

Sure, Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. And so thank you, Avri, for the explanations. Maybe I have certain deformation because I'm in some management boards. I'm not seeing the clear distinction between the accountability and transparency review and the structural review. Maybe it's due to the fact that the structural review is still very generically described.

But in a sense, the accountability and transparency review is a purpose review, a goal review. So we are looking at the organization in a very wide sense, according to how it delivers on its purpose, the mission, the bylaws, the core values, and taking into account the transparency obligations, etc. And the structural review seems to look directly at the structure. But the structure is just an instrument to the goals.

So I don't know how that sits together, how it fits together, and how we avoid duplications. Because it seems to be two very general reviews that look at the organization from different angles, but which will, in a way, duplicate. So I don't know if you have a good answer to that. But I feel it's important to, at this very initial stage,

to be very precise on what distinct each and every distinct review in the future will have as a function. So what is the precise, exact function of each review? Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. Yeah, I'll take it. This is Chris. Thanks, Jorge. And I have an answer. I have no idea if it's a good answer, but we'll find out. There's a danger here of getting really deep down into the weeds, and I don't want us to take up too much time. And we can happily talk about this in another venue. But to be very clear, if you start with a structural review, that is a review of the ICANN structure.

The external landscape assessment is something that we think, and I know that other parts of ICANN think should be happening anyway. As part of the strategic planning process, ICANN should be doing external landscape assessments. But for the structural review, it's clearly important to take a look at the external world and see if there's stuff out there that is relevant to the structure of ICANN.

So to take an example, Steve Crocker talks a lot about the possibility that what he refers to as DNS resolvers should have a place in ICANN. That is something that may appear from an external landscape review, where it says, you know what, in ICANN's mission, there are bits of the world that are doing jobs that

are relevant to ICANN's mission that are missing. So on the structural review, that's the first step.

The second step is to look at each of the SOs and ACs structure and to decide whether that's fit for purpose, could it be better, etc. And then as Avri said, so that is functioning solely and only on structure. Thank you so much and thank you for walking towards me slowly with the sign. I apologize. I know I'm speaking fast. Please forgive me. I will slow down. The structure, sorry, is entirely focused on ICANN's structure. And it is a once in a long time.

The accountability and transparency review is all about the topics to do with, if you look at past accountability and transparency reviews, they're all to do with internal stuff to do with ICANN. However, it is set in a way that it starts with looking at ICANN's mission, its articles and so on and so forth. And in the scoping process, topics will be chosen by the community to go into the ATR.

Now, to simply address your point, is it possible that an ATR could come up because of something that's within scope, come up with some suggested structural changes? Yes, it is. But that is only going to happen if the topic comes up in the cadence of an ATR. We think that any good organization should have an entirely structured, focused review on a fairly long cadence. And any management graduate will tell you an organization that doesn't review its structure is doomed to failure.

There has never been a proper structural review of ICANN. In 2002, there was an ICANN 2.0 review, which kind of looked at the

structure and made a lot of changes. But that was the very beginning. Since then, the transition is the only thing that has really led to the whole structure being reviewed and how it interfaces with each other. So I know that's not really answering your question. The scoping process, which we'll get to in a minute, is in place to ensure that repetition doesn't happen and that the right reviews do the right thing.

AVRI DORIA

Hi, can add a few words to that, and very short, brief ones. One of the essential differences between the two kind is, one is, are we living up to our words, our mission, our bylaws, and whatever? The values part of it all. The other one is, do we have a structure that is operationally valid that can work to deliver? And so when you look at those two, they're really very different. They may refer to some of the same things, but they are different. Can we do the work, and do we live up to our ethics, to our mission, to our values?

TRACY HACKSHAW

There's another question in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes, we have another question. Is it on this topic, Gemma? Yeah, European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. So first, I want to support the comment that has been just made by our colleague from Switzerland, because considering the difficulties of the processes related to the reviews of reviews, we really think any opportunity to ensure that there is a strong link between how we review whether the organization meets the objectives and whether the structure is fit for purpose to meet those objectives should be linked. So we think this is an important point.

