
ICANN77 | PF – GAC Capacity Development Workshop on DNS Abuse (1 of 3)
Sunday, June 11 2023 – 10:45 to 12:15 DCA

GULTEN TEPE: Hello and welcome to ICANN77 GAC Capacity Development Workshop on the DNS Abuse on Sunday, 11th of June at 10:45 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put it in the proper form. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking. You may access all the available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to GAC chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much, Gulden. Can you hear me? Can you hear me okay?

GULTEN TEPE: Yes, we do.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: How many people in the room speak Portuguese? Can you raise your hands please? One. How many people in the room speak Spanish?

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.

Could you please raise your hand? And I see only One. Okay. We'll do English then. So good morning, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen. It is my great pleasure and honor to welcome you to this Capacity Building Workshop for government delegates. This workshop is part of the ongoing efforts to strengthen the role and participation of governments in the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance. The main purpose of this workshop is to leverage your understanding and knowledge on different aspects of the multi-stakeholder model. The role and operations of the GAC, the Governmental Advisory Committee and also to build on the first DNS abuse workshop held back in Cancun. I think it was ICANN76 if I'm not mistaken, in Cancun.

The focus this time will be on developing policy advice for these and future meetings. This workshop will provide you with an opportunity to interact with experts and peers from different regions and backgrounds to exchange views and experiences and to learn from best practices. I hope you will find this workshop informative, engaging and useful for your work. I would like to thank the organizers, Karel, Tracy, the United States government, Susan Chalmers, Ken, and I hope I don't forget anybody. Pua Hunter and the under underserved regions working group, and the sponsors of course of this workshop for their general support and dedication.

I would also like to thank all the speakers and facilitators for their valuable contributions and insights. And last but not least, I would like to thank you the participants for your interest and commitment to this important topic. I wish you all a productive and enjoyable workshop. Thank you so much. And with that, let me give the floor to my good friend Tracy. Go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thanks, Nico. Are you guys hearing me okay? All right. Today, we're going to have some fun. So, I don't see any serious faces, nobody's checking their mail and all sorts of lovely things. We're going to be really engaged today. We're going to hear from everyone today. For those who know me, I don't like the four people speaking alone. Maybe we could start by, why are you guys so far apart? Why are you guys like so spaced out? Why don't you try and come a little closer together? I know COVID is not over, but a little bit closer, don't spread out so much. That's a good idea. Not seeing anyone doing it, but today we're going to do some moving around. So, don't worry, if you don't move around now, we're going to make you move around later. So, thanks, Nico and thanks everyone for joining us today.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Before I forget, I'll have to leave like in 10 or 15 minutes. I apologize beforehand because I have to be-- The Board workshop happens to be at the same time. Very sorry about that, but I'll have to sneak out in about 15 minutes.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

I won't let you pass. Let's see how it goes. All right, Thanks, Nico again. And so, my name is Tracy Hackshaw. I'm with the Universal Postal Union. I'm an observer to the GAC. I'm also part of the Capacity Development Workshop planning team along with my colleagues, Karel, Susan, Pua, the whole USG team, Ken and everyone, as well as

the wonderful team at ICANN org and our GAC support staff. Thank you so much.

Today, we are going to be focusing on the DNS abuse topic and specifically the contract amendments that were published recently. And what I would like to do today is let you know that we'll be moderating some of the sessions that you're going to be hearing today, but keeping in mind they're all interactive and ensuring that you take part fully, engage fully, understand fully of what we're doing with our topic. To do that, I want to start by introducing my colleague, my cool moderating colleague, Karel, who I just saw. There he is. Yes. Karel, go ahead. Yes.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Tracey, and thank you everybody, Nico included, of course, GAC chair. My name is Karel Douglas. I'm from Trinidad and Tobago. And this is yet another important workshop for you guys. It's really designed to make you all, or us interactive. So, you would recall we had the first one in Kuala Lumpur, which was an amazing success. We had one in Cancun, and again, this is another one and hopefully there'll be more with the intention of ensuring that people, you, understand the issues, what the issues are and also get involved.

That is really the objective. That's why it's so important for you to be involved understand with issues. By all means, ask questions. That is exactly what we want you to do, ask questions. And even if you don't necessarily want to ask it here, we do have an opportunity this evening when we have our social to interact with your fellow GAC members and

observers. So, it's really designed for you, today is about you. We hope that you will enjoy it and also find it quite informative as well.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Karel. Who here speaks French? All right. You are aware there's interpretation, so if you are struggling to understand the English and so on, please use the headsets so that we know you're paying attention and we know you're not checking your mail and doing other things at your desk. So, I want to encourage everyone, we put the-- as you can see, we actually put the headsets in front of you today so that you would not have an excuse that you didn't know that there were headsets. They're in front of you. So, we would really like you to encourage you to listen to the interpretation which we all in the back there, you see them in all the languages that you need.

Who speaks Arabic? All right. Good. So, we have Arabic. We have French. Who speaks Spanish? All right. Spanish, okay. But these questions are important for later. Trust me. And any other languages in the room that we haven't called as yet that are interpreted? Portuguese? Chinese? Russian? All right. Interesting. Good. So, we're going to have language breakouts later. So, keep that in mind. All right. More on that soon.

Now the objective of today's workshop is to ensure that you guys all have, as I said, all are engaged fully, understand what's going on with this DNS abuse topic, especially the contract amendments. But the objective is not today to start writing public comment. I'll make that very clear. We're not doing that today. So, don't get into the we'll be writing a public comment today. That's not happening today. We want

to encourage you to understand the topic and to get familiar with the public comment process. So, ask questions about the topic and the process so you fully understand it, and start thinking about whether you want to play a role in that process. Do you want to get involved? How far do you want to get involved? Nico?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Very quickly. Please feel free to ask any kind of question, technical or policy related, any kind of question in your native language. Well, provided is one of the languages for which we have translation services, right?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Definitely. We want to encourage language to be a big focus of today's meeting, diversity. We really want to encourage you to use the interpretation facilities and engage fully with us today. Thank you, Nico for that. Now the sessions today are meant to be fully interactive as Nico was pointing out. Questions can be asked at any time, at any time. Don't wait until people run through all the slides and then questions at the end, ask during. Feel free to ask questions during, engage with all the people who are presenting who kindly agree to present today.

