
ICANN79 | CF – GAC Communique Drafting Work Session (5 of 7)
Wednesday, March 6, 2024 – 4:15 to 5:30 SJU

DAN GLUCK: Hello and welcome to the GAC Communiqué Drafting session on Wednesday the 6th of March, 2024 at 20:15 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

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. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar and with that I will hand the floor over to GAC Chair Nico Caballero. Nico?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Daniel. Welcome back, everyone. Please take your seats. We're about to start and we'll be starting where we left, I guess Fabien. Could you please guide us as to exactly where we made some final tweaks, some final you know fine-tuning?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Right, so we are in issues of importance on the second section cost-benefit analysis of the new gTLD program and as you had requested in the second paragraph, we tried to remove the repetition of document

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.

and analysis and so we've proposed some a few formulation a few tweaks there to make it work and we're also suggesting maybe at the beginning of that paragraph to replace in this connection with in response given that the document that ICANN produced was specifically in response to the ICANN78 Hamburg community advice.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Fabien. So, I'll just read the second paragraph for the sake of time you know and for the sake of clarity as well. So, the second paragraph reads in response ICANN org compiled the document overview of analysis related to costs and benefits of the next round of the new gTLD program. The GAC understands that the Board may consider that this document has fulfilled the GAC's advice concerning the cost-benefit analysis.

However, the GAC has assessed whether the document can be considered an implementation of the GAC advice and concludes that it cannot be considered to constitute a cost-benefit analysis nor to be objective and independent. In this sense the GAC notes that the document produced is a detached assessment of certain individual costs and benefits. To be considered cost-benefit analysis the analysis must be comprehensive coherent and complete and must assess and quantify all significant advantages and disadvantages seen from a global perspective. And I'll stop here and I see again analysis, analysis, analysis so maybe we should fine-tune that again.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, we considered this one specifically and we felt that this was quite meaningful to refer to analysis again. We thought about would we say it but it felt that cost-benefit analysis was that the reference to the analysis must be comprehensive is sort of the work that goes into a cost-benefit analysis not the cost-benefit analysis in itself and so it felt that keeping the analysis was necessary here. So, you know we're just asking--.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: All right, no. I'm okay, I don't have any strong feelings, it's just kind of you know feels a little bit weird while reading but if everyone is okay, we should keep it I don't have a problem with that unless the floor tells me otherwise. I don't see any hand up which means that we're good to close this section of the communiqué if everybody agrees. Is that the case? And I see nodding and thumbs up and some clapping in the back so we're good. Thank you for that. So, back to you Fabien. Please walk us through the next sections that need to be worked out.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, now we're going to scroll down skip over section three which was agreed earlier to section four on registration data and we've just received text from the U.S. I believe and maybe other contributors.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Fabien. So, I will need help from my distinguished vice chairs for the first reading. Any volunteer? Thank you, Egypt. Please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA:

So, on registration data request service, RDRS, the GAC continues to support efforts to maximize participation in the registration data request service, RDRS, and reiterates that widespread use of the pilot by both registrars and requesters will help the RDRS meet its intended purpose of generating data to inform the ICANN Board's consideration of the policy recommendations related to a future system for standardized access and disclosure SSAD. We believe all contracted registrars should participate. The GAC welcomes ICANN Org continued efforts to provide regular monthly reporting of usage metrics while the pilot has only been recently launched.

These metrics have already shed light on potential improvements that could help the pilot meet its intended purpose and create an improved user experience. The GAC looks forward to continuing to work with the GNSO standing committee on the RDRS to address challenges and where appropriate suggest improvements to the RDRS. Specific issues might include confidentiality of law enforcement requests and voluntary participation by ccTLDs. In light of the feedback received from various stakeholders, we encourage further review to take place to eliminate unnecessary and confusing elements of the current requester interface, particularly with respect to requests from law enforcement and the applicability of various data protection frameworks.

