ICANN76 | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 6)
Wednesday, March 15, 2023 – 16:30 to 17:30 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Manal, we are ready to start if you'd like.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. This is the last communiqué drafting session. For today, we have an hour. I hope we can utilize it efficiently so that we can achieve as much as we can. To make sure that at least if we need tomorrow's session, it's going to be a final readout of the whole thing, hopefully. I can see that we have already received new texts. Thanks to all the drafters.

Please, if we can scroll down to the new text. This is DNS abuse. The text under DNS abuse reads, the GAC welcomes the fact that the contracted parties proactively initiated contract negotiations with ICANN to improve existing obligations related to domain name system DNS abuse. The creation of effective and enforceable requirements for registrars and registries to disrupt or mitigate DNS abuse will represent a positive and concrete first step in addressing this important topic area at ICANN.

The GAC encourages the negotiations to proceed expeditiously and looks forward to providing feedback on the proposed amendments during the public comment period. Presentations during ICANN 76 by the Public Safety Working Group and the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network, as well as discussions with the contracted parties and

---

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.

the at-large advisory committee, provided the GAC with a diverse range of information to inform the GAC for the upcoming public comment period.

And I'm pausing here with apologies for forgetting to pause after the first paragraph. Any comments on either the first or the second paragraph? Okay, moving on. The GAC considers that continued efforts in this area will be required, including possible further improvement of contractual obligations and or targeted policy development processes prior to the launch of a second round of generic new top-level domains.

I think we normally say new generic top-level domains, but anyway. The GAC would like to reiterate that maintaining accurate and complete domain name registration data is an important element in the prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse and encourages the contracted parties and ICANN to further consider inter-alia proactive measures as well as positive incentives for registries and registrars in future work on DNS abuse mitigation or disruption. And I'm pausing here, and I see a hand up from France. Please, go ahead.

FRANCE: I will take the floor in French. Thank you so much for this proposal, which I think is quite consistent overall, and I welcome it. In order to facilitate understanding, on the third paragraph, I believe we could omit the part that starts including possible further the first line of the third paragraph. I think it might be useful to omit the term possible, and this would help to achieve our goals in terms of global obligations. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you very much, France. Any opposition to deleting the word possible? I see no opposition. Thank you very much, France. Can we please delete the word possible? Any other comments? Yes, US, please go ahead.

| SUSAN CHALMERS: | Thank you kindly, Chair. I would just note that there is a short phrase in the Under-Served Regions Working Group report, which I think could be added to this section. I mean of course, I defer to my colleague, Tracy Hackshaw, to ask his views. But it was discussed that there could be a focus on capacity building on this specific topic in advance of ICANN 77. And I'm just highlighting this here.

So we would suggest, provided that others agree, that we could move this into the DNS abuse issues of importance section. I would just note that I think we might want to change the word agreed to recommended. However, I think the general intent is there. It took place during the DNS abuse session, and so I think it more properly belongs in that section. But I invite the view of other colleagues. Thanks. |

| MANAL ISMAIL: | Thank you very much. US, Tracy, please go ahead. |

| TRACY HACKSHAW: | I think that's agreeable, but I would also want to ask my colleague, Pua, to weigh in. Pua? |

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Tracy. Thank you, Chair. I support the proposal from our US colleague. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, everyone. So we are moving this part to the issues of importance to the GAC under DNS abuse mitigation. And I think we're good to adopt the text under DNS abuse mitigation. I see Iran and then UK. Kavouss, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I have difficulty to replace the word agreed by recommend. Recommendation is optional. So I say that reiterate, confirm, but not recommended. If we recommend that, that we downgrade the request. So I have difficulty to that replacement. Either you leave it agreed or if agreed is not good, saying that it was confirmed that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So any objection to retaining the original language, keeping it agreed? US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: I don't think that we would object. I would just note that this was the product of some very friendly banter in the chat. So it felt a little bit less formal. That's why we would suggest recommended, but we do not object to the word agreed. I just wanted to provide that context. Thanks.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you very much, US. So indeed, it was proposed in the chat and was supported, but not officially confirmed one way or another. So UK, please go ahead.
NIGEL HICKSON:	Yes, thank you very much, Manal, and thank you to the US for proposing with others this text, which looks an excellent way forward. I just have one suggestion, and perhaps this might have been thought of already. I thought one of the things that we were told about this week was a tool called the ACID tool. So this was the tool by which you could enter a domain name and find out who the registrar was, who the hosting provider was, etcetera. And I wonder if we could just welcome the deployment of this tool or welcome the use of this tool or something like that, because it did seem to be something that was quite worthwhile.
MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, UK. So let's first conclude on the previous suggestion. Kavouss, can you leave with recommended or suggested?
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	No, I don't agree with recommended, suggested. Agreed.
MANAL ISMAIL:	Even if it was proposed in the chat only?