The second one is a question and a consideration at the same time. Why do we have reviews that speak directly to the core of the mission of ICANN, like the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS as special topics? We have made this comment earlier as a GAC that we wanted to understand a bit how these essential elements would fit into the reviews of reviews process, because we really think this is something which is not a special topic. It speaks to the main function of ICANN, so it should happen on a regular basis. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Gemma. The whole basis of this system that we're proposing is that it's community-based. So part of the issue with having all of the reviews in a cadence, you must do a review in the next three years on security and stability or five years, whatever, is that it leads to the jumbling up of all the reviews into each other, the mess that we got ourselves into with timing, some reviews

running at the same time, things not being finished, implementation still being dealt with, and having reviews where you simply have a broad-brush heading that says security, stability, and resilience, and you put a bunch of volunteers in the room, and they set the scope of what that review should be about with a heading that says security, stability, and resilience, and we think that there is a better way to do that.

And the better way to do it is to say, here are the topics that we think are under security, stability, that we want to review. Get the community's agreement to that those are the topics that should be reviewed under that heading, and then do the review as and when it is necessary, rather than say we have to wait three or four years for the next security and stability review to happen before we can do it, or say we have to do a security and stability review even though there aren't really any topics that need to be looked at. So we think by doing it on an on-demand basis where the community makes the decision about whether or not it should be run and what the topic should be is the way to deal with it.

Now, the one last thing to say on this, and no doubt Avri will have something to say as well, is that the reason we've called them out as special topics is precisely because these are things that we think should be actively considered as topics for an on-demand review. So rather than just leaving it for someone in the community to say, hang on a second, there's a security and stability review, there's an item that fits under security here that we should be reviewing, and then bubbling it up through the community, ICANN will proactively

reach out every three years and say, is there anything that the SOs and ACs think should be reviewed under the heading of security and stability?

So we think that actually makes more sense and in fact lifts those topics higher up than simply by saying we're going to do a security and stability review, but we don't know yet what it's going to be about until we've got the volunteers in a room and they'll decide. So that's our view. Avri, did you want to add to it?

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, just a few things to add. I tend to think of it in terms of a macro view and a micro view. A macro view, yes, you're looking at all of that and indeed these things that are listed as specific can come up as issues in their macro respect. We're not doing enough for stability. But when you're looking at a proper security and stability review, you're dropping down into a micro view of very many specific topics. And if you try to put those all in one barrel, undifferentiated by the level at which you're talking about them, you basically have more than you can do in one review.

There is also a very strong tie to things that are currently in bylaws are important and are in bylaws for a reason. And there's a resistance one finds across the community for getting rid of specific bylaws that pull out the specific micro issues as opposed to leaving them all at that higher level.

TRACY HACKSHAW

All right, thank you very much. There's a question from Indonesia and there are two more questions and or statements in the chat. Maybe I could ask staff to shift the slides down to the questions that are in the presentation so we can deal with the questions now, all the questions. All right, so I know there's maybe a follow-up but Indonesia's hand is up first, so can we get Indonesia's question?

ASHWIN
SASTROSUBROTO

SASONGKO Sorry, I didn't hear you well. Yes, a few days ago, Nico sent us an email about the petition or some comments from ALAC regarding several things. I just wonder if this method of review of reviews can avoid comments or complaints or misunderstanding like this or it is separate from that one. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, they're definitely separate. Basically, even the complaint from ALAC and the letter from ALAC, which I understand has failed to get support, was indeed a different issue. It had to do with a specific motion and specific delays. This is a personal belief. I don't believe there's anything we can do at the review level that'll stop individual comments and complaints related to specific facts in time and in the world from coming out. Now what we hope is that anytime one of those is serious enough to become a larger issue, then it becomes one of those emerging issues we're talking about and can be dealt with in a review. But to say that a review can prevent there ever being a crisis, I don't believe that's possible.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you very much, Indonesia. So in the queue we have European Commission followed by Switzerland.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you. I will be very brief just to quickly mark disagreement with what was expressed because if the problem is that the stability review, security, resilience review is done by a bunch of volunteers, so we are not sure the solution is to fix the problem, so having the right experts in the room, not to make the review optional. Because once more, if we don't know what is happening with ICANN fulfilling the mission of ensuring the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, then we have a problem regarding the whole of the organization. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

My apologies if I was unclear. I wasn't suggesting that there is an issue with the review being done by volunteers. What I was suggesting was that having a review team empanelled without knowing what the scope is upfront is not a sensible way of doing it. It's precisely your point. If you want experts in the room, you need to know what the topics are going to be of the review, and security, stability and resilience is a very broad heading.

