ICANN76 | CF – Joint Session: ALAC and GAC
Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 09:00 to 10:00 CUN

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to the ICANN76 GAC meeting with the ALAC session being held on Tuesday, 14th of March at 9:00 AM local time. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community 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 participation chatbot. This is to keep accurate attendance records. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder 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 a 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 located on the Zoom tool bar.

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.

Finally, this session like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. This session is being recorded, and all materials will be made available on the ICANN76 meetings page. With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC chair, Manal Ismail. Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL:    Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone here in the GAC room and on Zoom. Welcome to the GAC bilateral meeting with ALAC and welcome to ALAC members in the room and a very special welcome to Jonathan Zuck. This is our first meeting with you in your new capacity as the ALAC chair. So a very warm welcome.

The GAC and the ALAC regularly meet during ICANN public meetings to discuss ICANN policy issues of common interest to both the government and end users. And we also gasp the opportunity of face-to-face meetings to coordinate and align views which also, in the past, resulted in developing joint statements on certain policy and operational topics.

I would also like to thank Joanna, the ALAC liaison to the GAC, and UK GAC representative Nigel Hickson who volunteered to be our temporary point of contact with the ALAC until we have a GAC volunteer for coordination tasks.

But before handing over to Joanna and Nigel who developed the agenda for today's meeting, allow me first to hand over to Jonathan if you have any opening remarks.

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Manal. I guess we're just two ships passing in the night but for years to come, we'll be able to say we always had Cancun. So thank you. I really want to take this opportunity to thank Manal for her service as the GAC chair. You've been an incredible chair. Six years I think it is. It's amazing and it's been amazing working with you. So thank you very, very much on behalf of the At-Large community. We're excited to work, Nigel, with you, but they are big shoes to fill. So good luck.

All right. And thanks, everyone, for being here for this bilateral meeting. It's a very strange format for a bilateral meeting to have a table like this, but we'll figure this all out eventually how to have these conversations. It's very productive for the At-Large Community to work with the GAC. We find multiple points of agreement because we share constituencies basically, right, which are just the people trying to use the Internet every day and ensuring that that experience is predictable and open and fair to the people trying to use the Internet. So we always value this collaboration very much. So with that, I'll pass it back to you to get the agenda started. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Jonathan, and I'm going to pass it directly to Joanna. Would you get us started? And thank you very much for all your efforts.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. I'm glad to do that. And please let me join Jonathan in thanking you personally, Manal, for enabling this cooperation and your

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

ongoing support. We've appreciated all your work thus far, and we hope this will continue also beyond your capacity as the chair.

Thank you for being here this morning. Our agenda is quite concise. It is, indeed, always a challenge to identify the topics to speak on in this relatively brief session. For the purpose of the Cancun meeting, we've identified three topics and asked topic leads to provide brief statements on behalf of each of the constituencies as an invitation to have a broader discussion. Given the time constraints, please kindly note that this is just a reflection of all the conversations that are ongoing between and among the constituencies within ICANN.

The topics we have selected for this meeting include the joint statement by ALAC and GAC that dates back to 2017 and was initiated to enable inclusive, informative, and meaningful participation. And we have two experienced topic leads on this. That's Alan Greenberg, who will be introducing this topic for the At-Large, and Jorge Cancio who is joining us remotely. They will both very briefly introduce the background for that document and look at possible proposed steps forward. There is work being done around that document and how we might wish to progress the efforts that were initiated in 2017.

As our second topic, we have chosen a theme that is quite popular, has been throughout this meeting since it started, and has led up to a plenary session scheduled for later this week and this is a discussion on furthering the multistakeholder model. We attempt to look at furthering the multistakeholder model from the individual perspective, as Jonathan indicated. We within the At-Large try to look at individual users as individuals and, thus, understand their needs and expectations

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

of the multistakeholder model where a similar attempt is done by the governments trying to best identify the expectations of citizens.

And this is why the topic of the multistakeholder is important to both constituencies and we welcome the proposal from the GAC that we should discuss it within a plenary. We're very much looking forward that plenary. And this is considered to be a preparatory exchange of initial ideas with the topic leads being Nigel Hickson speaking on behalf of the GAC and Marita Moll who will be joining us remotely giving the individual perspectives on that theme.

And last, but not least, the evergreen theme of DNS abuse today introduced again. We have talked within the GAC on DNS abuse previously, today introduced again by Hadia Elminiawi on behalf of the ALAC and Laureen Kapin who have kindly agreed to give a very brief GAC perspective on the pertinent theme of the DNS abuse.