The GAC also strongly encourages to include information about the RDRS and a link to it within the WHOIS lookup/registration data access protocol RDAP with a view to increase its visibility. Finally, the GAC

stresses the importance of continued education and outreach efforts throughout the lifespan of the RDRS to ensure both requesters and registrars are aware of the uses and limits of this pilot program as well as its intended purpose. To this end, the GAC encourages ICANN org to conduct a survey of registrars who are not currently participating in the RDRS to gain insights into the concerns of these parties and potential challenges that could be addressed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Egypt. Comments, questions, thoughts, any feedback in the room or online? And I have Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, the first thing that is highlighted, we, we should avoid personal pronouns, so I suggest that the GAC believes that, not saying we or you or they. This is point one. And then in the last paragraph, finally, the GAC stresses the importance of continued education. We should avoid the word education. No one educates anyone else. Increasing awareness, I have no problem. Developing capacity, I have no problem. But education, we should replace all the people proposed as educated, because we don't know who educate whom and they educate what. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. So, I guess in the first paragraph, we should correct that believes as well. The GAC believes all contracted registrars, just a little detail. That encourages, correct. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for

that, Iran. Any other comment? I don't see any hand in the, in the room. I don't see any hand online. And believe it or not, we're good to go. Apparently. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sorry. I think we haven't resolved the suggestion to not use education here. I'm not sure what's the replacement wording.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: In my understanding, it was outreach only. We should also erase end. But I stand to be corrected. I don't know who made that proposal. I think it was Iran. Finally, the GAC stresses the importance of continued outreach efforts throughout the lifespan of the RDRS to ensure both and et cetera, et cetera. I don't need, I don't need to read the whole thing again. Is that the way it was intended? I mean, is everybody okay with the way it is now? And I see nodding and I don't see any hand online. So, that means that we're okay to move on. Thank you, everyone. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, we're moving on to the second subsection of this section. So, if you scroll down on privacy and proxy accreditation implementation, so this is still under the heading of registration data. No, no, this is new text. Yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So, for this, I would ask my distinguished colleague from Colombia to do to do the reading. Tiago, would you please?

THIAGO DAL-TOE: Privacy and proxy accreditation implementation. The GAC supports a privacy and proxy PP accreditation process at ICANN. The GAC hopes the ICANN community will thoroughly explore options that allow implementation of approved recommendations that are still relevant from the previous PDP on PP issues and appreciates ICANN orgs recently shared work facilitating this process. The GAC continues to encourage registrars and requesters to participate in the RDRS. Doing so will ensure the community is able to produce evidence-based registration data policy, including on the use of PP services and their potential impact on usage of the RDRS or subsequent domain names registration request or subsequent domain name registration request systems.

Some requesters have noted confusion around the provision of PP information in place of the registrant information because they expect to receive data related to the underlying registrant. The mismatch between expectation and results may lead to user frustration and discourage use of the RDRS, which was noted in the WHOIS disclosure system design paper. Accordingly, the GAC looks forward to further work on these issues.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Colombia. So, at this point, let me open the floor for comments, questions, edits, thoughts. Are we okay with the text as

it is? Anything you would like to modify? Anything you would like to change at this point? I don't see any hand up. Is that a hand up over there? Sorry. Sorry. No. Okay. I don't see any hand up online either. So, let's move forward unless, Fabien, you tell me there's any editorial need at this point.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: None we have identified yet. We'll continue doing our clinical review as usual. But I think we're moving now to accuracy, which is the third and last subsection in this section of registration data.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much. So, I'll do the reading myself this time. So, on accuracy, the GAC reiterates that registration data accuracy is an important element in law enforcement, cyber security, IPR enforcement investigations, domain name registration management, and other legitimate third-party interests. At the same time, what's that echo? I hear some echo. There's some laptop with the microphone connected probably is not mine. I swear to God.