Now the outcome today is for you to understand what is going on within ICANN and within the GAC on the issue related to DNS abuse. So, with that, I hope you've had a chance to review the material before coming to this morning's session. We sent you written material. You've had the webinars, the recordings are there, the slide decks are there. So, if you have not made yourself familiar, it's probably a good time to use the

brakes to get yourself fully acclimatize it because we're going into a deep dive without even much headwinds, so we're going straight in.

Now Susan Chalmers from the NTIA is here with us. Susan was a very key part with her entire team in forming the overall strategy for this workshop. And as the host country, I want to invite Susan to say a few words to us now. Susan?

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Sure. Well, thank you, Tracy. Good morning, everybody. It's such a pleasure to see such robust attendance, and it was also very nice to see how many different languages are being spoken in the room, though I know that was not an exhaustiveness. But in any event, I'd just like to welcome you to Washington, DC. We're very pleased that you'll be joining us today for this Capacity Development Workshop. It is the culmination of a number of different webinars, as mentioned by Karel earlier. And please feel free to reach out with any questions and feel comfortable to intervene if anything comes to mind. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

I'm going to test our strategy of a talk show. So, Susan, what exactly is the objective of today's workshop? What would you say is the main takeaway that you would see from today's workshop?

SUSAN CHALMERS:

So, the main objective is to create, I'll just close my laptop here, is to create an environment where we are welcoming new GAC reps into the public comment process. So, there will be a focus on the development

of the public comment process, how that works within the GAC and then we have an opportunity for practical application of the tools that we use today to develop public comment and the proposed DNS abuse contract amendments. So, I'd say first, it's we're focusing on the public comment, and then we can dive a little bit into the substance and there will be a DNS abuse session on Wednesday, I believe, where the GAC can further discuss the substance.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you, Susan. Now, Nico, go ahead. Ask your question at any point.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: No, no, it's not a question. It's just an apology because I have to leave. But again, I will like to thank once again the speakers and facilitators for their valuable, actually invaluable contribution. And by the way let me tell you one thing. There are people from other stakeholder groups and constituencies. I mean, this is becoming popular, this is becoming important and rightly so because it is, but there are people from other stakeholder groups who would like to join these workshops, maybe not now, but certainly in the near future. So, with that, let me thank again the US government, the underserved regions working group, Karel, Tracy, Manal and everybody involved. I hope I don't forget anybody. And my apologies again, but I have to leave for the Board meeting. Thank you so very much.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

And thank you, Nico, for realizing the importance of this and coming and sharing with us. Really appreciate it. Thank you so much. All right. As Nico leaves, we did want to also recognize a colleague of ours, Blaise from the DRC, who is here today, I believe. Yes. Show your hand. There you are. And Blaise was actually supposed to present in our webinar, but he was unable to due to some timing issues and the second webinar on May.

So, I'm going to ask Blaise now to probably say a few words. Are you going to stay there, Blaise? Yeah. Say a few words on the perspective of DNS abuse from perhaps from your country, from the perspective of underserved regions and, Blaise, perhaps you could also speak to us about why it's importance for countries like yourself and others who are involved in this process as governments to participate in this public comment process. Blaise, go ahead.

BLAISE AZITEMINA:

Thank you very much, Tracy. And first and foremost, I would like to introduce myself. I'm Blaise Azitemina from the DRC, Democracy Republic of Congo, and I'm standing here in a position of the GAC representative. I would like to thank very much Tracy, Susan, and particularly the GAC support, for giving me an opportunity of bringing in public what was just a simple comment during the first webinar that we had, and they thought that it would be interesting to bring this in public. So, I thank them very much to giving an opportunity in the name of the underserved region working group to share what I think is the concern of these particular countries. So, don't expect any slide on the screen because it's just an experience sharing. So, I'll just be talking and

my intervention will be very, very brief, I think less than five to six minutes.

So, when we're introducing the meeting, our session, I think Tracy or the GAC chair just mentioned that there's translation available. So, I would like to make use of this facility, which was for a long time maybe problem and now has been corrected or addressed by ICANN in particular during our GAC meetings. So, as an encouragement to my colleagues speaking French particularly and other languages, I'll just show by an example that it's possible to raise concern, to participate in your particular language. So, I'll be speaking in French.

TRACY HACKSHAW: The headsets are on your desk in front of you. Thank you.

BLAISE AZITEMINA: Yes, I may wait for one minute by the time that everyone gets set. I may understand those not wearing headset they understand French, so they are still comfortable. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak during this session. This is a session that is meant to help us share our experience. We are helping the new GAC representatives be prepared, but it is very encouraging to see that during those sessions, you have colleagues who have been here for a while, representatives who have been here more so than newcomers. So, it shows that everyone still has to learn that there are new experiences, there are new topics. And even though we might have been here for a while, we can still learn because we work in an industry that evolves very much.

For a long time, we thought that it was important that all representatives be able to work at the pace of the GAC, but we have the US RWG countries that's always have a hard time presenting their concerns. We thought that for a while, it was an issue because there were difficulties with the translation process, but actually that issue was completely solved by ICANN and I would like to thank ICANN for that.

And so, what we thought is perhaps the issue is the topic. The topic is not of interest for the representatives of those countries. Maybe they are not involved. Maybe they are not interested by the topics or it doesn't concern them. But I would like to thank GAC support because there is always a call out to make sure that the topics that we are concerned about are addressed during the public session. But in spite of that, we still have an issue with the participation of these underserved countries. So, we thought perhaps the issue is with the interest of the topics that we talk about.

At ICANN we have our slogans. For example, one world one internet. We have the same technical internet, but we actually don't have the same world, the same context. So perhaps these representatives are feel not involved because the topic is not their main concern. So, one of those topics for quite a while was ccTLD delegation or re-delegation because those were topics of concern to them. During those sessions, we saw African countries intervene, speak to that topic because they were concerned about ccTLD transfers, delegation, re-delegation. So, that topic was addressed and the participation of African countries or underserved region countries diminished.

As far as cybercrime and DNS abuse topics, there is a huge concern. We have a topic that has to do with trust, with serenity, and with assurance on the Internet. But when we talk about DNS abuse topics, we are talking about dangers, attacks, abuse on the classic Internet, traditional Internet. But my comment actually has to do with the fact that in our countries, especially in Africa, where the countries are least developed, the Internet is not necessarily the same as what you might be able to see in advanced countries with broadband, cable and so forth where you access the Internet behind your computer. 95% of users access the Internet on their mobile phones, so in a mobile environment.