We have decided to reserve 10 minutes for a brief Q&A. There never is enough time for us to exchange ideas. So we kindly ask you to note your questions and, time permitting, we will welcome them in the dedicated brief 10 minute session. And then, we will go back to our chairs for a brief summary and wrap-up. With this in mind, I'm glad to give the floor to Alan Greenberg to start us off with the first team and introduce the 2017 Joint Statement by ALAC and the GAC. Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you very much. Next slide, please. This one's an interesting one. It goes back … We've just noted that Manal will be leaving. This goes back to the final meeting for the previous GAC chair, Thomas Schneider,

who some of you may remember. This was really I will say a pet project, a really key project for Thomas, in that then, like now, there was a huge turnover in the GAC. There are new people coming in that have a great amount of difficulty getting up to speed, finding documents, things like that, simple things—things that you need if you're going to be an effective GAC member and, similarly, things you need if you're going to be an effective At-Large member.

So we put together a statement that essentially was asking for some simple changes so that people could be more effective. We understood this was a big problem. ITI, which was ICANN's formal response to document management was already announced, but we felt we needed something quicker than that. Next slide, please.

We really had two simple recommendations. The first was—and we made a mistake in this one. We called it a document management system. We shouldn't have used that buzz word. But nevertheless, we were looking for quick, easy access to documents. So, for instance, currently often when you look for a document, you'll find the draft version but you can't find the final version, or you'll find a final version but not the final revised version.

So we were looking for something simple. On the cover of a document, put the date, put the name, put in a number so you can recognize when it was changed, and put the author so you can get ahold of someone if you have a question.

The second recommendation was make these documents understandable to people who haven't spent the last decade in ICANN. We want summaries, we want an absence of buzz words and acronyms

to at least get people to the point where they can understand what's going on. And if you don't do it for everything, at least do it for things where you're asking for comments in the public comment process.

We've gone through a number of iterations. This is now I think the second time, maybe the third time, that ICANN has come back to us and said, "Hey, look at what we have done." We weren't very impressed the first time, I'm afraid. Next slide, please.

The advice was looking for a quick fix. The expression that we've used sometimes is we were not looking to broil the ocean. We were not looking to do a huge amount of work, just some simple things to make life a little bit easier. The features that they've described last time and this time for ITI, I don't remember what ITI stands for—information something initiative—which essentially is organizing all of ICANN's documents, all of ICANN's web presence. The new features are great. They're really nice, but they don't address our problems, and they shouldn't have been presented to us as addressing those problems.

We still need documents identified. We still need easy-to-understand summaries and minimal jargon. And I guess this is a personal point of view, not necessarily a formal ALAC position, my overall response is annoyance. If they're really not going to do it, tell us. It's not what we want to hear, but tell us, and let's stop playing this game of presenting things that are not addressing the problem as if they are. And I'll turn it back to you.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Thank you very much, Alan, for that… Oh, sorry.

GULTEN TEPE:P          No, just to let you know we have a hand raised in the chat from Iran. Kavouss.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Thank you. Would it be appropriate to take that intervention in the Q&A section? Just [inaudible], please, sir, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:          Yes, good morning. Thank you very much. Congratulation, Jonathan, for your chairmanship. I know you many years and very active. Thank you very much. I suggest that at the end of each presentation we leave some little time for discussion. Otherwise, we forget what was the subject. It's very difficult. If you want to be productive. If that is the case, if the presentation of Alan is finished, I have two or three small suggestions to make.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Manal, I understand it would be appropriate for us to welcome that suggestion. Please, sir, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:          Something that I have experienced in other international organizations for easy access to the documents what's said by Alan, very good, but we need to add another word and we call them keywords. Keywords enable the people to have easily access to the documents. That is something.

The second even for me after some let's just say years of participation, I always have difficulty to read document with a lot of acronyms, acronym after acronym. When I look into the board resolution, all of the terms are explained in full. What is the problem to explain them when using these acronyms? Sometimes we don't know. I compared two page of acronym for myself, put it on my left-hand side, and whenever somebody talks, I have to look. What does it mean?