So, anyways, I'll do the reading again. And I'll catch up from, at the same time, any changes to accuracy policy at ICANN should strive to balance the various interests involved, including those of registrants with enhanced privacy needs. The GAC supports ICANN org's efforts to identify scenarios for assessing accuracy under ICANN's contracts that provide useful information to advance the accuracy scoping team's work and welcomes ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officers,

OCTO, forthcoming inferential analysis of maliciously registered domains, infernal, which could shed further light on accuracy.

The GAC welcomes the timely completion of the data processing specification between ICANN and the contracted parties so the community can resume its work expeditiously on the topic of accuracy. I'll stop here and see if there's any reaction in the room or online. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yeah, thank you, sir. In the first paragraph, second line, IPR enforcement investigation. Do we need the term enforcement investigation? Investigation, investigation. IPR investigation, I understand, but IPR enforcement investigation, I just asked them. And then, by the way, since there are many terms called or acronym IPR, we have to at least say that what we really mean by IPR. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Iran. Point taken. This is the first time we refer to IPR, so we should explain what the acronym means. Agreed. However, I'm okay with the IPR enforcement investigations because it refers precisely to that. But again, I stand to be corrected. Any other comment? Any other question? Any other modification you would like to go ahead with in the room, online? Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Just one critical comment from us. Data processing specification, I believe, is the first time that appears in communiqué text. I believe the

GAC has referred previously to the data processing agreements between the ICANN and the contracted parties. I understand the product of this work on data processing agreements will take the form of a data processing specification. So, this is accurate. But the first time it's introduced, I don't know if you want to consider consistency of reference and referring to this as the concept of data protection agreement or specify now that you're referring to the expected outcome, the specification.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Happy to defer to your recommendation, Fabien. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, USA. I have the United Kingdom. Nigel, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. That seems very sensible, what Fabien has said. No, my question was on the word inferential. But I'm not going to argue with it. This is on the third line of that paragraph. OCTO, forthcoming inferential analysis. Is that what the analysis is called? I mean, if it is, I mean, we can call, OCTO can call what they want, anything. But it's just, I'm not sure inferential is a word.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Sorry to interrupt you, Nigel. But yeah, that's why it's called infermal. You know, it's probably some play on words or something, done on

purpose. But yeah, it's inferential analysis of maliciously registered domains, infernal. Are you okay with it, UK? So, thank you for that. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, sir. Although you said that you are happy with the second line, still, I suggest that maybe if you want to retain the term enforcement, it should be either at the beginning, enforcement of intellectual property investigation, or at the end, but not in between. So, either you say enforcement of intellectual property IPR investigation, or you say intellectual property IPR investigation enforcement. I suggest that they put it at the beginning, enforcement of so on and so forth. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Iran. I can leave with that, as a matter of fact. But U.S., would you like to respond to that?

SUSAN CHALMERS:

Thanks. I appreciate the suggestion. And it's a convoluted phrase. But I do think it's accurate, because it's the investigation to enforce intellectual property rights. So, I think that's why it's phrased that way. But if you wanted to tweak it, it could be the enforcement of intellectual property rights, or the investigation to enforce intellectual property rights. It all sounds a little clunky to me. But you are investigating to enforce intellectual property rights. So, that's the point I wanted to underscore. I don't know if that helps or not.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, U.S. I have Chinese Taipei.

CHINESE TAIPEI: I have a simple suggestion. I think the word enforcement should be replaced by infringement, because normally we say IPR infringement investigation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We also probably don't need the defined term acronym if we're not going to use the acronym again. So, IPR, I mean.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, USA. Thank you for that, Chinese Taipei. Well, noted. I have Iran again.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, thank you, Sir. I think infringement is not a proper term to use here. We are not talking of non-conformity, which is one of the meanings of infringement, or non-respecting. We are saying the investigation to enforce and so on and so forth. So, I suggest that, particularly here, the term is properly used here. And what Laureen has mentioned is take care of what I have suggested. And I agree with her proposal. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran. Chinese Taipei, would you agree to that? Any strong feelings?