So if you know that it's time for a review of some specific topics that fit under the heading of security, stability and resilience, so the scoping committee, which we may get to because there is a

question about it, has set the scope, and the scoping committee is a cross-community group of leadership, then you are able to put the people in the room who understand exactly what the review is about, and are able to do that review.

It's got nothing to do with them being volunteers. It's just the way in which you set the scope, and it's important that the scope is set so that you can make sure that the review team are the right people to do the review. That's the distinction between how it is now, which is you put the review team in the room and they set the scope, to what we're suggesting, which is that you set the scope first.

Now that doesn't deal with the question of mandating that the review happens every five years. That's a different discussion, different argument, and that is what we think is more empowering to the community and better for the streamlining and management of what this community does, to have the reviews driven by the desire of the community to have the review, rather than have the review driven by a simple thing that says in the bylaws, every five years you have to do this, or four years you have to do this. That's especially the case if emergency things come up, because having to wait doesn't make sense.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Chris. Time check. We have 15 minutes and a couple of more questions. I highly recommend shorter answers and a little

bit more narrowly scoped questions, if I may. Switzerland, you have the floor.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I'll try to be brief. So I understood from Chris and Avri that the ATR review is a function review. Are we living up to the function? And the structural review is a form review. Do we have the right form? And I at least believe that we should combine form follows function reviews, instead of having two separate and potentially duplicative reviews. What could be a solution is to have ATR that looks into, are we living up to the function in a more periodic fashion?

And the form question, the more structural review, because we cannot transform the structure every five years, maybe only every 10 years or something like that. But having a form review and a function review separate, I think it's a recipe for duplication and not using our resources very efficiently. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. If I can actually agree with you, but it won't sound like agreement. Indeed, the form does follow the function, and I agree that you're doing the check on the function mandatorily every five years. And the checking on the form, which you posited as less frequently, would indeed be defined differently. Whether they follow each other or repeating each other is something for the scoping committee to ensure it doesn't happen.

But you have the function review every shorter interval, and every once in a while, you stop and say, okay, we've been set to checking our function. Function's okay, though some of the stuff isn't working right. Let's drop down into the form and make sure that we've got a form that delivers on all those issues. So indeed, if you're going to define different cadences for a different kind of review, they need to be defined as different, even if their content is related.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think we should try and address the questions now, Tracy, if that's okay. And in honor of Nico's request, I'll try and keep the answers as short as possible. So what decision-making powers will the review standing committee have? None. The review standing committee is a management committee. It makes recommendations to the community. And if you read the report, it's clear that each part of the review standing committee process is about going back to the community, each SO/AC, going back to their own SO/AC and saying, do you agree with this? What are the topics you think that should come up? And so on.

Where does the board fit in? The board is a part of the review standing committee. The members of a review standing committee are intended to be the chairs and vice chairs of the SOs and ACs, or their designees if they prefer. In the case of an accountability and transparency review scoping committee, the chairs of the last accountability and transparency review and

representatives of the board and the org. So that's the answer to that question.

Other than cadence, how will the mandatory accountability -- pardon me? Yeah, I think we've covered how will it differ from the current system. We're talking about having it pre-scoped, we're talking about it and so on. So I think we've probably covered that one. The way that the structural review differs from the organizational reviews, which currently aren't happening and in fact it's been recommended that they don't continue to happen, it's been the organizational reviews have been replaced by the continuous improvement program. And the organizational reviews did look at each individual SO/AC in its silo.

The structural review looks at each individual SO/AC and how it interfaces with the rest of the community and how it all fits together as one big structure. So the point about a structural review is that it looks at it as a whole in a holistic way so that the structural changes can be made looking at the whole of the community rather than just one silo at a time.

Will the structural review include the board and the nominating committee? The answer to that question is yes and no. Yes, it will include the Board. It may include some representatives not from the Nominating Committee but from the oversight body that is intended to be put in place above the Nominating Committee but we haven't reached a conclusion on that yet.

How will deferrals work? Well, the structural, the review standing committee will consider whether or not a deferral should be recommended but the community will decide. So again, if the structural reviews committee says look, sorry, if the RSC says, review standing committee says look, we're to have an ATR starting in six months' time.