I think other GAC people, maybe some, but not all of the people, are more I would say intelligent than me. I'm not among the intelligent people, but it's difficult to read it in a lot of these situations. This acronym also under the situation and so on. And what is that? If somebody [inaudible] the document and so on and so forth, for all of us would be good to have a summary. Whenever the document is changed or revised in other organizations, we put somebody off revision, that the people didn't know what has happened, why we bring this new document. These are the few things I submit to you for your kind consideration. You may accept it or may reject it. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Thank you. Thank you very much. That is duly noted. And this is an ongoing conversation, so any input is most appreciated. With this in mind, I would be willing to give the floor to Jorge, who I know is joining us remotely. It is unfortunate that the WSIS happening in parallel. Thank you very much for being here, Jorge. The time difference is duly noted. Should you be willing and able to give us a few brief points from the GAC side on that document and way forward, it would be most appreciated. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Sure. I hope you hear me okay. This is Jorge Cancio from the Swiss government, Swiss GAC representative. I was around during 2017, and I probably spent some time with Thomas, our chair preparing also parts of the Joint Statement. So this rings a bell to me. Maybe we can go to the next slide where we have some points from our side.

Well, just to give you some context, that ICANN documents have always been very difficult to understand, especially to newcomers. It's something like a tradition. But during the so-called ICANN accountability and IANA transition work, which happened between 2014 and mostly 2016, very difficult matters related, for instance, to the governance of ICANN and how that fit into California law where ICANN is based, were explained to the community in plain language with diagrams, with pictures, with all sorts of means so that people could really engage in those discussions.

So that was something that was in Thomas' and some other people's head at the time in 2017. And I think that was one of the reasons to trigger this Joint Statement with ALAC, which on the GAC side also took the form of consensus advice to the board. So if you look at the 2017 Abu Dhabi Communique, there is the Joint Statement in form of consensus advice to the board. And so the idea was ICANN is really able to do this, to prepare good documents that are understandable, that have good synopsis, and that also more or less identifiable.

But really the experience in the last five or almost six years now is that progress has been limited. It's true that this information treatment system, ITI, has been developed. But it seems to be more of an internal

document management system because if you look at many ICANN documents, some of them very important, like the Operational Design Assessment for the Subsequent Procedures, it's really difficult to know whether this is the final document, whether it's a draft comment, whether it's a revised version of the final document because there's no easy-to-find mention of that. So we are still behind what we asked for five years ago.

And then, we have the other part, the synopsis or the summary because, as Alan said, it shouldn't be only readable for those who have been spending more than 10 years in ICANN. It should be readable for the whole of the interested community. And taking, again, the Operational Design Assessment document, first it's a document that is 400 pages long, the one about subsequent procedures.

And the executive summary, which at least in my country, normally an executive summary should be one page or two pages. I remember Churchill, Winston Churchill, said that anything longer than half-a-page is a waste of time and surely it's a bad summary while the summary of the ODA, with all due respect, is 12 pages long. So it's really very, very difficult to understand. And, therefore, I think there's still a lot of work to do.

And if we look back at 2018 when the board responded to the GAC advice, the board said something like, "Yeah, we are doing this and that and the ITI and some other things." But they ended their response to the GAC advice with the text I am going to paste in the chat. It has a strange appearance in the chat, but basically it says that, "The board will continue to encourage the ICANN organization to produce

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**

**EN**

materials for community use that will facilitate growth and meaningful participation from all stakeholders globally and is open to suggestions, etc., etc."

I think perhaps the time is ripe to ask the board where they stand for this because as Alan said, as I just mentioned, there seems to be a gap between the expectations and what we have nowadays. The goal is for us to bring meaningful, inclusive, and informed participation. The new board chair, Tripti Sinha, mentioned yesterday very clearly that legitimacy and bottom-up participation are at the core of the ICANN community. So perhaps it's the right moment to get this topic again on the table. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:    Thank you very much, Jorge. Please just let me note, again, that if this is a topic of mutual interest, an intercessional meeting is most welcome. We welcome input and look forward to continuing. Also, on this specific topic, we've had small joint working groups on DNS abuse previously in SubPro and EPDP. So if this is identified as a shared topic of interest, we are more than happy to work on this intercessionally. Manal, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL:    Thank you very much, Joanna, and thanks to Alan and Jorge for the keen follow-up on this long-standing statement. And I think GAC colleagues are in a best position to test the current system and provide feedback, as we already have many new GAC members. So how user-friendly is the system to new GAC members? And if there are any

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**

comments or remarks, we can still take them into consideration. But I think we constitute a good pilot for this statement and we can refine and include any comments you may provide. Thank you, Joanna. Back to you.

JOANNA KULESZA:     Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm not seeing any immediate feedback on this point. But it is duly noted that that is a topic of mutual interest. There is a hand up. Please go ahead, sir.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you very much. Nico Caballero from GAC, Paraguay. And taking into account that we're in Latin America and Mexico and for whatever strange reason, I tend to speak a little bit at a slower pace in Spanish, I will ask the question and the comment in Spanish, if you don't mind.