So, the attacks are very different on that environment with a mobile when we have fishing and we have any other abuse regarding the web, this is quite different. We have abuse on our mobile phone. It's called mobile phishing. We have SMS that are being sent, text that are being sent. They don't do not use the DNS, but we do have this type of attacks on our phones. And they are very, very negative for us. Some money is being stolen that way and banks are using mobile phones as well. That's the way we access our banks in our countries. We have the SSD structure, we have mobile type of communication, and we have applications as well as being used. Those are internet applications, but on a mobile phone environment,

So, this is quite important for the community to understand that when we work on strategies, when you try to do prevention against threats and abuse, it's quite important to consider that in many countries, we use USSDs, SMS. And someone would like to have access to your mobile wallet or your bank account can do it through an SMS. This is not the same technical structure as DNS abuse using an Internet connection

with a computer, but this is an attack. This is a threat that is very negative for us. This is very deceptive and I don't have the solution. That's why I didn't bring any slides. But at a technical level, I do not exactly know what we can do, but we do have to find a solution. We have to propose strategies to deal with those issues and to make sure that abuse, attacks, and deceptions with SMS technologies with USSD technologies as well and mobile technologies can be dealt with by our community.

So, we'd like to thank the organizers for us to be able to talk about those issues, this is quite important for us. For most delegates, to represent governments. And for us and with our governments, we need to do better at that level. If we're able to help out at that level, we're talking about privacy, yes, but here we are talking about money being stolen from accounts and we need to do more and better at that level. And the GAC representatives have to look into it even if the web is not used the same way. We do receive text and SMS and says these where we are being asked to enter some details and this is as serious as web-based DNS abuse. This is why I wanted to talk about those topics and those issues of security. Thank you very much for your attention.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, Blaise. I just wanted to ask Julia, what time is this session supposed to end, 1.1?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: When you say the session, you mean?

TRACY HACKSHAW: This one, 1.1 after Blaise speaks. There's some questions.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: That was when this group is going in and we were going to switch to the next item.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yeah. And the time, what time would it be you think?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: No, that's not that.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Do we have any time for questions? I think there's at least one question in the room.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Yes, questions, yes, of course.

TRACY HACKSHAW: All right. And of course, I'd like to welcome all remote participants as well. If you have any questions or remote, please feel free to ask them. I'm seeing one question already in a room from the CTU, Nigel. Go ahead.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you very much. Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. It's a question of clarification really in terms of the challenge that Blaise was describing. And the clarification I'm looking for is In the SMS messages that are received, they have the phishing messages, do they typically contain web links or is the phishing totally independent of the usual Internet URL, you've got a malicious site and that sort of thing? So, that's the clarification I'm looking for you. You're making a distinction that it's not the usual web-based thing, it's coming through SMS, and I'm wondering if in the SMS, they are encouraging you to click on a link still, or if it's totally separates from that web-based technique. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thanks, Nigel. Blaise?

BLAISE AZITEMINA: Thank you very much, Nigel, for your question. That's a very interesting question. Actually, my concern during that webinar we had where I raised the question was in that form. You get an SMS, it's both of them. It either is sent to you a link. They encourage you through the promise of something or the deception is always the same through web or whatever, the text is the same. But it's either you have a link where when you click, you go to the classic, if I may call it classic web, and then there, you go through, I mean, you are-- It's now the normal DNS abuse we know in that same, but there are some other SMS.

That's why I also raised the platform of USSD. You get an SMS in terms of either a push, they ask you to dig to-- I mean, just either to call a

number, when you just call a number, you go through a platform where you are taking in charge, and then there they rob you. Or they send the push, you have to type a code. When you type a code starting, let's say, through hash, a number, and then hash you sent, you are taken in charge by them, you are under their control.

So, it's both of them and that's what I raised. I said, of course, you are addressing the issue of normal web that we know but do take in consideration that other users, most of them are under the mobile environment, and they don't always fall under the classic web, but they are still robbed. They are still also facing the problem, their identity, privacy, and money are in danger, but not on the classic web that we know under other technologies with mobile operators.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Blaise. And I think that's an excellent question to pause when we have the registries and registrars later today to ask if there's any particular aspect that they understand from that, that they can deal with at all from their standpoint. Is there another question? Yes. Sorry.

KUO-WEI WU:

This is Kuo-Wei Wu, I just retired. In answering his question, I think his question is really excellent. It's not only in Africa, actually in everywhere even in Asia Pacific, the people always got the forward mobile your message or whatever to steal your money. So, Africa is not alone, everyone. The problem is you are asking who you can talk to and who can solve this problem. I can tell you that. First of all, it's a mobile

company because you know that mobile company control all the flow of the show message because SMS is going to the mobile company.

And some of them, another one is, remember in a mobile environment only to company in charge. Apple, android Google. So, if we can ask the Apple and android coming to join to talk to them how to solve this kind of abuse. This is kind of abuse. I think everybody-- And more than abuse, actually it's separate crime. It's a crime. But if you want to talking about the international labor, how to do it then with this, then you might be need to go to the telecommunication, the organization. But basically, your question is everybody's question, the same problem. And this is not abuse. This is crime. And the solution would be the mobile company and also Google and Apple. They have to work harder to prevent this kind of misuse, a wrong way to using the mobile application. And finally, I think of course, you always can raise this question in every possible way to figure out. That is just try to help.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much. Yes. Question from Egypt, I guess. Yes.

ABDALMONEM GALILA:

This is Abdalmonem. Actually, it is a comment rather than a question. Actually, I think is an issue for the next abuse and SMS is related to two main arms. The first arm is related to authorization and second arm is verification. The authorization like that I received a message from Google, I received a message from Facebook, how could the country whitelist these center IDs in order to send me a message?

So, some of the regulators or some of the countries went into why at least these sender IDs, you have to be licensed from this telecom regulator or from this country in order to send the messages to the clients for this telecom operator. This is one of the issues is to authorization. But at the same time most of the attacks and most of the issues came from internally, not from outside. So, I solve the issue from outside for whitelisting the sender IDs and don't have a solid arm for the internal client in order to make some phishing or send some SMS to the client using some other sender IDs. This is the first thing.

