



# 78

# ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

## Governmental Advisory Committee

Hamburg, Germany, October 2023

### ICANN78 Capacity Development Workshop Report

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Day 1</b>	<b>2</b>
Session 1   ICANN and the GAC's Place in the Wider Internet Community	2
Session 2   GAC Priority Topics	2
Session 3   The GAC High Level Government Meeting - Introduction, Background and Preparations	3
Session 4   Breakout Session - GAC Regional Priorities and Issues Identification (Part 1)	3
Session 5   Breakout Session - GAC Regional Priorities and Issues Identification (Part 2)	3
<b>Day 2</b>	<b>3</b>
Session 6   Introduction to the Namespace and Case Study	3
Session 7   Blockchain - Introduction and Applied Learning	3
Session 8   Alternative Namespaces: Policy Issues for the GAC	4
Session 9   Breakout Session - Identifying Government Technology Policy Interests and Concerns (Part 1)	4
Session 10   Breakout Session - Identifying Government Technology Policy Interests and Concerns (Part 2)	4
<b>Post CDW Survey</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Conclusions and Next Steps</b>	<b>5</b>
Thank You and Acknowledgements	5
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>5</b>

# Introduction

Held during the first two days of the ICANN78 Annual General Meeting in Hamburg, Germany, the ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Capacity Development Workshop (CDW) was conducted with the goals of increasing member awareness of ICANN and its operations, informing attendees about the GAC and its role in the multistakeholder model and expanding the knowledge that the members had on emerging technologies, such as Alternative Name Systems.

The GAC's Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) took the lead on the first day of events, focusing on building a foundation for GAC members to become more involved in policy and advice work. With presentations from ICANN Government Engagement, topics such as the DNS, the Next Round of New gTLDs, DNS Abuse, and the upcoming High Level Government Meeting were discussed.

The ICANN GAC CDW is a collaborative effort between GAC Leadership, the GAC USRWG, and other members of the community who were interested in furthering the following objectives during ICANN78:

- Increase stakeholder knowledge on the functioning of ICANN in the broader Internet governance space;
- Provide participants with foundational knowledge of the Domain Name System;
- Lower information barriers to participation in the work of ICANN;
- Increase participation of GAC members in the activities of the committee; and
- Enhance community and internal committee collaboration

Additionally on the second day, members from the governments of the Netherlands, United States, Germany, United Kingdom, and the USRWG worked with the ICANN Office of the CTO (OCTO) to discuss emerging technologies relating to the DNS. This included Web-3 / Blockchain, Alternative Name Systems, and further enhancements to the IANA Namespace / current DNS. This second day was a new addition to the past work of the CDW, based on feedback from the ICANN77 CDW and the above representatives.

## Day 1

### Session 1 | **ICANN and the GAC's Place in the Wider Internet Community**

Tracy Hackshaw (UPU) and Karel Douglas (Trinidad and Tobago) opened the CDW and welcomed all participants to the first session of the ICANN78 GAC CDW. They welcomed the GAC chair to the session and the Chair provided a few words on some of the accomplishments of the GAC and the goals of the next two days of the Capacity Development Workshop, especially with the over 100 new delegates to the GAC over the past year. He also thanked the German Government for their great welcome and participation in this meeting.

For the first day of the CDW, topics focused on building a strong foundation for GAC members. The Domain Name System and policies that affect it were on the docket with additional time for operational

concerns, like the High Level Government Meeting in Kigali, Rwanda. The hosts of the CDW, from the Underserved Region Working Group, provided the introduction and then began the program.

ICANN Government Engagement staff member Laurent Ferrali took the stage to present on ICANN's Role and Governance Model. Starting with the background of ICANN and some basics on the DNS ecosystem.

Policy Development was introduced, including specifics for the Generic Name, Country Code, and Address Supporting Organizations. Alongside policy development, Advisory Committees were described, the Government, At Large, Root Server System, and Security and Stability.

Diving deeper into the content relevant to the GAC, Laurent touched on how GAC operations are motivated by the ICANN bylaws and the GAC's own operating principles. These guidelines dictate how the GAC works on things like working groups and other bodies at ICANN.

This first session received 100% satisfaction, similar to the 100% received for the first CDW session during ICANN75. The most common response was "Very Satisfied" (11/20).

## Session 2 | **GAC Priority Topics**

Shifting gears a bit from the first session Pua and Tracy discussed primary current issues of importance to governments. ICANN GDD Accounts and Services team representative Russ Weinstein provided details and statistics on DNS Abuse. He also provided an update on the Contracted Parties Agreement Amendment process and some statistics from the DNS Abuse Institute.

