
ICANN77 | PF – GAC Capacity Development Workshop on DNS Abuse (3 of 3)

Sunday, June 11 2023 – 15:30 to 17:00 DCA

TRACY HACKSHAW:

All right. For those on the recording, we are going to be moving to breakout session shortly, but we'll start with Susan from USG to speak about some of the items that were discussed just recently in the last session to highlight some key points that we will be discussing going forward. So, I'll just wait for like a couple of minutes. I hope we haven't lost anyone because it looks like we have lost people. It's my major fear, but that's all right. Yeah? Colleagues, all colleagues convince your colleagues to return to the room while we begin our session. All right? We're going to begin now. Remote participants, I'm sure are waiting anxiously, so let's ensure that they're also are given enough attention. So, we don't want to leave them waiting. I'm just dragging on time for a little longer. All right. I'll hand over to Susan.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Hello. Hi everybody. So, the purpose of this breakout session in the afternoon is for folks to convene per language group, and we have different chairs set up. I see our colleagues who speak Arabic have taken advantage of the language set up there. We have French over here, English over there. And so, in terms of the substance, what we just discussed, what we did was send out a One-Pager in advance. The One-Pager tried to encapsulate all of the relevant information pertaining to the contract amendments. I think the good question to start is what is existing? What are the existing requirements? Then the next question is, what has changed?

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.

TRACY HACKSHAW: So, I think, Gulten, we're looking for the first page of the One-Pager.

SUSAN CHALMERS: But that's if we just want to put the questions back up, that's also okay. I don't need to be on camera.

TRACY HACKSHAW: So, the summary, the One-Pager, page one of the One-Pager. Page one of the One-Pager. Yeah.

SUSAN CHALMERS: So, the One-Pager, you'll have it in your email inbox. And if we can show it up on the screen, that'd be great. But, basically, it's a summary of what has taken place, just a very short background, on the history of the contract amendments. It provides the definition of DNS abuse for the purposes of the contract, and then it also gives a basic outline of the process. I accepted the challenge to try and fit all of this information onto one page. I'm sorry actually that we didn't have it translated into different languages beforehand, but hopefully, this is a useful resource. And the page comes with separate attachments to kind of fill everything out. Oh, so there we go. Oh, okay. It's over there.

So, again, if you'd like to refer to just a very short and simple document that tries to encapsulate what's going on, that was the purpose of the One-Pager. And there are also questions for discussion, but that is for later, so I'm going to turn it back over to Tracy.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Susan. So just to reiterate, the One-Pager that Susan referred to is a guiding document that we encourage all of you, unfortunately it hasn't been translated, but it's in English, to sort of remind us of what the key issues are that we want to discuss going forward, including today. All right? Now what we're going to do now is break into the groups that we talked about before the break.

So, to my right for those who are watching in the room. Is that correct? Yeah. To my right, that is French. So, I want to encourage all French language speakers to assemble at that area. You don't have to go now. I'm just saying it. That's French, to my right. To my left, the Arabic speakers are already there, well done. That's Arabic. If you want to join the Arabic group and you speak Arabic or you would like to join the Arabic group and participate, feel free. Arabic to my left. Where did the Chinese group go? Oh, there we are. Chinese speaking members are going to take the chairs from the back of that room and go to the left of the interpreters. Left? Yes, left. So Chinese speakers to the left.

I'll ask once again, do we have anybody speaking Spanish in the room, who are native Spanish speakers who want to join a Spanish speaking group? All right. So, the absence of no Spanish speakers, in the absence of Spanish speakers-- One speaker we have, two, you will join the English group because that's how unfortunately it has to be. Italian, Spanish, and English. Let's see what happens there. So, the remainder of the room is going to join our English group. Now let me explain why that is so.

The English group is going to join-- it's the biggest group, obviously, but you're also joining the remote participants. So, in your group, you'll be the only group that has a mic. You will have to use your mic to speak. It will not be amplified, they will turn off the amps, but the mic is important

because no one will hear you remotely if you don't use the mic. So, we're going to give you a mic or mics to speak into, it will not be amplified. When you hear the sound like this, but remote people will hear you. So, make sure you use the mic when you're speaking. Don't speak at once, speak one at a time so remote folks can hear you.

Your work is double. You not only have to speak into the mic, you also have to monitor the chat. We're going to have the chat from the Zoom room on the screen, and hopefully you can see it there. If not, I would advise someone else in the room in the group to have their machine and Zoom because the folks who are speaking "remotely" can only speak via chat. So, when they're hearing you talk, they respond via chat. For the English speakers, it's that clear? I know that sounds a little complicated, but is that clear? Yes? I'm seeing nodding. Good.

So let me explain the rules now. They are rules for everyone. For everyone, these are the rules. So, after we break into these groups, the objectives of this are-- Maybe I can get that that slide, now, Julia? Gulden, the slides with the guidelines. Is that possible to get up? So, the workshop aims: To introduce and or clarify the public comment process by new primarily GAC members, ensure new GAC members are sufficiently familiar with DNS abuse, and the contract amendments to enable them to participate in the development of GAC input, develop and strengthen new GAC members engagement and participation in GAC public comment activities, identify and support new GAC members who are willing to act as topic leads, penholders, shepherds, etc. within the GAC, and to participate in GAC-ICANN committee processes such as GNSO, PDPs and ICANN reviews, And finally, develop and discuss a framework for future public comment activities in the GAC, including possibly, possibly a straw man for this particular issue.

So, let me make it very clear, the objective is not to develop the public comment document today. And you'll see the question I'm going to ask another refocus on the public comment process, the actual comment. That's the last item. And if you get there, well done. But if you don't get there, don't worry, don't panic. It's about a process, so trust the process. Okay?

Now the One-Pager will be your guideline material and the breakout session guidelines will be-- Let me explain what's going to happen. Let me see if have I lost the breakout guidelines? If not, they can go up on screen. So, each group will nominate a topic lead or leader in the group for the questions that are being discussed, one group leader. You'll also nominate—please do this at the start of the group—a rapporteur, someone to take notes, someone to summarize the discussions, and importantly for the English group, that'll be someone who has to look at the chat as well. So, I'm suggesting you may have to have an "electronic rapporteur", and an "on-site rapporteur". Maybe two rapporteurs for the English group. And nominate a presenter or somebody who reports out.

So, three ideal rules. You can also have a timekeeper, etc., to make sure you finish your activity. Is that clear? Any questions on that? You could use your mics if you're by a mic. Yes?

ALISA HEAVER:

Thank you. I would want to suggest to split the English group in two groups because we have a really large English-speaking group.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

We're coming to that. We haven't seen the English group yet, so let's see what that looks like, but that's potentially what's going to happen. Right.

So, any questions on the actual group leader, rapporteur, etc.? All right. Good. Now there are three questions to be considered. And there we go. These questions are, as you can see, they're not questions that are designed to generate the public comment. They're discussion questions. So, I'm suggesting you take each question at a time. There's a main question in bold, and there are some issues to consider in not bold, normal text. Right? Everybody can see those issues on the screen? Yes?