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm not talking of chat. I'm saying that recommended and so on and so forth. I mentioned that recommendation is something optional. I recommend to you to do something, you say thank you very much, I don't take that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Which is indeed the case. It's a recommendation, it's optional, it's not mandatory indeed. So, US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Perhaps the word 'suggested' may be more agreeable.

MANAL ISMAIL: Would it be better to put the word 'suggested', Iran?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, I don't think that we are more than suggestions. I don't understand what was the problem. This is what we have agreed.

MANAL ISMAIL: Because it was just in the chat. Some people didn't even see it. So it was not really a decision.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I take it in the submission now. I submit that agreed. I don't vote to the chat. I don't like the chat at all.

MANAL ISMAIL: Exactly. And since it was only in the chat and some people like yourself don't like the chat, so it's better to keep it light for now since it was not agreed in plenary, if you don't mind. Please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I don't know, Manal, your position. I don't know. You're turning the thing around. This is an important issue that we want to mention that, but we don't want to go to the chat or non-chat or to command it and so on and so forth. It was agreed that the DNS abuse should form the basis of the next wave of the GAC capacity building and intervention and so on and so forth. I don't understand. But I don't also know what you mean next wave. What means wave? What is wave? I'm not talking of electromagnetic wave.

MANAL ISMAIL: Next wave, next version, next program. We can use any term you wish. So any objection to keeping it agreed? Okay, thank you everyone for your flexibility. Then we are keeping it agreed and I think we can mark the text as adopted, please. Let's move on. We have here a new text on the registration data consensus policy.   The text reads, the GAC welcomes the implementation work on the EPDP team phase one final recommendations of the registration data consensus policy and

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback as part of the public comment process. Any comments?

Okay, thank you Fabian for noting that we will fix the terminology here. Noted. The GAC supports the EPDP team's efforts to develop a policy that complies with existing data protection principles while establishing clearly defined minimum data elements that allow contracted parties to process data based on the obligations within their jurisdictions.

At the same time, the GAC looks forward to receiving the implementation review team's analysis and response to the public comments, including inter alia. First, the issue of response times to urgent requests to ensure that responses to such requests are in fact expedited in a manner consistent with an emergency response. Second bullet, defining urgent requests to include those involving, "imminent or ongoing cyber security incidents."

Third bullet, avoiding the risk of implementing a partial system resulting in a policy gap by, among other things, resolving inconsistencies between the phase one recommendation regarding the optional collection of the registrant organization and the subsequent phase 2a recommendation to require the functionality of distinguishing between legal and natural persons.

And I see two more bullets, clarifying the obligation of contracted parties to enter into a data protection agreement or into data protection agreements. Requiring the collection and publication of reseller data. And lastly, clarifying the policies impact on the thick

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

WHOIS transition policy. And I'm pausing here to see if there are any requests for the floor and I see Paraguay, please go ahead.