Jason Merritt (Canada) then introduced and provided context for implementation of the New gTLD Program Next Round as the topic lead for this area. He then brought Bob Ochieng, ICANN Org New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sr. Director, to discuss the new gTLD program. Bob informed GAC participants about the next round of new gTLDs with the goal of representatives better contributing to GAC discussions on these matters.

Finally Rosalind Kenny-Birch (United Kingdom) and Tracy Hackshaw (UPU) gave some background and objectives of the GNSO Guidance Process on the Applicant Support Program. They also detailed what is currently being discussed and what is potentially up for GAC consideration and discussion during the week of ICANN78.

This session received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being "Very Satisfied" (11/20).

## Session 3 | **The GAC High Level Government Meeting - Introduction, Background and Preparations**

The next session had its focus a few months in the future, the HLGGM preceding the ICANN80 Meeting in Kigali, Rwanda on 9 June.

Laurent Ferrali outlined the production schedule for the meeting, along with the process to create the agenda and decide what will be discussed on that day. Charles Guhungu (Rwanda) provided an introduction to the history of hosts of the HLGGM meetings in the past as well as some logistics for the

HLGM in Kigali. “Our government is very ready to receive you, to host you, and we are ready to engage all government leaders to be able to attend such kind of very important meeting”, said Charles.

This led Laurent to begin discussing the HLGM agenda and agenda setting procedure. This was done in the context of best practices learned from past meetings as well as some discussions about what was of importance in Hamburg.

Speakers from delegations including Grenada, Mauritania, Trinidad and Tobago, Hungary, Netherlands, UK, Nigeria, Egypt, and others provided input on things they’d like to see on an agenda or what the processes should entail. This brainstorming will allow the GE team and GAC Support Staff to work on a framework to be presented to and collaborated on with GAC Members and Observers for the next half year.

This session also received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (11/20).

## **Session 4 | Breakout Session - GAC Regional Priorities and Issues Identification (Part 1)**

## **Session 5 | Breakout Session - GAC Regional Priorities and Issues Identification (Part 2)**

These two sessions are grouped as they were both part of the breakout sessions for the first day of the GAC CDW. The first session was the actual group brainstorming and discussion session. The teams self-selected into groups that were classified by the following languages: two English Language groups, and then one group for each of the following languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, and Spanish. The unit of observation for the different prompts provided was the geographic region in which the participants were part of. For example the English Language Group had to consider North America, Europe, and Africa, while the Arabic Group discussed the Middle East and Africa. This is an important distinction from the ICANN77 CDW, which was strictly language based discussions. The geographic regions allowed for better framing within the ICANN engagement model and was well received by the participants. There was also an online group, which was conducted in English for those attending the ICANN meeting remotely to participate in an equitable manner to how the in room discussions were conducted.

The second of the two sessions allowed for each language group to present their findings and results of their discussions.

The following were the guiding questions posed to the participants, mainly about internet governance and the role of the GAC, and answers varied between groups and locations.

1. Outside the context of the GAC, how do government representatives in your region collaborate and interact on Internet/DNS matters?
2. How is ICANN viewed by governments in your region and what can be done to enhance the perception of ICANN in developing countries?
3. From your delegation perspective, and considering the ICANN78 key topics for discussion in the GAC this week, which issues in your region do you believe merit particular attention and why?

4. What issues (policy, operations, etc), are of concern to your government/region that you believe need to/should be discussed within the GAC?
5. How can regional participation by GAC members be improved?

Both of these sessions received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (11/20).

## Day 2

### Session 6 | **Introduction to the Namespace and Case Study**

While the first day of the CDW was assisted by the ICANN Government Engagement Team, the second day of the CDW featured members of ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO). Tracy Hackshaw (UPU) and Alisa Heaver (Netherlands) were the hosts for today’s sessions, which instead of being introspective towards the GAC and ICANN policy issues, looked outwards at emerging technologies and alternatives to the IANA Namespace.

David Huberman of OCTO was first to speak, focusing on the current DNS and resolution because in order to understand what is new and different, it was important to lay the groundwork for the technical backend of the current system. This “Ted Talk” style presentation centered GAC Members on how the domain name system works from entering a URL to getting a webpage in return.

Alain Durand of OCTO then went into the Alternative Name Systems (ANS) that are currently and formerly in operation, including Handshake and Tor networks. The presentation focused on the characteristics and technical drivers of alternative namespaces along with challenges to the IANA namespace.

Of note to the GAC, DNS Abuse was discussed with relation to Alternative Name Systems.

This session also received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (16/22).