Second thing is sending is related to verification. Maybe the message you contain itself contains some links. I received the message from the bank HSBC, but the content of the machine itself contain a link to a fake URL. That will be a crime as well. That is my comment. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much. And not seeing any questions on remote or otherwise, I think we are okay. Thank you very much, Blaise, and that was obviously very interesting and very engaging to all our questions. So, they said maybe the point you raised, we can also raise it during the registry-registrars contracted parties house aspects when that comes up later today along with ICANN org in the session we have after the break, after lunch, I believe. So now I'm going to hand out to my colleague, Karel, who is going to take it from here and moderate the next session.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Yes, thank you Tracy. I just wanted to go back to Blaise. I mean, the issue is so important, the two issues. One is the actual DNS abuse issue, but the other issue is involvement of countries who may or may not see the importance of the issue. Because you mentioned that some people or some countries, sorry, may attend and may not be involved because it doesn't resonate or the importance doesn't really transfer to well, is this going to affect me or how does it affect me? How are these issues that are being discussed in this big room with a lot of acronyms that you said? No, I don't understand. And I go back home to whatever country I would have come from and I'm not able to either transmit the message, I don't understand the message. And I guess a, that is why we are here and b, this is why we have to get involved because you're right, a lot of these issues do affect us, your citizens, the people who are using mobile networks or other networks as the case may be.

So, yes, so we really want to get persons involved and understand the message and understand why it is important to you and your people, and to carry the message back and see what could be done. So, in my country, certainly, we have actually, I work with the telecom regulator, I'm the legal person there. And the two issues that came up here concern matters where the regulator has a role to play. So certainly, I see the importance of it so that I will go home and indicate to my superiors, hey, we need to do something about mobile efficient, mobile DNS of abuse, if that's such a thing.

But thank you. But let me move on because I know time is of the essence. So, thank you very much, Blaise and others for the fantastic questions. Our next topic is the public comment process from a GAC perspective. And we have a wonderful person of Manal, former GAC

chair and experienced member on public comment proceedings, Manal Ismail, who will provide some guidance on what is public comment. Why it is important to the GAC and share her experience with the process and any lessons learned that participants can take away.

We will also be joined by Benedetta Rossi, GAC support staff posted on matters related to public comment proceedings, processes in the GAC. Benedetta, and I said, Bernadette, before, and I do apologize for that, Benedetta will provide context on the different steps when public comment proceedings are published and particularly what the GAC process is for managing these requests. So over to you, Manal and Benedetta.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Karel. And good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone here in the room and colleagues in Zoom as well. Very excited to be back with you again. It never crossed my mind that I will start this meeting from the head table again, but here we are. And Blaise, I cannot agree more with you regarding the different reasons for lack of active participation. Sometimes it's language barrier, sometimes it's the acronyms, sometimes the complexity of the topic itself or people lacking background information that they need to decide on the matter. So, it's very important that we hear back from you how we can serve you better and how we can help you prepare for the meeting.

And before getting to the slides, I think one general comment is that you may need to consider this GAC work as an ongoing thing and not just leave it for the three ICANN meetings because, intersessionally, you

need to make sure whether or not the topics on the GAC agenda are of interest to your government or your organization. Make sure whether or not you have national stands on the different topics so, that by the time you arrive here at the meeting, you are able to engage actively and discuss freely representing your national views. If you just start preparing at the time you are here and the maximum is that you will understand the topic, but you might not be comfortable enough sharing national views on the topic.

So, with that, if we can go to the next slide, please? And as Susan mentioned, we will start generally on public comments and then get deeper into substance in specific DNS abuse and ultimately finalized during the relevant session of the GAC. So, what is a public comment and who can submit a public comment? Public comment is the proceeding by which ICANN seek input on their work and policies. It is a very unique and important characteristic of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model.

Obviously, it contributes to ICANN's transparency, accountability and inclusion. So, everything is published on the website transparently and everyone is eligible to contribute and also provides an opportunity for the ICANN community, but also other Internet stakeholders and the general public to provide input on ICANN's work, and policies. So, I think this is a very unique characteristic to the organization, very open and anyone can provide comments and we need to benefit from this. Normally, the public comment period is open for a minimum of 40 days, unless mentioned otherwise in ICANN's bylaws or community operational procedures.

If we go to the next slide, please. And this is quickly on the supporting organizations and advisory committees and apologies if you already know this, but it's good to have a level playing field for everyone. So, ICANN has three supporting organizations and these three organizations are in charge of developing and recommending policy. So, the initiation normally comes from the supporting organizations, and then we have the four advisory committees who provide advice on a particular issue or policy area.

As you can see, the supporting organizations are the address supporting organization, the country code names, and the generic names and the advisory committees are our very own GAC and the At-Large, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and finally the Root Server Advisory Committee. I thought also it would be worth noting that despite we have four advisory committees, the GAC has a very special status in that respect, because GAC advice, if it is not followed, it triggers the ICANN bylaws for a consultation process to find a mutually acceptable way forward.

So, can we go to the following slide, please? And this is also quickly on how does the public comment work. So normally, it outlines a specific issue or question for community feedback. The public comment may seek feedback on a variety of topics and this includes ICANN org or community governance documents like operational plans or budget and so on, policy recommendations coming from the ICANN policy development process, other recommendations from organizational and specific reviews, implementation plans for consensus policy recommendations, also cross-community working group

recommendations and finally, ICANN base agreements with registry operators and registrars.

All submissions are made public and archived. And ICANN org staff summarizes submissions, identifying common themes in a summary report and then the relevant group, whether this is the ccNSO or the GNSO or the ASO, the relevant group then reviews submissions and summary report and addresses the input and finally proposes next steps. And please feel free, as Tracy and Karel mentioned, to interrupt and ask questions anytime.

Can we go to the following slide, please? So how to make a public comment submission? There is a very helpful guide describing the steps in details and the steps mainly starts by creating an account if you don't already have one. And this account will allow you to view the public comment procedures the public comment proceedings and then you can create a public comment submission, view all the submissions for a specific proceeding and also manage your public common submission. So, you can open it again, re edit something modify and so on as far as the public comment period is still open and you're not past the deadline and the submissions, it's worth noting here that an individual government or intergovernmental organization can submit their individual comments as well and of course, it goes without saying that we also submit collective GAC input.