NICO CAVALLERO: Thank you, Chair. If you can go up a little bit, Fabian, maybe we should explain what EPDP stands for unless it was already explained before. Was it? Because for better clarity.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Paraguay, well noted. Any other comments? If not, then with this friendly amendment, we can, I think, adopt this part of the text. Oh, I'm sorry, I think we still have more text to read. So under WHOIS Disclosure System, the GAC welcomes the launch of a proof of concept WHOIS Disclosure System to generate data that can inform further community discussion on phase two of the expedited policy development process and the recommendations on the system for standardized access and disclosure, which are currently on hold. Drawing on the GAC's discussions with the board and the GNSO at ICANN76, the GAC notes the importance of maximizing voluntary participation in the system, including through potential incentive structures. Any comments? Yes, please, Tracy, go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes, thank you, Manal. I believe the ICANN org has named that system now and they said it's renamed to Registry Data Request System. So maybe we should identify it that way now, I would suggest, perhaps.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, and indeed, I think it's -- US, please.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	This is Laureen Kapin for the record. The precise board disclosure still refers to it by this name, so we could refer to its new name, and I thought actually there was a parenthetical somewhere that did that. But for precision about how the board referred to it and its resolution, it was still called the WHOIS Disclosure System. But we certainly could note that it will soon be called something else, as is the ICANN way.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you very much, US. I see Iran. Please, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	Thank you. Just editorial, but when we say in brackets 'SSAD', something is missing. A standardized system for access and so on. There was a full text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, and this is why it didn't treat well with me. Thank you. So it's system for standardized access and disclosure. Thank you. And then thank you for digging the new name. Any other comments? If not, then please let's adopt the text under this section. And can we scroll down to see if there is -- is there any brand-new text that was not read? Can we just start with the new text? So we have GAC advice to the board under privacy proxy. I'm sorry, I see Brazil. Please, go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA	Sorry, I think I was out of the room when we went to the discussion on the emergency program. I apologize for that, but it was possible to get back to the text.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Sure, let's do it now, and UK also had a proposal on the text, so let's make one more read here. It's short text. So emergency assistance program. Acknowledging the importance of the emergency assistance program for continued Internet access initiative developed by ICANN. GAC encourages ICANN board to consider partnering with a wide range of organizations, and there was here text saying including specialized IGOs such as the International Telecommunication Union in order to facilitate implementation and amplify the impact of the proposed program without prejudice to the development of a more comprehensive framework as per GAC's ICANN75 communique. And the UK proposal is to delete including specialized IGOs. Just keep the wide range of organizations without signaling a specific organization. So I see Iran and I see UK.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	Thank you, Manal. I mentioned also yesterday to the board that they can't do anything without ITU. So I request we get back to the International Telecommunication Union, because ICANN does not have any infrastructure. Any assistance without infrastructure makes no sense at all. So they need to put, so I would like to bring back including International Telecommunication Union. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, Iran. I have UK next.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH:	Thank you, Chair. Rosalind KennyBirch, UK GAC alternate. We would suggest removing this language just to keep the language more general as the Emergency Assistance Program is an independent program led by ICANN. We believe that partnering with a wide range of organizations specifically captures this without zeroing in on one specific institution. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you very much, UK. So the proposal is to keep the suggestion open. It doesn't necessarily exclude the ITU, but it doesn't signal out any specific organizations. I see Argentina, then Lebanon and then Iran. Argentina, please go ahead, Gabriella.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK:	Thank you. Thank you, Brazil, for raising this issue in the communique. From the meeting that we had with the board, I think they will send us more information, right, on this specific program according to what is public on the ICANN website. The request for information is already open and the deadline is on the 27th of March this month and already has the criteria for participate and all the requirements are in the request for information. But I'm not sure about if the program exists and all the definitions and details are in other parts of the ICANN website. So if this is the case, we can also include the request for information regarding the program and not the request for information

because I feel that there is much work to be done before the request for information regarding the program. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So if I understand correctly, and I would tend to agree, maybe adding something to the effect that we look forward to receiving further information on the program, right, as agreed during the session. And I see nodding from Argentina. I hope this is and I see nodding from Lebanon as well. And Lebanon, the floor is yours, please.

ZEINA BOU HARB: Thank you, Manal. Actually, we had prepared a list of questions on this topic to the board and we were not able to get answers, so we are very limited here. We are limiting our contribution to the partners that will help the ICANN in providing this assistance while we ask, for example, who are the entities that can apply to get this assistance. So we need more information about all the program, not only about the partners of ICANN in implementing this program.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Lebanon. So maybe we can add one sentence and we can do this maybe offline, if not ready now, that we look forward to receiving further information, including on, and we can take exactly the same thing that was in the question to the board, which is the criteria, modalities, and the whole list. So noted, and we will fine-tune it and make sure it reflects all the missing information. Thank you,

Argentina. Thank you, Lebanon. I have Iran and then Brazil. So Iran, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. I don't understand some people. They do not listen to what we said. First of all, in second line, please delete to consider partnering, to consider collaboration with. Partnering, I don't think it is a partnership. To consider collaborate, not -- to collaborate. Not to consider, to collaborate with. It's not consideration. As I mentioned in resolution 101, 102, 130, and 133, we have always mutual collaboration between ICANN and ITU, and that is important. So please delete to consider to collaborate with. That is point one.