Currently, there are some implementations going on from the last ATR we had or an on-demand review that we had or a structural review that we had three years ago. We think that we should defer this ATR for six months until those things have been implemented. They will make that recommendation to the community and each SO and AC will vote on whether or not it should in fact be deferred and if there's community agreement, it will be deferred. If there isn't, it won't be.

Then finally, as the global public interest will be a consideration for an on-demand review, I think in all cases, but anyway, for an on-demand review to become, sorry, I'll start again, for a topic to become the subject of an on-demand review, what role can the GAC have in shaping these topics? I think the answer is the GAC has a critical role in the same way that the whole of the SOs and ACs have a role in shaping topics, but the GAC is able to produce advice based on its understanding of what the global public interest is and it is part of the GAC's stated role to make statements about what it thinks the global public interest is. Therefore, the GAC has an

important role to play in shaping any discussion that has to do with the global public interest.

Manal, are you there and did you want to say something?

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chris. Yeah, I'm still there. No, I think you've covered the questions quite well in light of what has been discussed within the group. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Can we just flop up, go back up one more slide? Five minutes. Can you just go back one slide for me, please? Just to give you an overview, just so you've quickly seen it, that's the intention of the review scoping committee, board, leadership, org, and then previous ATR if it's an ATR one. Down the right-hand side, you can see it's a central coordination mechanism. It's management, it's not decision. It does screening based on criteria. Those criteria include budget and what have you. It can make recommendations for deferral and there are thresholds for how these decisions eventually get made in the community.

Okay, next slide and then the one after that, please. How do you want to deal with that?

TRACY HACKSHAW

So these are the questions that I think we have for, we can't do it now obviously, but certainly on the mailing list and public

comment that is coming up. So please have a look at these questions that are coming up in the materials that you have to provide your feedback. So maybe back to Chris to do a next wrap up on this.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yeah, just to say, please read the report in its current form or when it comes up a public comment, it won't be that much different from the way that it is now probably, but we think that those guiding principles are covered. I should say there are actually five of them there, not four, we think they're covered, but we'd be happy to get requests for explanation, requests for more detail should it be required. Can I have the next slide, please?

Just to give you some idea of timing, just to avoid confusion, 26 is not intended to be a day. 26 is intended to be the year in case anybody thinks that we're going to be doing this in 27 or 28. We are anticipating that the draft for public comment will go out in about 10 days to two weeks' time. That we will then obviously deal with the public comments, make any adjustments and then in late August, send out a final document to go to the SOs and ACs for their consideration and then eventually to the board. That's it, Tracey.

TRACY HACKSHAW

All right, thank you very much. And I think we don't have time to do the final question that we thought about, but we have Manal who wishes to add something.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Tracy. My intervention is on the previous slide. I think if we have a couple of minutes, it would be good to hear from GAC colleagues on the second part of the slide, which is a follow-up on what the GAC has already provided in the communiqué in Mumbai. So it would be good to see how the points flagged in Mumbai communiqué has been addressed so far. If Chris and Avri are okay with this, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Manal. Is that for us to respond? Is that your proposal? You want the GAC to discuss? We don't have time. We have one more minute for this session and that's why I'm asking. Or is it a direct question to Avri and Chris?

MANAL ISMAIL

No, no.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So you want me to ask the GAC these questions, Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL

If we don't have time, it's okay. There is still an opportunity for input from the GAC, so maybe the GAC can take this into consideration when submitting input.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Manal. That was precisely what I was going to suggest because there are three questions and some other things to take into account. The first one are important reviews that are closely linked to ICANN's mission and so on and so forth. Go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

No, no. I was going to say the first point has already been covered. It's okay. I don't want to delay the upcoming discussion, so I'll leave it at this. Thank you, Nico.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just let me say, I know we're out of time, I just wanted to say if anyone on the GAC, if you want to meet with us on a call, on a Zoom call at any time, or individually, or as a group, or a small group, we are open to talk to anybody. The CCG itself, the chairs, we're very happy to talk to you, answer any questions. You can send emails, you can contact the ICANN staff and say you want to have a call. We're really, really happy to do that. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Chris. By the way, these three questions can be answered via email or we can consider discussing these topics during this week. Thank you so very much, Avri, Chris, and of course, Tracy. Thank you so very much. We're going to wrap up. Thank you, Manal, of course online. We're wrapping up this session. And thank you again, Chris and Avri. Always welcome at the head table.

