ICANN78 | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 5) Thursday, October 26, 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 HAM

DAN GLUCK:

Hello, and welcome to the ICANN78 Communique Drafting session being held on Thursday the 26th of October at 8:30 AM UTC. My name is Dan Gluck, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form. Interpretation for this session will include six UN languages and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you'll use to listen during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu.

Please state your name for the record and the language you'll speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

To view the real-time transcription, please click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar. to ensure transparency participation in ICANN multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. With that, I'll hand the floor over to GAC chair, Nico Caballero.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much, Daniel. Welcome back. Please take your seats, we're about to start. So we'll continue where we left off, which is basically the HLGM, sorry, under issues of importance to the GAC. Yeah, yeah, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

This is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support staff. Just to highlight what's on the screen here, which is that Netherlands and Rwanda work together on a final proposal incorporating the input from Germany. So this is the text you see here highlighted. This is the final proposal for this section.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Fabien. And by the way my apologies to Iran, you requested the floor right before the break. Is there anything you would like to add at this point?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

No. Thank you very much.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, Iran. So then I'll go ahead and read the paragraph as it is after the agreement between the Netherlands and Rwanda. So the text reads, "The GAC welcomes the invitation from the government of Rwanda to host the next High Level Governmental Meeting, HLGM, in Kigali on 9, June, 2024. This meeting will be held ahead of the ICANN80 policy forum scheduled for 10-13 June, 2024, offering potential opportunities for participation throughout this meeting. The GAC agreed to have a further call to discuss and finalize topics of interest to be covered during the HLGM.

GAC representatives are also invited to inform the Rwanda's hosts of the names and contact details of the high-level representatives to be invited at the earliest convenience for the invitations to be sent in November alongside with a proposed agenda." So that's where we are. I have Lebanon. Go ahead.

ZEINA BOU HARB:

Just a clarification questions. Shall the GAC member contact the Rwanda's host directly or through the support team?

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you for the question, Lebanon. I don't have a direct answer right now, but we'll see. I have, sorry, Rob, go ahead please. GAC staff.

**ROBERT HOGGARTH:** 

Thank you. This is Rob Hoggarth. Yes, Charles and I are working on a communication that will be sent soon to members of the committee outlining the next steps with the HLGM preparations. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Rob. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be short, of course. Many thanks

to all our colleagues who provided input to this text as a small editorial that I just noted. I think the heading should also say high

level governmental meeting and not the government meeting. Thank

you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. Well noted. Rob, go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I'm sorry for the clarifying the clarification, Marco. All the references in

the GAC's history, we do refer to it as a high-level government meeting. It's the Governmental Advisory Committee, but of course, you all can change it, we haven't had one in six years. I'll leave that to you all.

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Rob. That was my understanding as well.

Netherlands, would you like to comment on that?

MARCO HOGEWONING:

Well, point taken, and then I suggest we make sure that the body of the text is in line with what the heading says.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Netherlands. I have Iran, and then the Netherlands again, or that's an old hand.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

No, it's new hand.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yeah, new hand. Sorry, just a point of clarification. We said in the second paragraph that the GAC agreed to have a further call. Are we discussing having a GAC, call the virtual meeting, or do we need to say this one or we need to say a slightly different, GAC agreed to pursue the matter as well as finalize, not talking about the call unless you have a specific arrangement for the call. So just a suggestion, instead of further call, saying that GAC agreed to pursue the matter as well as finalizing, just as suggestions. Thank you.

Instead of further call, pursue the matter as well as finalizing, rather than talking about the call. Nevertheless, you can have a call, it is also pursuing the matter, but not specifically mentioning in this communique that you have a call, pursuing the matter is the same thing. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, Iran. Any other comment? Okay, so I'll just read that last part, and thank you Iran again for the suggestion. The GAC agreed to pursue the matter and finalize topics of interest to be covered during the HLGM accepted. Is everyone okay with that wording?

And I see some nodding. Okay, so let's wrap it up then. Thank you very much. Let's move on. So now we'll cover RDRS, right? So I just wanna confirm with the US delegation and the India delegation if we are okay to move on with the RDRS wording. Is that the case?

SUSAN CHALMERS:

I'm sorry, chair. Could you repeat the question, please?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

No, no, no, I just wanted to know if, if we're ready to move on with the RDRS issue because my understanding was that you were getting together with India in order to do the word-smithing regarding that.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Yes, absolutely. We did. We had a very productive conversation over the break. Thank you. And we have some language to propose. In the first paragraph, after the last sentence, we'd like to add the words, "The GAC remains supportive of this idea."

And I'm just going to move very, very quickly here. At the end of the urgent request paragraph. Sorry. In the urgent request section,

because this is related, we could just scroll down to the bottom of the urgent request section. We would like to propose a new sentence. And the text of that sentence is, "Because of the vital public safety interests implicated by urgent requests --

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Can you read a little bit slow?

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Yeah. So because of the vital public safety interests implicated by urgent requests, the GAC emphasizes the need to commence and conclude this implementation work as soon as possible. Further, this work should include accreditation issues, among others. So this language is in substitution for the balance of that text.

So it would supplant, yes, that text as well as the two paragraphs in the section above. And I see that my colleague from India is now in the room, so just to make sure that he notes that we have added that additional language as discussed to the first paragraph of the RDRS text. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, US. India.

SUSHIL PAL:

Yeah, thank you. Thank you, our colleagues from US working together with us. So we are okay with the text, we agreed on the text except that we only have one observation to make. Second paragraph, go



down, I think. Can you go down, scroll down. I think we would still-no, no, just stop. Sorry. A concern on the WHOIS data, I think we still want to retain and see what are the milder or a broader language can be taken.

So we would request—I think we had a discussion with the US who said that maybe this relates to the accuracy data and maybe when we discuss—the accuracy are we discussing that, are we not? we're not discussing that at all today, I guess.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

So the proposal relates to work of the accuracy scoping group, and we haven't addressed the accuracy work during the ICANN meeting. And we didn't think that it was ripe issue to address in the communique text. So we're not necessarily supportive of adding anything in addition to what we have already just proposed. Thank you.

