EN

ICANN76 | CF – GAC Working Group Reporting & IGOs Discussion
Monday, March 13, 2023 – 13:15 to 14:30 CUN

GULTEN TEPE:

Welcome to the ICANN76 GAC working groups reporting and IGO discussion session being held on Monday, 13th of March at 1315 local time. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN committee may be in attendance, the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC members to type your name and affiliation in the chat box. This is to keep accurate attendance records. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name.

If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment as indicated in the chat. The feature is located at the bottom of your Zoom window. Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six UN languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking on the interpretation icon on Zoom toolbar.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I hope you all had the chance to attend the opening ceremony today as well as the Q&A session with the ICANN executive team. This is the GAC session on IGO protections and the GAC working groups reporting, so we will split the time between both topics. First, we will get an update on IGO developments and this includes the EPDP on specific curative rights protections for intergovernmental organizations, as well as the GAC mechanism to update the IGO list.

And once we're done with the IGO protections, we will start the reporting back from GAC working groups and we have four working groups on the list. The Underserved Regions Working Group, the Human Rights and International Law Working Group, the IDNs and Universal Acceptance Working Group, and finally the Public Safety working group Working Group to adopt the work plan. With that, allow me to hand this over to our topic lead on IGO protections, Brian Beckham from WIPO. Please, Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Thank you, Manal. Good afternoon, colleagues. My name is Brian Beckham. I'm from WIPO, the World Intellectual Property Organization

and as I mentioned in the opening session earlier this week, I am here also representing a coalition of IGOs who have an interest in this topic.

So with that, let's get right into the update. One more slide, I think. So by way of update, as some of you may recall, there has been a process further to GAC advice on the topic of protecting IGO identifiers in the DNS. This stems for those of you who might be a little less familiar with the topic, from some nuances to how trademark law work and how privileges and immunities are afforded to IGOs under international law.

The upshot being there was advice that IGO identifiers would be reserved from registration in new gTLDs until policy work was undertaken and so that brings us to the present update. So since the last couple of ICANN meetings, a small group of IGOs and GAC members have been working with the huge thanks to ICANN support staff on a list which would allow IGOs to add their name and identifier to a list which would give them protection from registration in new gTLDs. And so that list has been sent to, the list to add IGOs to the protection list has been sent to the GAC mailing list prior to this meeting.

And the mechanism itself covers how to add a name and an IGO to the list, how to change or modify an IGO name or identifier and how to remove. As some of you may recall, there have been specific requests to remove IGO identifiers from the list so that those in particular two-character codes could be added, could be sought by way of registration in new gTLDs.

Next slide, please. So as I mentioned, the link to the add and delete lists or forms, I should say, have been shared to the GAC list in the run-up to this meeting. Basically what's been added to these forms is some

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

additional backgrounds, some additional definitions. It's a pretty straightforward document, but certainly would encourage your detailed review of that. And any questions or suggestions, feel free to send those to myself directly -- excuse me, or to the full GAC list. And then of course, there's an annex, which has a bit of a more detailed explanation of the history of this file.

Next slide, please. So at a high level, basically, the idea was to use these forms, which would be standardized. They're sort of fill in the blank forms. And we have a screenshot in one of the next slides whereby IGOs could request to be added to the list. There's a verification process that they would meet the specified criteria. And then of course, there's a request for the specific identifier that the IGO is seeking protection for. Once a form would be submitted, then the GAC chair would acknowledge receipt of that, would take a preliminary assessment of the fulfillment of the criteria. And then if necessary, there would be a dialogue with the requester.

On the next slide, you can see a screenshot of the form to add an IGO to the list. As I mentioned, it's a reasonably straightforward form. I think it may go slightly onto the second page. But again, this has been shared to the GAC email list. So please do have a look at your convenience and provide any feedback. In terms of the concept of removing an IGO from the list, then it's effectively taking the same type of form instead of adding, it's a request to remove. The same process is followed whereby the GAC chair would acknowledge receipt. And importantly, and this is one area where there's actually a comment.

If we can, I think, go to the next slide. There's a comment in the document itself for your consideration, to what extent it would be useful

or necessary to spell out the consequences of a request to remove an IGO identifier from the list. The upshot being that unless there's a particular dialogue with the registry, then the name would be lifted off of the reserve list and go into the first come first serve pool of registration availability. So again, would invite your feedback on those two documents before they could be finalized.

Next slide, please. I think we can skip to the next two slides actually. So shifting gears slightly, in parallel to the work on the forms and the IGO list, as some of you may recall over the course of the last year and a half or so, a focused work track, which was initially chartered as its own work track, but then was folded into the phase one of the rights protection review work, looked at possible amendments to the UDRP, the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy to allow IGOs to file a case. Currently, IGOs face difficulties in accessing the UDRP because of the way that their trademark rights work under the Paris Convention and also owing to their status as international intergovernmental organizations, which have privileges and immunities, which allow them not to be subjected to jurisdiction of national courts.