But I thought sometimes it's a topic of specific interest to individual governments. So please even if the GAC is not submitting collective input on the topic, feel free to submit an individual submission. And finally, on this, you can also subscribe to the public comment

announcement system, which would alert you when a new upcoming public comment proceeding is published or an upcoming proceeding opened the close date of an open proceedings. If it is extended, if the proceeding is closed and finally, whenever a report is published for a closed proceeding. Yes, Tracy Please.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Hi, Manal. I wanted to find out a little more about that comment you made about the individual country comment. What is your experience with that being the case? Have you seen a lot of that in your time where individual countries submit comments in addition to GAC public comment in place of if GAC doesn't submit anything, and if that does happen, how would you see that working normally? Do they need to come and tell the GAC that it did something? That kind of synergy. Is that happening or is it just they do things on their own? And if they do, how do they do it in your experience?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Tracy. And indeed, a very important question and Definitely, there were several individual submissions and an Egypt that individual submissions on topic of specific interest to Egypt. I recall submissions during the introduction of ITNs, So, we had individual submissions and also, I think during the AINA transition, we had several governments submitting individual input as well. It's always good to bring it to the attention of the GAC because sometimes it can align with other governments. It may serve as an eye opener. You may find others supporting the same points and this may encourage submission by

other government supporting your very own comments which really also happened during, I recall also the introduction of IDNs.

At the time, we made sure to share our comments as a government within the GAC and this triggered discussions within our region, within the Arab countries and even we started coordinating at other venues other than ICANN like the League of Arab States and we ended up by several government submitting input even if they are not members of the GAC, so you don't really have to be a member of the GAC to submit the input. So, it's good to coordinate with other interested GAC members even to support your very own views. So, we can have sessions and sessions about the AINA transition. I hope this address is your question, Tracy. And we have also long-standing members in Zoom. So please feel free to chime in. Can we go to the following slide?

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Manal, I think we have a question from Mr. Nigel Cassimire.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Please, Nigel.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:

Thank you. It's not really a question. Just I think it's also worth mentioning that the ICANN website, you go to ICANN.org and across the tab, there's also an option to click on public comment. Which gives you all the open public comments documents. So, it's a quick reference as well. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sure. Please, Thiago, go ahead.

THIAGO DAL-TOE: Thank you so much, Manal. Following up on Tracy's question. So, when the GAC does provide a public comment, how is that process in terms of negotiation? And given that we have a 40-day period, these meetings are done online. Do we make the call-in advance and we present a topic to the GAC and then there's a discussion? So just to understand when this discussion takes place within the GAC?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Sure, and I think this is a perfect introduction to the upcoming discussion and just before, I think, was this the last slide on my part? Can we go to the following slide, please, just to check? So, one more slide and then we will get into the specific process, but before doing that, just quickly to mention that of course, if a government or an intergovernmental organization is submitting their own individual input, they will do this individually within the GAC, we normally coordinate and then we have Benedetta, our support staff submitting on behalf of the GAC.

So, what are the benefits of public comment. I think we've already touched on a few, but generally speaking, It's an example of the multi stakeholder model in action. It reflects diverse viewpoints and expertise which accordingly strengthens and refines the proposals. Also, as we mentioned, transparent and accountable and this

reinforced the legitimacy of the outcomes and makes it easier to be trusted and adopted if it is transparent and accountable.

For the GAC, historically, the GAC provided input at the time when the policy recommendations were submitted to the Board for approval. And at this late stage within the ICANN PDP, the GAC concerns were very difficult to address because it was a late stage within the process. And accordingly, I can accountability and transparency review teams, they came out with recommendations encouraging GAC early engagement within the discussions.

So, it is definitely an opportunity for governments and intergovernmental or organizations to make their voices heard, as said individually or collectively, and in a timely manner so that they can be taken into consideration. So, with that, shall I hand it back to you, Karel, please?

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Manal. And thank you so much for a fantastic presentation on the public comment process. I'll pause for any questions before I go to Benedetta. But while we pause, I just wanted to underscore the importance of what you said far as the importance. So, importantly, yes, we have to do the process to ensure transparency and object activity, but there's also a critical issue here at hand is that being involved in the process, being involved in the process means that you have a role in the outcome and that is important so that at the end of the day, Benedetta, correct me where I'm wrong If I'm wrong, but I think the idea is that if you're at the table, then you have a role to play and that's why it's so important to be involved. so being able to comment

on things that take place has a direct impact on the outcome. And so that's why we want you to be involved as much as you can. But I do see a hand – yes, Canada.

JASON MERRITT:

Thank you so much, Jason Merritt from Canada. Thank you for the presentation. Thank you for all the information. I think this is a fantastic session to host. I just had a quick question and maybe perhaps we'll get to this, but in terms of the follow-on action after submission to a public comment, what are if any the obligations or the procedural processes to acknowledge or address any comments that are submitted from an organization perspective? Does that make sense? Thanks.

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Okay. And this is Benedetta speaking. I think it really depends on the comment at hand. I find it slightly difficult to provide a sort of an overall answer to the question, Jason, but for all public comments, ICANN org will provide a public comment report outlining what all the comments stated and then sort of next steps in terms, then it depends if it's a policy development process, if it's going to go to the Board. But again, it really depends on what the comment is about.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Germany.

RUDY NOLDE:

Thank you. Rudy Nolde from Germany for the workload. I have a similar question on the value of these public comments and how they are considered in a certain process because public comments or public consultations are common in many countries, oftentimes mandated by law, but it's not always the case that this leads to any change in a certain policy proposal, mainly because traditionally public consultations take place when many decisions have already been taken. So, my question would be how these public comments are being taken into account and do they really influence ICANNs work? Or is it advisable to engage in these, I can process these at an earlier stage.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Rudy. And in fact, these consultations take place before the decision making. So, it should be shaping the final decision making. So, it's very important that the input comes early during the discussions and maybe also to engage with those who have different views. So once the public comment is open, everyone submits their comments You have your comments on record, but you can also see comments by others. So, if everyone is pushing in the same direction, you can expect the final outcome to be along the lines you've submitted.

If there are different views, then maybe this is triggered to have some discussion with those who have different view and it can trigger some refinement among the community so that by the time the recommendations or the outcome reaches the Board, it becomes easier for the Board or at least the decision becomes obvious or easier to make. Otherwise, if we wait until very late in the process when the Board is discussing. It still weak and influence, but it becomes very

disrupt of the process and we repeat the whole work again and it's not of course appreciated by other parts of the community. But just to quickly differentiate between two things before giving the floor to Iran and the Zoom Room, just to differentiate between the GAC advice to the Board and GAC input to PDP.