When you get to Question 3, the last one, we may ask you at that point to start working on a public comment. We'll be monitoring the groups. If you finish 1 and 2. Fantastic. You got to Question 3. At that point, you'll be starting to consider, well, what does this going to look like? At that point, there are questions in the One-Pager that has attachments that you will want to consider further. Again, to reiterate, there's no race, we're not rushing to do this. Let's go through each one, discuss, come to some conclusions, and report out on the process. If you get to do a public comments straw man by the end, all power to you. Fantastic. If you don't, don't worry, it's not a problem. Okay? This is very simple. Any questions on that so far? Nigel.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:

Yes. I am not clear. I saw a list of questions before the one that's currently up right now.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

No. The list of question of questions was accidentally put up. You're not considering that. This is the only question we're considering now. These questions on screen now are the only ones we're considering? Okay?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Yes.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

All right. Any further questions on the questions? Julia has a question or remote has a question?

JULIA CHARVOLEN:

Yeah. Remote question from Kavouss who has his hand up in the Zoom.

GULTEN TEPE:

Kavouss, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Because I need to gain light of the chair. Yes. Okay. Can I proceed?

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Okay. Thank you. On Question 2, is there a benefit to having a united GAC submission only or having a GAC submission as well as individual? If we have a GAC, I would say full GAC submission or united submission, and then we have submission from GAC members which supports that united, there's no problem. Preferably, is more advantageous that we have GAC united questions or united submissions. However, from member in addition to that, if it is in support and enforcement of the GAC united GAC submission, that is very good. But if it is in one way or the other against that, it may break the influence or downgrade or underestimate the

influence of the GAC united advice. So, this is my answer to that question. United GAC advice. If there is anything from member state in support of that. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Kavouss. You can raise that in the group discussion with the remote participants and the English group. For those who are hearing Kavouss' input now, so feel free to discuss it when that comes up. Excellent. So, are we okay? Are we okay? All right. As Alisa said, we are likely to English is going to be large, so I'm going to ask you a question. For those in the English group who are going to be with the remote people and do the extra work of having the mic and so on, please proceed to those chairs by that camera.

The English group who wants to participate—No, please don't say you don't want to participate. The English group folks who are willing to do the extra work and participate with the remote participants, there's a large circle of chairs. Please move to that circle. I'm pointing, for those who are not seeing me, I'm pointing to where the camera is in front of the audio area. The AV area. And you can start moving now. No time to waste, no time to lose. Let's go. So, it's happening. And let's see what happens from that move. Yeah. That's what I want to say. I'm going to announce it after. Let's get the groups to move because we're losing time. Okay. Awesome.

French to the right, English, center, Arabic to the left. Chinese, right, it's already set up, to the back, back left. All right? So, this area here I'm pointing, English who would want to participate remote English. All right? For those who don't want to participate all, nobody's forcing you, but please let's all join if we can. Let's see who's left over after this. So

English, there we go. People are moving. Fantastic. Thank you. You're moving. We're going to come by your group. I know if you'll have any question we're going to come by your group, no problem, to answer any questions. English, large group here. English, large group here.

GULTEN TEPE:

Tracy, Kavouss would like to take the floor again.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Unfortunately, we are not doing that at this moment because we are now in group session. Sorry. We now moved in the groups. He could put it in the chat if he wishes. All right? English. All right. Anybody who is not in the English group sitting here who wants to be in another group? See, it worked out. People are just [inaudible - 00:17:49]. They've left. Yeah. All right. Standby, we're going to start. The mic is going to-- Now let me explain this to you guys. I'm not talking in the mic very much. This mic that you're seeing here is the mic you have to use going forward or this one. It will not be amplified, right? Right. All right. Good. So let me see. If I have to talk, I'll talk and then--

KENNETH MERRILL:

All right. Can hear me? Can you type in the chat if you can hear me?

NIGEL HICKSON:

So, if we're discussing the first question, I suppose the context for this is as a GAC, we're going to be discussing this issue later in the week. I mean, this is a capacity building session, so we're able to float wider ideas. I suspect this week, we're not going to be able to have the luxury because

of the agenda constraints of going into breakouts. Perhaps I'm completely wrong, but I think we've only got two set discussions on the SubPro, one which is going to primarily concentrate on Closed Generics. So, there's going to be not a lot of time to go into breakout rooms, but clearly, we will be discussing this in the GAC. And given that the comments are due, was it the middle of July? We're going to need to consider whether we need a separate process in the GAC, I suppose, after this meeting or whatever, to get our comments together. But this is quite an important process, so perhaps we need to dedicate some more time to it.

KENNETH MERRILL:

I propose we stick with topic one and then we can move to Jorge's topic as a point of discussion. Maybe as number 3, maybe?

NOBUHISA NISHIGATA:

I've got a question on 1, like, what would be the exact issue from the perspective of the underserved region people on this issue? In my understanding, whether it is underserved or not like the bad guys comes to you through the internet for the phishing, etc., stuff, right? So, if the government, from the GAC perspective, the government people has to say something, then they just come to say something. Right? So, if there is some disadvantage for the underserved region people, then we would like to know what it is.

JAMIE MCPHERSON:

I was, yeah, just going to say, are there any people online or in this circle that are from underserved regions that can talk to that point? I'm not

sure Australia is classified as an underserved region. I'm pretty sure not. So, I'm going to stop speaking.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah, I'm not sure I understand the first question. So, I think as we heard this morning, DNS abuse affects us all in different ways. It was very interesting to have that presentation from-- Yes. I don't think DNS abuse in these contract amendments are-- They affect everyone. They affect us in different ways. So, I think really the importance is that we have time to discuss it in the GAC to see what our views are in light of the presentation earlier. That's the important thing, to have an opportunity to discuss and to be able to say in our response where we think these go far enough or where we think some of the words are ambiguous or whatever, but that's just my thoughts.

ALISA HEAVER:

So, this is Alisa from the Netherlands. Just for the online participants, we cannot hear you and will not be able to hear you, so you will have to put any comment you have in the chat. So, hands raised will not be dealt with in this session. And so, if you want to say anything, you would have to type it in the chat.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Okay, everyone. Based on the time, we will go until 4:30 for this session, 4:30. Everyone hearing me? 4:30 for the breakout groups. 4:30.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me. I raised a hand.

GEMMA CAROLILLO:

Hello, everyone. I hope you can hear me correctly online as well. This is Gemma, European Commission. I was to follow up on comment from Nigel regarding the first question we're supposed to discuss. And this is about how to best ensure the inclusion on the underserved region participation in this specific public comment. I think we should not indulge into creating new processes like by default, needing to appoint somebody from each region's well-served or underserved. It's important that colleagues have all the possibility to join in and volunteer. I think there has been a call. There could be another call via email, for example, to the full mailing list for pen holders.

And then, I think, honestly, governments and organizations, they participate based on their interest. I don't think that personally we from European Commission, we wouldn't want to be called in participating every time necessarily to all the public comments. But it's important to get the opportunity, the instruments, and be involved. So, my point on Question 1 is that, wide publicity, call for participation is more than sufficient, but we should not pre-identify topic leads from all regions. Otherwise, this becomes also cumbersome exercise. Thank you.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:

I don't know if it's on. Well, hopefully, I can be heard online. Okay. Thank you. This is Nigel Cassimire from the CTU. I'm based in Port of Spain, Trinidad, and we are part of the Underserved Regions Working Group. My understanding is that this process has a very short time window, which is like mid-July or something of this sort. So, I don't see new processes being practical in that type of time frame. I would suggest that the Underserved Regions Working Group members probably just make a

special effort to reach their people and involve them and get the comments that might be relevant to this particular issue in the particular time frame that we do. So, I would depend on us essentially to reach out. Thanks.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Can the remote participant make a comment?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Apparently, they can. Except that the whole room will hear. The other suggestion would be if it's a short comment, in the chat.