SUSHIL PAL:

Okay. Thank you, US. I think the first paragraph can be deleted. I think that's fine. We agree to delete that. Yes. And the second paragraph, maybe we'll propose the linear language. But if the house agrees, I think maybe we can have some, the GAC should at least--, I know that the accuracy work is also on hold, but at least is it okay for the house to at least highlight the urgency of having a complete WHOIS data?

If the deletion is something very harsh or very strong language, which US and maybe a couple of other colleagues as well may not agree, can



we request Board to at least review those DNSs or send some communication to the registrar to review those DNSs where the WHOIS data is not complete. We'll propose alternative language, meanwhile, you can go on.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, India. I have the US and then the UK. I'm sorry that was an old hand. I'm sorry. I have the UK and then Australia. UK.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry. Yes. Thank very much, Mr. Chairman; Nigel Hickson, UK GAC. Thank you very much for the work that India and the US have taken forward on this. Just had two points, first of all, the additional text, which I think makes an awful lot of sense. Thank you so much for it. I just wanted a clarification on what the accreditation issues were.

I think I know, but it would be good if that could be just outlined. I'm not suggesting a change of wording, but just for our clarification. And secondly, the two paragraphs that our distinguished colleagues from India have just looked at, I think the second paragraph, we can't really have here under the issues of importance because we didn't discuss it at length or didn't discuss it in the meeting.

And what I would suggest is that it doesn't appear in the communique, but it's something that we have a discussion in the GAC on at some point, either in an intercession call or whatever so we can further understand the implications of particular names, because this is a

really substantive issue and not one that we can lightly address at this time in this meeting. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, UK. I have Australia.

IAN SHELDON:

Thank you, Chair. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia, for the record. I think my UK colleague mostly addressed my concerns here. I have challenges in discussing the activation of domains within an expedited timeframe. That is quite a bold suggestion, I think warrants for the discussion in a more fulsome way. It raises quite a lot of technical challenges as well, which I think I'd invite the technical community and the broader ICANN community to provide some advice to the GAC on as well. I have a little bit of a difficulty here in the second paragraph. I think it warrants discussion, but I think it goes beyond what we might've discussed here in the meeting this week. Thanks.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, Australia. Any other comment? Any other edits, suggestions? And I have Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes sir, I think the paragraph which has been currently highlighted in this color, still, I have some difficulty the arrangement of the things. This is replaced by the text proposed by US, or it still remains, because I had difficulty to say that which area we want to deactivate and also

brought to our attention. Who we mean our attention, the GAC brought to our attention, who we are talking about. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Iran. Well noted. So would India be okay with parking this

SUSHIL PAL:

That's what I said, you can clean this RDRS as we are okay with RDRS as of now. But this idea, I think we'll be proposing a separate language. Where? I think we'll propose it later on, I think. You can take it out, or maybe I think it's more appropriate in the DNS abuse section. I think if you can delete it from here, but keep a placeholder in the DNS abuse one, which is essentially the same thing, I think that would be okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Perfect. So we'll do just that. Thank you very much for your flexibility, India. I'll go ahead and read then the parts that were corrected. If you screen-- ah, sorry, I have the Russian Federation. Go ahead, please.

ANDREY ZHIVOV:

Dear colleagues, I want to support intervention of UK about additional clarification related to sentence regarding accreditation issues. What does it mean in the text where we talk about urgent request? It'll be good if you will clarify what does it mean. Thank you.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Yes, thank you for the question. So this was proposed in response to a suggestion from our colleagues from India. And so I would also invite our colleague to elaborate further if he wishes.

SUSHIL PAL:

Thank you, Russia. This is just to clarify, because we have different names for the systems, SSAD and RDRS and whatnot. We have some kind of agreement where the Board believes or Board is in agreement that the matter of urgent public importance have to be provided within 24 hours. But then how, how will we provide this, right?

There has to be a request again from the requesting agency, which was one of the challenges in the SSAD as well. We just want to emphasize upon this aspect of accreditation, which actually essentially means verifying the identity of the requester. I was told that this is the term normally used in ICANN. So this is just to emphasize that the system for making it operational for providing requests within 24 hours by the identified or accredited person or agency is put into place. That's it.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, US. Thank you, India. Russia, are you okay with the answer? Russia.

**ANDREY ZHIVOV:** 

Thank you very much, but it's still not clear what will be results of mentioning or even taking it in account accreditation issues related to the registers or to the domain administrators, or it'll be some new

limits in accreditation of whom. I think that this sentence or this idea or is it accreditation or identification? This idea needs more discussion in GAC, because we as a representative, not only our citizen, but business society as well, need to discuss it with industry expert. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Russia Federation. I have Canada and then the US. Canada, go ahead.

JASON MERRITT:

It's not specifically to this point, so I'm happy to defer if the conversation needs to go back and forth.

**ANDREY ZHIVOV:** 

Thank you, Canada. US.

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Thank you kindly, Canada. And yes, just in response to offer some further background. So, accreditation was within the phase two EPDP discussions and was a recommendation that was made.

Accreditation is, so this has been an issue that has been discussed in the interest of moving forward here, what we've proposed to include this as one issue amongst others that the urgent request decision can address going forward. And I do want to note that the GAC did make a request to the Board on urgent requests, that letter that we sent did receive widespread support from all corners of the GAC.

And so we think that this could be a useful consideration going forward, but it is a lightweight suggestion and it is in the issues of importance. I hope that answers the question and we can proceed from here. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much, USA. I have the European Commission and the UK. European Commission.

MARTINA BARBERO:

Thank you very much, chair. And just very briefly, I agree with my colleague from the US. I think this is a topic that was quite widely discussed, this issue of accreditation in the context of urgent request. It was discussed in the context of the implementation problems from the registrars side when they receive urgent request.

And I think the fact that we included amongst other issues, it helps finding a language that could be accepted by all colleagues, because this is not the only topic, of course, but it's an important one as I highlighted by the Indian colleagues. I think this is a good compromise. We hope this could be understood as a middle ground in that respect.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much, Martina, European Commission. I have the UK and then Canada. UK.