Let me call Australia and China for the next session, which is going to be on the GOPE, the operations update, basically. Let's give a couple of minutes for them to come here.

Okay. We're starting the session now. This session is going to be actually very short, 30 minutes, maybe. If we can do it in 25 minutes, even better. That's going to be in the hands of our future GAC chair, Mr. Ian Sheldon from Australia, and of course, Guo Feng from China. Welcome. Without further ado, the floor is all yours.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Ian Sheldon, GAAC Australia, for the record. Hopefully, this is a reasonably quick session. By way of background, the working group has reviewed a set of administrative updates to the operating principles. These were intended to improve clarity, consistency, and alignment with current GAC practices and references.

We circulated two copies of this, one clean and one redlined version. We worked this through with the working group actually over the last 24 to 18 months. I hoping these changes are reasonably straightforward. And now we'd like to surface them with the full GAC for consideration. So, I think what we're keen to do here today is to see if we can kickstart one of those review processes. So, much like last time, we have to go through a procedure where we table the proposed edits, seek endorsement, and we'll get to this in a later slide, and then implement them at a

later time. Feng, is there anything else you'd like to add on this slide by way of background?

GUO FENG

I just want to add that I think that GAC operating principle evolution is a very important working effort for the GAC, because the GAC operating principle is our basic rule for us to operate. So, perhaps I want to thank everybody who made contribution to this working effort, as well as the text of the current redline operating principle. And I think, to me, if my memory serves me, that it was started from two years ago that we started this effort, and last year we have done with the extension of the tenureship of the chair and the vice-chair, then we fully focused on this effort of the administrative changes.

So, the current text has been, to me, from my observation, is fully discussed in the working group. So, I think we, as Ian and me, as the co-chair of this working group, we think maybe it's time to bring it up to the whole GAC for further discussion and potential further action. Yes.

IAN SHELDON

So, perhaps we can go to the next slide, please. So, I trust everybody has had a chance to look at the document, but for clarity's sake, there's a process outlined here. So, if GAC members support operating the principles for revision, then one member must move to initiate the revision. We'll seek a second, and

hopefully supported by a simple majority of members present. Then we move into a 60-day consultation period, whereby you can take a closer look at the revisions, see what you really think about these changes, and then following this consultation phase, you get a final chance to consider whether they should be adopted at the end of the consultation period, which will be at the Bali meeting.

Are there any questions on the process or procedure outlined here? Hopefully it's a straightforward one and one that will be familiar to many of you, having been through the operating principles update as we looked at the leadership tenure discussion as well. Any questions at this juncture?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

We don't have hands in the room or online, Ian, so far. Let me double check. No, we're good to go. Back to you.

IAN SHELDON

Great. Perhaps we can move to the next slide, then. So, we have a couple of questions, which I think I've started asking. Are there any questions at this stage on the proposed changes? And, again, I do stress these are, in the co-chair's opinions, administrative. We've tried to update numbering, some dates, reflections to bring it in line with some of the bylaws. In our view, hopefully these are non-controversial, but I do want to check if there are any other questions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So, let me put it the other way around. Is anybody against these improvements we're trying to make here? This would be a good time for flagging it, if that is indeed the case. And, again, one more time to check if there are any comments or questions. And I see a hand from China. Please go ahead, Guo.

GUO FENG

Thank you. Actually, I'm not against, but I want to explain a little bit, add a few points on the text of the current operating principle. Now we have two versions of the text. One is the red line version, and another one is a clean version. And look at the whole administrative changes we are having with regard to the current text. To me, there are three aspects of editorial changes, administrative changes.

So, from my observation, the first one, I think, is maybe first aspect is about the preamble. What we want to do is perhaps we want to streamline the narration of this part of operating principle, the preamble. We want to reduce the redundancy and we want to make the wording look good. This is the first aspect. The second aspect, perhaps, is the alignment of the wording with the current practice of the GAC. The most important, the most obvious modification in this regard, I think, is to change the wording like GAC Secretariat into GAC Support Staff. It is obvious that now we do have a GAC Secretariat, but we do have Support Staff to support the whole GAC currently, and this is the second one.