This was work that was chaired by Chris Disspain. There were GAC and IGO representatives on the working group, as well as representatives from across the community. We were able to achieve full consensus on each of five recommendations. You can see there for yourselves, this is a high level snapshot. Be happy to discuss in more detail offline the specific recommendations, but the upshot is that through some small adjustments to the UDRP rules, it would in the future be possible for an IGO to file a UDRP case whereby if they met certain criteria that they were an IGO, which is the recommendation one, defining what an IGO

complainant is, then they would be exempt from the requirement under the UDRP to submit to a court jurisdiction.

One of the core issues for the working group was with the recognition of IGOs privileges and immunities from court jurisdiction, preserving the ability of a registrant to nonetheless file a claim in court if they felt that, that was necessary in the particular case. And so we were able to come up with a path whereby the registrant who lost the UDRP case could request for a court to look at that. Of course, the court may decline jurisdiction because of the IGO asserting immunities, in which case the safety valve, if you will, was that there would be an arbitration process whereby that appeal from the UDRP case would be heard not in a national court, but through an arbitration body.

One of the things that is outstanding is the actual arbitral process that would be covered in the implementation work from the recommendations of this working group, which I understand is now in front of the board for a vote. We expect that, that should be approved given that there was full consensus within the working group. There was a unanimous approval by the council. But of course, the decision to approve that process and move it over to implementation rests now with the board.

So that brings me to the next slide, which is in light of prior GAC advice, which spoke to the topic of access to curative rights protection mechanisms, specifically the UDRP and the companion URS for new gTLDs. It was necessary, and in particular, worked with the GAC leadership and ICANN staff, which we understand this is the first time that at least formally speaking, prior GAC advice is being updated to reflect the discussions in a working group whereby the prior advice is effectively

overtaken. And so because there was a sufficient compromise in the working group where we were able to get to a positive result for everyone, then it was necessary to update the GAC advice which to reflect the current state of that.

So this has been, I don't know, I'm sorry, I don't remember if this has been shared to the list, or I don't think I saw it in the draft communique itself. It was shared to the list. So I don't know if it's necessary to read the proposed GAC advice here. It's been already shared with a number of delegations and IGOs and received support so far. But in effect, it's a way of updating the prior GAC advice and saying that there's support for the work of the working group and a desire to move forward with this topic.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry, Brian, maybe we can read it as a refreshing to everyone just in case so that we can continue building on this during the session, thank you.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Sure. I'm sorry, what you see on the screen there is actually an excerpt of the GAC comment, there was prior to the board vote on this, there was a public comment period. So this is a summary of the comment that was submitted by the GAC on that public comment round. If we can move first quickly to the next slide, these are the areas where prior GAC advice had opined on the topic of access to curative rights protection mechanisms and which needed to be updated in light of the agreement in the working group.

So on the next slide actually is the proposed advice and rationale. And so I'd be happy to read that into the record and take any questions. So the

proposed advice is that the GAC supports the recommendations of the EPDP on specific curative rights protections for IGOs and advises the board to approve such recommendations for implementation. For the reasons stated inter alia in the ICANN74 communique, the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms as domain names should remain in place pending implementation of the recommendations of the EPDP. Insofar as the above noted EPDP recommendations proposed targeted amendments to the UDRP rules to accommodate IGOs in addressing the abuse of IGO identifiers in the DNS, this advice supersedes those aspects of GAC advice in the following communiques.

ICANN51 from Los Angeles, which stated that in implementing any such curative mechanism, the UDRP should not be amended. ICANN56 from Helsinki, which stated that any mechanism should be separate from the existing UDRP. ICANN57 from Hyderabad, which stated that dispute resolution mechanism modeled on, but separate from the UDRP. And ICANN59 in Johannesburg, which stated that IGO access to a curative dispute resolution mechanism should be modeled on, but separate from the existing UDRP. So as you can see the prior GAC advice, which proposed that a separate standalone mechanism be created was overtaken by the recommendations of the working group, which proposed some targeted amendments to the UDRP itself.

The rationale was that the GAC affirms that IGOs perform important global public missions with public funds, that they are the unique treaty-based creations of government under international law, and that their names and acronyms warrant appropriate tailored protection in the DNS, in the global public interest to prevent consumer harm. It is also recalled

that the EPDP recommendations strike a reasonable balance between rights and concerns of both IGOs and legitimate third parties.