ALISA HEAVER: Kavouss? Kavouss, this is Alisa from the Netherlands. You have to put your comments in the chat.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Anyone in the chat has any further comment on Question 1? Any suggestions? Otherwise, we'll move on. Okay. Let's move on. Okay. Anyone in the group has comments on Question 2?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. So, this is UK. Nigel here. So, on Question 2, I really want to follow up what was said before. We're in a very short time period, and I think as others have said, including Kavouss, the impact of what the GAC does is best if we have a GAC united view on these public comments. And then if individual governments are able to also contribute and back up the GAC view, then that's excellent or perhaps individual governments might have

other views. As we noted before in this morning session, all governments, of course, are able to take part in a public comment process. But I think for the importance of this contract amendment, it's important that the GAC can at least speak collectively in the first instance. And to do this, we're going to need some time this week to at least have an initial discussion because is it the 15th of July or? Yeah, it's only a month away or just, yeah, whatever. Thanks.

NOBUHISA NISHIGATA:

This is Nobu from Japan. And regarding the Question 2, I echo what Nigel said and then just in case of Japan. And then, of course Japan is going to support the GAC, for example, consensus takes the comment to the ICANN or therefore the public comment. And we will be engaged in some work towards developing the whole GAC comment. But on the other hand, not only Japan though, I think each country has each country's issues in DNS abuse, right? So, like for Japan's case, Japan has to say more about the beyond narrowly defined the DNIS abuse and we have some expectations, particular expectation on the further work on what negotiation just mentioned in at the previous systems.

So, there should be some rooms that every government has a different voice, but on the other hand, we just decide maybe today or this week to work together to make the momentum to push the negotiation parties move forward. Right? That's my opinion. Happy to hear other voice.

ALISA HEAVER:

This is Alisa from the Netherlands. What I'm wondering though is do we intend to come up with GAC advice during this week that would be, well, GAC advice or obviously being consensus based? Or will we be working

after the GAC meeting on what we would want to hand in on the public comment? Yeah, public comment, I think it is. I'm not sure about that process. If anyone has any idea on that. Okay.

GEMMA CAROLILLO:

Perhaps useful to recall also for the others. This is Gemma, also for the online participants we discussed this morning, I had your same question to Manal as she was presenting the processes and the reaction. So, my understanding is that, of course, the public comments is in a way kind of equal to GAC advice in terms of the procedure in the sense that if somebody opposes the text that is proposed in the group, you cannot go ahead and submit as GAC public comment.

In terms of effectiveness, GAC advice is much more effective than any public comment because the GAC advice must be taken into account by the Board, while this is not necessarily the case for the public comment. But in terms of timing, and that's my last point that Manal explained, she said it would be advisable according to the previous experience to go first with the public comment, and then followed by an advice once you see what's happening on the addressing of the public comments. One element to note, though, is that today they say they want to finalize the drafts in October, which might be before we have the opportunity for another GAC advice. So, this is-- But Finn wanted to-- Please.

FINN PETERSEN:

Finn Petersen from Denmark. I fully support what you said because this is not a matter which the Board are dealing with at the moment. So, we shouldn't issue a GAC advice but come up with any comments we have. Once the process is finished, then the Board will look at it and at that

time, we can come up with a GAC advice. Hopefully, if we have any comments they have been taken into account.

KENNETH MERRILL:

This is Kenneth Merrill, United States for the record. I wanted to share a comment from Jorge in the chat who says that it makes sense to go first for GAC input to the public comment as the question is not yet before the Board, and then we can develop GAC advice intersessionally. Yeah. So, that's from Jorge of Switzerland.

IAN SHELDON:

Sorry. Ian Sheldon, Australia. If we don't issue GAC advice in this instance, we could potentially still provide issues of importance or elevate it on as part of the GAC communique even if it's not formal advice. So, I think we still have an opportunity.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:

So, we think there is benefit to-- Nigel Cassimire again. We think there is the benefit to having individual member submissions as well, which can help to clarify specific country, circumstances, or benefits, separate from the collective GAC submission. And we believe generally that we should go through the process of the public comment before assessing the need for and producing a GAC advice. Yeah? Okay. Excellent. I'm just looking to see if there's anything from the participants online.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me. I have a comment. Can I make my comment?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: The trouble is a comment being made to the whole room, and we're all sharing the room in different languages. That's the trouble. I don't know if there's a comment that could be summarized in the chat.

JAMIE MCPHERSON: Yeah. This is Jamie, Australia. Just a practical question. Do we have a session for the GAC to agree the public comment or is that--? Okay. So, it's just going to be in the communique after?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Nigel, UK. So, Jamie raised a very valid question about how we're going to discuss this in the GAC. And I think we really do need to discuss this. It's probably quite difficult doing it by correspondence. It's easier to discuss and, hopefully, there's this session today, there's going to be other sessions where the contracted parties and the Org lay out the rationale for the changes. And so hopefully by later in the week, the GAC will be able to discuss this. So, whether we do it in a drafting session or whether we do it at some other time, I don't know. The GAC secretariat will obviously help us in this regard, but I think it does need to be discussed.

KENNETH MERRILL: We have a comment from Kavouss. This is by the way, Kenneth Merrill from the United States going to be sort of serving as the rapporteur here. So Kavouss from Iran says that he mentions it is more effective to have GAC collective submission. So, thank you, Kavouss.

ALISA HEAVER: Thank you. This is Alisa from the Netherlands. If we don't really have a GAC session anymore on this topic, I'm going to say it's a pity that we're not using this time instead of discussing the process, for example--

TRACY HACKSHAW: We're stopping at 4:30, timekeepers in your groups, we're stopping at 4:30.

ALISA HEAVER: To discuss, for example, the questions, the really good questions that Susan put in the paper, for example, what is actionable evidence? When is action prompt? These are things I would really love to discuss with you. And yeah. I see a lot of nodding here around me to discuss more of the substance instead of the process.

KENNETH MERRILL: I'm going to read another comment from the chat from Francis from Burundi who says for a united GAC submission, there's an advantage of stronger collective voice and increased visibility to attract more attention from the ICANN community.

NOBUHISA NISHIGATA: Good point from Alisa. This is Nobu from Japan for record. But maybe the question in the One-Pager is more like it is not asked to answer. It is more like for registrars or registries to answer or maybe ICANN Compliance should be the part of the who answers the question from the One-Pager in my understanding. So maybe I'm not sure about how we play for this kind of game. Maybe just put everybody comments on the

communicate space or? I'm not sure. Regarding the straw man and type of things, and then if we can agree that Susan's One-Pager is pretty good straw man to me, or maybe there could be some point we can add. But then maybe, I'm never really sure about the Question 3 now.

KENNETH MERRILL:

Another comment from Kavouss who says, in particular, if there's a GAC collective submission, but one or more GAC individually opposed to that collective submission, then the GAC collective advice would be weakened. I'm not telling them anything. And Martina says just to mention that we will be discussing this topic in plenary on Wednesday during the DNS abuse and new technology sessions.