Point two, without collaboration, specifically with ITU, which some colleagues are faithful member of that, I don't think that any assistance should be given. If there is no infrastructure, there is no assistance. The establishment of DNS without any infrastructure makes no use at all. So we should be realistic and objective. So I request that when we say collaborating with, after collaborating with relevant, collaborating with relevant, wide range of organization, because there might be some not relevant.

And then that including, I won't say in particular, but I come down to including International Telecommunication Union. I'm sorry, I want to maintain this. This is very important. As I mentioned yesterday in the board that there are unity in ITU, that is the development sector. As soon as there are some emergency situations, they are available and they can work with ICANN collaboratively in order to establish what ICANN is going to do. So without that, otherwise I have difficulty with

the entire text and I propose to delete section five totally if ITU is not mentioned specifically. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss, and please, we need some cooperative spirit so that we can reach consensus language for the communique. So there are three proposals here. One to retain the mention of the ITU. Second is to change consider partnering with, by to collaborate with. And frankly, personally, I would leave consider but I leave it to GAC colleagues. We cannot issue the communique with all instructions to the ICANN board. If we want to keep it soft and diplomatic, we need to maintain the word consider but I leave it to GAC members.

And finally, we have a proposal for relevant instead of a wide range. Again, it's up to GAC members but I think it narrows the -- we're contradicting ourselves. We were suggesting a wide range and then we're saying relevant. So, but again, I'm just brainstorming out loud and it's up to GAC members to decide. I'm sorry, Brazil, is this a new hand? I see Brazil, I see Lebanon, I see Iran. I'm not sure if these are new hands.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, Luciano, Brazil. Then I'll just to react a little bit to the case suggestion. We don't make a strong point of this. I just had the impression when the program was announced that it's something relatively modest in terms of how much we're talking about. And it seemed to me the initial concept is to have as partners local entities that possibly private entities, NGOs, so on and so forth. What our

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

suggestion was more in the perspective of suggestion that ICANN org, ICANN board, try to think a little bit outside the box and it's not a lot of money. If they want to leverage these resources in a more productive way, it would be interesting to find organizations that have this kind of punch. Otherwise, this is really not significant.

I don't have a problem with some of the suggestions. I just think that perhaps a reference about the possibility of considering collaboration or partnership with IGOs is something that we would prefer. But again, I don't make a strong point of this and it's just to point the board to this direction that I understand they can consider partnering to a wide range of partners, but they're still thinking within the same framework of partnering with local entities that perhaps don't have the expertise or the financial capability of really giving a broader impact to their initiatives. That was the topic. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Brazil. I see Iran next. Is this a new hand? Yes, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. I can withdraw relevant, leave it as wide range because you're pushing for that. You always object to me in this meeting, many times, but no problem. Because always relevant, we could not discuss with somebody who is not relevant. There are many organizations wide range. I don't understand that we discuss with somebody who is not relevant. They should be expert in either DNS or telecommunication, but not the other thing. But I have no problem to take out that. But I maintain reference to International

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

Telecommunication Union and I now replace, instead of including, in particular. Chairman, I don't understand that. Without infrastructure, ICANN cannot do anything. I think we say something just to cheat ourselves or we want to do something properly. That is that.

I have no problem with the proposal of Brazil, IGOs, that's not the problem, but I would like to say, in particular, International Telecommunication Union. ICANN was not accepted to be part of the ITU in 2010. We agreed with that. We put the results in three resolutions saying that mutual collaboration and we have to respect that. We have to respect that. I don't think that this is one-sided collaboration. It's mutual collaboration and I said that now, instead of including, in particular, International Telecommunication Union. Otherwise, I don't agree with this text totally. Has nothing to do with becoming something we need to understand the people. Without infrastructure, you can't have anything. It will be just a propaganda. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Iran. And just again to set the record clear, I'm not pushing for a wide range. I was just flagging that this changes the message. If this is what GAC colleagues want, I'm happy to adopt whatever language the GAC agrees to. So either relevant or a wide range, I don't have a position here. Any comments on the proposed language on the screen? Yes, Lebanon, please go ahead.