**NIGEL HICKSON:** 

Right? Yes. No, thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to come back and thank the US and India for the clarification. I was wondering if we could be quite happy to have that accreditation issues there, and with the indulgence of our Indian colleagues, perhaps we can remove that paragraph for now and have a further GAC discussion on it as proposed and perhaps we can move on. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, UK. Canada.

JASON MERRITT:

Thank you so much. I think my comments were a bit preempted by Nigel from the UK there, I was thinking along the same lines. With the explanation on the accreditation, it makes sense to me that that paragraph, that that short concise paragraph is well placed and well worded and covers all what we were hoping that it encompasses.

My confusion was the moving of the other paragraph down to DNS abuse on the WHOIS. I was gonna suggest that we go with what we had originally, at the beginning of this discussion with, is to, yeah, remove that paragraph and stick with what was proposed above, because I think that's what the essence of what we're trying to get at here, and it's well placed. Thanks.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, Canada. So that's where we are. Do we agree on doing that? Are we okay with following that path? And I see some nodding. So let's go back then to-- yeah. I'm gonna read just for the sake of

clarity again, because I'm getting a little bit confused. So again, let's go back to topic number four, which is urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. I'll give it a, read and then we'll go from there if everybody agrees. Fabien?

**FABIEN BETREMIEUX:** 

Yes. Thank you. Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support team. Nico, just for your information, the edits in the first paragraph were our suggestions to make sure that the reference to registration data consensus policy is precise and consistent with ICANN's use of those terms. And we suggested to avoid a repetition. So we hope that you can support those edits.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you for the clarification. So the text reads, "The GAC welcomes the Board's reaction to the letter sent on 23, August, 2023, in which the GAC asked the Board to reconsider the publication of the proposed registration data consensus policy for gTLDs, and expressed its public policy concerns on the appropriate timeline to respond to requests for registration data in select emergency circumstances known as 'urgent requests.'

The GAC supports the initiative of the Board to separate the topic of urgent requests from the publication of the overarching Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs, and to speedily continue discussions on the former to achieve an outcome which is acceptable to all parties.

The GAC reiterates that 'the proposed outcome of up to three business, not calendar days to respond to the narrowly defined category of 'urgent' requests for the main name registration data does not serve its intended purpose,' and that the use of 'business' not 'calendar' days is particularly problematic in this respect, as it can lead to significant delays and would vary across different jurisdictions leading to uncertainty.

The GAC also recalls that in January, 2023, the ICANN Org Implementation Project Team, IPT, excuse me, carefully reviewed the public input received and concluded that there was 'sufficient justification to revisit the policy language and to require a 24-hour response time for urgent requests.'

The GAC looks forward to the early reopening of the discussions with the community, also based on the further input, which is expected to be provided by the SSAC with the objective of 'achieving an outcome that better meets the public safety considerations posed by urgent requests.' Because of the vital public safety interest implicated by urgent requests, the GAC emphasizes the need to commence and conclude this implementation work as soon as possible.

Further, this work should include accreditation issues among others.' Can you scroll down a little bit, please? And that's the end of the text as far as I understand. So that's where we are. Any comments, any edits, any question? Are we okay to move forward? Any strong opposition?

Seeing none, and I see some nodding, so we're good to move on then. Thank you so much. So we'll go back now to RDRS, and I'll read the



text again in order to make sure we're all on the same page and that there's agreement. So the text reads, "I'll read the whole thing and then we'll take a look at the details if you don't mind.

The GAC welcomes the launch of the voluntary Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, this coming November. The GAC encourages members to inform their respective relevant communities of the launch. Widespread use of the new system from both registrars and requesters will help the system meet its intended purpose of gathering sufficient data to inform the ICANN's Board's consideration of the policy recommendations related to a future System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, SSAD, of the main name registration data.

To promote usage, the GAC notes that the Board urged the GNSO Council to consider a policy development process or other means to require registrars to the use of the RDRS. The GAC remains supportive of this idea. Other factors that will impact usage relate to whether users submitting legitimate requests receive data relating to the underlying registrant as opposed to information related to a privacy or proxy service.

Currently, many leading registrars provide privacy proxy services to registrants by default. ICANN Org's Operational Design Assessment, ODA, of the SSAD analyzed the potential adverse impacts on that system, noting that 'SSAD requesters may have a negative experience using the system if the data they seek is protected by a privacy or proxy service.'

The assessment also observed that 'requesters may feel confused or frustrated with the system if they don't receive the registrant data they



seek due to proxy or privacy service use.' And that these risks 'significant user confusion and or dissatisfaction.' The GAC highlights these risks because registrars, including those that provide privacy proxy services directly for their registrant customers, will have discretion on how to respond to requests.

The GAC observes that the RDRS' success depends in part on how satisfied users are with the system, with positive experiences promoting repeat usage. Finally, the GAC also encourages users of the system to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the RDRS. So that's where we are. Comments, edits, anything you would like to comment? Oh, I have Iran and then the US. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, sir. I think in the second line of the first paragraph when we say GAC encourages members, are we talking GAC members? If that is the case, we could say encourages its members, otherwise, I don't know to whom we referring. I think if we are dealing with the GAC members, we say its members. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you so much for that, Iran. I have the US.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

In the interest of streamlining, which I know people are supportive of in the second paragraph, starting with other factors, I have a suggested streamline for the sentence starting with ICANN Org's Operational Design Assessment. We can, after noting that, we can



delete that first quote and go straight to the second so that then it would read as noting that requesters may feel confused or frustrated. So just to make it a little shorter and still retain the thrust of the information.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you so much for that, US. I'm certainly in favor of having shorter and sweeter paragraphs, but I'm in your hands. Does everybody agree with the US suggestion? And I see nodding and more nodding and more nodding. Any strong opposition? And I see none.