### Session 7 | **Blockchain - Introduction and Applied Learning**

Building on the introduction in the last session, Alain Durand went over how blockchain tech works. In general, not specifically related to domain names, blockchain information was presented along with a technical overview for the backend of the blockchain.

To more specifically tie together blockchain technology and the DNS, Paul Hoffman of OCTO applied the two together into how web3 domains work (including resolution). Paul discussed how data in the blockchain name systems differs from the global DNS. Most importantly, this presentation helped the audience understand the mechanisms behind the scenes for things like reporting DNS abuse and the processes needed to remove a web3 domain from service.

Paul, Alain, and David then all took questions from the GAC on the topics of the day before the panel discussion to take place in the next session.

This session also received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (16/22).

## Session 8 | **Alternative Namespaces: Policy Issues for the GAC**

A panel was convened and moderated by Owen Fletcher (USA) and Alisa Heaver (Netherlands) with industry experts to discuss real trends and information about the information that was disseminated earlier during the OCTO led sessions.

This panel was made up of Georgia Osborn (DNS Research Federation), Marc Trachtenberg (Greenberg Traurig LLP), Ray King (Pork Bun), Swapneel Sheth (Verisign), Régis Massé (Afnic), and Brian Beckham (WIPO).

The main topics were the security and stability of the DNS and ANS, Trademark Issues, and GAC / Community Responses to the issues presented by the Alternative Name Systems.

This session also received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (18/22 - The highest rated session of the CDW)

## Session 9 | **Breakout Session - Identifying Government Technology Policy Interests and Concerns (Part 1)**

## Session 10 | **Breakout Session - Identifying Government Technology Policy Interests and Concerns (Part 2)**

Similar to day one’s breakout sessions in format, the second day’s breakouts diverged on content and were aligned with the topics discussed by OCTO, subject matter experts, and community members on emerging technologies and the alternative name systems.

The guiding questions for these discussions are listed here:

1. Do you have other concerns or questions related to blockchain-based namespaces, beyond what was already discussed today?
2. What public policy considerations should guide the GAC, or governments, in addressing any issues related to alternative namespaces?
3. Do alternative namespaces deserve further attention from the GAC? If so, what should the GAC focus on?
4. What technical information or input does the GAC need to inform its approach to these issues?
5. What DNS matters or tech innovations keep your government’s Internet policy makers and regulators up at night?
6. Are there other emerging technology issues the GAC should learn more about?

The joint session also received 100% satisfaction from those who completed the survey, with the most common response being “Very Satisfied” (16/22).

# Post CDW Survey

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1x\\_LrK2e71rCguF05DpMH0iM\\_tUBHWcZqpO-iiYRN8Kk/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1x_LrK2e71rCguF05DpMH0iM_tUBHWcZqpO-iiYRN8Kk/edit?usp=sharing)

A survey was designed and conducted to gain feedback on the CDW, with the goal of improving delivery and increasing GAC participant satisfaction in future workshops, including at the ICANN79 Community Forum in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Questions were asked to determine, both qualitative and quantitative satisfaction with all ten sessions over two days of the workshop. Using best practices for surveys, including five point likert scales, neutral language, and similar questions to past CDW surveys in an attempt to establish longitudinal data and results, 16 questions were sent to all participants.

Out of 83 participants (based on attendance estimates from ICANN's meetings team), 22 submitted surveys. This is an increase of 100% over the ICANN77 Post-CDW Survey (11 respondents). Compared to the last ICANN AGM, there were fewer respondents to the post-CDW survey (31 vs 22)

Some interesting findings include overall satisfaction of either "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" of 21/22 respondents. The remaining respondent provided neutral feedback. Compared to ICANN 77, which used a different likert scale, this has decreased from 100% answering "satisfied" or "very satisfied". This is not statistically significant, but still of note that there is room for improvement.

The Day 1 CDW (GAC Foundations) had a slightly lower satisfaction than Day 2 of the CDW (Emerging Technologies and Alternative Name Systems), but overall they both had 100% "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied". For Day 1 the split was 10 "somewhat satisfied" and 9 "very satisfied". For Day 2 the split was 17 "very satisfied" and 5 "somewhat satisfied". The difference in denominator relates to higher attendance among respondents for Day 2 over Day 1.

The highest rated session of the entire CDW per respondents was the Alternative Name Systems Panel on day 2, with 18 of the 22 responding "very satisfied" with the session.

Relating to the breakout sessions, there was great satisfaction qualitatively as well, with participants stating that breakout sessions "are very useful to initiate cooperation between participants" and that when compared to past workshops this "CDW was a lot more hands on, with possibility to participate in dialogue and engage with others." A suggestion relating to this was to adapt the CDW to include "Less formal lecture style presentations, and more discussion time."

