

**GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SECRETARIAT**

EXECUTIVE MINUTES

GAC MEETING, SAN JUAN

26 & 27 JUNE 2007

1. GAC Membership and Observers

The following XX members took part in the meeting:

Anguilla, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, European Commission, Finland, Indonesia, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niue, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, United Kingdom.

The following observers were also present:

Internationale de la Francophonie

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda for the meeting was adopted and is attached to these minutes.

3. Adoption of the Minutes of the Lisbon meeting

The Chair advised that the executive minutes of the Lisbon meeting had been circulated to the GAC list two weeks ago and asked if there were any amendments or suggestions.

No changes were made to the minutes as circulated and were endorsed by those at the meeting.

4. Work priorities for the GAC

As a result of earlier presentations made to the GAC and discussions with the Board during the GAC/Board Joint Working Group meeting, the GAC identified three main items being discussed in the ICANN arena at the moment and which the GAC should focus on. They are:

- Internationalized domain names (IDNs)
- IPv6; and
- DNSsec

There was also considerable discussion around the inclusion of SPAM as an issue to be considered by the GAC. This was raised in the context of a presentation by the Chair of the SSAC, Steve Crocker, which suggested that WHOIS is being used to generate SPAM which may impact on the security of the DNS. Concern was raised by some that SPAM is not traditionally an issue that falls within ICANN's mission and would be considered by many to be 'mission creep'. In addition, it was noted that several other expert international organizations are already dealing with the issue. There was general agreement that if the GAC is to devote time to consider SPAM in the ICANN environment it must be very clear that it is being considered in relation to the DNS and to DNSsec.

The Australian Government representative offered to lead a small group to define the issue and develop a discussion paper and presentation for consideration at the Los Angeles meeting.

It was suggested that the GAC should concentrate its work on improving interactions with other communities in ICANN and with the issues that are being dealt within other communities, as has already been done with the development of the "principles" documents. It was also noted that this becomes difficult when the timing of other meetings conflicts with the GAC meetings.

It was acknowledged that it is difficult for GAC members to be present during all the various discussions happening in the ICANN community and consideration should be given to developing processes which will alleviate this. The Chair noted that it is anticipated that the presence of the GAC Liaison, Donna Austin from ICANN staff, should provide the GAC with an extra resource to make the GAC's work more informative and to enable the flow of information on a regular basis about what is going on in ICANN.

Members were encouraged to form small working groups on issues of interest and the conveners of working groups were also encouraged to lead the work of their respective groups and plan the work for upcoming meetings.

5. Endorsement of the list of issues related to the IDN in cc space

During the meeting members considered the joint paper prepared by the ccNSO and the GAC, namely the: [ccNSO-GAC IDN Working Group Issues Paper: Selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes](#)

A number of suggested changes to the text were made and in consultation with the ccNSO an agreed version of the [Issues Paper](#) was presented to the ICANN Board.

It was acknowledged that the process to determine the answer to the questions raised in the Issues Paper could take anywhere between three to five years given the policy development process and possible formulation of an ISO standard related to IDN ccTLDs.

The Chair related his experience at a recent APTLD meeting in Dubai where much of the agenda was related to IDNs and in particular the implementation of IDNs. The Chair advised that a very strong message in all the sessions was that once the technical issues had been resolved and IDNs are ready to be introduced into the root, the Arab countries would be willing and ready to be the first to do so. This was also reflected in various public statements. Other GAC members confirmed that they were aware of other ccTLD managers who claim to be ready to implement a corresponding IDN ccTLD and that there is real political pressure to do so.

Given this, the GAC discussed whether it would be appropriate to suggest a parallel process regarding the implementation of IDNs particularly as they relate to the ccTLDs. There was general agreement for an approach whereby there would be one process which could take some time in developing and putting in place all policies related to the introduction of IDNs in the cc space, and in parallel, there should also be a gradual roll-out of IDN ccTLDs. Modalities should be worked out by the Board and the introduction should not cause any security or stability threats to the internet.