The third one is editorial, the numbering issue, as mentioned by Ian. We are renumbering our principles. With the current text, we are missing some of the numbers from 37 to 39, so we renumber the area operating principle. I will stop here and leave it there. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, China. That is an explanation of part of what is being done. As you can see, nothing out of the ordinary, nothing controversial. The GAC Secretariat does not exist. Last time we talked about that was maybe 11 years ago, nine years ago or something. Back to you, Ian.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Would any GAC member be willing to move to initiate these changes? I see one hand from the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Given that I sense that there seems rough consensus in the room, the Netherlands is willing to move on the principle 53 and adopt these changes.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Do I have a second? Who can support the Netherlands in this?

-
- NICOLAS CABALLERO We have Canada, as far as I can see. Canada, would you like to say anything, or is it just a hand up?
- DAVID BEDARD Thank you, Chair. Just to echo my colleague Marco's comments about the broad consensus in the room, we feel comfortable seconding the motion. Thank you.
- IAN SHELDON Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? To echo Marco and David's sentiments, it doesn't seem like there is strong opposition and there is reasonable support for this, so we'll proceed to the timeline outlined on the previous slide. Feng, please.
- GUO FENG Yes, I just want to add, I see in our chat box, we have Egypt second this motion, and also Uganda. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Perfect. So then it would be Canada, Egypt and Uganda, if I'm not mistaken. Right. And again, the outstanding questions were no problem as regarding the administrative updates, should the GAC initiate the formal revision process under principle 53? And the answer is yes. And once again, this is a good chance for anybody who is against to say so right now. If that is not the case, we'll move on. And we assume that all members or all GAC members are

comfortable proceeding according to the timeline as Ian explained a little while ago.

And again, the proposed action is to consider initiating the formal process to revise the GAC operating principles under principle 53 according to the timeline he has already explained. Do we all agree? And I see nodding in the room, once again, we just need to do this like three or four times in order to ensure that there is broad consensus. So thank you very much. We'll proceed. Ian, back to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. So please, please do have a look at the changes, consider them in further detail. I also realize that the operating principles working group is also considering a raft of other amendments beyond what we're proposing here. So if you do have further thoughts on those other changes, please send them to the working group and we can consider them for the next batch of amendments. So with that, I might hand back to the chair. And I think that that's all the working group was after, unless my co-chair had any further comments.

GUO FENG

So I think that we still have a further opportunity of the next 60 days to further consultation on our changes of the operating principle. And anyone who wants to refine the wording, the current wording

and provide another way of the text, please do. And please circulate email and we can have a discussion further. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. And it's time to wrap up. I'm very happy to tell you that we're becoming even more efficient than usual. We're finishing 14 minutes before the allocated time. So enjoy your coffee. This session is adjourned. Please be back in the room at 11:45. Thank you so very much.

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the ICANN86 SSAC session on Registration Data on Tuesday, 9 June at 11:45 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all of the devices when speaking. With that, I will leave the floor to GAC Chair, Nico Caballero. Nico, over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. Welcome to the session on registration data issues, our discussion on registration data issues. We have a fantastic lineup of speakers. We

have two guest speakers today. We have Eleeza Agopian from ICANN org to my left. We are having Justin instead of Marc Anderson, correct me if I'm wrong. I'm sorry, Marc is here, I'm sorry. Yeah, yeah, yeah, thank you. We have Marc and Justin to my right. And from the GAC, we have David Bedard from Canada, Gabe Andrews from the U.S., and Owen Fletcher from the U.S. delegation as well.

This session is going to be running, as you know already, for 45 minutes, and then we'll move on to our next session. So without further ado, let me handle the floor at this point to David for the opening remarks. Please go ahead, David.

DAVID BEDARD

Thanks, Nico. Good to see everybody. Thanks for engaging in the session here today. So we just have the agenda here. So we'll be covering the standardized system for access disclosure of registration data, or the SSAD, Supplemental Recommendations, so that'll be our first agenda item, followed by a discussion on urgent requests for disclosure of registration data, and then Privacy Proxy Accreditation Discussions update. And lastly, we will touch on any GAC Civil Communiqué considerations as they relate to registration data issues. So next slide, please. And next slide.

Great, so I won't go in too many details since we have Marc here that he'll be going over some of the history of the SSAD process, but just a reminder for folks, during the ICANN board meeting in Dublin, the board made a decision to continue with the RDRS, or the

Registration Data Request Service, for up to two years while the community continued deliberations of the system and its future. So this followed the release of a report by the Standing Committee on RDRS, as some of you might recall, it was, I believe, last August, that proposed a series of modifications to the original recommendations coming out of the SSAD process.