ALISA HEAVER:

So, this is Alisa. Is it for any one of you really clear what actionable evidence is? So, I'm trying to steer the discussion towards the substance. I've read the 14, 15-page document and to me, it remains unclear what actionable evidence is that registries or registrars have to act upon. Okay. I see Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you. Nigel Hickson, UK. So fully agreeing with Alisa. So, I think we need to go on and look at some of the wording in the contract amendments. And actionable evidence is unclear to me. I mean, evidence, yes. Clear evidence or-- But evidence is evidence. Actionable evidence implies that in some way the evidence promotes actions, which is doesn't seem to be the case. I think there's also a problem with the word reasonable in 1380, 1381 where it says "registrar shall take reasonable and prompt steps". What does that mean?

And also, there's the issue that I raised before but we didn't get round to answering where it says that "registrar must promptly take the appropriate mitigation actions that are reasonably necessary". It's these words which might well be appropriate because of legal connotations or whatever, but if these words allow a registrar to say, "Well, we didn't think there were any reasonable actions and therefore we didn't take any," then we're back to square one, but perhaps I'm just wrong.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

It's Katz Larry [ph] from Australia. I'm fairly new to this topic and I wonder that these amendments are all about reacting to complaints or reacting to possible harms. Are there any obligations on registrars to be proactive in terms of auditing or assessing the validity of activities that are occurring without complaint?

ALISA HEAVER:

Do you mean before a domain name is put online because--? Which point do you mean? Before it's reported? Okay. Thanks.

JAMIE MCPHERSON:

This is Jamie McPherson from Australia. I too was interested in the idea of some proactivity in this regard, but I was considering more ICANN Compliance and whether instead of just waiting for someone to first issue a DNS abuse report and then issue a complaint about the lack of response on that DNS abuse report to ICANN Compliance, if they would consider doing a degree of proactive checking like over a percentage of the responses? Because it seems like all these words are quite subjective. If it was a domestic system, you would have a court to decide what reasonable is, but there is no court structure, and that's fine. But you do

need someone to do a check of some of them just to see how they're tracking. But I'd be interested in others' views.

KENNETH MERRILL:

Just for the record, Kavouss had a comment I think from the last question, but I just wanted to make sure that I got it on the record here. So Kavouss says, "I do not understand why those who wish to submit separate comments should not join the others in submitting collective submission. We should be united in submitting collective comments submission rather than providing separate submission."

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Yeah. I just wanted to respond to—Karel Douglas from Trinidad and Tobago—in response to the issues of the words actionable evidence and promptly. I know that one of the things that attorney lawyers like myself have-- Should I scream? Yeah. Oh, okay. What I was saying is that in drafting agreements and laws in particular, there's always a tendency to draft broadly because of the number of permutations that could possibly happen. And each time that an action, let's say in this case happens, it could be different. Let's just say, for example.

So reasonable response in, let's say, in a case where it's an emergency, where let's say there is life or death scenario, reasonable would be maybe a matter of minutes. That's reasonable because somebody's life is in the balance, whereas maybe it's a lesser type of some, let's just say, I'm thinking of something very maybe there's a typographical error, something like that. Reasonable in that case, obviously, would be maybe days or weeks as the case may be. So, in interpreting the words, so

actionable evidence, I'm assuming that the draft's persons would have said, okay, well, it may vary. So, what is actionable in this case?

So, the evidence has to be our level, a threshold where you could take action. And if it's, for example, I have to prosecute somebody because of an offense, the evidence I need in a criminal offense, at least those who are from the English legal system would know that to do a prosecution, it has to be beyond reasonable doubt. He's guilty beyond reasonable doubt. Whereas in civil types offenses, it's on a balance of probabilities. So, the level of evidence, the threshold for the evidence is different. It's actually lower.

So, I'm just saying that when we see words that it is broad and I do recall somebody saying, well, it would have been perfect to put a number of days or 14 days or 10 days, but of course the problem would then be that that would not meet every occasion. So, 10 days or 14 days in a life-or-death situation would be way, way too long. So, I was just trying to explain why in some occasions you'd find broad terms, but it'll be left to either, well, ultimately, the courts if it ever grew under, but let's just say in the real world, you would have to say, well, this is a reasonable approach. Yeah.

KENNETH MERRILL:

So, Jorge Cancio from Switzerland says that's why data collection, monitoring, and accountability are important so that there is some consistency in how their concepts are applied. So, I'll go to Jamie from Australia and then to Francis.

JAIME MCPHERSON:

This is Jamie McPherson from Australia. I acknowledge what you've just stated, and I'm not arguing to change the word reasonable. I understand the need for flexibility. I think I'm just advocating for a degree of oversight on some of the decisions made by someone independent of the process, perhaps ICANN Compliance. I think it might be best not to rely on a court system because court systems are quite overburdened. I'm not sure they would fit in this scenario. It would better to have ICANN Compliance or some kind of ombudsman body that checks a degree of the responses and decides if, indeed, it was reasonable and there was actionable evidence.

Yeah, it just seems like a sensible process rather than relying on ICANN org waiting for an extra complaint about a report of DNS abuse that wasn't actioned or was actioned, and checking just those. That just seems too narrow a focus, I think, to understand if this has worked.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Yeah. So, Karel Douglas again from Trinidad and Tobago. So, yes, I agree. I think I was just explaining the concept of all theory how one would interpret the law or words that may be vague. But as far as a practical approach, yes, Compliance would be the perfect person to assess what is reasonable. But in reality, what would happen is that over a period of time, a body of law or decisions would come about where we would know what is reasonable in this particular circumstance. And like I said, maybe over years or whatever. And each occasion, we will know, oh, this is what has been the standard.

So, standards would eventually be evolved from actions, as the case may be, and not necessarily from the court. The courts, I only use that because that's where laws are interpreted. Ultimately, the courts would

be the one to define and interpret what is the appropriate meaning. But as you were saying, maybe the body itself, ICANN, would have a body of decisions where persons would have taken certain actions so you'll now understand what will be reasonable in a certain case as the case maybe. Any other comments?

JAMIE MCPHERSON: I just wanted to just note that I'm nodding a lot. This is Jamie nodding.

KENNETH MERRILL: I don't have a question. I was going to read a couple of comments, but if you have--

TRACY HACKSHAW: Hi, everyone. Five more minutes. Begin wrapping up, begin rapporteuring, pulling the noose together, identifying a presenter to report out. Five more minutes. Five more minutes. Doesn't matter where you are, don't panic. You don't have to finish all the questions. Wherever you are, begin wrapping up and begin reporting out. Thank you.

KENNETH MERRILL: Okay. So, folks, for folks online, we have five more minutes. I wanted to read a few comments from the chat very quickly for the group here. So, Francis from Burundi says for individual GAC member submissions, I see an advantage such as to ensure that a GAC member can independently arise their voice for its concerns and priorities that can support the value of individual government perspectives within the broader

multistakeholder ecosystem, which is ICANN. And Jorge responds to Francis saying, Jorge from Switzerland, respond to Francis from Burundi saying I think that notwithstanding a potential GAC collective input, individual GAC members are always entitled to file individual input. And then finally, Kavouss from Iran says dear all, reasonable is a subjective term.