And so I'm just noting for myself, I think two typos there, which we can correct offline. So that's it by way of update of the update of the forms to add IGO identifiers for protection for the reserve names list and for the EPDP on curative rights protection, and then of course proposed GAC advice for this communique. And I'd be happy to take any questions now or offline.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, thank you very much, Brian. So, Luciano, were you seeking the floor? And then I have Iran next, Kavouss. So, Brazil, please.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Yes, thank you, thank you Manal. No, thank you very much for the presentation. Sometimes we lose track of the process, so many things going on, on different directions. I just wanted perhaps to hear from colleagues that were involved in this process, if they do believe it's mature, this advice is mature for recommendation, for approval right now, it's just a matter of wanting to understand a little bit, perhaps to listen a little bit to other colleagues that are more directly involved in this process. Thank you, thank you very much.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Certainly, the proposed advice was drafted in consultation with IGOs who have been part of the coalition with a number of GAC colleagues who

have been participating in the working group and in the file. So we believe it represents the current state and a good compromise on the file.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brazil and Brian. Next, I have Iran; Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you Manal. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. First of all, I would like to appreciate very much the tireless effort and follow-up action of Brian. I was with him most of the time, Susan from United States also and few other things, but he so actively continued to pick up all of the points that we did not find necessary to intervene because we well represented. With respect to the GAC advice, replying to our distinguished colleagues from Brazil, it is sufficiently mature, this advice, this draft. So I didn't think we have to wait. If we wait, the train will go. So we have to wait. Always if there are some things that we can catch it later on, but for the time being, I think we have to go with that one.

I didn't have any opportunity to comment on what our distinguished colleagues Brian prepared but I have some, I would say substantive and editorial. The editorial is that we just refer to the previous GAC advice. Then we say that this replaced and override the previous. We just give the GAC sessions and the remaining part with hyperlink. Not to make the advice too long. And hyperlink is all of these things. One substantial thing that when it is mentioned in the advice that pending, we should say up before pending and protected because we want to protect that until implementation. So we would emphasize and we have to put or

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

introduce a word to emphasize. GAC would wish to emphasize that and then we say protection, we should also inject the word protection.

I think this GAC staff advice would merit to some discussion if people wants but I think it is a good time to proceed and not wait further than that one. A lot of work has been done. Having said that, at the end of this session, I would like also distinguished Manal, you express our sincere appreciation to Chris Disspain, who was the chair of this. He is very ably, kindly, neutrally and professionally listened to everybody and tried to find a solution in his very competent way that he's very well-known person in ICANN. So I think it's good that we send our application in a way that you decide more appropriate either somewhere or at the end. So I think it is good to say that one. And then other people may have some other comment but I think we have to proceed. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. I have next Switzerland and then UK. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Manal. And thanks very much to Brian for his tireless efforts on this matter regarding the proposed advice on the PDP on IGO protections. I just sent you, Brian, some formatting proposals. It's just to put it into the format of GAC advice we normally use. So please have a look. I hope it's useful. And regarding the question posed by Luciano about whether this is timely, I think this is now before the board. So it's the right time to advise the board. And there are two issues or two aspects on the one side to really support the approval of the recommendations of this EPDP.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

And as Brian and Kavouss mentioned, and they both participated in that process actively where I was alternate participant. It is a good balance. It's a good compromise that has been found. And this is an issue that has been lingering on for 10 years where it was very difficult to find a compromise between the GNSO and GAC positions. So I think it's timely to support it.

Now on the other side, the other part of the advice is really to clarify that the current protections and the corresponding moratorium of maintaining the current protections of IGO acronyms has to be maintained until the implementation of the new curative protection measures is fully completed because otherwise we would have a protection gap between lifting the current system of protection and the future curative protections. So I think both things are necessary and therefore I support very much this proposal. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Jorge. I have next UK and then Indonesia. UK, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Sorry, good afternoon. Thank you very much, Manal. I'll be very brief indeed just to, I suppose echo given the longitude of this process and many of us were involved in this from 10 years ago or eight years ago or whatever it was. And it's really excellent that we've reached this stage and it's due to the tireless efforts of a number of the IGOs and principally Brian for not giving up on this process. There were times when we wouldn't reach an agreement, but we now have. And I think it's

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

appropriate that we, given this important stage, we give the gap advice on those two issues that Jorge has outlined. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Nigel. Indonesia, please go ahead.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Yes, thank you, Manal. Ashwin from Indonesia for the record. Thanks, Brian, for the presentation and so on. Actually, I only want to ask a short question. During the discussion in the working group or discussion during the group and others, is there any time you discuss about on the IGO protection for big organization like UN, for example? At the moment, UN use un.org. And organization under the UN like ITU use INT, for example. itu.int, upu.int and so on. Is there any discussion about the possibilities, for example, for the UN to get the so-called closed gTLD.un, for example, then ITU, UPU, and so on can be put under .un? It's just curious to know about that possible discussion because anyway, UN is very strong, very large, largest organization, perhaps the largest IGO in the world. Thank you.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Thank you for the question. I think with the specific question about a hypothetical .un gTLD, of course, there's the question of that being a two-character code and for new gTLD applications, those weren't possible in light of two-character country codes, which are currently used for countries.   And in terms of the other IGOs, for example, that you mentioned, the ITU, absolutely, that was considered in the working

group, and that was the very first recommendation of the working group, which was to define an IGO complainant.