So, our GAC input to the PDP is again part of the overall community input summarized in the report has been a data mentioned and considered to the extent possible. But the GAC advised to the Board has a special status and if it is not followed, so here we can exactly see how this has been considered. There is a formal process for this and if it is not followed, then this triggers the bylaws and the Board comes back to the GAC and start consulting until we find a mutual agreed way forward. Shall I give --

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yes, please. Yes. Definitely if we have calls or questions in the chat, by all means, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, please, Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Good morning. Do you hear me, please?

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

The public comments as Manal mentioned independent of the difference between public comment and GAC advice that she very perfectly mentions the differences. Public comments are two categories. Sometimes it's collective public comments or comments submitted collectively, sometimes individually. Public comment during the PDP preparation, when it comes, it depends how it's followed. If there are someone in the group that taking that public comment and the pushing for reconsideration of that, it may have some positive effects. If not, that will not be taken into account.

I have faced several times for different public comments. For instance, for IoT or IRP, we have public comments that it was 30 days and then 120 days, and then one year, then the people public comment, they change it to two years and so on and so forth. There were people in the in the group pushed for that and finally, the people investigating that take that. That is something that the-- so this is different between two type of public comments. The public comments in collective manner, for instance, like GAC comment supported the Board. Normally Board will take that into account normally. If they have problems, difficulty, that we discuss sitting Board and GAC in the common meeting and so forth. And I have not seen cases that ignored. They try to do whatever's possible, but sometimes it is not possible. But sometimes you go back to the original or origin of the policy and so on and so forth.

So, it is better we made public comment before the policy is made in a draft. Once draft is finished, then still we can make public comment but the Boards have sometimes, difficulty to treat that. So, it is better we

actively participate in the preparation of the policy and then making comments on that and trying to be behind the public comment, but not make a public comment and leave it and without taking follow-up actions. Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, Kavouss, for the comment. Quite important. I do recognize The European community, correct?

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you. It's Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. I would like to thank you for the very helpful explanation from Manal and more experienced colleagues inside the GAC and reconnected me to the question from our German colleagues. So, if I understand correctly, when we do participate into public comment, proceedings, we see then a report out of the public comments and this might lead or might not lead to action, while when there is a GAC advice on a certain matter, then this needs to be followed up in appropriate manners by the Board. So, in your experience, when the GAC participates into public comments in order for specific issues to be surely taken into account, have we ever accompanied the public comments with GAC advice on specific matters? Because this might helpful be helpful also for today's discussion. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Gemma, and thanks to the European Commission. So normally the public comment is somehow to pave the way for easy

acceptance of GAC advice at the end. So, it is more of in the government terminology lobbying for the GAC advice, it's good to start convincing other parts of the community because otherwise, the GAC would surprise everyone at the end of the process with the GAC advice, and at the same time, the Board may be receiving a very different signal from another part of the community.

So, this delays the whole process and as you know, in a bottom-up organization, difficult for the Board to decide and to say to decide on two very different views. So, it will ultimately push it back to the community again and try to get it resolved bottom up. So, it's more of delaying the process. It's easier to do the discussions first timely during the process itself so that by the time it reaches the Board, it's going to be an easy decision hopefully. Does this address your point? Thank you, Gemma.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, European Commission for your question. I've kept Benedetta waiting long enough. So, we could possibly ask questions after her presentation. If it's okay, Benedetta?

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Thank you. Thank you very much everyone. So, my name is Benedetta Rossi, and I'm part of the GAC support team. Part of my responsibilities within the support team include helping GAC members track and publish public comments. Manal provided an excellent overview on what public comments are and who can submit them. So, I'll proceed to provide some context on the actual GAC process for public

comments. So how did the GAC process on public comments evolve. In 2019, in partnership with the GAC leadership at the time, GAC support worked on areas to improve planning efforts and eventually developed a dedicated page on the website for public comments. I believe someone will post that link in the in the chat for you.

This page includes and I believe others have already mentioned this today, a list of the currently open public comment proceedings, which are also visible on the ICANN website and all public comments submitted collectively by the GAC since 2019. The purpose of this dedicated space is for GAC members that have a one stop place for information about public comment opportunities for the GAC and to ensure timely submission of comments and maximize information shared with GAC membership. In this one stop page, you can therefore find the preliminary assessment of GAC interest in filing a specific open public comment proceeding, identification of drafting responsibilities for comments that the GAC wishes to file, and then the link to public comments, which were filed by the GAC.

The process for public comment begins with GAC leadership review of open public comment proceedings. This is done via the GAC leadership meetings where a public comment review has become a standing part of their agendas. During leadership meetings, GAC support provides an overview of open public comment opportunities, noting information on the specific content of the open proceedings which areas may be of interest for collective GAC input and previous GAC leadership guidance on similar public comment opportunities.

GAC leadership then makes a preliminary recommendation on which proceedings may warrant a GAC collective input versus those which may warrant individual GAC membership input as Manal noted earlier. It's important to note as Manal reviewed earlier, that regardless of whether the GAC identifies a comment should not be filed as a collective comment, any GAC member and any community member still has the opportunity to file a comment in their individual capacity.

So once this part is completed, GAC support will share a public comment report via the GAC mailing list and this includes the list of the open public comment opportunities. So, that GAC membership is aware. And leadership guidance on possible opportunities for collective GAC input. And then GAC members are encouraged to provide input to the public comment report. So potentially identifying any comments which may warrant collective input, which weren't necessarily, for example, identified by the by the leadership team. The public comment report doesn't include decisions. They're just some preliminary guidance from the leadership team. And then if there's interest from GAC members to actually file a collective input, then that can be discussed as a follow-up.

Then once a comment is identified as warranting collective input, GAC support will liaise with the Penholders which are identified. And those can include GAC working groups, small groups, Topic leads or GAC individuals depending on the on the preceding and on the level of interest by GAC membership. And then GAC Support will provide assistance during the drafting process as needed. So, for example, with references in the drafting portion, input on the topic or the history of

the matter and then send reminders about the deadlines to Penholders to make sure that the comment is submitted in a timely matter.