Okay, I'll just read that part for the sake of time, right? I don't need to read the whole thing. I'll get right there. So the text would read like this, "Currently, many leading registrars provide privacy proxy services to registrants by default. ICANN Org's Operational Design Assessments, ODA, of the SSAD, analyze the potential adverse impacts on that system, noting that 'requesters may feel confused or frustrated with the system if they don't receive the registrant data they seek due to proxy or privacy service use.'

And that this risks 'significant user confusion and or dissatisfaction.' Are we happy with that text? And I see some nodding again. Any strong opposition, any strong feelings against it online or in the room? Seeing none, I'm very happy to tell you that we're ready to move on.

Okay, so now I suggest we cover DNS abuse in order to see if we are in agreement, which hopefully will be the case, otherwise we can always park it and discuss later, but later is not that far away because we don't have that much time left. So Fabien, any remarks?



FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I think on this section, we have two proposals. There is the first few

paragraphs and I'm highlighting here, which were proposed by the US, European Commission, Canada, UK, and Japan. And we have the carryover text that was initially suggested by India in the RDRS section.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Having said that, can you scroll up? Yeah. Thank you. And I have

India. Go ahead, please.

SUSHIL PAL: You'll be okay with the text. Otherwise, I think maybe our alternative

text, which is much milder, I think if somebody can type it out, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: At a slow pace, please, so that they can write.

SUSHIL PAL: The domains with the incomplete-

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Can you hold on for a second, India, please? They're gonna be-

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Just clarify, where would you like that text to be inserted?

SUSHIL PAL: Toward the end instead. Yeah, all text to the one which is deleted.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: In place of the existing text. So this is new text that will replace the

existing text? Is that what you're saying?

SUSHIL PAL: Yeah, in place of this because this is only taken care in the urgent

request.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, perfect. So please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL: As the domains with the incomplete/inaccurate information are more

prone to be used for DNS abuse, therefore GAC urges the Board to take it up with the registrars for review of those DNS with

incomplete/inaccurate information.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Is that all, India? Okay, perfect. Thank you. So again, for the sake of

clarity, I'll read the whole thing in order to provide more context-

SUSHIL PAL:

Review of those DNS. That's fine. Good. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Sorry, can you repeat please? Okay. So can you scroll up a little bit so that I can read the whole thing? Okay. So number five, DNS abuse. I'll read the text as it is, and then we can discuss. The text reads, "During ICANN78, the GAC welcome updates on advancements in DNS abuse measurement, examples of DNS abuse mitigations solutions, and an update from the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee.

The GAC urges the contracted parties to adopt the DNS abuse amendments, so that baseline obligations for gTLD registries and registrars regarding DNS abuse are established in ICANN's contracts. The GAC also urges ICANN Org to provide the community with the ability to monitor the implementation of the amendments.

At the same time, the GAC notes with disappointment, the suggestions made in its submission to the public consultation on the contract amendments were not reflected in the final amendments or advisory. The GAC underlines the importance of taking GAC input into account in future work. In particular, the GAC reiterates the importance of considering proactive monitoring and transparency of reporting.

The GAC also recalls the practical need to recognize the inevitable evolution of DNS abuse, including how it is defined in the amendments, as well as abuse report handling, tackling systemic abuse, and additional reporting and data collection requirements.

Once the amendments are adopted, the GAC intends to engage with the community in discussions on policy efforts around the abovementioned topics, as well as all the key themes linked to effective implementation of the amendments, such as clarification of key terms from the amendments, i.e. reasonable, actionable, prompt, and further actions to mitigate DNS abuse such as capacity building efforts.

Can you scroll down a little bit, please? As the domains with incomplete inaccurate information are more prone to be used for DNS abuse, therefore the GAC urges the ICANN Board to take it up with registrars for a review of those DNS with incomplete inaccurate information." I'll pause here in order to see if there's agreement on this. Any questions, any comments, any edits you would like to make at this point? And I have Japan. Japan, go ahead, please.

**NISHIGATA NOBUHISA:** 

Thank you chair. This is Nobuhisa speaking from Japan for record. Let me say first that I think I understood what my distinguished Indian colleagues want to say in the last paragraph, and I will say I share that the feeling in the same way since Japan is suffering from many, many bad conducts in the internet in many ways. But on the other hand though, I got some questions. Could you put the screen on in the text?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Yes. Japan, sorry, we're having some little issues with the connection. Sorry about that. It's probably an example of some sort of DNS abuse.



**NISHIGATA NOBUHISA:** 

Hope not though. Yeah, a little down more. Yeah. Thank you very much. I see it. So maybe there's a further clarification though, then the clarification is gonna be, what would it mean by incomplete and inaccurate information? I can understand what it means in the feeling, but it doesn't represent in the text.

There's no incomplete or inaccurate domain names, but the problem is that the request that cannot get the exact same information from the parties or registrars, et cetera. So maybe we need some correction if I'm saying that the correct things.

Then it's more like a bigger question, but can we agree to add that like this says that ICANN Board in some way from this time of being? If we could, I can join it, but I'm not really sure via dis communique, then can we urge the GAC, no, sorry, can we urge the ICANN Board to the registrars within some respective or responsible community, for example, GNSO or whatever, it's fine, but I'm not very sure that the ICANN Board has the right or the authority to do this with answering our request here in the communique. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Japan. Well, noted. I have Iran, the United States, Canada, and the UK. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

First of all, thank you.



NICOLAS CABALLERO: Iran.

GULTEN TEPE: Kavouss, we cannot hear you anymore. Could you please unmute

yourself?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: You're on mute, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Sorry, I'll repeat again. Thank you very much. India. The first line

says that after information, are more prone to be used. What do you

mean by more prone to be used? So can you have some other

language? More prone, I have certain difficulty to clearly understand what do you mean that. Pros and cons, prone, more prone to be used?

What does it mean? Thank you. I'm sorry, just a clarification.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: India, would you like to answer now or later on? Okay. So I have the

US, Canada, and the UK.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, chair. And notwithstanding the foregoing question from

our colleague from Iran, and I also had the same question that he did,

but we would propose some alternative language to the suggestion

from India. I think if I'm understanding correctly, the general desire here is to reflect the accuracy topic within the DNS abuse section.