And it covered the definition is in the report of the working group, but it's an entity established by a treaty between governments, specialized agencies of the United Nations, for example, WIPO is a specialized agency of the United Nations, ITU, et cetera. So that was fully considered in the work. And I would also like to, it's a topic that's fairly complex, especially when we start talking about the privileges and immunities and international law and how that's dealt with in courts around the world. So it's a very complex topic, and I wanted to for the record, fully endorse the comments of Kavouss to give appreciation to the chair, Chris Dispain, who led us through that work and was able to get us to a successful conclusion.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brian. I have Iran next, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. To reply to my distinguished colleague from Indonesia, I think ITU has been involved in this matter in a general way. The issue is very complex and is not within the patience and detailed discussions in ITU. It was discussed at many councils, I was present. It was discussed on plenipotentiary, and perhaps the secretariat could, if the people want, refer that there was a letter from the United Nations Secretary General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, to the ICANN with respect to the need to protect the IGO. So I think the action is already on the board. So I believe that ITU in implementation of resolution 101, 102, and some

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

other resolution permanently refer to this and rely on the activities of the GAC.

I was in some of the ITU, I referred that the GAC very seriously following up this action, and they are, I think, they would be more than happy for the time being. I don't believe that we need to create a UN gTLD and so on and so forth, because the issue is not only common in one gTLD, it is better we leave it as an all IGO. And by the way, Brian remembered that we had a lot of discussions to define who is IGO, and there was some disagreement. They didn't want or they wanted to expand it outside the way that we want, but finally, we convinced them. We convinced them and they agreed to the definition and so on and so forth.

So for the time being, while I don't oppose to what Ashwin mentioned, but I think for the time being, it's sufficient this case and we would appreciate also the activities of the ITU. And if I participate in an ITU meeting, I also report that in one way or other that the issue is in the good hand of the intergovernmental, -- sorry, of the governmental advisory group that always refer that a close collaboration between the two is necessary. And I think that is for the time being sufficient. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. Any other requests for the floor? Okay, seeing none, then thank you very much, Brian, for all your efforts and thanks to everyone involved. And I believe we are in a good position to go for the advice here in Cancun. So, okay, perfect, thank you. And with that, we conclude the IGO protections part of our session today. And now we will be starting the reporting from the working groups. And I

think the first working group is the Underserved Regions Working Group reporting on the GAC capacity development activity that took place on Saturday. So, Pua, you would be -- please, Cook Islands.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, thank you, Manal. So, the updates from the Underserved Regions Working Group. We held our second hybrid capacity development workshop for the GAC members and observers on Saturday the 11th. The agenda for the workshop was developed based on the results of the pre-workshop survey that was shared by the GAC members. And the agenda was divided into two main areas, taking into account the number of new GAC representatives and also the relevance in understanding the processes and operations of ICANN org, as well as the community and ICANN board. So, the first part covered introductions to ICANN, the role of the GAC and the policy development process.

The second part deep-dived into policy priority issues that are of concern to the GAC, specifically the DNS abuse, subsequent procedures and WHOIS. The sessions were intended to provide GAC participants with background and GAC decisions on the current issues and discussions, hopefully and potentially to allow new GAC members to contribute to the GAC's discussions during the ICANN meeting week and also beyond. A post-capacity development workshop survey has been shared with the GAC for feedback by next week, Monday the 20th of March. And we will really appreciate your response to assist us in the preparation of future capacity development activities.

Going forward, the Underserved Regions Working Group plans to deliver ongoing capacity development interventions and activities through

several modalities, including, but not limited to, additional workshops and webinars. I also want to take this opportunity to inform the GAC that we, the Underserved Regions Working Group, are continuing to update our work plan. And we kindly invite members of the Underserved Regions Working Group and any interested GAC member to actively assist us in the delivery of our tasks outlined in our work plan. The document is actually available on the GAC website for your indulgence. Please feel free to see me or my co-chair, Karel Douglas, as well as the GAC support team, in particular, Julia Charvolen for any assistance regarding the work of the Underserved Regions Working Group. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you so much, Pua. And thanks to all involved in the capacity building activities. It's really helpful, I hope, to new GAC colleagues in specific, and brings everyone on board for our discussions here. Next, we will have the Human Rights and International Law Working Group reporting on Workstream 2 activities. And we have Bosnia and Herzegovina as one of the co-chairs. So, please. Yes, Suada, have a seat. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Distinguish Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm very sorry, Suada, just a second. I'm sorry, Kavouss. Iran, please, go ahead.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I was late. I apologize. I think perhaps I wanted to make some comments on this. As I mentioned on Saturday, the underserved countries, even they are under the envelope of underserved, but their requirements, their needs, their situation are not identical. And now we are not limiting to that. We would like to see whether, first of all, there is any feedback from those countries on the assistance or capacity building already provided, whether they are sufficient, whether there are some areas that need further enforcement, and moreover, whether there are new subjects for them that are of the priority in order to implement that, that should be taken up at our next activities and so on and so forth.