Well, basically, what I wanted to say is that I am very much in agreement with what Jorge Cancio and our esteemed colleague from Iran mentioned, as well. I remember perfectly the time that Jorge mentioned when Thomas Schneider was the GAC chair. And the main point that I would like to point out, especially for the Latin American colleagues, is that this is a very, very important tool for all of us, not only because we have a generation renovation, so to speak, and the teams of the representatives of GAC of Latin America, this tool is very important because, as a matter of fact, for people even after they've been here for 10 years, as it is in my case—I was in GAC for 10 years and after 5 years, I went back to GAC and surprisingly, I noticed that the names that I used to use, it was like a romance between the

abbreviations. And then, there were new abbreviations. So it's simply to support the initiative and support what Jorge Cancio said, and also the details that my esteemed colleague from Iran mentioned. It's definitely going to be a very important tool for all the GAC colleagues. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA:     I see one more hand. [inaudible] get feedback. I'm going to start with Manal, and then Jonathan. Would that be appropriate?

GULTEN TEPE:     No, I'm just noting two hands in the chat from Brazil and UK.

JOANNA KULESZA:     Great. Jonathan, did you want to take the floor?

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Thanks. I find the situation very unfortunate because this predates my time in the At-Large Community, And as ITI was getting going, there was an open process for looking at prototypes, making suggestions for features and things like that, IN which I participated in. And had I been aware of this advice then, it's unfortunate that this didn't make its way to the team from the board because some of these things could have been feature recommendations and still can.

I think we have to deal with this as recommendations for the system and not think of it as a stopgap any longer because I don't think that a stopgap is practical, given the amount of effort that's gone into ITI. So I

think we can talk to [inaudible] and try to figure out how to add some of these features. But some of these things are not related to technology but are actually just best practices too. The idea of writing an understandable summary or something like that has nothing to do with technology. It just has to do with whether or not the work teams, etc. are directed to produce that part of the documentation.

Unless we're suggesting that staff should do that as a separate exercise, then some of these things could happen automatically. The board could just say, "From now on," or the GNSO council could say, "From now on, when documents are produced, there should be a summary alongside them." And so it might make sense to separate this as we move forward into recommendations for ITI and recommendations for the community because it was really both. But I think we have to try and think in the context of ITI, which while slow to appear and does have amazing functionality.

JOANNA KULESZA:     Thank you very much, Jonathan. I am aware of the time, but I am going to prioritize an actual conversation that seems to be starting. So with this in mind, I will hand the floor over to UK who I believe was first to raise the hand, and then hand to Brazil. UK, please go ahead.

ROS KENNYBIRCH:     Thanks very much, and thanks for raising this important topic of conversation. Ros KennyBirch, UK, alternate. Important work has been taken forward on enabling inclusive, informed, and meaningful participation at ICANN, which is very welcome. However, and as

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

presenters have raised, we must continue to look at how we can better enable participation with a careful eye to encouraging a diverse array of engagement from across geographies and backgrounds.

For example, we could look at how to make public comment periods more accessible through the publication of accompanying explanatory notes. Easy-to-understand summaries are crucial to supporting the work of the GAC and encouraging meaningful participation. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Thank you. Brazil.

LUCIANO MAZZA DE ANDRADE : Yes, thank you. Luciano from Brazil. I think while those issues are, I think they are crucial because they touch upon questions of legitimacy and transparency that I think are key for the function of the ICANN in general, and for GAC as well. [inaudible] specific on the topic of the summaries. Jorge mentioned Churchill. There is another quote. This a long text because I didn't have the time to make it shorter. And that's I think sometimes, I had this feeling yesterday, sometimes our cause have a lot of work to try to give the background of what's going on and so on and so forth and people simply get lost in the middle of this kind of bureaucratic and technocratic discussion.

I think it would be really important perhaps to consider somehow have layers of information and have a more detailed information on the whole process, the whole background, if necessary. But sometimes for the purposes of the discussion, enough not only for the public,

sometimes even for GAC representatives, for instance, to have a one-pager that is a summary that say, "Look, we have this whole process behind us. Now, the main topics are those. That's what we're discussing now. And that's what the issues have to focus on to look forward."

So I think it's a crucial issue, and I thank you for bringing this to our attention again. And I do think it's an essential topic to be considered. Thank you. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. I note there's one more hand, a hand from Alan, and I'm going to give him the floor in a moment. Please just let me note we have long-discussed joint capacity building and outreach programs and I believe that this discussion fits right into building the capacity and enabling informed participation.