So the board decided to non-adopt the 18 SSAD recommendations as a package. So this essentially allowed the GNSO to continue further work on changes to those initial recommendations. And those changes would be informed by what was proposed in the Standing Committee report on the RDRS.

So to go through these proposed changes, the GNSO Council established a supplemental review team composed of members of the community, and this will include two GAC representatives, myself, David Bedard, GAC representative from Canada, and my colleague Owen Fletcher from the USA. And the goal of this will to be deliver final recommendations to the board by February next year.

So our role here is just to really ensure that key GAC priorities are accounted for within the process. So especially the authentication work, as we know this has been a perennial issue and particularly of importance for the GAC, especially considering the recent work on updates to the registration data policy, which introduces a 24-hour response time to urgent requests by verified law enforcement, pending the work being done on the development of the

authentication mechanism, which we'll hear, I think, a little bit more, both from my colleague Gabe here, but also from, I believe, from the board later today.

So with that, I will turn it over to Marc to give us a little bit of an overview on the SSAD, and Marc, over to you.

MARC ANDERSON

Thank you, David. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Marc Anderson from VeriSign, and I was selected to lead the GNSO SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team. Don't worry about the acronyms. I'll get into all those as we go through this.

But I do want to give a little bit of background and history about the SSAD, what we're trying to accomplish, and what our goals are. The SSAD, or the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure of Non-Public gTLD Registration Data, was developed by a GNSO Council effort after it was identified that a large amount of registration data that had previously been public was no longer public, and there was a legitimate need by requesters to have access to that data. So the goal of this GNSO Council effort was to establish a standardized system where requesters could go to access the data and would not have to figure out where to go. You would have a single centralized system for accessing or submitting requests to access non-public gTLD registration data.

Now, this was the work of a GNSO Council effort. They produced 18 recommendations, as David mentioned, and submitted those

recommendations to the board. The board produced an assessment, what they called an Operational Design Assessment, or an ODA, and that Operational Design Assessment raised significant questions about the feasibility, particularly financially, of those 18 recommendations.

And so the GNSO Council and the ICANN board worked together to come up with a path forward, and the path forward that they identified was that they would initiate a pilot. They would have a two-year pilot period, and they produced a pilot system called the RDRS. It's the Registration Data Request System. That pilot was optional, and it was to test out the feasibility of a system and to produce lessons learned that could help inform policy development. I think this is one of the more innovative things that we've done as an ICANN community is we've produced a pilot to help inform policy development.

So at the end of that two-year pilot period, a standing committee produced a report that captured all the lessons learned from the Registration Data Request System, or the RDRS, and provided that report to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council, as David mentioned, then took that report and created a supplemental recommendations team, and that team has been tasked to consider all the lessons learned from the RDRS pilot and update the 18 SSAD recommendations to produce new policy recommendations.

The goal of these new policy recommendations, and maybe if we go to the next slide, please. The goal of these new policy recommendations is to produce a new centralized system for standard access and disclosure that will meet the needs of the different communities involved. And the different communities specifically that are implicated by this are the requesters, those people with a legitimate need to access non-public registration data, the data subjects themselves, the registrants, and the data controllers. In many cases, that's the registrars, but in some cases, that may be registries.

So we're specifically tasked with considering the needs of those three specific stakeholder groups, the requesters, the data subjects, and the data controllers, and make sure we produce recommendations for a system that works for each of those groups. This slide shows what's within scope. We're committing to producing recommendations that, in addition to meeting the needs of the three different groups involved, are implementable. One of the things we learned from the initial SSAD recommendations is we have to take into account, is it cost effective?

So we'll be working with ICANN staff very closely to make sure our recommendations are implementable, are cost effective, and meet the needs of the broader community. We'll make sure they're board ready, and we take into account all the lessons learned from the RDRS pilot and the standing committee's report. We have some nice bullets here on what's out of scope. We're not starting from

scratch. We have lessons learned and recommendations from the RDRS pilot, which give us a really good starting point. We're working on modifying the 18 SSAD recommendations, not scrapping them altogether, not starting over from scratch.

GABRIEL ANDREWS

--registration data and the law enforcement authentication work that we're working on. Waiting for the slide to settle a little bit here. I'm not sure what it is we're looking at.