CHINESE TAIPEI: Well, I have thought that we are looking into whether a particular IP right was infringed. That's why we need the data. Otherwise, it's hard to imagine we want to enforce something while it is not infringed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. So, let me read the whole paragraph again for the sake of clarity. The paragraph would read on accuracy. The GAC reiterates that registration data accuracy is an important element in law enforcement, cybersecurity, intellectual property rights, domain name registration management, and other legitimate third-party interests. At the same time, any changes, et cetera, et cetera. Are we okay with the way it is drafted now? Any strong feelings? I have the European Commission. Go ahead, please.

MARTINA BARBERO: Thank you very much, Nico. I think the distinguished colleague from Iran said we could go back to investigation to enforce intellectual property rights. Because I think deleting infringement investigation doesn't help. I also think that it's my limited IPR knowledge that were the correct IP terms. But I think the rephrasing suggested by Loreen, investigation to enforce intellectual property rights, if we can live with that, it's a bit longer, but equally accurate. Speaking of accuracy.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, so you would suggest we keep the wording as it was?

MARTINA BARBERO: I would suggest to use what is now investigation to enforce intellectual property rights, which is the suggestion from Loreen, if I understood correctly.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, European Commission. So, let me read just the first paragraph again. So, it would read the GAC reiterates that registration data accuracy is an important element in law enforcement, cyber security, investigations to enforce intellectual property rights, domain name registration management and other legitimate third-party interests. There we go. Apparently, I see agreement in the room. Any opposition? Any strong feelings about this? I don't see any hand online. That means that we're good. Ready to move on. Thank you very much for your intelligent suggestions. Back to you, Fabien, in order to see what else needs to be dealt with.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So, we're continuing a chapter of issues of importance to the GAC, and we're skipping over five, which was transparency and GNSO statements of interest, which we addressed yesterday and it was agreed on. So, we're moving to a new section now, six regional Internet registries. We understand the text here is proposed by Netherlands, Australia, Niger and Egypt.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, so given the fact that it was hardly proposed by Egypt, let me give the floor to Lebanon. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah, Lebanon, please go ahead. Could you please turn the microphone on, please?

ZEINA BOU HARB: The GAC appreciated the information received from the ASO concerning AFRINIC and welcomed the fact that AFRINIC continues to serve the African region despite the circumstances. However, GAC members expressed concern about the situation and the impact it may have on the distribution of number resources in Africa. The GAC understands that there are legal constraints to providing full transparency on the ongoing legal procedures and welcomes receiving further updates regarding AFRINIC governance.

The GAC took note of the announcement that the ASO is considering to initiate a review of the criteria for establishment of the new regional Internet registries, ICP-2, and is looking forward to receiving future updates on this important process, including how interested GAC members can take part.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Lebanon. Comments, thoughts, edits, questions? Are we okay with the text as it is? And I see nodding in the room. Any opposition? And I see Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Go ahead. No, no, sir. I think we are just on the situation that consensus by exhaustion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Well, that would certainly be my case, Kavouss, given the fact that I didn't eat lunch, as a matter of fact. And I'm a little bit cranky today because it's my daughter's birthday and I'm not there. So, I'm especially sensitive today. So, yes, you have a point, Caboose. Thank you for that. So, is that an old hand, Iran?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, chairman. Just I want to say that you did not have lunch. Perhaps you do some sort of fasting, Ramadan. So, we have six days to the Muslim countries, Ramadan. So, you're practicing them. Thank you very much joining orally with the Muslim countries. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Any other comment or question?

ZEINA BOU HARB: Nico?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Yes.

ZEINA BOU HARB: Can we add a reference to this ICP-2? Because for newcomers, this is something new.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: You mean explain the acronym?

ZEINA BOU HARB: Or a link to a document or anything.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Good point, Lebanon. Thank you for that. Okay, so I see Bangladesh. Sorry, I see Bangladesh. Go ahead.