And just for information of some of the colleagues, I refer to the discussion that I had last week with the Deputy Secretary-General of ITU referring to the workshop and so on and so forth with one of our high-level person in the ministry. And we mentioned that perhaps sometimes the workshop may be to be organized in one way or other by ICANN or whatever entity locally with a group of countries that they have common problem, common difficulties, common interests, and common state of economy similar to each other. And we gave an example of Asia Pacific. There are many countries, situation in Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and so on and so forth, entirely different from situation in Japan, Korea, Australia, and others.

So the demand is different, the priority are different. And it was listened to this request and said they will take that into account. I don't want that we repeat that example here, but that should be good to take that into account that we need to see really what are the areas that some of these countries are in need in with a high priority and so on and so forth. I just give one simple example. And that example is the implementation or

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

putting into operation of from the IPv4 to IPv6 that some countries still they have problem, they have difficulty, and so on and so forth. Some logistic difficulties, sometimes technical difficulties, sometimes equipment difficulties, so on and so forth.

So these are the things I would like to submit to the distinguished chair of the group for consideration and perhaps to follow up actions. Thank you. I'm sorry I was a little bit late, but I had to raise that, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. Pua, would you like to respond? Please, Cook Islands, go ahead.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Kavouss, Iran, for the constructive response. Our capacity development agenda is always based on pre-workshop survey. And for any of our past workshops, we have reports that are available. And I invite GAC members to read these reports because you can actually get some insights into what you'd like to contribute to for future capacity development workshops. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, and I have the US next. Please, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. The United States extends its sincere thanks to the Underserved Regions Working Group for its excellent efforts on capacity development for GAC representatives. This is incredibly important work.

We look forward to sharing our input on the work plan. Finally, diversity and inclusivity within the GAC is important as the next ICANN meeting will take place in Washington DC in June. The United States hopes to work with the Underserved Regions Working Group on capacity building efforts, including on ways to more proactively engage GAC representatives and the development of our next meeting and agenda. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, US. Yes, Pau, please. Cook Islands, go ahead.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you again. I just want to welcome on behalf of the Underserved Regions Working Group the comments from the US. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Indeed, thank you very much. And now we're having a reporting back from GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group. And we have Bosnia and Herzegovina as one of the co-chairs. Suada, and also we have Alperen from ICANN org and I understand Giacomo is also online with us. So with that, I'm handing this over to you, Suada.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Thank you, Manal. So good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. My name is Suada Hadzovic, GAC representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I'm happy to welcome you to this Working Group update session. And I hope you are all well. And thank you for your presence. I would like to thank to Julia Charvolen from the ICANN GAC support staff,

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

to Giacomo Mazzone, GAC representative of African Union of Broadcasting, World Broadcasting Unions, and Alperen from the ICANN staff for their help in preparing this Work Group update. So let me start with presenting the agenda.

Firstly, I will give you a brief introduction to the background of the Workstream 2 recommendations and related Our Work Group activities. And in this point, we will also have a speech from Alperen from my left side, from ICANN staff to give us a short introduction regarding the Workstream 2 recommendation and the Workstream 2 community coordination group as well. Then we will continue with a review on Workstream 2 community coordination group activities. And the third point, our colleague Giacomo Mazzone will lead the topic three. It's about additional budget request on sign language.

And in the fourth point, we have any other business and we will define the following steps. We appreciate any feedback and or suggestions. So let me continue by giving a brief introduction to the Workstream 2 because of our new GAC colleagues. On November 2019, the ICANN board approved the Workstream 2 recommendations and the Workstream 2 final report have 116 recommendations on aspects ranging from diversity to transparency. And a total of 42 Workstream 2 final report recommendations have impact the GAC in some way or form. This report is divided into the eight issues.

And at ICANN69 meeting held in October 2020, our working group human rights and international law agreed upon leading the implementation of recommendation one, diversity and recommendation three, human rights core value. And our work group activities that we will talk today about are related to defining diversity recommendation one. So next

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

slide, please. On this introductory slide, you can see a graphic overview on Workstream 2 recommendations, which is prepared by the ICANN staff and which will be presented to us by Alperen Eken from ICANN staff. Now I would like to kindly ask Alperen to take the floor.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you so much, Suada. It is Alperen Eken from ICANN org for the record. In the Workstream 2 report, the recommendations as Suada said were divided into eight categories, eight main categories. These are diversity guidelines regarding empowered community, human rights framework of interpretation, jurisdiction, ombudsman, SO/AC, accountability, transparency and ICANN org staff-related recommendations.