I see one more hand still from the floor. I'm going to give the floor to Alan, then hand the floor over to you, sir. And then I'm going to close the discussion on this item. And it is duly noted we do need an intercessional on this specific topic that I will do my best to plan in due course. Alan, and then the hand from the floor, and we will move to DNS abuse.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a quick comment on some of the comments that have been made. Many of the other things that were mentioned as needed are in the original document. What I presented here was just a very brief summary of it. So that's number one.

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

Number two, regarding presuming this should be done within ITI … And by the way, the ITI people are well aware of this statement. They're the ones who have given the response at this point. At this point, a huge number of our documents are not on the web but on the Wiki. Almost every working document is on the Wiki. And at this point, there is no plan to incorporate Wiki into ITI.  So although I don't like the concept of stopgaps, we do have a problem that needs to be addressed. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Wonderful. Thank you. Indonesia, you have the last word for this.

ASHWIN SASONGKO SASTROSUBROTO: Just to add somewhat problems, there's not probably so many documents that we need to study, but also there are so many abbreviations that we have to find out. I mean, frankly speaking, I have to use Google search again with this to find ICANN documents. Sometimes, I feel ashamed. How can a GAC member has to find documents through the…? I'm sorry for this, but I hope it's only me. But I used Google search, I did to find the GAC document I think, this ICANN document because [inaudible] GAC document. I have a GNSO document but I it disappeared. But I think it's better if I can go directly to the GAC website and find it from there rather than from Google search engine and so on. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:          Thank you very much. We have successfully identified a cross-community challenge that we are ready to address. So that is duly

noted. And with this, I'm going to kindly ask our speakers to take us through our next agenda item. I'm trying to be as mindful of the time as possible. Please kindly note that Internet governance has been a component of a cross-community working party between the GAC and the ALAC.

Nigel has kindly agreed for a long time to carry the leadership, together with Oliver Crepin-LeBlond of that cross-community working party on Internet governance. And it is only appropriate that I have the opportunity today to hand the floor to Nigel to start us off with a discussion on furthering the multistakeholder model, not a follow up, but an introduction to the plenary that is planned and has been suggested by the GAC and welcomed by the ALAC during this meeting. Nigel, the floor is yours.

NIGEL HICKSON:          Yes. Thank you very much. I'll be very brief, and just three things to start. One, it's great being a temporary liaison. Most of the things I've done seem to be temporary, but it's always an immense pleasure to work with the ALAC. Secondly, my Indonesian friend, even GAC staff when I was on the GAC staff, we used Google to find documents. So I wouldn't be ashamed at all. And thirdly, apologies for the bandage on my head. A tree this morning sort of uprooted itself and fell into me or perhaps I fell into the tree. But anyway, yeah.

So essentially, in the next just 10 minutes or so, Marita and I are just going to briefly outline what's going to take place we hope at this plenary session tomorrow and why it was proposed in the first place. I think a good reference point for this is the speech by Tripti, the ICANN

Board chair, yesterday, which I found was inspiring, eloquent, and really comprehensive. There she placed ICANN within the overall Internet governance landscape, within the overall socioeconomic, political sort of conundrum, if you like, on Internet.

And I think this is very important because ICANN is a really critical part of the technical community. It does an awful lot. It really has something to say for itself with the IANA transition and many other accomplishments, not least the incredible work on international domain names that's taking place. But it does its work in a wider ecosystem. And developments in the multilateral space, whether it be in the UN or the ITU and developments elsewhere oversee effect it. And the WSIS+20 process stemming from the WSIS summit in 2003 and 2005, which came out with this Tunis agenda which codified the roles and responsibilities of different actors in the multistakeholder process that formulated what was to become the UN Internet Governance Forum is an important step.

And all we are trying to do in this session on Wednesday is to, if you like, to highlight the importance of WSIS+20 process. It's not ICANN's business. ICANN are not going to be negotiating it. But we are involved. And as governments and as stakeholders, we can all be involved in the process leading up to it. There'll be multiple consultations. There'll be multiple opportunities as the UN are doing at the moment on the Global Digital Compact to involve ourselves in this multistakeholder process. So I think I'll stop there and hope that many of you will be able to come along on Wednesday—sorry, tomorrow—and engage in this debate. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:     Wonderful. Thank you very much. There is an immediate response from [Evan], I understand, in the chat. Sorry, go ahead.