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Dr. Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. Just for clarification, in the very last part of the first sentence, AFRINIC continues to serve the African region despite the circumstances. I think this is the first line and maybe for the first reader, it can be difficult circumstances or current circumstances, but I think there is the adverb is required before the circumstances. It can be current circumstances or difficult circumstances. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Bangladesh. Are we okay with the proposal? Can we use current or difficult? And I see Netherlands. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: I think it's a good addition, but prefer to use the word current as it's more neutral.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. So, we'll keep current then unless there's strong opposition in the room. I don't see any hand up. I don't see any hand online. So, that means that I don't need to read the whole paragraph again, I guess, unless you tell me otherwise. So, that not being the case, we're good to move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Next and last section of issues of importance, number seven, IPv6. And I believe this was proposed by the Netherlands.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, let me read it and then we'll see if we have any reactions. So, it would say, the GAC recognizes the need for urgent deployment of the IPv6 protocol. And is looking forward, excuse me. And is looking forward to continuing discussing policy options to incentivize and accelerate the adoption of IPv6 with other ICANN stakeholders. And by the way, thank you so much for including that Netherlands. I'm a full supporter of the IPv6 protocol by all means. Any reactions, thoughts?

ZEINA BOU HARB: I propose removing with other ICANN stakeholders and to discussing with other ICANN stakeholders because the adoption is not with other stakeholders.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Lebanon. I have Papua New Guinea and then Iran.

RUSSELL WORUBA: Thank you, Chair. Excuse me. One of the thoughts that came out clearly in our meeting with the ASO was the need to get governments to appreciate the need. And I'm wondering if that can be put in this section somehow. Maybe a suggestion would be to include that as a short update in the high-level government meeting. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Russell. I have Iran and then the Netherlands.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I think I have a small difficulty with the latter part and looking forward to continuing discussing policy options. I don't think we are talking about policy options. We are talking of transition from IPv4 to IPv6. So, we don't need any policy. The policy is known since many, many years. Resolution 180 of planning potentially Bucharest has all elements of that. So, we need ways and means how to make this transition. Some countries still need technical help assistance. Some other people have difficulty for the equipment because they cannot find necessary.

So, I don't think that we need continuing discussing policy options. Policy is already available that make as soon as possible transit or change to the IPv6. But we have to know how to do it. But you don't need any policy perhaps distinguished colleagues from the Netherlands may kindly review what he suggested perhaps not to refer to need to a policy. Thank you. The policy is already known since decades. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And also, thanks to our Iranian colleague. I actually hope our Iranian colleague had had the chance to listen into our conversation with members of the ISO and the NRO where we actually went over the fact that several policies exist both at the ICANN domain level for instance, in the applicant guidebook and several policies also at the TLD level that encourage IPv6.

The slide also incorporated several national public policy options that are used by several GAC countries to accelerate IPv6. So, that's why I choose to actually talk about policy options here but maybe as a compromise to address some of the Iranian concerns we can simply remove the word policy and continuing discussing options to incentivize and accelerate if that would resolve the conflict. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that Netherlands. I have Egypt.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Yes, thank you. I think to pick on what was just mentioned by our colleague from Netherlands, I would go for adding actually after with other ICANN stakeholders as well as at national and regional level because this is more or less what we discussed at the session that it could actually, there could be option for policy discussions at national

and regional level for IPv6 acceleration. And I would also suggest with my colleague from Papua New Guinea, the idea of including IPv6 and I know it's beyond our discussion now but also maybe that IPv6 is something to address within our strategic objectives but that's a thought for later.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. So, hold on Egypt. So, do you have like an exact wording for that?

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Yes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: How would you like it to be drafted?

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, after with other ICANN stakeholders as well as at national and regional levels, something like that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, thank you for that Egypt. Let me read the paragraph again. So, it would read, the GAC recognizes the need for urgent deployment of the IPv6 protocol and is looking forward to continuing discussing options to incentivize and accelerate the adoption of IPv6 with other ICANN stakeholders as well as at national and regional levels. Is that a good

text for everyone? And I see nodding in the room. I have Bangladesh. Go ahead.