I will note that we had some great discussions, including on a day negative one, if I may, event on accuracy about the connection between accuracy and DNS abuse. So in the interest of moving forward, I would just suggest a brief sentence, and instead of the text proposed by India, which does have some other procedural challenges as noted by our colleague from Japan.

And so the text would be, "Finally, the GAC recognizes that the accuracy of domain name registration data as it pertains to DNS abuse remains an ongoing topic of interest."

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, US. I have Canada and the UK. Canada.

JASON MERRITT:

Thank you very much. I won't belabor the issue that much, but I had some of the same views as my colleague from Japan I think if I characterize them correctly. One was, it seems like a very defacto statement that was there-- if I could just see it. Just scroll down.

Sorry. Yeah. More prone to be used for DNS abuse. I'm not sure where we land on that, if that's a fact, if that's still up for discussion. So I had some concerns or issues there. And then procedurally, I was thrown off a little bit about urging the Board to take up with registrars. It seemed a bit maybe misplaced or direct given the context and placement within the communique.



But I think as I was going through this in my mind, the sentence proposed by colleague from the US I think would, in my mind, alleviate some of those concerns around that. I would support that new sentence and think that we could delete the original sentence, and I think it makes it much more clear and much more in line with discussions that are had within the GAC. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Canada. I have the UK.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to support what has been said, and I think the text from our distinguished delegate from the US is quite appropriate. It is of great interest to the GAC, I think the accuracy issue as we've discussed before, we discussed in Washington. I think a reference here to that is appropriate. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, UK. Any other comment in the room or online? I have India. Go ahead, please.

SUSHIL PAL:

Thank you, the colleagues from various country for responding. I'll clarify first of all, I'm okay with the text from the US except one thing that is of interest, but then where is action? What does GAC propose any action in its communique or we just here to show interest?



If we can have some additional line, which at least brings out or clearly as to what GAC recommends, that would be useful. However, clarifying to the Japan's and Canada's concern, about incomplete and inaccuracy, I don't know whether in the technical guides here or not, but there are many DNS, which does not have a complete WHOIS details, and that's what we mean here, incomplete and inaccurate.

We can clarify that WHOIS details. And regarding the process, I'm not very sure about the process. Maybe if one of you can suggest a better process as to how they should be handled, I'm okay. I don't know whether the Board is supposed to take away the registrar for registries. Who else? I don't know. Whosoever it is, the procedural part, I'm not concerned. ICANN as a body should take care of it and should initiate some action on this, that's all my intent is.

And as clarifying to the Iran's point of more prone, more prone, because these are the DNS, if you speak tech technical guys, they'll tell you, these are the DNS which are utilized for all kinds of cyber-attacks more than the one which has a complete WHOIS detail because they can be identified and they're accountable, they can be traced. So that's it.

And yes, accuracy and DNS abuse, both are completely interconnected as US colleague has pointed out. Maybe if the forum agrees, I think maybe one additional line, I mean whatever is positively correct would suffice, hat would be good with us.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, India. My suggestion would be to part that, that suggestion in order to have more time to discuss and maybe fine tune the content and prepare some good text so that we can move on with the rest of the communique, otherwise my hunch is that we'll be stuck here for at least two more hours.

So I suggest that during the coffee break or during lunch, you work out some sort of appropriate text along with our GAC colleagues or by India itself and move on. So, sorry, sorry. I have Iran, I have the European Commission, and the US and Denmark. Go ahead, Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, sir. I am in favor of the text proposed by US. The only thing, when we say of interest, as UK mentioned in his intervention, of great interest in the second line, Fabien, great interest. And then we need to add something that which need to be pursued, duly pursued and taken into account. We should complete the sentence. I leave it to us to add something at the end of that to take the follow-up action to be pursued or duly pursued and implemented. So that is something I ask you as to add during the break, as you have mentioned. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you for that Iran. And I see support from India, and I see some nodding in the room. India, would you like to-- sorry,

SUSHIL PAL:

If our colleague and maybe request to US colleague to complete that sentence, I think we can close this and we can take off or we would want to work during the break. We're stopping at only convincing our interest and doing nothing about it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

US, would you like to answer that?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yes. I think that in the interest of moving forward the text, and thank you to our colleague from Iran, I propose that the text as it appears on the screen be accepted and then we move forward. So we'd be happy with the text as it is.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, US. I have the European Commission and Canada.

MARTINA BARBERO:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Interest of moving forward, we agree with this text, just to clarify that in fact it is indeed a topic of great interest to the GAC, and there are a lot of work going on in accuracy, so to acknowledge that the work exists.

So this is why maybe there's reluctance from some member of the GAC to say that we need to do something new in terms of-- it's much more about pursuing the work that we're doing and bringing it to maturity and completion. But just to reassure the Indian colleagues that my

colleagues are very active in these groups and they tell me there's a lot going on as well. I think this is definitely on the radar as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, European commission. I have Canada.

JASON MERRITT:

Thanks very much. Just to quickly offer support for the way forward from colleagues European Commission and the United States, I think it captures what the essence of what we're trying to get at here, and I think it's well placed. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Canada. And I see some nodding, so I guess we're okay to move forward. I'll just read those two last-- actually, one last paragraph. It's actually just one sentence. So it would read, "Finally, the GAC recognizes that the accuracy of domain name registration data as it pertain to DNS abuse remains an ongoing topic of great interest to be pursued."

Are we happy with that text? Is everybody okay? Can we live with it? Any strong opposition? And I see none, and I see nodding. Okay, we're good to move on. I'm very happy to tell you that we're ready to move to internal matters. Sorry, Benedetta, go ahead.