[EVAN]:     Yes. Thank you very much. Nigel, please kindly note that the multistakeholder model is something that currently many or some have been accepted. Some others, they work with that in a de facto manner. I hope you kindly note that. De facto means that they have not rejected but they have not accepted yet. So this is something. Now, it's many years passed from 2005 when the European proposed this IGF to resolve the issue of internet governance. Nothing has been resolved yet, except people getting together, very good, talk to each other, very good, workshop, very good. Sometimes some idea may come back but there is no tangible output from that. When the DNS of users is blocked, this is against the universality and the inclusiveness and indiscriminate situation. So there are some points to be addressed.

And I don't think that, Nigel, ICANN could do that. This is something that need the entire people involved in that. So it is neither the totally UN nor the totally ICANN community. It's a common approach that people to see to what extent why do not go into the detail of the multistakeholder? At least resolve the problem of the situation. This is something that the people know.

One of my colleagues [inaudible] that his DNS is blocked. So when DNS is blocked for some nontechnical, non-administrative but some other aspect, that is a catastrophic situation. This is not objectives of

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

universality, an objective of inclusiveness. We say that we want connect un-connected. But we do not un-connect the connected. So this is something contradiction. I'm sorry to take this, Nigel, and we have to do something. And I think that this is not a single business of the ICANN. It is a collective approach of everybody. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: And thank you. I do appreciate this lively discussion we're having. So thank you, sir, for sharing your thoughts. I see a hand from Brazil, and I see a hand from ALAC from Amita. Brazil, please go ahead.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Sorry for taking the floor again. I think it's an important topic. Thank you, Nigel, for bringing attention to it. It's very early stages in terms of the WSIS review process. We don't really have much from on it yet.  Nigel said, there's this whole discussion about the Global Digital Compact. Nobody really knows how one thing will fit into the other. And just I think I was a bit puzzled by the way the initial discussion was framed because it was about the multistakeholder model.

I think that the problem is we don't have multistakeholder model. There is one ICANN multistakeholder model. There's clearly a model. But then, you have instances of multistakeholder participation and engagement in different processes and I think that is what we are probably discussing in this instance. As Nigel mentioned, the Tunis agenda is a very carefully and negotiated document that has a clear indication of responsibility and competencies of different bodies and organizations. I think that's something we have to take into account.

And then, we think this concept of an IGF is a [inaudible] of multistakeholder participation and I think most countries are, and Brazil certainly is, engaged in trying to find ways and we have tried this for many years now to improve the system and perhaps make the IGF more effective and ensure that it can contribute better to the overall multilateral discussions.

I think it's a very important debate, and I think just echoing a little bit what our colleague from Iran mentioned, I think it is important to clearly bear in mind where the responsibilities of the chapter are to dominate the discussion more complex than it already is. Thank you. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much. Again, I'm mindful of the time. I see two hands from the ALAC. So I'm going to ask my colleagues to make brief interventions, and then I will close the queue and give the floor to our next speaker, who is Marita Moll. Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOWDHURY: Thank you. Amrita Chowdhury for the record. I do kind of endorse the WSIS+ 20 discussion happening. And the ICANN community I would not say ICANN, the ICANN community being engaged in it, while it is the nation states who would be deciding what happens, but at least if we can have our opinions shared with the nation states where we look at issues, Internet blockage, for example, or anything else and preserving the only platform where people can come together and discuss, that is the IEGF being retained. I think we would continue some discussions

because if we actually take away those kind of platforms, though it is said to be a talk show, but at least it is producing messages now. If we kind of stop those platforms, we would not have any more such discussions. We like it, we hate it. We need everyone at the table in their own ways. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:         Thank you. Sebastian, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:    Thank you very much. Just to say the title of the session today is Know the World of Model. The title of the session will be looking to WSIS+20. How can we improve multistakeholder participation in Internet governance? And it will be a discussion with all stakeholders participating to the ICANN meeting. And I will stop here because I think it's much more interesting to listen to Marita because she will bring substance to the discussion. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:         Thank you very much, Sebastian. Without further ado, I'm going to hand the floor over to our ALAC speaker, Marita Moll, who is joining us remotely. Marita, the floor is yours.

MARITA MOLL:            Yes, good morning, everyone. Yeah, do we have another slide here? It's just a short one in any case. The session that we will be having tomorrow is really I call it a taster. It's the attempt to bring up the subject to make the community aware of the fact that this subject is

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

**EN**

coming forward well in advance in order to start working on the things that we have to do in order to bring some ideas forward.

It's a little outside of the work that we do here at ICANN specifically. We can't directly participate in these discussions at WSIS. We know that, but we know that because we're together, and we collectively speak to each other. We can find ways, we hope, of getting some of the ideas of our different communities into the discussions that go on. And that was the purpose. And I think, and I hope, it will only be the beginning of a discussion on this WSIS+20 process.