Among these, four of them were directed to community directly, but as Suada has said just now, two more group in these recommendations are related to GAC in other senses. Among the community-directed recommendations, when we started the implementation, we believe that it was the best way to continue with two parallel streams of work.

The first stream would be an individual work from all SOs and ACs, and the second stream would be a community coordination group which we will be presenting later. And after the community coordination group complete its work, it will refer to some other recommendations that needs dependencies from the Workstream 2 community coordination groups. So over to you, Suada.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

SUADA HADZOVIC: Thank you, Alperen. Next slide, please. Now we have topic two. It's about the Workstream 2 community coordination group. And I would like to ask again Alperen to explain us some about the background.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thanks again, Suada. It is Alperen Eken for the record. Workstream 2 community coordination group background. So SO/AC chairs agreed to form a lightweight coordination group in December 2021. This group was to serve as a central point of exchange for best practices, lessons learned, and sharing information and progress among ICANN community. However, it is not a decision-making authority. Community coordination group address topics that can benefit from a uniform community-wide approach. Each SO/AC, GNSO stakeholder group, and regional At-Large organization to appoint one member and may appoint one alternative.

We have Suada and Giacomo from GAC as members and alternatives. Except ASO, all groups have completed their process of appointing members. This group operates in a transparent fashion. All our information, meetings, recording, attendance, and documents that the group has been publishing are on the ICANN Wiki. Specifically, the Workstream 2 recommendations that were identified as likely to benefit from community coordination are recommendation 1.1 on seven proposed elements of diversity, recommendation 1.7 on a process for handling complaints about diversity, and recommendation 2.3 on a standalone framework for exercising and power community.

In addition to that, we have recommendation 3 that group thinks that it will benefit from coordination. Since the group's establishment, CCG had lively discussions, and during these discussions, the group evolved to also

EN

encompass recommendations 1.2 on identifying diversity elements mandated in community governance documents, and recommendation 1.6 on the creation of a diversity toolkit. It is over to you, Suada, and the next slide, please.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Thank you. So, on this slide, we can see the list of elements of diversity. We would like to stress that, or to recall all of us, that in addition to the initial seven elements of diversity in the Workstream 2 final report recommendation, the GAC suggested two more elements which are bolded on this screen at the end. Diversity of resources for meaningful participation, and diversity in attendance. So, as you remember, our Human Rights International Working Group shared the GAC perspective document. And it was agreed, and it was adopted, and in document, we have a review of all seven elements, and we put the GAC perspective regarding each of seven elements.

And, for example, in essence, the GAC agrees with the Workstream 2 final report approach. But, for example, related to the elemental language in the GAC perspective document, it is emphasized that the GAC believes that language shouldn't only be restricted to spoken language. And, for instance, during ICANN meetings, regular sessions could continue offering closed captioning, while primary sessions could additionally include sign language.

Additionally, related to the element physical disability, GAC perspective is that the GAC believes that disability shouldn't be restricted to a particular disability. For example, physical disability, as noted in the Workstream 2 final report, as we noticed that in the Workstream 2 final

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

report, it is written physical disability, and our intention is that it should be only disability without physical.

And we also added two new elements. So, what is the diversity of resources for meaningful participation? It's about that the diversity is not only determined by geographic and logistic matters, for instance, but also by the economic availability of resources that could have a very large impact on access to ICANN services, or by the diversity of expectations.

And digital divide, for instance, can exist within the same geographic area, language, and age groups, but can also be determined by an economic and cultural dimension. The concept of meaningful connectivity, as it is defined by UNSG roadmap for digital cooperation, is helpful in conceptualizing this kind of diversity. And also, we added this diversity in attendance. It's about moving towards the future of hybrid meetings, where new situations will create different levels of participation.

So, next slide, please. So, we can start with introduction to Workstream 2 community coordination group activities. I would like to point that GAC members, the participants in every GAC, every cross-community group meetings. Just to stress that the intention is not for community groups to work on the diversity recommendation in a silo, as it is a community effort first. So, we shared with GAC two documents. It is about outcome of activities across community group, and it's about draft survey on diversity. So, all of us have opportunity to give comments and suggestions.

So, this draft survey on diversity is still in work, and now, cross-community group work on new survey. It's about diversity on

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

perceptions survey, and it will be all shared with GAC. And we will have some time, maybe one month to give some comments, and to finalize these toolkits. Next slide, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, sorry to interrupt, but for the sake of time, if we can make it a bit faster, because we still have to -- it's okay, but we still have other groups.

SUADA HADZOVIC: Sorry about that. Okay, now I would like to kindly ask Giacomo to take the floor, and next slide, please.

GIACOMO MAZZONE: Thank you very much, Suada, and thank you to all the participants for your attention. I just will focus on the proposal that we have submitted to the GAC, and kindly has been approved, and now is going on through the various procedures within the ICANN routes. Being coherent with the final report and the GAC's perspective, we have proposed to have an additional budget request for making an experiment and making some tests and research about sign language during plenary session as a pilot project for community feedback due to the broader group of participants attending the sessions. And we have presented this initiative to the working stream too, and at the GAC in various meeting.