IAN SHELDON:

This is Ian Sheldon from Australia. I think the point I'd like to raise is that we keep hearing about these contractual amendments as reestablishing a floor. And I think we need to be quite measured in how the GAC engages with this topic. I think establishing a baseline level of expectations has been critical and getting to this point has been remarkable effort in the time frame they've worked through. So, for me, I think it's important that the GAC establish where those critical red lines are, and what we can tackle beyond passing this first step of amendments. Because my thinking goes to further engagements and further efforts beyond this initial action.

I think I'd very much like to get this floor established, passed, get community agreement in place, and then continue to build and extend further. And we can tackle some more of these things later. But if we also think that they're missing critical parts of this that we think are absolutely fundamental, let's get them in that'll comment, get them into the advice and see if we can extend our engagement with other parts of the community as well to make sure we test that thinking. And when we do put these things forward, there's a good chance that they'll be listened to and adapted. And so, it's GAC working with the rest of the empowered community to address some of these concerns as well.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Last minute. Wrap it up.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you. So, this is Gemma Carolillo, European Commission. So, I wanted to address two things. First of all, what the colleague from Australia just mentioned, I fully agreed that this is a very positive development. So, we are starting from something positive and also in a way kind of remarkable in terms of what has happened in the past years. At the same time, everybody should do their job. I mean, here we have private organizations negotiating their contracts. And hence, of course, they look at their garden as it's normal. We are tackling, however, a topic which is a public safety issue. And from policy makers, we should be able to provide an input from that perspective.

So, I am thinking that it is not about the GAC making like some revolutionary proposals, but to look at improvements to what has been already proposed, perhaps are their things that might be missing elements, such as the GAC's the part on the monitoring? And talking in double sense. From my side, I think proactive, from the operators as they have a very good practices in place already. And from ICANN. And then also, as there is a lot in the advisory, which is recommended but there are a few things, for example, to inform the right actors. So not only the register, but the resellers, the hosting providers. That they recommended. These things can be easily made like an obligation in the sense, it's no harm and you ensure that you have all the right actors on the same page.

So, I'm looking more at sort of incremental improvements. And if you haven't done it, I really encourage everybody to read the advisory because there are a few things which really makes so much sense. You say, why are in this in the contracts already? Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Okay. All right. I think we're out of time unless anybody has any burning comments. But if not, well thank you everybody. Thank you. And we need a rapporteur for presentation. That's okay. Alisa?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Okay. This is Julia from GAC support. We will now go back to plenary and start have groups report on what they've been discussing. Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Jamie? Yeah. Nigel or Nigel? Just the rapporteur. Or you would want to start with sorry. No, Jamie, you were saying something. I missed something.

TRACY HACKSHAW: All right. We get back to our plenary session now, and group reports out. I would love to start from left to right, so the French group was still meeting. Okay. The Arabic groups has finished very quickly, so let's start with the Arabic group in reporting out. Is that okay? All right. So, can I suggest you could stay at your seats? You can go up on stage, you can use a handheld mic, whatever is easiest for you. All right. So, let's have the Arabic groups start first with a report out as to what they discussed, and what they achieved. I know it's taking a while to get back to our

seats, so I'm just letting the Arabic Group know they are first. Can I suggest that the French group to go next, then the Spanish group, then the Chinese group, then the English group will go last? And maybe at that point, I could ask remote folks to speak as well. All right?

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Shall I?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Okay, folks, the Arabic group is going to speak, so let's give them your attention. All right. Everybody's okay. Everybody's good to go. All right. Remote folks, we're going to back in plenary. Interpreters, we are back. Arabic group is going to speak now. Manal, on behalf of Arabic group. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tracy. So, this is Manal Ismail on behalf of the Arabic group, Zeina, Christine and Abdalmonem. So, we discussed the questions. We didn't go deep on Question 3, but let's take them one at a time. So, regarding the process, we were thinking it's important to increase the pool of active GAC members. So maybe we can start thinking about the upcoming public comment opportunities rather than start by the open ones. And maybe GAC support can send to GAC mailing list, the upcoming public comment opportunities and try to identify interested GAC members in front of each upcoming topic so that they can start investigating the topic, getting ready, consulting nationally, whatever preparation they need to do so that by the time the public comment period is open, they are ready to coordinate.

And hopefully, we have different volunteers for each public comment proceedings. So, it's basically again small groups, but by everyone. So, we're increasing the number of small groups, and hopefully consulting on the GAC mailing list also. So, the other way around. I know now the support staff, they share the open public comment periods with the GAC leadership and take it back to the mailing list. Maybe complimentary to this, we can have support staff sharing the upcoming and start the discussion on the GAC mailing list and come back to report to the GAC leadership if it makes sense.

On the submission and whether we should encourage GAC submission only or have submissions by individual governments as well. Definitely, there is a merit behind having a collective GAC submission. It has its weight. It has its significance within the community and to the Board and everywhere. Still, governments and intergovernmental organizations, in fact, anyone is free to submit their individual comments as well.

I think a good approach would be GAC members notifying on the GAC mailing list that they will submit certain public comment. Sharing it may inspire others and might end up being collective GAC input. And again, the other way around, collective GAC input may inspire individual GAC members to submit their own. But in all cases, they are not mutually exclusive, but also, we cannot force governments or intergovernmental organizations to submit or not to submit their individual inputs.

Yeah. We didn't have time to discuss the third question, but I think the One-Pager is very useful. So, thanks to the US Government. And again, we could listen from new GAC colleagues, but I think having concise and to the point One-Pager helps to jumpstart everyone to get engaged. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, Manal. Thank you to the Arabic group. Let's give them a round of applause. Excellent. Are there any other inputs you want to say something? Yes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just want to add one point that we discussed maybe. It's about the topic leads. We discussed that it would be important to turn to GAC membership as a whole first to try to raise interest to have a topic lead, and then to revert to leadership if there is no interest from within. Yeah. So just try to encourage the wider GAC membership first.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much. That's a very good point. Thank you. Are there any immediate responses to that? Any immediate feedback folks want to give to what the Arabic group has come up with? I'm not seeing any. So, think about it, so we can discuss it going forward. I'm going to ask now for the French group, and feel free to speak in your own native language because this was the point, right? So, feel free to speak in your native language. If you are, let us know so we can get our headsets ready and it seems like that is happening. Yes? French Group? Excellent. So, since we want to know who you are, introduce yourself as well, and let's go, French Group.

TOMBOYE IBRAHIM: Hello, everyone. My name is Tomboye Ibrahim. I come from Chad. In our group, the French-speaking group, we talked about the first question. So, the idea is to understand how to proceed in order to ensure the

inclusion of underserved region participation in public comments. What we mentioned is that the lack of participation of these underserved region countries, whether it is in person or remotely was due not only to perhaps a lack of infrastructure, access to the Internet, energy issues, but also, to the lack of involvement of these countries, lack of involvement of the deciders or decision makers at a very high level. Perhaps because they don't understand the importance of the topic or perhaps because they are waiting, as Blaise was saying this morning, to be personally involved in order to react on those topics.