ZEINA BOU HARB: It's not actually on the language on the screen, but it's on the announcement that was made by ICANN. If we can off record check the

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

emergency assistance program for continued internet access that is published on the ICANN page and on which there is eligibility criteria for the third parties that will be providing the assistance with ICANN to the requester. There is a list of criteria. Maybe we should read all the announcement in order to be able to check who can partner and on what.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Lebanon. So maybe keeping it flexible. Yes, Argentina and please, Kavouss, let me know if this is a new hand. Argentina, please go ahead.

GABRIELLA SCHITTEK: Yes, thank you. I think the criteria published on the website are for the request for information, not for the program, just specifically for this request for information to collect all the possible providers to make a database, I think. I wanted to say that in the -- maybe I'm wrong, but in the previous, the first experience that we have on the emergency last year in the Ukraine, I think the ICANN partnered with the UN at that time. So I think it's much better to keep it broadly because we don't know in the next emergency with whom the ICANN can be partnered with. So the thing is that we still don't know what is the program and we still don't know if ITU will be willing to collaborate with ICANN. So we are the governments here. ITU is a governmental organization. So maybe we don't know what ITU will do. Thank you.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, Argentina. And you really make a very good point. So collaboration takes two parties to collaborate and we cannot really enforce it from one direction. I have Iran, please go ahead.
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	Thank you, Chairman. Distinguished Argentine delegates, your government has ratified ITU Constitution, Convention, Resolution. In Resolution 101, 102, 130, 133, there is a resolve that ICANN and ITU mutually collaborate. So it is there.
MANAL ISMAIL:	Kavouss, please.
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	It's not optional. I'm very sorry. I don't insist on some of the people.
MANAL ISMAIL:	I'm sorry too because we have very limited time.
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	And we do not allow the situation -- Please let me finish.
MANAL ISMAIL:	If you're speaking on the topic, please finish.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am speaking of the topic that the people say that ITU is not because may not collaborate. Yes, ITU is obliged to collaborate with ICANN. ICANN is obliged to collaborate with ITU because it is in the resolve of the resolution of the plenipotentiary which is binding.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. And I encourage everyone to speak their government's views without commenting on other governments' views, please. So thank you very much for considering this. So we need to conclude if possible on this text. Otherwise, we can park it till tomorrow and go to the GAC advice to the board. And I just want to remind everyone that this is issues of importance to the GAC. So it's our brainstorming. It's not cast in stone. We need to pay due attention to GAC advice to the board. So if there are -- please, Brazil.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Sorry, Manal. I just insist because unfortunately tomorrow I won't be here. I just withdraw my suggestion. I mean, if it's impossible to get some kind of consensus, perhaps an alternative would be just to take the information received and indicate that we expect additional information, more details for further consideration or further -- I don't know, something along those lines and nothing more specific. We wouldn't have a problem with that. That's just true.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Brazil, for your flexibility. And sorry, I didn't know you will not be here tomorrow. So maybe we can...

LUCIANO MAZZA: Oh, it's fine. It's my problem. Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL: Maybe we can try to start with this text. We need to conclude on everything anyway. And I have a request for the floor from France as well. So please, France, go ahead.

FRANCE: Thank you. Thank you, I agree with Brazil's suggestion. I think we can have an alternative phrasing. But going back to the previous comment made by the Argentine colleague, I think that it is quite paradoxical when we just focus on one single organization. So I think we need to allow ourselves to consider a partnership with all organizations. Of course, this does not exclude the ITU. I think that we need to focus on the wide range and work on a different phrasing if necessary.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, France. So if we're not able to conclude on the text as it stands, maybe we can take the language proposed by Brazil to just keep it high level. And thank you, Brazil, for your flexibility. So did we capture what Luciano suggested? Can you repeat again your suggestion?

LUCIANO MAZZA: Sorry, Manal, it's not a specific draft suggestion. It was just along the lines of what was in the very end of the paragraph. Something that we

perhaps begin this item, acknowledging the information received by the board that indicated there was partial information somehow because they were not in a position to provide additional detail on the program. And I look forward to receiving additional and more detailed information on the program for further consideration by GAC, something like this. And leave open to have a better reflection on this in the next meeting.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Brazil. So acknowledge the initial information received from the board and look forward to receiving further information. And I see already the rest of the text on the screen. Iran, please, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I support that very short paragraph. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. So thank you very much, Brazil. Thank you very much, everyone. I think we have text to adopt under the Emergency Assistance Program. Once we are done, if we can go back to the GAC Advise, the new text we have. So, again, this is Privacy, Proxy Services, Accreditation Issues, Policy Implementation. And the text reads, the GAC advises the board to prioritize the assessment of the pending RDS-4S2 review recommendation, R10.1, which called for the board to monitor the implementation of the PPSAI policy

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

recommendations and all necessary steps to resume this implementation consistent with the intent of the GAC's previous advice.