**BENEDETTA ROSSI:** 

Yeah, this is Benedetta speaking. Just one quick comment. There's one sentence that was added, but I added on the transparency on



GNSO SOIs following comments I believe were from the US and the UK, I believe, asking to add just a recognition that the motion from the GNSO council that was held yesterday did not pass. So that was added. You can see it on the screen.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that Benedetta. I'll just read it for the record. It reads, "The GAC understands that the GNSO Council motion on the CCOICI recommendations report on the SOI requirements on 25, October, 2023, did not pass." Do we need to clarify the acronyms? We'll do that later, yeah. Oh, okay, yeah, you're right. Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement, CCOICI. Go ahead, Fabien.

**FABIEN BETREMIEUX:** 

So, may I suggest GAC support friendly amendment on the GAC support suggestion, which would read the GAC understands that the GNSO Council motion on this matter on 25 October, 2023, did not pass. So we don't have to repeat all the acronyms.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Would that be okay for the GAC? And I see some thumbs up and some nodding. Any strong opposition. Okay, I have Hungary. Go ahead, please. And then the UK.



SZABOLCS SZOLNOKI: Thank you, Nico. Just one word. What do we mean by understand?

Do we take note?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Hungary, for that. Very good catch indeed. Thank you for

that, Hungary. UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Mr.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was gonna make the same point. It either did or it didn't, it's a factual matter. I just think for the benefit, and I'm not trying to-- for the benefit of those that perhaps haven't been following this as closely as others, as far as I understand it, what this means is that we expressed some concern before because it was possible that certain parties would be excluded from this requirement for giving statements of interest or they would be excluded from

revealing their clients.

So if I'm a consultant and I work on a policy development process, then I have to say, obviously, if one of my clients is directly affected by that policy development process. And there were certain classes of people that thought that perhaps this shouldn't apply to them because of various ethical considerations or whatever.

And as I understand it, this now does not apply. So everyone that's involved in a policy development process has to reveal whether in their statements of interest, what clients they have, so to speak. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, UK. Any further comments? So, seeing none,

we're good to move on. Thank you for that. So let's get directly to

internal matters.

GULTEN TEPE: Nico, this is Gulten speaking.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Yes.

GULTEN TEPE: We have Iran in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. Could instead of did not pass, we put something else.

It is maybe very informal language, did not pass. It was not agreed, it was not coming true. Could we have something instead of that?

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Not accepted, maybe, or not adopted. What would

you prefer? Any suggestion?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Any of the two, sir.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Okay. Thank you for that. I'll read it. "The GAC notes that the GNSO Council motion on this matter on 25 October, 2023 was not adopted." Would that be okay? And I see nodding in the room. Apparently, we can actually live with this. I'm very happy about that. Okay, so let's move on. Internal matters. Yeah, go ahead, Fabien.

**FABIEN BETREMIEUX:** 

Fabien Betremieux from the support staff. Just to clarify that we have received a text from the [01:06:08 - inaudible], so we'll add that here. We have texts from the Underserved Regions Working Groups. You wanna scroll down, we also have texts from the [01:06:15 - inaudible] Working group, and we've added this section on capacity building at the request of several GAC members. So can we suggest maybe to discuss that new section on the GAC capacity building efforts, which I understand was suggested as a new section in internal matters that would enable the communicator reflect some substantive discussions in capacity building workshops or capacity development workshops that may not raise to the level of issues of importance.

And the second objective with this section was also to recognize that the capacity development workshop are not just for underserved regions GAC members, but also for newcomers as well as any GAC members. Therefore, providing that visibility for the benefit of the entire GAC membership.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much for that., Fabien. And I have the Netherlands. Go ahead, please, Alisa.

ALISA HEAVER:

Thank you, Nico. This is Alisa Heaver for the record. I just wanted to, before you start reading out, explain something about it. So the first part of the text up until the bullets was basically provided by, I think, GAC support staff. And below that, you can see alternative text to the paragraph above. No, sorry alternative option for this entire section.

So that's text that I have provided because I thought it would make more sense to split the text into what has been discussed on day one and day two and really be clear on that because in the initial text where you had those bullets, well, it was summed up in bullets what has been discussed in day one.

And then there was one bullet on the alternative naming spaces and a whole paragraph on what had been discussed on those alternative naming spaces. So to me it felt disbalanced. So just to keep that in mind before we, well, discuss the text further or read everything out. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Netherlands. So if I understand correctly, we would need to choose between the two. Is that what you're saying?

ALISA HEAVER: Yes. I think, well, I don't think we need to have three different options.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Netherlands. I'll go ahead with the-- can you scroll

up a little bit please? I'll read it as it was, and then I'll read the options

if you're okay with that, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So given that the very beginning of the text here with the bullets was a

suggestion for us as a starting suggestion, we're happy to defer to the

Netherland proposal, of course, so we can remove that text. And so

because the other additions below the list of bullets here seem to be

more specific to specific topics, should we first read the Netherland

proposal, which covers the topic overall, and then discuss the various

specific suggestions that were made.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I think that's a reasonable approach, I would say. Who provided the

text below?

JOSE LAY: Chair. Yeah, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Oh, Timor-Leste. Yeah, go ahead.

JOSE LAY:

Right. The text is proposed by Timo-Leste. Thank you. We're in consultations with the Underserved Regions Working Groups Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much, Timo-Leste. I'll go ahead with Netherlands text, and then go back to the proposal by the Underserved Regions Working Group. So the text would read, "At the beginning of the meeting week, the GAC conducted a well-attended productive and international two-day capacity development workshop, featuring several topics of interest to GAC participants.

Day one focused on explaining ICANN and the GAC's place in the wider internet community, an introduction on the new gTLD program, highlighting financial and in-kind support for applicants, DNS abuse mitigation, and providing information on the next GAC High Level Government meeting. Day two was more technically oriented and provided introductions to the DNS blockchain and alternative namespaces.

Such namespaces constitute an alternative to the DNS. The GAC emphasizes the extreme importance of protecting the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS, which is an indispensable part of the foundation for a single global internet. The GAC intends to monitor further developments related to alternative namespaces.

The GAC would like to thank the OCTO team for their efforts in helping to set up this informative session on alternative naming spaces." And I'll pause here in order to see if there are any reactions or comment. And I have Brazil, go ahead, please.



LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, chair. I think we're fine, the text, just very small suggestion

on day one, focused on, I would eliminate explaining focused on ICANN and GAC's place. Some other language to be less on, I don't know, it maybe alternative, but I think explain is a bit little interactive,

let's say.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Brazil. Would that be okay as it is? And I have China. Go

ahead, please.

GUO FENG: Thank you, chair. With the paragraph starting with day two, the last

sentence, the OCTO team, I think perhaps we can have the full name if

it appears for the first time and have the OCTO in bracket. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, China. I have Trinidad and Tobago, and then the Cook

Islands. Trinidad and Tobago, please go ahead.

SHELLEY-ANN: Thank you, chair. We are fine with the text, just a minor edit, first

paragraph, perhaps change informational to informative.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Well noted. Thank you for that, Trinidad and Tobago. And I have the

Cook Islands. Go ahead, please.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, chair. Just with the last sentence of day two, the GAC

would like to acknowledge OCTO. For day one, just for consistency's sake, and also to ensure that we are not missing out acknowledging

those who provided support, perhaps we can also add the GAC

acknowledges, or would like to thank the government engagement

team, who was also very helpful in our efforts. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Cook Islands. Can you repeat at a slow pace so

that we can include it there?

PUA HUNTER: Just for day one, we have support from the government engagement

team. So perhaps we can look at the last sentence at day two and

repeat the same sentence at day one, but focus it on or change it to

government engagement. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Cook Islands. I have Lebanon.

ZEINA BOU HARB: Thank you, Chair. I think on day one, we should say in the wider

internet governance ecosystem, not internet community.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Lebanon. I have the United States.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Chair. Just streamlining suggestion. In the last sentence of the last paragraph on day two, I would just propose that we end that sentence after the word session. So we're thinking OCTO.

And also just to note, it would be good to see consistency between naming spaces and name spaces. I think the term is name spaces, but we can avoid that if we just shorten the sentence as you have done. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, US. Any other comment or edit in the room, online? If not, let me just read the two paragraphs again in order to see if we're on the same page and if we're okay to move on. So, "Day one focused on ICANN and the GAC's place in the wider internet governance ecosystem, an introduction on the new gTLD program, highlighting financial and in-kind support for applicants DNS abuse, mitigation, and providing information on the next GAC High Level Government Meeting.

The GAC would like to thank the ICCANN Government Engagement Team. Day two was more technically oriented and provided introductions to the DNS blockchain and alternative name spaces. Such name spaces constitute an alternative to the DNS. The GAC emphasizes the extreme importance of protecting the security,

stability, and resiliency of the DNS, which is an indispensable part of the foundation for a single global internet. The GAC intends to monitor further developments related to alternative name space.

The GAG would also like to thank the ICANN office of the Chief Technical Officer, OCTO, for their efforts in helping to set up this informative session. Are we okay with this? Is it acceptable for the GAC? Any opposition? And I see the Netherlands and the Cook Islands. Netherlands, go ahead, please.

ALISA HEAVER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to note that on day one, the last sentences,

the GAC would like to thank the ICANN Government Engagement

Team for what? So it would be for basically the same, for their efforts

in constructing the program for day one, something like that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Netherlands. Cook Islands, go ahead,

please.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Chair. Netherlands actually covered what I was gonna say.

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you for that, Cook Islands. Any other comment? I have

China.



**GUO FENG:** 

Thank you, Chair. Guo Feng from China for the record. In terms of the paragraph starting with day two, the second sentence name spaces, this sentence. Do we need this or not? I think if we make this paragraph more concise and shorter, we can delete this. I don't know if there is agreement. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you for that, China. Are we okay with deleting that part of the paragraph, such name spaces constitute an alternative to the DNS. And I have the Netherlands.

ALISA HEAVER:

Thank you. I think this sentence bridges what's been said in the first sentence and what's been said in the second sentence. So for people to, well, who are not well known with alternative naming spaces, I think it just gives a very, very, very brief clarification of what it is, and then why we do emphasize, well, put the emphasis on the third sentence. So, well, it's seven words on this full communique, I don't think that would make the difference.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, Netherlands. So if I understand correctly, you want to keep it there for informational purposes, basically, right. Thank you. I have Switzerland.



**JORGE CANCIO:** 

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. As a matter of fact, this is a very short sentence, but it has a lot of meaning to it, or it can be read in many ways. So a normative way of reading it is to see these name spaces as an alternative altogether to the DNS. I don't think we want to say that, and so that's one issue. The other issue is they are not an alternative, they are alternatives because each of them is an alternative.

They are not an homogeneous one or space. So maybe this sentence needs some reworking or maybe as my dear Chinese friend said, maybe it's better deleting it if we are not completely clear what we are saying with it. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, Switzerland. I have Trinidad and Tobago, and then China.

SHELLEY-ANN:

Thank you, Chair. I actually lowered my hand because Switzerland sort of raised the issue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Sorry, I can't hear you. Can you speak closer to the microphone, please?

SHELLEY-ANN:

Oh, I have my mask on, sorry. Thank you, chair. I actually lowered my hand because Switzerland actually sort of clarified the issue for me.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Okay. Thank you. I have China, please.

**GUO FENG:** 

Thank you, Chair. With the intervention from my colleagues in this room, perhaps we can add some few words after the sentence. Something like, which attracts attentions from the GAC members. So it will perhaps have a more fluent flow with a following sentence. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

So China, it would read such name space constitute an alternative to the DNS, which attracts the or which attract the attention of GAC members. Yeah, which attract the attention of GAC members. Such name spaces constitute alternatives in plural to the DNS, which attract the attention of GAC members. Would that be okay for, China? Okay. Thank you. I have Iran, I have Egypt, and the Netherlands. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, sir. In the second line of the day two, we say, and alternative name space, that means we have already a name space and we want to have alternative name space. So what do you mean? Do we need the word alternative or just name space? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Iran. Egypt.



MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Nico. So my proposal would be, and thanks Jorge for pointing the impact of the second sentence. So maybe day two was more technically oriented and provided, I would say, introduction without an S to DNS, blockchain, and impact of alternative name spaces on DNS, for example. And then we can maybe delete the second sentence if okay with Netherlands as this highlights that this is alternative to the DNS.

And I thought maybe impact would highlight that it may have a negative impact. We can put negative as well, if we wish. So I'm sorry to keep talking. I'm just proposing this instead of the second sentence, I hope it addresses both concerns the Netherlands, China, and Switzerland. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Egypt. Netherlands.

ALISA HEAVER:

I would like to offer another alternative. So for the second sentence, such name spaces could be perceived as providing an alternative to the DNS.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Netherlands. I have the UK and then Egypt.



**NIGEL HICKSON:** 

Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. We could certainly support what our distinguished colleague from Egypt said, but also in the spirit of flexibility, we could also accept what our friend from the Netherlands proposed as well. I think what is important is that we don't say the namespace are an alternative because we they're not necessarily an alternative, but they have the potential to be such. So the language which the Netherlands have proposed is probably fine. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, UK. Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you. And I'm happy also with the Netherlands language. I'm just trying to complete my proposal, which was impact of alternative name spaces on DNS, so that it's clear that it is an alternative to the DNS name space. But again, I'm flexible. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you so very much. So okay, before I read the whole thing, I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yeah, thank you. I suggested instead of alternative on, saying alternative for, but not on, for DNS. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, Iran. Any other comment? Any other edit? Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Sorry to insist, but I wouldn't speak of an alternative.

It's alternatives because each of those name spaces is a different

alternative, so we cannot speak of one alternative or an alternative.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Switzerland. Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry to seek the floor again, but it's on DNS and not for DNS

because we are talking about the impact. So the sentence reads, day two was more technically oriented and provided introduction to DNS,

blockchain, and the impact of alternative name spaces on DNS. Thank

you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Egypt. I see no other requests for the

floor. So apparently, we're happy with the text as it is. Correct me if

I'm wrong. And I see Hungary.

SZABOLCS SZOLNOKI: Thank you, Nico. Just one question concerning OCTO. We thank

OCTO for their efforts. We thank the office for their efforts, for the

efforts, or for its efforts. So I'm not sure.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you very much, Hungary, for the good catch. Any other comment at this point? So we need to decide. Yeah. Fabien's got a point here. On day two, we need to decide which of the sentences we're keeping, or we can keep both. But so let me read, actually, it's the third paragraph.

So "Day two was more technically-oriented and provided introductions to the DNS, blockchain, and the impact of alternative name spaces on DNS. Such name spaces could be perceived as providing alternatives to the DNS, which attract the attention of GAC members.

The GAC emphasizes the extreme importance of protecting the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS, which is an indispensable part of the foundation for a single global internet. The GAC intends to monitor further developments related to alternative name spaces.

The GAC would also like to thank the ICANN office of the Chief Technology Officer, OCTO, for its efforts in helping to set up this informative session. So, going back a little bit, should we keep the sentence in brackets, should we erase it? What should we do? And I have Trinidad and Tobago. Go ahead, please.

SHELLEY-ANN:

Thanks, Chair. Could I make a small suggestion with respect to the question in brackets?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Can you speak closer to the microphone, please? I can't hear you.



SHELLEY-ANN:

Just a small suggestion with respect to the sentence in brackets. If we could say, noting that such name spaces could be perceived as providing alternatives to the DNS, and then we delete, which attract the attention of GAC members, and then go on to read the GAC emphasizes the extreme importance, et cetera. I can repeat it, noting that such name spaces could be perceived as providing alternatives to the DNS, the GAC emphasizes the extreme importance, et cetera.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you for that, Trinidad and Tobago. And I have Iran. Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I support this proposal. It's very good. Thank you.

**NICOLAS CABALLERO:** 

Thank you, Iran. And I see nodding from the Netherlands and from India and from China and from many other countries. So, yeah, voila. So let me read it once again before we break for lunch in order to have more clarity.

So, "Day two was more technically oriented and provided introductions to the DNS, blockchain, and the impact of alternative namespace on DNS, noting that such namespace could be perceived as providing alternatives to the DNS, the GAC emphasizes the extreme importance of protecting the security, stability, and resiliency of the

DNS, which is an indispensable part of the foundation for a single global internet.

The GAC intends to monitor further developments related to alternative name spaces. The GAG would also like to thank the ICANN office of the Chief Technology Officer, OCTO, for its efforts in helping to set up this informative session." Can we live with this text? Are we okay with it? Any opposition?

GULTEN TEPE: We have Iran in the queue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Iran, go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. Thank you, sir. Instead set up in the last line, it says to organize

this. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran. Well noted. So there we are. There we are.

MANAL ISMAIL: Egypt is responding here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I'm sorry, Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, very minor. I'm just withdrawing the proposal to have on DNS in

the first sentence since we are keeping the second sentence now. It is clarified already by the second sentence, and we have too many DNSs

in the paragraphs. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Very good catch, Egypt, indeed. Thank you so much for that. So there

it is. I don't think I need to read the whole thing again, right? Unless

you tell me otherwise.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Nico. We have UK.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: UK, go ahead, please.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And great, yeah, reads really well with

the addition that Egypt have provided. I just wonder whether we

could look at the third paragraph or were you're gonna do this?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Well, I was planning to do that right after lunch, but we can do it right

now if you want. We can stay here for half an hour over the allocated

time, but I'm okay with that.

GULTEN TEPE: Thank you, Nico. Papua New Guinea.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Russell, go ahead, please.

RUSSELL WORUBA: Thank you, chair. Since I was the original instigator for this draft, I

would say that we could easily withdraw it considering the essence of

it is captured in the day two paragraph. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Papua New Guinea. So we'll do just that. There's still

some text to be reviewed, but I suggest we pause now, we go have

lunch, and then with some more clarity and more energies, we

continue the discussion.

There's still some text to review before this. So again, yeah, we'll break now for-- actually, oh, we have a 75-minute lunch break. That's

cool. So we'll be back at 1:15. Enjoy your lunch. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