Next slide, please. The idea is to use this to support a specific request from the community for activities that is not included in the recurring ICANN budget. This is the spirit of the ABR, and the proposal in this sense was submitted on November 21st, and now we discussed internally and

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

it was formalized in time for the end of the submission period closes on the end of January. Now we are in the phase two of this timeline, that is the assessment report from the ICANN org before the end of April, and then it will go to the board finance committee on May, and finally to the ICANN board at the end of May.

Next slide, please. So based on the outcomes of discussion, we have a very fruitful discussion within the GAC many proposals coming from the members and we thank all of them starting from the chairperson to Iranian representative, Denmark and many others that contributed the proposal has been integrated with all this and now is part of the ABR that has been submitted for the process and I don't go more in detail because for the sake of time you can read in the document and I think that we can conclude there. If there are requests and questions specifically we can go more in deep, thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Giacomo, and thank you very much Suada. Any questions? If not, then reiterating my thanks again and next we have the working group on IDNs and Universal Acceptance and, Hossain, please if you may. Iran, please go ahead.

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all my colleagues and colleagues. First of all, thank you Manal and all your GAC crew, Rob, Gulten and Julia, for all your efforts to keep the GAC community integrated and engaged within the super dynamic nature of ICANN as the whole internet.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

Actually, I remember well the day I got informed of this position in Kuala Lumpur and realized that this working group has not been active for years that was my second in person meeting in GAC while I was encouraged to perform some tasks as any newcomer. I had a lot of questions on how we can increase the contribution of our GAC community to ICANN. So every parent knows well the best trap to catch a young energetic son is offering him a tough responsibility as exactly you and Rob did.

Anyway, I had some knowledge about IDN and UA which have been subject to considerable discussions and debates in many fora including ICANN and GAC. I was aware that treating issues like language has been always an important sensitive and delicate issue for all nations I have been a policy researcher and university lecturer in different corners of the world North America Europe and Middle East expert in internet governance so I thought that there might be a bunch of opportunities in this topic to bring us together closer and add to GAC value for ICANN and the whole online world.

Today in her opening speech the new president of the board and acting CEO of ICANN org referred to the importance of UA as one of the main instruments to implement the inclusiveness and non-discriminatory approach. Over the past decade the domain name system has expanded dramatically and so there are now more than 1200 active new gTLDs representing many different scripts and characters. IDN or international domain names enable people around the world to use domain names in local languages and scripts with more than 60 IDN country code top-level domains representing global communities online in native scripts but while the DNS has changed the rules used by many applications have not

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

evolved to support all top level domains leaving many users unable to realize the full potential of the internet today.

Universal Acceptance or UA solves this issue by ensuring that all domain names and email address can be used by all internet enabled applications devices and systems. UA means that everyone can navigate and communicate on the internet using the domain name and email address that best aligns with their interest business culture language and script. Now and quite briefly I take this opportunity to share some news and updates about UA since ICANN75, what working group have done so far and what's the plan in this coming year to take the airplane off back to the sky.

As you have heard the UA day is on the way once we learned it we had several discussions and meetings with its leaders like Dr. Ajay Detta and related persons inside ICANN org like Dr. Salmat Hossain, you may know them. In parallel to other communities, we have the working group have provoked some local and regional events as just you might have seen in press released finally more than 50 worldwide events are planned on coming weeks, it demonstrates the large amount of interest that has been generated regarding the event later this month. So would you please consider sharing this information more widely within your governments and around your region and all GAC members and their respected governments are more than welcome to any of them.

Later today I'm going to send an email including some links and resources in this regard. Regarding the IDN activities since ICANN75 working group pleased to see February GAC webinar sharing info on GNSO IDN EPDP effort. We will watch for the initial report of the EPDP phase one effort to be generated in April of this year and we'll discuss potential GAC

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

comments on that. Working group will also watch for the final report of the EPDP effort to be published later this year I think likely November for potential GAC comments. I should thank you Mr. Hickson from the UK and Mr. Santosh from India for the great work on the GNSO EPDP effort.

And last but not least, the working plans for working group plan into 2023. Working group is available to provide GAC with input on further future label genetic rules or other public comments. We will do an assessment of global response to UA day 2023 and what governments may be able to do in future and also we will be exploring opportunities for further information sharing and education for the GAC on UA and IDN matters later this year. I should add just to be brief one important thing as well once I gladly accepted the job I sent an email to all colleagues to visit potential active members of working group. It added me a couple of new friends like Mr. Abdelmonem Galila from Egypt. Could you just raise your hand, Abdelmonem? Thank you.