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. Just for a clarification and a suggestion that the GAC recognizes the need for urgent deployment of the IPv6 protocols but maybe for a general person, it can give a sense that it's not a new deployment. It's already deployed but we are talking about accelerated deployment. So, maybe instead of urgent accelerated deployment can be just for consideration but I'm not very strong on that thinking.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, Bangladesh, if I understood correctly, you want to go ahead with urgent or accelerated?

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA: I want to go to accelerated. That's my suggestion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Thank you for that. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I think accelerated is the second line. So, we do need to have two time accelerated. So, maybe first option was correct, as in deployment. And then as a second line, accelerate the adoption. So, I don't think that two times we should refer to accelerate. And then I

have another comment. I have some difficulty with other ICANN stakeholder. I have an agreement to say that incentive and accelerate adoption of IPv6 at national and regional level but not together with other ICANN stakeholders.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: This is something to be adopted. Okay, Understood. Point taken. Iran, thank you. I have Egypt and then the Netherlands.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Yeah, just to avoid that we have accelerated twice, we can use at the second time expedite the adoption of IPv6 so we don't have accelerated twice. And then with other ICANN stakeholders, it's because I think we've identified potential work with the ASO, with the ccNSO. So, I believe it's well put to, I mean, there is actually work that could be done with other ICANN stakeholders. So, I would suggest keeping it there. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. Well, noted. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think our Egyptian colleague already kind of stole my comment. It's essential that this is a collaborative effort throughout different constituencies. Also in a more formal matter, the GAC as an advisory committee has little options as to advise other stakeholders. So, I think in that sense, it's sufficient to remain stating

other ICANN stakeholders or be ICANN stakeholders if other is a problem. But I do think we should recognize that this is not something that the GAC should be doing alone.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. Well, noted as well. I have the UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think this text is excellent. Oh, it's gone.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Can you go back? Can you please go back? Oh, thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: It's so good. No, I just don't think you need as well as. I think it's with other ICANN stakeholders at national and regional levels is fine if that's okay with Egypt. Because I think it sort of as well as sort of makes you think is, it's like, I think that, that looks good, but yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, no “end” there, Nigel? You think we don't need the word end at national and regional levels or you want it as it is, just at national and regional levels?

NIGEL HICKSON: I mean, ICANN stakeholders are there, yeah. I mean, with other ICANN stakeholders at national and regional levels, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: Unless you meant something else. Did you?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Egypt, please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: I think one of the things that we discussed was how governments can actually do work on a national level within digital transformation projects, adopting IPv6. So, I think it's in addition to with different ICANN stakeholders. So, that's a plus, I would say, but I stand to be corrected.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Egypt, is that an all hand, UK? Nigel, is that an all hand?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, no, I'm very flexible. I mean, whatever suits. I mean, yeah, yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. Adoption of IPv6 in a given country. I take my country. We don't consult ISO. We take IPv6. And if we have the possibility, we transit from IPv4 but not consulted, not with together with the ISO and others. If somebody insists to that, we say that in consultation with other, I have no problem, but not with for adoption. We don't need to take the other, but we could consult them. In consultation with other ICANN stakeholder, just to cover the point of our esteemed colleague from the Netherlands. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Very good point, Iran. Thank you for that. Netherlands, would you agree? Okay, and I see some nodding. UK, okay with it? Okay, perfect. So, it looks like we have agreement on this. So, let me just read it one final time. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Just a quick question on the location of at national and regional levels. I'm not too sure. I understand whether it's preferred to be before or after in consultation with other ICANN stakeholders. It's a small thing, but it feels to us that it might read better if it is before. So, adoption of IPV, to options to incentivize and expedite adoption of IPV6 at the national and regional levels in consultation with other ICANN stakeholders. So, I just wanted to clarify that before you get to read it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I don't think that would work because it would look as, if you needed, I wouldn't say permission or anything, but consultation with ICANN stakeholders in order to perform that at a national or regional level. But again, my opinion is irrelevant here. So, I'll do short, short. So, let me read again as it is, and then see if it works. So, the GAC recognizes the need for accelerated deployment of the IPV6 protocol and is looking forward to continuing discussing options to incentivize and expedite the adoption of IPV6 in consultation with other ICANN stakeholders at national and regional levels. And I'll pause there to see if there's any reaction. I see Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman. Your reading is correct. We don't need to replace, displace the in consultation after the national level. So, the text as it is, in my view, is correct. It's sufficient. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. I have Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Chair. I think we are missing something by deleting the end. I think we were talking about two different cooperations, one among ICANN stakeholders and the other at the national and regional levels. But now we're conflating both into one.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: That's why I wanted to use the word end.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think--