The GAC also received a briefing from Ram Mohan on IDNs in the gTLD space. Ram noted that the gTLDs believe that they have much in common with the ccTLDs. Ram advised that the gTLDs would like to share a briefing paper with the GAC that provides some clarification on where the gTLDs stand with respect to IDN TLDS in general.

With regard to the parallel process being discussed by the GAC, Ram suggested that there may be some advantages in following a gTLD process which starts with the issuance of guidelines for applications followed by an open period for objections, and then a period for reconciliation of these objections. Where reconciled, there is a level of technical scrutiny to make sure that there is not a technology issue at hand. Once this is confirmed, it is ready for deployment.

6. Security

The GAC, in conjunction with the ccNSO, received a presentation from the Chair of the Security and Stability Committee, Steve Crocker, on deployment of DNSsec and denial of service attacks (both presentations are available on the GAC website). The presentations were well received by GAC members.

The denial of service attacks presentation provided classifications of the type of attacks and discussed the classic attacks to a number of root servers which occurred last year. This is a common occurrence which results in no great damage to the root system. The presentation also covered the recent attack towards Estonia which was unusual in that the attack was directed toward a single country. The analysis of this attack is ongoing and will be of interest to governments. GAC members agreed that the security and stability is an area which will remain a top priority for governments.

A joint workshop with the ccNSO in Los Angeles on these issues was suggested to assist GAC members understand the issues and concerns that face ccTLD managers and which would also enable the ccTLD community to recognise and understand the concerns and issues from a government perspective.

7. Implementation of IPv6 and exhaustion of IPv4

The GAC received presentations of the Republic of Korea and the Netherlands (available on the GAC website) on their policies related to promotion of IPv6 in situation of gradual exhaustion of IPv4. A wide range of issues were raised during the course of discussions, including secondary market, so-called legacy addresses that are allocated prior to the establishment of current address management network or management framework and the readiness of equipment and devices to handle the implantation of IPv6.

Given the potential implications for government and the need to be fully informed about these issues, an executive summary of three to five pages was requested explaining what the issue is about, why it should make a difference, what should be priorities for government representatives and also the general public they represent would be most useful.

8. Transparency and accountability

The GAC received a presentation from Paul Levins, on ICANN's progress in dealing with the issues of transparency and accountability. An update was provided on ICANN's response to the One World Trust report and there was discussion around the possibility of further GAC input to the development of transparency and accountability principles. The plan of action was published on 23 June, and the draft management operating principles were expected in the near future. It is anticipated that there will be discussion by the GAC on this issue in Los Angeles.

During the GAC's open session with the Board, ICANN's President sought assistance from the GAC in defining the term 'accountability'. The GAC member from Canada volunteered to prepare a short paper on accountability which could form the basis for discussion and which could ultimately be provided to the President for information as requested.

9. Outreach

GAC members provided an update on outreach they had conducted since the Lisbon meeting and members were encouraged to consult the outreach plan and indicate their willingness and availability to participate.

10. Fellowship program

The GAC reflected that the fellowship program recently launched by ICANN is extremely valuable and has the full support of the GAC. The GAC has offered to disseminate the information on this program through the GAC mailing list and also discussed the value in maximizing the efficiency of participation of fellows in GAC meetings by introducing a buddy system.

11. Working methods

This discussion specifically addressed the continued work of the Board/GAC Joint Working Group. It was felt that the initial aim of the group has been achieved and it would be an appropriate time to consider changing the terms of reference for the group. The Chair and Vice Chairs of the GAC agreed to interact with the relevant Board members to define the new terms of reference for this group in a direction that would become more coordinated in the activities of the GAC and the Board.

12. New gTLDs PDP

The Chair of the GNSO provided an update on the status of the PDP on new gTLDs. The GAC was encouraged to see the effort the GNSO had taken to map elements of the GAC's principles on new gTLDs against recommendations in the latest report provided through the policy development process. The timeline for completion of the process is within the next two months which will mean that the GAC will possibly be considering the final proposal in Los Angeles.

13. WHOIS

The GNSO also provided an update on the status of the WHOIS working group which has been considering in large part elements associated with the Operational Point of Contact.