Second, the GAC advises the board to regularly update the GAC on the status of activities related to privacy and proxy services. Any comments? I'll continue reading the rationale. The GAC notes in the recent quarterly report on ICANN-specific reviews (21 February 2023) that "it is anticipated that ICANN-org may begin to work on the impact assessment of the outcomes of ongoing community work in Q1 2023 to inform board action of recommendation 10.1."

Of the second registration directory service review, RDS-WHOIS2. R10 - - I'm sorry, any comments? Then recommendation 10.1 provides for the ICANN board to monitor the implementation of the privacy proxy services accreditation policy recommendations and thus implicates the previous GAC advice in the Kobe communique and the GAC's follow-up on previous advice within the Montreal communique. Any comments? Yes, please, Colombia.

COLOMBIA: Thank you, Manal. Just on the previous paragraph, when we mentioned the second registration directory service review, since we have on the number one to prioritize right after the GAC advises the board, my suggestion would be to include the full name on the first instance on the first number rather than the end of that second paragraph -- or the first paragraph of the rationale. And delete that information at the end of the first paragraph of the rationale.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, Colombia. Yes, we normally try to be very concise and to the point on GAC advice to the board, but if in issues of importance to the GAC, we elaborate more, but I'm in your hands. Okay, thank you. Thanks. So I think we have the text to adopt here. Just a second.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	Do we have any additional new text that we haven't read? In follow-up on previous advice, we need to clarify whether we can delete what's in there on that topic.
MANAL ISMAIL:	So if we can adopt this part first, please, before moving on. Yes. Thank you. So do we still need the follow-up on previous GAC advice here? We said we will have a placeholder for DNS abuse and SubPro until we have issues of importance to the GAC on the same topic discussed, and we also took the GAC advice. Do we need it? No. Any objection to deleting it? I see everyone in favor, so thank you very much. And DNS abuse, do we need any -- I see agreement from Iran to delete? And I see a hand up from UK. Please go ahead.
NIGEL HICKSON:	Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. So we're on the DNS abuse and SubPro. It's difficult to -- is that the question? Sorry.
MANAL ISMAIL:	We had a placeholder here, and we said until we clarify things and issues of importance to the GAC.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

NIGEL HICKSON:	Thank you very much indeed. No, it's our intention that we should put something here. We had a discussion with the GNSO. We had a discussion with the board, and we mentioned that there was previous GAC advice, not least in relation to the CCT review, which touched on a number of elements which would need to be picked up prior to SubPro. And the board, in our discussion with them, said they would welcome clarification in that respect. I mean, there had been some time ago, perhaps two meetings ago, some dialogue on this. And it was recognized that there was some recommendations which we encapsulated in GAC advice which would not necessarily be sold by the contract negotiations indeed.
	You will recall that in our meeting, there was discussion of mini PDPs with the board. So I think it's timely to be able to follow up on that previous advice and note that there is still some outstanding GAC advice on this. Because it gives clarity. Because you, I, and others might not be here in 18 months' time, and someone will look at the GAC advice and say, well, hold on a minute. We can't go ahead with SubPro because of this previous GAC advice. So I think clarity is important. Thank you.
MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, UK. I have Iran and then Brazil. Iran, please go ahead.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. I think we have properly and sufficiently discussed the issue in the issues important. For the GAC, we don't need to come back to that. We don't need to refer to the previous GAC advice. They are already there. They are taken into account or will be taken into account. So I don't think that we should need to add anything. I am not comfortable to repeat something that is already sufficiently covered in the point issues important for GAC. So we don't need that at all. Thank you. The new one, after all, DNS abuse and SubPro. We don't need that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Iran. Noted. Brazil, please go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, Manal. Luciano. I will be careful how to phrase this. I think it's sometimes the discussion is monopolized by a few issues. And we know they are very important issues. I would invite Nigel and UK to have a look at what comes before and to check if it's not covered. Because I cannot believe that after so much that is written about those topics, it's not enough. I mean it gives you we have a very unbalanced communique where only a couple of topics are always overcharged and taking like 8% of what's said. I know that reflects the amount of work that has been done on those topics and how many participants feel about those topics. I'm not diminishing in any way this element. But I just think it's not essential. My suggestion was that it's not included. Thank you.