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I agree with you. I'm sorry to interrupt, but just to get to the point.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, if colleagues agree, I think it would be good to put the end again.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So, I see Bangladesh and the Netherlands. Please go ahead.

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is from Bangladesh. And I feel it's a bit, there's some problem in the sentence because we are talking about looking forward to continuing discussing, and then we're adding and in consultation with. So, do we need to discuss in consultation? I think in consultation with, this part is creating problem and it's repeating. So, I think this should be corrected.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Bangladesh. As a matter of fact, I wanted to put end right after stakeholders, right after the comma in stakeholders. In consultation with other ICANN stakeholders and at a national and regional levels. That was my point. Thank you for flagging this, Bangladesh. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you. I'm in doubt whether I'm now helping or adding to the confusion, but I was thinking maybe we can do without actually mentioning ICANN and in consultation with stakeholders at and then maybe do a global, regional and national levels. So, turn it around and not make it very specific. Just have the notion that this is something that you might want to involve other stakeholders in.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. That's an interesting suggestion. So, let me read it as it is. The GAC recognizes the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and is looking forward to continuing discussing options to incentivize and expedite the adoption of IPv6 in consultation with stakeholders at global, national and regional levels. Can we leave with this? I have Australia and then Iran.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Chair. Ian Sheldon and GAC Australia. Sorry not to cut across my Dutch colleagues here, but I think I have a preference to keep ICANN in there. I think we need to remember that the GAC is a body of ICANN and we need to be very clear and careful on the GAC's remit in this space, particularly what we are and aren't responsible for. So, I have a preference for keeping ICANN in this paragraph. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Australia. Iran?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I have no problem because so many versions have been said it's difficult at this late hour to see what is what, but at least I want to be ensured that at the end of the paragraph we add comma as appropriate because I don't know whom I have to consult. I go to the national, I go to the consultation, back to the national, I go to the regional, come back to national because something said I add as appropriate and that is limited to the case by case. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran. Before I give the floor to Bangladesh, I still think we need end right after stakeholders because one thing is whatever we do with ICANN within the ICANN environment, so to say, and a totally different thing is what we do at a global, national or regional level with or without ICANN involvement. But again, that's my thinking. You know, that's my irrelevant opinion. I have Bangladesh.

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA: Thank you, Chair. Shamsul Zohar from Bangladesh. The first thing is that I agree with you that I think the way it was proposed by our colleagues, we should have the end before the, at global level, that's the first thing. And second thing is still my opinion is that in consultation, this is not fitting in this sentence. That's my observation because we are saying that forward to continue in discussing options to incentivize and expedited adoption of IPv6 with other. So, we are discussing with others, but then we are mentioning in consultation. So, I think in consultation is not fitting here. That's my opinion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Bangladesh. Egypt?