We also discussed the fact that despite the lack of infrastructure, there are abuses that are not necessarily DNS abuse, but they still can be considered abuse. And the realities are very different depending on the countries. There is also the cultural question, which means that we trust people. You might get a call and basically just trust the person who's calling you, and in the end, you have your bank account emptied or you might be faced with host of other issues of a criminal nature. So, in order to fight against these issues, some countries set up cells to fight against cybercrime. Others have not, however. They are in the process of drafting laws against cybercrime.

We also mentioned the fact that the Francophonie, the French-speaking countries, could give a voice to those underserved countries. What we also noticed is that ever since the departure of Emmanuel Adjovi, the Francophonie, so the French-speaking countries has not been as involved in ICANN to address ICANN-related issues. So, what we thought is perhaps we need to work with the Francophonie to get more involvement of these countries within ICANN and to have more of a say in the decision related to these issues at ICANN.

As far as the next point, which has to do with giving more benefit to GAC submission versus individual submissions. Because collective submissions of the GAC have more weight, so to speak, we do favor using the GAC in order to submit our comments. We also mentioned that some countries might agree with the consensus that we came to at the level of the GAC, but sometimes there are specific items that could be added that are related to the laws of certain countries. But we do believe that we should favor collective submission by the GAC as far as public comments.

As far as third point, we don't really have anything to add as far as public comments, but perhaps we can work on that to have something to offer later. Thank you. I don't know if the others in the group have something to add? Go ahead if you do.

OUSMANE LY:

Ousmane Ly, Mali, GAC representative. I would like to add, she did mention it, but what we've realized is that we have a cybercrime industry in our region. The infrastructure issues, the energy issues, don't prevent them from acting. So, this GAC proposal is something we support because at the local level, when law enforcement authorities want to act, they don't have the right tools to act, but the criminals are already moving on to the next step in terms of the means, the intelligent means that they have commit evil actions.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much. French Group, thank you. And good to hear some new voices in the GAC. Chad, we didn't get your name. What's your name? The actual, yes.

TOMBOYE IBRAHIM: Tomboye.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Tomboye?

TOMBOYE IBRAHIM: Yes.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Welcome. Thank you very much.

TOMBOYE IBRAHIM: Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW: New voices. Feedback, anything? Is that France?

JONAS ROULE: Yes. Just to say it's better to say French-speaking countries than French, I think.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes. Thank you. Good point. Thank you for the correction. Yes. Appreciate that. So, any feedback from the audience, GAC membership on the inputs from the French-speaking countries, or from the Arabic-speaking countries? None so far? Okay. Good. We're moving to Spanish-speaking countries. I guess, Colombia.

THIAGO DAL-TOE:

I'm Thiago Dal-Toe from Colombia for those of you who do not know me. In our group we had Gabriela from Argentina, and Ross from the United Kingdom, which in our view was very significant to have a different view. In relation to the first question, what we are discussing is how to explain to underserved regions how these different issues will impact their countries. With very specific meetings to explain in detail, and try to find or define their positions before providing a comment, a public comment, which goes in line with Manal words. This idea to get prepared for upcoming comments, not those that are already open, so that we can give sufficient time to develop knowledge on the topic.

We were able to discuss item two as well. And we agreed that it is much more important to have consensus response of a united group and not specific country responses. However, we understand that in certain cases when there is no possibility to reach consensus, it is okay for a country, for an individual country to make an individual comment, but always saying or highlighting that the intention was to find consensus in the GAC. That is to say acknowledging that the priority is the united GAC submission work, and when that is not possible, go for the individual road that will underscore the importance of this group.

We were also able to discuss how the different topics could affect the various groups, such as the registration data request service if I'm okay with the name. And we said that underserved countries should receive some explanation or perhaps a special meeting to understand the impact this new system will have and the associated costs impacting their institutions. The institutions started to help would use these services so that they are able to submit their comments ahead and within the GAC,

be able to have a consensus public comment considered in the vision of the underserved region countries. That is all. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thanks Spanish-speaking countries and Colombia. Anything else from the group, anybody wants to add anything who was in the group with the UK/Spanish? Want to add anything, Argentina?

GABRIELA MATTAUSCH:

Argentina speaking. Thank you, Thiago, for your words. Basically, adding up on the consensus issue. Since I started, in GAC, we have not specifically worked on how consensus was reached. So, I was not able to be in that process, but I highlight how important it is to reach consensus at least at first, and we should acknowledge also that there are sovereignty issues in countries that might require individual comments. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Very good input. Thank you. Any inputs, any comments, any feedback on the Arabic countries, the French countries and now the Spanish-speaking countries inputs? Anyone? So, you all are quiet now, but that's okay. We heard you talk before, so we know you can speak. So, that's good news. Fantastic. So, let's move on now to the Chinese-speaking countries, who were the largest group, besides the English group, which is quite interesting. Thank you.

KEN-YING TSENG:

Thank you, Tracy. I will speak Chinese for now. Our Chinese-speaking group had a wonderful discussion earlier. We had some government officials, and myself, Ken-Ying Tseng, I am from the Network Consulting Center from Taiwan. We also have Owen from NTIA. He speaks fluent Chinese, so he joined our Chinese-speaking discussion. In the three discussion questions, in the first one, how can we best ensure inclusion and participation of underserved regions because their infrastructure and technical development is not there.

To this question, we have a few suggestions. First, we are asking ICANN, as well as other participants and businesses participating in the ICANN ecosystem to consider some assistance. So, this type of assistance could be financial assistance or assistance in building infrastructure. So, for example, we noticed that low earth orbit satellites are becoming more and more cost effective. So perhaps we can help underdeveloped, underserved countries to have better broadband so that they could further participate in ICANN discussions.

The second suggestion is a little more straightforward. If infrastructure is not enough, participation online is harder. So perhaps we can return to old traditional ways instead of asking for feedback online, ICANN can provide underserved regions and countries to submit their discussion and ideas on paper. These countries can perhaps write in their feedback ideas and mailed it back to ICANN. So, this is another suggestion. Since it takes longer to submit your feedback in this traditional way, I think ICANN should consider lengthening the time period for public comment period. A longer time frame would allow underserved regions and countries to have proper opportunities to submit their ideas.

There's another thing. Usually, the documentation provided and resources provided to countries for these public comment periods are all in English. I think for public comment period, the documentations and resources should be provided in different languages, different translations. I'm sure translation today is much doable and much more cost effective. So, I think this is something that ICANN should consider. Of course, this would add some costs to the whole operation. So, this is our suggestions to the first question.

As to the second question on GAC submission consensus, whether or not GAC should allow countries to submit their own opinions for their own governments. After our group discussion, we think that ideas and comments and feedbacks are diverse, and ICANN encourages the very democratic discussions and diverse discussions. So, I think GAC members should feel free to express their own feedback in addition to GAC consensus submission. I think in GAC's submission, they can also include or note additional comments from certain GAC members. I think this will be a really good reflection of digital inclusiveness.

To the third question about DNS. Let's use DNS as example. What are some of the proposals that we can have to promote participation? We notice that for DNS amendments, even though some of the wording can be more precise than the reality, but there's no specific definition. Well, the definition in different countries can vary as well. So, we think that could be problematic. And we believe that when we face with these problems, we should find out a solution to have less such problems. For instance, first, our governments can provide support to the industrial players and guide them to generate the industrial standards, which we believe that such a methodology could be more efficient than forcing the industry players to reach a certain standard.