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you very much, Iran and Brazil. So, UK, is it okay to? I see you giving up. So, I appreciate your flexibility. Then we have nothing on the follow-up on previous GAC advice. So, we have five minutes remaining. And if we can -- yes, please, UK.
CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:	Sorry, just to note, there's new text for the PSWG. I've just inputted a while ago as well. Thank you.
MANAL ISMAIL:	So, it's in now? Perfect. Thank you. So, I'm going to read the reporting from the GAC Public Safety Working Group. And the text reads, the GAC Public Safety Working Group continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG participated in the capacity building workshop, supporting the orientation of new GAC members on the importance of WHOIS data and mitigating DNS abuse. The PSWG also led a session to update the GAC on DNS abuse that included one, presentation on UK and US, cybercrime statistics and how they relate to the DNS. Two, updates on various initiatives from the community to support the mitigation of DNS abuse.

Three, a presentation by the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network detailing their suggested framework for when is it appropriate to act at the DNS level to address technical and website content-related abuse. And four, discussed what the GAC could do to forward the work within the ICANN community. I'm pausing here. I see a hand up. Kavouss, is this a new hand, Iran?

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is new hand. It's totally editorial. Please separate one, two, three, four in a separate line in breaking the line to be more evident, more clear, and more highlighted. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Noted, and I can see support staff already taking care of this, the PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small group that focuses on domain name registration issues. The PSWG noted the importance of accurate registration data and the ability to identify the most relevant entity to disrupt and investigate DNS abuse. The PSWG also participated in the update to the GAC on domain name registration data issues. With regard to ICANN's org proposed design of a proof of concept WHOIS Disclosure System, soon to be renamed the registration data request service, the PSWG noted the response from ICANN org indicating that a lack of functionality to maintain the confidentiality of requests for law enforcement agencies and highlights that this will likely lead to a reduced engagement from this significant user group of the system. The PSWG continued its outreach, holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies. Any comments?

Thank you very much to PSWG working group. I think we can please mark the text as adopted. I'm sorry. I tend to talk faster when I'm reading. I do apologize to the interpreters. I'll try to do better tomorrow. So any -- can we just, before we conclude, see what's missing? Apart from the typos, anything that we need to discuss, I mean, in terms of substance? I think we parked a few, a couple of. So

any objection to the GAC to this sentence? The GAC also welcomed information they provided. I believe this refers to the contracted parties. They provided on concerning the development of the so-called asset tool concerning a reference for data on a domain name registration. So maybe we can fine tune, but any comment in principle? Iran?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. It may not be appropriate to call something so-called. So-called is some sort of the intimization that we are not very happy. Give, spell them out what does it mean, but without saying that so-called. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you and I fully agree. We can, if UK agrees of course, we can delete so-called. But I see no objection in principle in welcoming the tool. So we're already one minute over time. I'll sit with support staff to identify what's missing. I appreciate if you can have a final look on the communique. Tomorrow we will be doing the final reading and finalizing any parts that are still highlighted to be finalized. With that, please enjoy your night or day -- I'm sorry, I see a hand up from UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks, and this session has gone extremely well. So I'm not going to spoil anything because I know I'm on a losing wicket, so to speak. But we did have some text to add into the issues of importance under the registration data category just on the accuracy issue, on the accuracy

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

working group and the discussions we had on that. So I can propose a text later on this evening and we can consider it tomorrow. I promise it's very uncontroversial.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much for flagging and I hope you can spend a few minutes tonight to just go through the communique and come ready tomorrow to adopt the communique. But I have a hand up from Fabian. So we will work on cleaning the text, only highlighting or keeping highlighted the parts that were not resolved yet, so that when you review the communique, you can just focus on parts that were not concluded yet. With that, I do apologize. I've been running overtime throughout the day. I'm very sorry and the meeting is adjourned. We'll reconvene tomorrow at 09:00 local time. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|76
CANCÚN