When I'm talking from the At-Large perspective, we'll be talking a little bit about what the essentials are, but mostly about how to work with the politicians to formulate a long-term vision because that's something that we'll have to do almost with our own GAC representatives, with our own government representatives who are going to be in the meetings on WSIS+20.

In order to bring a really practical example to this, I'm hoping to speak tomorrow a little bit about the fact that back in 2005—yes, that long ago—I was actually involved in a WSIS consultation that was held by the Canadian government to gather the ideas of civil society about what the Canadian government was going to bring to the table at Tunis. It was called "Paving the Road to Tunis." That was 2005. We had 200 people discussing the whole thing for one and a half days, came out with a consensus paper.

These are the kinds of things I'm hoping that we can do again here in Canada and, hopefully, other people will take that as an idea of how groups can do some of this work. But certainly, the language will be

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**

different. For one thing in this 2005 paper, we don't see that word multistakeholder. It's going to look quite different, but the process may be very similar.

So, yeah, that's kind of what we're hoping for tomorrow, just moving this topic ahead a little bit. It will be a lot of speakers, and my session there will probably be even stronger than my session here. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:    Thank you. Thank you very much, Marita. And I appreciate you being quite concise. I do notice already said that there is a standing cross-community working party. So if advancing the multistakeholder model or multistakeholder is of interest, an intercessional meeting is most welcome.

And speaking of things of joint interest, the DNS abuse has been a standing item on this bilateral agenda. And I do welcome our next speaker. Hadia will take the floor first to share the At-Large perspective on DNS abuse. And then, I shall swiftly hand the floor over to Laureen. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:    Thank you, Joanna. So as a new round of GTLDs is coming up, the ALAC community started an exercise to look at the CCT review and SSR2 recommendations related to DNS abuse, the approved ones. So if we take a brief look at a couple of the CCT review recommendations—for example, the recommendation related to studying the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars, and DNS security abuse—the recommendation has been implemented.

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

So currently, we have the domain abuse activity reporting system, DAAR, in place. However, two points to highlight here. Our hope is to discuss with the community how to make better use of the data and improve DAAR. And a second system does not as of yet officiate names with registrars due to the difficulty of obtaining sponsor registrar data.

If we look at another implemented recommendation which says that ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations, this recommendation has been implemented to the extent possible. However, the registry registration data directory service is consistent. I've been told to speak slowly. So I'll do that.

So if we look at another implemented recommendation, which says that ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations, this recommendation has been implemented to the extent possible. However, the registry registration data directory service is consistent labeling and display policy is impacted by the EPDP Phase 1 recommendations, which may require additional consideration of the policies data publication requirements and means to enable consistency among registrars.

In relation to accuracy, current community work, the accuracy scoping team is trying to decide if further work or PDPs are required in that regard. So let's take now a look at a couple of SSR2 recommendations. For example, recommendation number nine, monitor and enforce compliance. The ICANN Board directed the compliance team to monitor and strictly enforce the compliance of contracted parties to current and future SSR and abuse-related obligations in contracts,

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

baseline agreements, temporary specifications, and community policies. And this work is currently under implementation.

However still, as mentioned, the accuracy scoping team is looking into whether further accuracy of related work is required. The completion of the work of the scoping team is essential if ICANN Org is going to monitor and enforce contracted parties to improve data accuracy.

Another recommendation which we might want to look at is recommendation 10.1, which is also a work in progress. The recommendation says, "ICANN Org should post a webpage that includes their working definition of DNS abuse, i.e., what it uses for projects, documents, and contracts. ICANN Org should post a webpage that includes their working definition of DNS abuse, i.e. what it uses for projects, documents, and contracts. The definition should explicitly note what types of security threats ICANN Org currently considers within its treatment to address through contractual and compliance mechanisms, as well as those ICANN Org understands to be outside its agreement."

Again, the completion of this recommendation is important for enforcement and compliance purposes. Also, it is still in progress, one of the recommendations that says that ICANN board and ICANN Org should perform a further comprehensive review of the SSR1 recommendations and execute a new plan to complete. And there are many relevant recommendations in SSR1

Let's look also at access to date. When addressing data required to handle, prevent, and mitigate DNS abuse, the report, which is the SSR2 review report, references four types of data. Registration data, which

ICANN|76
CANCÚN

facilitates tracking abusive actions. In that regard, we have the GNSO Temp Spec EPDP's recommendations, as well as a pilot registration directory disclosure system. Completion of this is important before a new round. We have another form of data required, the TLD zone file data, which supports security research. This information is currently available.