Such a self-disciplinary approach will also help the industry players to align with the future practices based on their own opinion. Secondly, because DNS abuse involves quite a wide range of topics, and we believe that it's very important to prioritize. For instance, some of the topics, which is more about universal aspect, then we should prioritize those in order to have a consensus among the community to solve problems easier in the future. These are our sharing. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much Chinese-speaking countries. It was very comprehensive. Thank you so much. So, any other members from the group would like to add anything further? No? Okay. And would we have any further input from the other membership of the GAC on any of the contributions thus far? All right. So last but by no means least, we have the English-speaking countries and the remote participants together in one huge diverse mélange of interesting things I'm sure it's going to come out now. So, there was an experiment and I think after some teething problems, it seemed to have worked out okay. I think so I think people have survived, so that's great.

So, I'm going to invite the rapporteur or rapporteurs from that group to contribute and to give us what the diverse and rich views of the English-speaking countries, those who are not speaking English but didn't have any other group to go to unfortunately, and the remote participants. Take it away. Who is the rapporteur or the speaker? Nigel. Oh, it figures, UK.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thanks very much, Tracy. First of all, this has been an incredible session, and so many thanks for organizing this. And I was quite moved both by the contribution, all the contributions we've had, but the fact that the Spanish group had had Ross in it and the Chinese group had Owen in it. And this just shows the strength of the GAC in terms of the linguistic variety and the cultural variety. So, I think this just does show how important this session is. It was wonderful to hear the French-speaking countries as well.

So, the UK-- Sorry. The English speaking. It's the old colonists. No. So, the English-speaking group, I think, obviously had a good reflection on the questions. Many of the points have been covered. So, I'll be very brief in indeed. Clearly, and as was just said in the last contribution, the contribution from everyone is so important during this common period, whether they're underserved regions, marginalized regions, or whatever. Everyone has a different perspective on this issue. Everyone has a different experience. And as we heard from Burundi and others this morning, everyone experiences different effects of DNS abuse. So clearly, contributions are very important indeed.

But we didn't think that breaking up into small groups this week to discuss these issues informally, fantastic, but not within the GAC group because we've really got an urgency in this. We've really got an urgency if we're going to meet the deadline to put a GAC public comment in, then we really have to work collectively together. And I think we also take up the point that was just made about the fact that some countries will need to put comments in in writing perhaps, and there'll be other ways to submit comments. And July is fast creeping up.

And on the first point, we do hope that we're going to have sufficient time this week in a GAC session to be able to collectively come together and work on what Susan has put together and what others might be able to contribute in terms of our comments. On Question 2, I think we concur with many other countries. And this was something that Iran and others made in the chat and Switzerland, thanks to all those that contributed to the dialogue as well. That GAC collective input is so important on this issue, that we come together and we give collective GAC input. Yes, of course, countries may well want to put their own perspective in as I noted earlier. And it's very indeed, very encouraging that countries come in and support what the GAC has to say, while perhaps adding their own particular knowledge in these issues. But certainly, GAC collective input is very important indeed.

And thirdly of course, as I've just said, we need to be able to come together and discuss what our input should be. And as various people in our group recognize, this is a really significant step forward. The fact that we've had a contract amendment, I think the first one or the first significant one and we had the RDAP one, but the first significant one since 2013. So, it's important that we see that this contract amendment goes through. And as we heard, this is the beginning, not the end of the operation, but even so, GAC members will want to come together and to perhaps seek elucidation to seek clarification on certain terms, the words actionable, the words reasonable, etc., come to mind whether there's going to be proactive monitoring of DNS abuse and how that works and how the reporting arrangement works in terms of feedback.

So, there's a number of issues that the GAC might want to discuss, but clearly, it's important that we've come together collectively to give that input. And I'll stop there, but others will want to contribute, including of

course, our colleagues online where it was quite difficult to encompass all their views.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Nigel. And maybe on that note, perhaps our online colleagues would like to come in and say a few words at this point. I'm looking online and see if anybody is going to be playing their hands up. It doesn't seem so at this point. But if you have any further contributions, please add them to the chat. Still, yeah, not seeing anything in the comments or hands up in the remote area. I did see the chat becoming very active including feedback from Burundi and others in the chat room. So, thank you very much.

Any other inputs from the English-speaking countries group that Nigel didn't cover? If anybody else wants to say anything further, feel free. Don't be bashful. Please feel free to jump in such new voices new people we haven't heard before. No one, not even English? There's an online comment. There's a hand up. Yes? Go ahead.

GULTEN TEPE:

Tracy, this is Gulden speaking. We have Kavouss Arasteh representing Iran delegation, raised hand.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Kavouss, go ahead. Kavouss, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

GULTEN TEPE:

Kavouss, you might want to double unmute.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. I did, but someone mute me.

GULTEN TEPE: We can hear you now.

TRACY HACKSHAW: We can hear you now, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. Someone mute me remotely, which is not good. In any case, I think the Question 1, the title, the way it has been drafted gives the impression that currently underserved region participation is excluded, which is not the case. To ensure the inclusion, they are included. They should participate and they can participate. There is no exclusion. So, the title of the question and the explanation of the question, they are different. They are not consistent. So, if you forget about the title and come to the explanation, it's much better. So, I don't think that there is any exclusion of any people underdeveloped or underserved or develop and served to the participation in development of comment. So, there is no such exclusion.

Second question. Once again, I mentioned that every effort should be made that we have collective consensus advice. The worry of the people is that maybe if you could not get that consensus supposition, but it is up to the chair and its competence and efforts and devotion to build up the consensus. I have seen that in the previous GAC chair, she was so able that at every difficult position, she tried the best and finally for collective

comment, we got the collective comment without any objections. However, every GAC member, there is no need to have any authorization. Everyone is authorized, every government, to submit their comments, but they should be encouraged not to submit comment to weaken, to undermine the collective advice.

The title of Question 3, I don't understand a straw man. I don't really understand the straw man. Perhaps you serve a straw man to develop principles by which the public comment will be built, but not a straw man. This term straw man is using in some particular countries and in all ICANN literature. So, we don't need a straw man. They are principles, they're very forward and so on and so forth. So, these are the situation.

But my final thing, this subdivision and language may help or may not help. Because I saw the very big differences between that. The Chinese group have entirely different views. They talked of industry and so on and so forth. We are not dealing with industry. We are dealing with GAC, but not industry. But in any case, it is up to you, in future, to have this subdivision of the languages and so on and so forth. But I think it would be much better if you have.

And lastly, I as a participant remotely, I did not have right to comment when the English group was discussing. They said that put your comment on the chat. It doesn't seem to be fair. I think remote participant and physical participant have the same right to comment. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

All right. Thank you very much, Kavouss. Appreciates your inputs as usual. Very, very comprehensive. Thank you so much. Is there any other further input from the remote participants? Not seeing anything. Jorge

says, thanks. A very useful workshop. Thank you, Jorge. So not seeing anything further up. So, I think that's it. So last call, if any further inputs from the room, last call, last call, good. I think that's it. Thank you all for the excellent workshop. Thank you. Thank you.