Once a comment is ready for review, GAC support will share it with GAC membership via the GAC mailing list with a specific deadline for review. There isn't a set deadline for review by GAC members since this really depends on multiple variables, so including what the actual topic is. As Manal was saying, the length of the of the actual public comment preceding, how long it's going to be open for. The timing of the actual drafting of the submission by GAC membership, which can be very quick in terms of turnaround or for more challenging topics may take longer and then, for example, substantive matters pertained to policy topics may take longer than, for example, some more operational matters to draft.

So, the deadline for review is noted clearly in the email when it's submitted for review by GAC members. But there isn't a specific turnaround frame. Then input is then collected by GAC membership and reviewed in preparation for a comment to be finalized and then filed by GAC support on behalf of the of the GAC and once a comment is filed, GAC support will post it on the GAC public comment page and then share it as an FYI to GAC mailing list with a link to the to the to the comment. So at least the GAC members are aware as soon as it's been published on behalf of the GAC. If we go to the next slide, that's my final slide. Very quickly, just a little bit of data for you for you to review.

So, as I noted earlier, we've been collecting comments from the GAC since 2019 and since then, the GAC has submitted a total of 33 public comments, which is an average of approximately seven comments per

year. Based on the categories of the GAC action and decision radar, which for those who may not be aware of this really useful tool, it's a tool which provides an exhaustive picture of all the foreseeable and envisioned GAC inputs per category. And according to the categories which are included in this radar, the highest number of comments so far, so since 2019, were filed on ICANN governance topics.

I think Manal touched on this already. Include, for example, the ICANNs operating and financial plan and budget items pertaining to the effectiveness or evolving of the multi stakeholder model, and Icahn's strategic plans. There were 12 comments filed on ICANN governance topics since 2019. And then the second category which received the most public comments by the GAC is about matters pertaining to the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs with a total of 6 comments and then followed by the same number of topics or scary comments filed by the GAC on who is and data protection matters.

It's important to note that while the data somewhat identifies some of the GAC priorities, it's also very much hinges on the topics and number of public comment proceedings which are opened by ICANN. So, policy matters, for example, on new gTLDs or who is on data accuracy are very important topics to GAC members, but they hinge on the publication of reports from the GNSO, for example, when it comes to policy development. And that usually occurs not as often in the years since it depends on the milestones from the policy development process or in the working groups or similar efforts, which may take a couple of years to finalize. So, this concludes my very quick overview of the GAC process. Happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, Benedetta, with those very insightful comments on the process itself. And if there's any questions by all means, please ask a few. If not, we'll move swiftly to oh, we do have a question. Yes. So, yes, please. Thank you.

JONAS ROULE: Thank you very much. As you know, France is committed to permitting linguistic diversity. So, I will take the floor in French and a special thanks to the interpreters. So, my question is about how a majority or consensus to adopt collect active public comment of the GAC? Do we need majority of consensus?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much, France, for the question. From what I can see, Manal can obviously correct me, any comment which is submitted by the GAC as the committee is a comment that has received no objections. So even if, I don't know, let's say 10 penholders draft a comment, and when it's circulated to the to the GAC mailing list, one member says, no, I cannot I object, then it's a bit like GAC advice. It cannot be it won't go ahead. So, I hope that answers your question.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you, France, and Benedetta. Thank you so much. Yes.

ZEINA BOU HARB: I have a brief question, but maybe I switch to Arabic. And my question is addressed to Manal.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Could you identify yourself as well? Thanks.

ZEINA BOU HARB: Manal, you gave Egypt as an example of submitting a comment during the public comment procedure. Do you in Egypt? I'm asking because I'm trying to learn from you. Do you hold local discussions and submit a comment on behalf of Egypt as a whole or does that happen also through the representative from Egypt and GAC? I'm just wondering, these are just in or a comment that you are presenting, is it represented or reflecting the point of a view of one part in Egypt or as a country? I am just wondering if the comment is representing the whole Egypt as a country. I'm trying to learn from you please.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'll try my Arabic as well. Let me try to respond in Arabic. This is clear. Zeina is a representative from Lebanon just for the transcript and the previous speaker also from Lebanon. This is exactly what should be done. That there should be discussions on a local level and what is commented or what is presented should reflect as a whole point of view representing the whole Egypt.

And also, like for example, if we have something related to IDNs, we need to discuss this matter with the subject matter people in Egypt and if something related to things that deals with the foreign affairs

ministries, it we need to discuss this among people who are in charge of that. We have to have a dialogue on a national level that addressing the matter in question and then after that, we have to agree on something that represent our all point of view as and to be an Egypt point of view at the end. Thank you so much for this question.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Manal. Thank you, Lebanon, for the fantastic question. At this point and time, I'd like to move back to Manal, because Manal, I think you are going to tell us a little bit more about the identification of Topic leads and penholders and drafting and they got reviews. So over to you?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Karel. And we go to the following slide, and this is more focusing on how we do the public comment input preparations within the GAC. We have been asked several questions on how can I be a topically or a pen holder or how are they being chosen or assigned? So basically, support staff share open proceedings with the GAC leadership highlighting any presidencies in handling similar cases. So, Benedetta regularly compiles a list of all the open public common proceedings. She presents them to the GAC leadership. Also guiding the GAC leadership on how similar cases were treated before.

The GAC leadership provides initial guidance regarding the open proceedings and then probe the GAC interest in submitting collective GAC input again in light of the GAC leadership and this relates to the email you will receive regularly on the GAC mailing list from Benedetta,

compiling all the open public comment proceedings and highlighting the initial guidance from the GAC leadership. The GAC leadership then calls for volunteers among interested GAC members, either to serve as Penholders unless the topic already has an identified topic lead. If we go to the following slide, and this has to do with the drafting itself.

So, one initial draft is usually shared with the GAC for review and input and this initial draft is normally proposed by either the Topic leads and by Topic leads here, we mean volunteer, GAC members or observers who volunteered to lead us on a topic of interest to the GAC and this naturally is an ongoing discussion, so that's why we assign a topic lead. So, whenever we're discussing the topic, they do the preparatory work or try to reach out to relevant other parts of the community we need to discuss with.

For Penholders, it's a bit different. It's a onetime volunteering to address a topic that does not have a topic lead assigned to it. So, for example, we would like to comment on something other than the four topic we already have on our GAC agenda subsequent procedures, the IGO protections, DNS abuse and so on. These four topics already have Topic leads. But if a topic is popping up for the first time and we need to draft something then we try to seek Penholders. So, this is as I said, more of a onetime. Also, as Benedetta and myself mentioned earlier, sometimes if we don't have GAC volunteer and we need to submit something in relation to the governance documents, then support staff, if instructed by the GAC share, they do so on our behalf. So, they gather input from the GAC, try to formulate the first draft and then seek any feedback before submission.