Suggestions for future CDWs included the following:

Internet Policy Development (working with the ISOC)
quick summary of current development
Management of ccTLDs
Policy making, approval, design and implementation process and how the GAC can interact with it. A session on NIS2 impact on Internet Governance and ICANN may be of interest for all GAC members.

ccTLD redelegation

For instance, "Challenges for the role of the GAC in the future" or "Interplay of the GAC in the current internet governance ecosystem", although I would be interested in many others, depending on the future needs of the GAC.

Emerging technologies apart from Ethereum namespace system

UA and EAI

Explore more the relation and issues related to ccNSO

3 Key topics should be addressed at the next set of CDWs, however a major focus should be placed upon how GAC representatives can leverage their ICANN attendance to help their country: 1) the interaction between ICANN and the RIRs (particularly as related to numbering policy, the ASO, and the IANA function); 2) the importance of ccTLDs to country development and/or digitisation efforts and how various countries can leverage their attendance at ICANN to help make best use of their ccTLD; 3) the role of ICANN and the GAC as relevant to cybersecurity.

Economics of the DNS

Role of new technologies in the context of the DNS (Quantum, AI, Virtual Worlds)

Bulk registration of domains

To share the basics surrounding Internet governance / technologies is an urgent challenge for GAC to engage its members in the deeper discussion within the ICANN. Expect the CDW to raise the knowledge-level of GAC participants to help them share better understanding of the common ground in the ICANN community(ies).

## Thank You and Acknowledgements

In addition to the organizers, planners, moderators and presenters, the GAC would like to thank the following groups for their collaboration and work on making the ICANN78 GAC CDW a successful event: ICANN GAC Support, Government Engagement (GE), Global Stakeholder Engagement (GSE), Global Domains & Strategy (GDS) , and Policy Development Support Teams.

## Appendix

Discussion Notes from Day 1 Breakout sessions:



# ENGLISH

## NAmer.

- ① Nat'l, IGF, Meetings, RIRs - ARIN
- ② Address barriers to entry: simplify process raise awareness, change management
- ③ Focusing on ICANN's remit
- ④ Wider IGF context, transparency in ICANN
- ⑤ Translation/output docs

## Asia Pacific

- ① APNIC
- ② same as above
- ③ All (diverse region - developed - undersew)
- ④ GDC, WSIS+20 - key int'l dialogue
- ⑤ Time Zones - meetings / simplify info avoid opaque language.

## Africa

- ① AfrINet
- ② same as above; discussions re coverage, affordability cloud issues re infrastruct. - infuse ICANN into national IGFs, encourage state govt particip.
- ③ Role of emerging tech vs sovereignty Policy Discussions
- ④ Targeted awareness / cap bldg
- ⑤ Emerging techs - changing roles

## LAC

- ① LAC XIC, ~~ARIN~~
- ② same as above - diff to navigate
- ③ All - slow to act (Cbean) - focus has been on cybersec.
- ④ Policy Devel / Int'l Participation in global dialogue
- ⑤ Simplify Processes Awareness / cap bldg

## Europe

- ① RIPE, EURODIG
- ② same as above
- ③ Collect Access to Registration Data
- ④ Global ICT / IGF Discussions
- ⑤ Simplify / Simplify communication of info

# ARABIC

① \* Internet issues WG  
under LAS

\* ITV Arab WG  
on related issues

② <sup>Enhance</sup> Outreach to relevant  
<sup>regional</sup> orgs to create a link  
with GAC and

ensure active participation  
of GAC members and

encourage new members to join  
\* HLCM is a good opportunity



3- \* UA to ensure meaningful connectivity for digital economy and inclusion

- \* Applicant support program (regulatory constraints/compliance)
- \* New gtds (early warning, sensitive strings, lessons learned)

4- \* ~~Strengthen~~ role of government in setting policies related to Management of CCTLD

- \* Regional capacity Building and facilitating knowledge sharing in the region.

⑤ Encourage activities participat  
GAC's regional mailing list  
\* on  
~~to coordinate pre-meeting~~

\* continuous coordination  
on topics of importance  
and potential advice



# ENGLISH

## Caribbean

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

The budgeting...  
Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

## ASEAN

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

## AFRICA

### African telecom union

## EU

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

## Pacific Regional Forum

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...

Q1 (A) - Why is it not...  
Q2 (A) - Some of the technical...  
Q3 - all of the common...  
Q4 - it is not easy to...  
Q5 - party was not...