Okay, so background on urgent requests. We just talked about the mechanism that people can make requests for registration data through a specific category of requests that are involved when there's a threat to life, or a threat of serious physical injury, or a threat to critical infrastructure, or a threat of child endangerment. These are what we're categorizing as urgent requests in the ICANN context.

And without going into too much background, this was a key part of the discussions for a long period of time. And the recent development is that policy was finally settled that when urgent requests are made, there would be an expectation for a response within 24 hours. And this is policy now that's published as of last month, and that's the new development since the last time we met. So this is the result of a lot of discussion and back and forth, and we're glad to have the issue settled. Let's go ahead and move on to the next slide.

One of the key parts of this discussion, though, is that those urgent requests are predicated upon there being authentication of who's actually asking, right? So they're authenticated urgent requests. And as Marc just alluded to, one of the key challenges that was originally contemplated with SSAD is the cost of that authentication component, because it is really hard and there really aren't perfect solutions available.

So what the Public Safety Working Group has tried to do is, in recognition of those cost challenges, try to take a step back and say, okay, rather than expecting ICANN to somehow create a system that can authenticate cops around the world everywhere, what existing or aspirational tools might help? What can we bring to the table that can assist with this? And that's the strategy that we've taken. So go ahead and go to the next slide.

What we've identified to start with, and this is the start, this is not the end, we've identified two efforts that we thought could help here. One is that in the United States there's an existing law enforcement enterprise portal that somewhere between 10,000 and 18,000 US-based law enforcement agencies have access to, that we can use to help authenticate for US agencies.

And then I've engaged colleagues and counterparts at Interpol. Like many of you have heard, at the last ICANN85 we had them co-presenting on this issue. They're building something called a global digital police identifier system that will also be a portal that their member nations, 192 if memory serves, might have access to,

to initiate requests. In this case, both of these are possible identity provider systems that any law enforcement can make a request to. The request would then connect to ICANN systems, it says RDRS here, it might be called SSAP in the future, sort of doesn't matter what the name is.

The key piece being that an authentication token is passed in a secure fashion, and then when a disclosure request is made, that disclosure request can be accompanied by that authentication token so that the registrars know who they're talking to is who they think they're talking to. That's the key piece. It doesn't change any part of what they have to decide. It's just providing that confidence that they're speaking to who they think they are speaking to. Then the responses that come back from the registrars go directly back to the law enforcement employee.

Additionally, and we'll move on to the next slide here too, you may recall from discussions at the last ICANN meeting that we were also contemplating whether or not it would be helpful to share with ICANN and with the contracted parties lists of known law enforcement agencies and the email domains that they use.

This is not to be confused with real authentication, but it is something that we've heard from folks in the contracted party space might be a useful additional data point. And I think this is still being explored based off of the feedback we got at the last ICANN session that folks do seem interested. But it is not, in my mind and in the mind of my colleagues at ICANN, the priority work.

The priority work really needs to be the true authentication mechanisms.

The last thing I'll mention is that with regards to those portals, even though we're starting with maybe the Department of Justice in the US and with Interpol for its global members, we very much envision that to be the start and that other, what are we calling them, Marc? The DUG stands for Domain User Groups? Designated User Groups.

Other designated user groups can stand up and choose to follow this path. And say, hey, maybe it's AFRIPOL that wants to stand up and act as a designated user group for all of its law enforcement agencies within the continent. Maybe it's CERTs, the computer emergency response teams and security incident response teams of the world, that might not be badge and gun carrying officers but have a very important role to play in critical infrastructure protection. The key thing is that we're trying to blaze a trail here that others can follow. Okay, let's go ahead and move on to the next slide.

So with all this said, the last update that we really have is that there's been some desire by various folks in the ICANN community to have better visibility into how these conversations are proceeding. And I will accept much of the responsibility for that. I think when we were originally engaging my law enforcement counterparts, I was a little bit overly cautious about how much we were talking about how the authentication mechanisms happen,

and so I erred on the side of being secure and not as open as I can, as used to.

But I think we've really walked back from that position and we're embracing now the idea that ICANN can play a leading role in keeping the community abreast of how these authentication tests are proceeding and how we're making progress against this goal. And so with that in mind, I have my counterpart, Eleeza Agopian, who I'm going to hand the mic.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]