The third form of access data is the reported abuse data used to inform ICANN's analysis of DNS abuse. Further work is required in that regard. Facilitating reporting both incidents from end users, contracted parties, as well as professional security practitioners is important prior to the launch of a new gTLD program. And, again, this is work in progress.

The fourth type of data is contractual compliance data to support trend analysis and evaluation of operational approach to mitigate abuse, which is, again, a work in progress. The SSR2 report also notes some issues such as bulk registrations where the report observes that some registries and registrars promptly establish practices to quickly and substantially increase domain registrations after the launch of a new round. Example, bulk registrations, many of which are used for abuse activities. Current communication that we got between the GNSO and contracted parties is ongoing.

To that end, we find that the implementation of some relevant consensus policies as well as the completion of related community work needs to happen before the launch of the new gTLD program. It's important to note here that the ALAC community has just embarked on this exercise. So we continue to look at relevant DNS abuse-approved PDP as recommendations and determine their importance in relation

**ICANN|76**
CANCÚN

to the new gTLD program. I stop here and hand it back to you, Joanna. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:     Thank you. Thank you very much, Hadia. I am going to kindly ask Manal and our support staff to go five minutes overtime if it's appropriate and hand the floor, briefly, to Laureen. Thank you very much, Laureen, for letting us participate in the Public Safety Working Group meetings on DNS abuse. I welcome your contribution.

LAUREEN KAPIN:      Thank you, and I will try to be brief. I'm mindful of the time, and also mindful that we're going to be going into a very robust time wise and hopefully content-wise session on DNS abuse right after the break after this session. So lots of DNS abuse on the agenda.

So some areas of discussion that shouldn't surprise you because they've been talked about already many times during the meeting because they're so important are … I think we need to progress the slides please. No, still one. There we go. This looks more familiar to me.

So we're going to discuss this again because it's so important. And that's the ongoing contract negotiations. This is a really positive step. And as we've been reminded, and I want to highlight, it's an unprecedented step that the contracted parties on their own initiative have come to ICANN to ask to negotiate parts of the contract to better take action against DNS abuse. So that's a really positive development. And I know that we're all eagerly awaiting the results of that process.

Another really important issue that's been highlighted is that this is a first step. So this is that first step on the journey, and other steps could follow. Those include targeted policy development process efforts. And the reason we say targeted is that we know the more precision and focus that we give to a very specific topic being tackled in a PDP, the better chance we have of a positive outcome, and also an outcome that takes less time. So that is something that's been contemplated.

And the other thing to recall is that these negotiations are one set of negotiations. There could be future sets of negotiations. So more to come on this. And I know the community and certainly the GAC is eagerly awaiting the outcome.

And then, finally, voluntary efforts. In addition to things that are required, we welcome the diversity of efforts that are being taken by various parts of the community to tackle DNS abuse. We note that if things aren't required, the bad actors aren't necessarily going to volunteer to do better because as the scorpion said to the frog, "It's just not my nature."

So one of the things that is an ongoing issue is that what do you do to deal with persistent bad actors, those folks who typically are not coming to the ICANN meetings and being concerned about these issues. And that is the topic of some of the CCT recommendations and SSR2 recommendations. So thanks for letting me share some GAC perspectives.

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much. I do note there are comments and a hand raised. But we have overextended our welcome by one minute. So I'm going to swiftly going to hand the floor back to Manal. Thank you for having us. So please, kindly, together with Jonathan, wrap us up for today. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Joanna. And it's always a great pleasure to meet with the ALAC and align views. We hope that the same happens at the national level between government representation and the ALAC peers. And we're looking forward to your participation at the panel discussion tomorrow and also to ensure that ICANN's ITI megaproject addresses the new commerce simpler needs and finally continue to call the need on DNS abuse being a topic of mutual interest. With that, Jonathan, any final remarks?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Joanna just instructed me to just look to sit up here and look pretty. So I hope I have accomplished that task for you. And we look forward to future intercessionals with GAC on these issues. We really do share issues in common, and we need to dig into them. So this has been a good table of contents for the book yet to be written. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Jonathan, and thanks to Joanna, Nigel, Alan, Jorge, Marita, Laureen, and Hadia. And many thanks, everyone. This concludes our bilateral with the ALAC. It's now time for a 30-minute

break. And please be back at the room at 10:30 Cancun time, 15:30 UTC for GAC discussions on DNS abuse. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

**ICANN|76**
**CANCÚN**