In all cases, interested GAC members are always welcome and encouraged to share views and contribute to the drafting of proposed GAC input in collaboration with the Topic leads Penholders or assigned support staff. If we go to the following slide, so normally the Topic leads and Penholders compile the points of interest to the GAC or points of concern to the GAC and this would constitute the first draft that is submitted to the GAC for review. This initial draft shared with the GAC, we try to allow as much time as we can for review and feedback by the GAC and normally, we work at backward from the submission date and see how much time we can allow for GAC members to submit their comments but still allowing time to compile the comments, take them into consideration, finalize the submission and submitting it.

And again, throughout the process of course GAC support staff provides the necessary support. They assist us with references. And most importantly, it also provides prior GAC input on the same topic so that we can make sure we are not contradicting ourselves or at least we have a good reason if we're doing so. So, it's good to have information on previous GAC positions on the same topic for consistency. If we go to the following slide, I have more slides on finalization and submission, GAC members, provide comments or input, if any.

The received input is discussed normally on the mailing list. And sometimes we have calls dedicated if need be, if we would like to have more of real time discussion rather than the mailing list. The Topic leads and Penholders with the help of course of GAC support staff, they compile and reflect the agreed points in an updated final version. So not necessarily everything that was shared goes into the final draft. Sometimes after we discuss, we have a subset of points that we agree

need to be reflected and once reflected, this final version is then shared with the GAC for information and is submitted to the relevant public comment procedure hopefully by the deadline as described in details by Benedetta earlier.

And finally, and I think we've already touched on this. If we go to the last slide, please, this has to do with the visibility of the submitted public comments. So, the submitted GAC input as we mentioned earlier is posted publicly online and archived and generally speaking for parenthesis, all the submissions for a certain public account proceeding are made public. Including the name and contact information of the submitter, but I just wanted to highlight that despite not being enforceable, but still the collective GAC input has its significance as it coming from 181 governments and 38 intergovernmental organizations.

So again, even if it is not a GAC advice per the Bylaws, it still has its own weight and own significance and the public comment as I said earlier is a good opportunity to discuss and understand the different views on the topic either to get convinced or to get ready to discuss and debate. And I'll leave it at this. Thank you. Back to you, Karel. Sorry.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Manal. And you are correct. I think we will be going to Tracy next because we are a little tight on time and I know there are questions that people would like to ask, but certainly we'll have an opportunity after this session and even at social reception this evening, where you'll have a lot of chances to talk and ask questions. So please make sure that you're there. Tracy, over to you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Karel. Thank you, Manal. It's a fine excellent session on this. I know I'm standing between you and lunch, but I do have a question I wanted to ask and I'm hoping my colleague from the US government can respond. Quickly, is it possible within like just a couple of minutes as someone who has done public comment, would you be able to summarize the process that you went through and how you actually conducted the public comment itself? And I think the FTC is able to respond on that. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Sure. And first of all, what I want to emphasize and this is Laureen Kapin speaking on behalf of the Federal Trade Commission from the United States. I want to emphasize a surreal team effort so I may have been involved but I was always involved with many people. So, if it's an object that were Topic leads for as Manal had indicated, then we may be holding the pen and compiling certain issues of concern. A team will then usually go about drafting a first draft that then is submitted within the Topic leads for their review and once it's in good enough shape, so to speak, it will be circulated to the full GAC, and that usually generates questions, comments, concerns.

There will be discussions back and forth and attempts to ensure that people's concerns are addressed either through a side conversation to explain something that's ambiguous that will then hopefully be made more clear in the draft, or there will be changes made to the draft itself, and then it typically will be recirculated. But what I also really wanted to emphasize is the importance of the GAC public comments. As Manal

indicated, these are visible It's not just one government speaking, it's the entire GAC by the time that it is voted on and affirmed. And it has an impact and I just want to give two examples. One is the most recent and that is in the comment that the GAC submitted on the phase 1 implementation of the policy recommendations on domain name registration data.

The GAC had several concerns, but one was very important among others, and that was how long it takes to respond to urgent request, and the title tells you all you need to know. There are urgent requests that means that there is life or critical infrastructure in play in the request for information. That's why typically the law enforcement agency is deeming at an urgent request. And the GAC and many other members of the community, whether through an advisory group or they're in their individual capacity indicated that they believed that the implementation got it wrong because they didn't have a short time period to respond. And the GAC indicated that needed to be reconsidered and in its recent addendum looking at all the public comments, Org noted that there were a number of a large amount of input concerning the definition of urgent requests. I'm reading now from the report and they actually changed the implementation team's approach to that and to decide on a 24-hour notice period.

Now, I will tell you that generated some concern by folks who disagreed with that, and there will still be some discussions on that, but we're hoping that the conclusion which the IRT org has correctly reached in our view holds. And then also the public comment on phase 2, of the domain name registration data raised a number of concerns about the phase 2 SAD approach and we believe that had an influence in the

Board's decision to take a time out and explore on a pilot program to decide whether these recommendations are actually going to be fit for the purpose it's meant to serve.

So, I just want to highlight that one, it's a team and two, it's really important and then three, everything gets better when there are more voices heard. So, just another call to encourage folks to contribute, and this is a great example of a concrete way to introduce these topics and gather puts, so it's terrific and I commend all the organizers.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Laureen, and USG for that very helpful and brief walk-through of the process. I'd like to thank all presenters on this morning, Karel, for moderating, Manal and Benedetta for the last session. We will now be breaking for lunch. Unfortunately, then, we can't take any more questions because the interpreters who've been with us for another extra 10 minutes, thank you so much, need a break as well. And lunch is not provided unfortunately, but there are many food places around in the hotel and outside. And we hope to see you back here directly at 13:45 Washington time and at that point you will get right into the meat of the matter, the actual DNS abuse substance and the contract amendments.

So, we'll break now and we want to see you back here at 13:45 Washington time. That is, I'm not sure that is an UTC. It's 1745 UTC. Thank you so much and see you back in about 1 hour and 20 minutes? An hour and 20 minutes. Yes. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]