The GAC also discussed its response to ICANN's request on the draft procedure for handling potential conflicts between WHOIS requirements and national privacy law. Given that the proposed draft reply was only circulated a few days prior to the San Juan meeting it was agreed that there was not enough time to adequately consider the proposed response. An interim response was agreed which was incorporated into the GAC communiqué.

14. ccTLD Sunset Principles

A staff discussion paper was posted in December on the [retiring of country code top level domains](#). It raises a series of questions related to what ICANN should do when a country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list. The GAC considered that there a number of issues which may be of political importance which should also be considered in the context of this discussion given the national sovereignty issues associated with a ccTLD. It was also felt that the issue of what happens to the registrants should also be considered in the paper.

There was considerable discussion around the current situation with the anticipated retirement of .su—Soviet Union which is being phased out to be replaced by .ru—Russian Federation. It was noted that the .su ccTLD is still active and accepting domain name registrations which highlights the concerns raised by the GAC member.

It was agreed that it would be appropriate for the GAC to send a signal to ICANN staff via the communiqué that the GAC have opinions on the proposal and will want to be consulted before a decision is taken.

15. Internet Governance Forum

The IGF will be taking place in Rio de Janeiro from 12 to 15 November 2007. The Chair advised that informal open-ended consultations took place in March and May to commence preparations for the meeting which includes developing an agenda and ideas for workshops. The next round of consultations will take place in Geneva in September. The Chair asked if it would be appropriate for the GAC to participate in some form.

The IGF is composed of main sessions and workshops and other activities. In Athens, main sessions and workshops were the only modalities of participation. The workshops were not necessarily related to the main session and this is one of the changes for Rio in that most of the workshops will be related to the main sessions. One of the main sessions will be on the management of critical resources, another proposal for a workshop is the transition from IPv4 to IPv6.

One of the options available to the GAC to participate would be through an open forum in which the GAC could present on the way the GAC works. It was suggested that the GAC work online between now and the IGF to prepare a short presentation and then as many GAC members as are able to attend the forum should really try to take part in that session and engage interactively with people who are interested in knowing what we do and how we do it.

It was agreed that the GAC is ready to contribute to ICANN's participation in the IGF in a substantive way by presenting all relevant information on GAC's activities within ICANN on issues related to the management of critical internet resources.

16. Discussion of paper: "Should GAC make an evaluation and express comments/recommendations on the ICANN Strategic plan and annual report?"

Prior to the San Juan meeting, the GAC member from Italy, circulated a discussion paper on whether the GAC should make an evaluation and express comments/recommendations on ICANN's strategic plan and annual report. The paper recalled, among other things, that article 71 of the WSIS Tunis agenda says "...that the process towards enhanced cooperation to be started to UN Secretary-General involving all relevant organizations by the end of the first quarter of 2006 will involve all stakeholders in their representative roles, will proceed as quickly as possible consistent with the legal process, and will be responsible to innovation. Relevant organizations should commence a process towards enhanced cooperation involving all stakeholders, proceeding as quickly as possible and responsive to innovation. The same relevant organizations shall be requested to provide annual performance reports."

As ICANN is due to produce an annual report at the end of the year, it was proposed that the GAC make suggestions to ICANN about items that could be included in this year's

version. The report should not only contain the requirements set out in the Joint Project Agreement with the Department of Commerce, but it should also address expectations of the broader internet community. Reference was made to the joint statement made by Brazil and Argentina in Lisbon on a related issue.

Further, the GAC should also consider entering into a more comprehensive evaluation of the framework for ICANN's evolution, in particular the way it works with governments and how ICANN relates with the GAC, including commenting on the strategic plan.

There was general agreement that discussion on these issues should be continued intersessionally with the intention of producing suggestions for the ICANN Board on what the GAC would like to see in the annual report at the Los Angeles meeting. Discussions about how best to examine and contribute to the strategic planning process will be longer term.

17. Other business

Election of a new interim Vice Chair.

Due to the retirement of GAC Vice Chair, Pankaj Agrawala from the GAC, it was necessary to elect an interim Vice Chair, pending selection of a replacement Vice Chair at the Los Angeles meeting.

The Chair nominated Bill Graham, from Canada, as the interim Vice Chair and this was agreed by the members present at the meeting.