So, we stand between you and I'm seeing some lovely goodies setting up on the room there. So, before we get to that, I'm going to ask my colleague Karel, my colleague Susan from the planning group, Hunter Pua is not online, to join me here and to start to give some final thoughts, and perhaps some next steps going forward. So, I'm going to hand over to Susan who will give some of her thoughts on this as the host country.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Cheers. Thank you, Tracy. I'll be very brief. I just want to begin by thanking everybody for participating today. It's been a long day, so thank you for your dedication and all your contribution. I also want to thank my colleagues for working together to put this webinar on and in particular also, our GAC support. Thank you so much.

I thought there were just a few interesting highlights for me today. The first regards the GAC public comment process and the question of whether we submit a collective one or to be supplemented by national comments. I think that's a really interesting discussion and I think it's something that we could certify to Nico, to our chair, to get his thoughts on. The second one would be just that in terms of the resources, that One-Pager that we provided, I hope it's useful, but maybe we could look into trying to get it translated to other languages. So, if any GAC reps in particular are interested in seeing that translated, perhaps we can do something about that. Not to force more work on GAC support staff, but let's see how we can accommodate that.

And the third point will be that there are many more substantive areas of the public comment we can work to address. And I think that that's a discussion for this week and going forward, but Nigel is quite right, that July date will be fast upon us. So, I will turn it over to Karel and Tracy, and then we can also discuss next steps. Thanks.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Yeah. Thank you, Susan. Karel Douglas here from Trinidad and Tobago. Yeah. Let me echo what you just said, to a large extent to thank everybody who is here. It's so important that you were here and participated. And for those who are not here, virtually of course, thank you as well, but those who are not here. I want to thank Pua Hunter, who is the co-chair of the group, Underserved Regions Working Group, also Nico for his leadership, and the vice chairs who also supported this effort, and many, many other persons who are in the back, literally in the background right now as we speak, so Rob, his team, Julia, Gulden, Fabien, Benedetta, as well as it's dangerous to call names because you tend to forget somebody. Susan in particular because this is a largely her initiative to bring this idea.

And it's actually a fantastic idea and hopefully, others will see this as an opportunity to bring other matters that they feel should be addressed. Quite rightly, this is an important matter now, but the next meeting maybe it'll be a different issue. I know somebody did mention subsequent procedures or maybe there's other issues WHOIS. So, the idea is that next meeting and the meeting after that, we may take a deep dive into those topics and give you an opportunity to discuss those topics and how do you feel about those topics as well. I just make sure I'm not forgetting anybody. Owen, Fletcher, Kenneth Merrell. I do have some

names here. I just don't want to miss out anybody from NTIA. Anybody else? Just let me know. And I do apologize if I forgot anybody because sometimes it's hard to miss somebody and they're like, hey, what about me?

Yeah. So, having said that and Tracy, of course, again, for your fantastic work on this. And there were many calls. It's a lot of work and effort that went into this. But I think the effort is all worth it if we are involved. So, I think going forward, we want people to volunteer, and I do know the idea is that people will want to if they do want to step forward. Tracy, correct me if I'm wrong, the intention is that we like to have volunteers, people who feel, "Hey, I like to contribute to something or the other." So, Tracy, what do you think?

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Yes. Absolutely. So now is the time. We've heard your voices, we've seen you actually speak, so we know you can speak. We've seen you write. We know you can write. So do not stay silent any longer. Do not come to the meeting and just-- And we want to see you now. So, with that said, I'm seeing that you all were speaking, I went and took some pictures, I recorded you. I heard your voices. I know there's voices in the room. Let's start having the volunteers come forward.

So, this is an official call for volunteers from this particular room, it's not the only time we'll do a call, to help with this particular process. This is a call right now. So, if you wish to jump in, help with this process, staff is looking on, put your hands up, let's get some hands up in the air, "I want to participate in helping draft the public comment for the DNS abuse contract amendments that are coming from the GAC". This is it. We are

asking to see those people who are interested. Put your hands up now. Let's go. I expect enough flood of hands to come forward.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Not all at once.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Is one is a hand, a hand snuck up? Is there one? You're seeing somebody's pressing their mic? Somebody's doing something? Yes. Is that Taiwan? Taiwan. Fantastic. And your name. Let's get your name. Use the mic.

WEN FONG: Sorry. Wen Fong.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Wen Fong from Taiwan. Excellent. One. Do I hear two, do I hear two names? Nigel, Nigel Hickson from the UK. Thank you, Nigel. Two names. Do I hear three, three names? Egypt.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Abdalmonem. I am interested.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Interested. Let's go. Do I hear four? Come on. This is working. Do I have four names? This side of the room is still silent. Come on French team. Come on. I know one of you wants to say something. One of you is going to put your hand up. One of you is going to do it. Yeah. There we go.

Mali. Well done. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Excellent. Excellent. Wow. Yes. Fantastic. Staff, you saw what's happening, right? It's recorded. Mali, UK, Taiwan, Egypt. Anyone else? We are four to start with. Colombia. Let's go. Colombia. Yes. All right. It's five. All right. I think that's a good start. It's a good start. It's a good start.

So, we know we have, of course, as usual support from the PSWG, the US government, and the usual penholders who all want to pick part of this, but we have five new people. Well, Nigel is not new, but new enough. Nigel is not new, but to jump into this process. And of course, this is an open call, feel free to continue volunteering on the mailing list. And of course, after the session we have on help me, is it Wednesday? Wednesday is the DNS abuse session. So, Wednesday, Wednesday, I believe, I'm sure more people will be more convinced to come up and volunteer. So, thank you so much. I think it achieved its objective. We got five people.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yeah. That's fantastic. Certainly. Julia? Julia has somebody in the chat. Julia, do we have a remote volunteer, maybe?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Julia, we have a remote participant stepping forward? Yes? We're not sure.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Okay. We have someone. Who was it? Martina from the European Commission also.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Martina from the European Commission snuck in remotely. So, EU Commission. Thank you so much for volunteering. Anyone else? Any else remotely? No? So, six, that's six, six from this session. Thank you so much. All right. So, I would like to thank everyone for their engagement, their participation, their operation, especially the team from the English-speaking countries group who help with the remote participation for the workshop. We appreciate that. Thank everybody who really contributed today and came out and as Karel said to give up their time and their effort. Really, really appreciate you. And to signal that appreciation, the- - Is it ICANN or is it GAC? I don't know. We're buying drinks and food for you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yeah. As a sign of appreciation for your attendance today, we do have a few items to refresh you after a long day. So, Tracy--

TRACY HACKSHAW: Beverages, right here. You have to leave. I don't want to see anybody "I have to back to my room". It's right there.

KAREL DOUGLAS: And the reason why we have it here is that it avoids you having to go all the way to some other location. Right here you can mingle, you can mix and mingle right here in the room, not too far. I'm sure you say I did forget something. I forgot to thank the presenters who came. Terrible mistake on my part. So, thank all presenters. I can't recall all the names

now, but Manal. So, I already started Manal and others. But thank you so much for a fantastic job.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Of course, and thank AV team, interpreters, everyone for all their efforts. Let's appreciate--

KAREL DOUGLAS: Please a round of applause.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you. Thank you. Well done, well done everyone. We appreciate you. And excellent. So, with that, I think that is it, Karel?

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yes. Thank you so much. And please join us for drinks.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Close those doors. We're staying in the room. We're staying here. We are going to talk to each other whether we like it or not. Let's do it. Pretend it's coffee. Thank you very much.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Thank you all. I believe the food is ready.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]