And whom we are working back to back in this issue as there has been there have been recently several new GAC reps. We are always looking forward for new members especially from those governments which consider different languages as a unique asset for a connected internet. So please don't forget to contact me or GAC support staff if you would like to join the working group. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much Iran. Thank you, Hossain. Thank you for stepping in and volunteering to take this job while you just joined the GAC. So thank you very much and thank you for all the efforts and this timely update and the information you provided on the Universal Acceptance

Day. And I cannot but echo what Houssain said so please make sure to participate to the Universal Acceptance Day and please consider participating to the activities of the working group as well. Any questions or comments? Yes, US please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you so much. Thank you to our colleague from Iran for this update. Universal Acceptance is truly the foundation for a multilingual inclusive internet. And we look forward to sharing news about UA Day within our government as requested. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Perfect. Thank you. Iran. Kavouss, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you Manal. Thank you, Hossain, for the presentation. You're right that the Chairman of the Board and the...

MANAL ISMAIL: Kavouss, please if you can speak closer to the mic.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, today I was attending the meeting when the Chairman of the Board and the Acting President of ICANN, [inaudible - 01:10:12], our Acting President. They indirectly and directly refer to this universal access as one of the main important elements. Among the statistics which was given, there are various statistics. Some of them is saying that out of 8.7 million people in the world, 63% are connected and the other are not

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

connected. Among the reasons, not only this one, is this different language, different scripts, different so on, that is contribute to the further connectivity of the people to the internet. So that is an important issue.

Something for our colleagues Hossain is that I have experienced this in other organizations. When there is a new group, if there is no contribution, that group remains a one-person group. So the invitation now is for all GAC members to contribute to this very important issue for which the ICANN also is one of the leading in the world, the Universal Acceptance and so on. So therefore, this invitation should be taken very seriously and perhaps maybe at our next or next to the next meeting.

We would have a more contribution from the GAC with respect to this important issue that although ICANN is going well and in 2023 they have the first steps or steps about that, but also they need the contribution from government, from GAC and that was important that these contributions are based on the input from the different members. So this invitation I think should be perhaps reiterated in the report of this meeting that this invitation for contribution is highlighted at the meeting. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. I have China next. UK, is this an old hand? An old hand, okay. So not an old hand. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm very sorry. So UK first. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Not at all. Just to really thank our Iranian colleague for this inspiring report. I mean this work is just so crucial as Kavouss said was recognized by the ICANN board chair this morning. I just wanted to offer, as was noted, we had a very good webinar where the chair of the EPDP on IDNs gave an overview of the work we're doing in that group. It's highly technical, the work is technical in the sense that we're dealing with variants of IDNs and we're trying to assess how best to treat them to ensure that where we can, that we have as much global take up as possible in these different scripts, but at the same time that we ensure the stability and security of the internet.

And I just wanted to say that if anyone wants to talk to me about this work that we're doing, I'd be very happy to talk to them and provide them with updates of the progress we're making in our meetings. And of course, there will be the opportunity when we produce a report in a couple of months' time for everyone to contribute. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, UK. We have only one minute left and I have China, I have Nigeria, and I need to say something about the Public Safety working group Working Group plan as well. So please, if you can keep it very brief. China, please go ahead.

CHINA: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I would like to thank Iran colleague, take the chairmanship of this working group. Just want to share that Chinese government also pay a lot of attention to the UA because we also have a multilingual content as well as a top-level domain in China and also the Internet Society of China also have a working group related to IDN and

UA. They carry out some activities related. So taking this opportunity, perhaps we are considering whether to join this working group later. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, China. Well noted. Nigeria, please, very briefly.

NIGERIA: Thank you very much. Thank you, Hossain, for taking this leadership mantle. So what I wanted to say is similar to what China has said. Nigeria is the most populous black nation in Africa. We're a nation of huge diversity. And in regards to the Universal Acceptance, the government of Nigeria is already partnering. We want to host a program towards this Universal Acceptance.   But you did say something during your presentation that you would review your working group once you're done, feedback, impact of this Universal Acceptance, and you would see how to make recommendation of what government should be doing in future. We're open to this. We want to learn more.

We're also, as a government in Nigeria, we are promoting diversity and use of indigenous languages cut across. So we're open to learning from what your working group would in future provide for everybody. Thank you. Well done.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Nigeria. And thank you very much, Iran, again. Thank you, Hossain. And just before we conclude, I have added a fourth agenda item here. It's the GAC Public Safety working group Working

Group Work Plan. This has been circulated to the GAC in November. And the working group has been receiving comments throughout the past period. They accommodated almost all comments received. And I hope we are in a position at this meeting to endorse the working plan of the GAC Public Safety working group Working Group.

So if no objections to that, then we will make sure to have this reflected in the communique as agreed. Thank you very much, everyone. And apologies for exceeding the time. I hope you all be back in the room at the hour so that we can start our discussions on who is in data privacy. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]