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, I tend to agree with my colleague from Bangladesh. I think what the sentence is trying to say is that we would like to discuss options with other stakeholders, whether within the ICANN community or even beyond with the purpose of incentivizing and expediting adoption of IPv6. So, if we can maybe move the sentence and move that to the end, it would make more sense. So, we're merely here discussing options to do that. We're not right away taking options to expedite. We're just discussing the options.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Egypt. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. I still have difficulty with the sentence. I think perhaps one way would be discussing options with other ICANN stakeholders to expedite the adoption of IPv6 at global, regional and national level. So, this discussing with ICANN stakeholders we immediately after the discussion, discussing options or various options with other ICANN stakeholders to adapt, to expedite adapting, sorry, not to intensify and expedite. I mean, we don't need this intensifies. A stakeholder to expedite the adoption of IPv6 at global, regional and national level. So, this consultation would be before adoption. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Lebanon, please go ahead.

ZEINA BOU HARB: Yeah, I proposed a text in the chat. Maybe it will respond a little bit to Kavouss' comment about moving the ICANN stakeholders to after discussing. And my question is, are we here asking about discussions at the global, regional or national level or adoption at regional and national and global level? Because there's a difference between the two.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I don't understand your question, Lebanon. Would you please repeat?

ZEINA BOU HARB: Can I read the proposal in the chat first?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Of course.

ZEINA BOU HARB: The GAC recognizes the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and looking forward to continuing discussing, comma, with ICANN stakeholder and at global, national and regional levels, comma, any policy options to incentivize and to expedite the adoption of IPv6.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Sounds good to me, but I think we should correct in looks forward or something like that because otherwise it wouldn't make, but anyways, that's just me. I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Thank you, Lebanon. Could what she suggests we put it, okay, it is there already? Yeah. Is that the paragraph proposed by Lebanon? Correct. Yeah, okay. So, let us take it over in one minute or half a minute and then we come back. Thank you. I think it seems better improvement, but you have to read it carefully. Don't bother yourself to think we check to read it again. Let us, we read it ourselves and come back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Iran. Any other comment? Any other idea in the room? I don't see any hand up. I see, as a matter of fact, I see two hands up. One from the Netherlands and one from Japan. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING: I'm happy to take the text suggested by our Lebanese colleague as a compromise.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Sorry, Netherlands, can you come again, please?

MARCO HOGEWONING: I said, I can live with the text suggested by our Lebanese colleague as an alternative compromise.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Okay, thank you. So, do we have any other comments? So, we have Japan.

NOBU NISHIGATA: Can I? Is it my turn to speak or I'm not sure?

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Yes, please go ahead.

NOBU NISHIGATA: Okay, thanks. Oh, just I'd be appreciated if you refer to my comment in the chat. One comment and one question.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, I'm sorry, I think you mean in cooperation with to stress the GAC is limited. We are not the ones.

NOBU NISHIGATA: No, no, not what I wrote.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: I'm sorry, this is Netherlands.

NOBU NISHIGATA: Yeah. In the meeting chat, yeah. It's above in the Netherlands, just you read.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: I'm sorry, I can't see it. If someone can see the comment and can read it out.

NOBU NISHIGATA: If you go up in the chat thread, then I mean, I can read the same thing, but one comment would be like it is kind of order of the world. I would say like a global national regional, the order is wrong. I would say like a global regional national or national regional global. Either will do to me. And the other one is one question. I'm asking somebody to clarify who we mean by ICANN stakeholder.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, I think what we were talking about was the ASO, the ccNSO. And that's what I remember for the discussion. I don't know if there are other stakeholders, but those are at least the ones that were mentioned.

NOBU NISHIGATA: Okay. Yeah, yeah. The point is like, if you mean by the, you mean the ICANN stakeholder is ASO, then I'm not really sure how the ASO can help the government or some regional body to accelerate the deployment of the IPv6. I mean, of course there could be more different type of the

stakeholders, like for example, IETF people. I mean, of course the technician can be regarded as ICANN stakeholder as well, but I'm not really sure what you mean by ICANN stakeholder. So, that's my question. Thank you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, is that a satisfactory response to your question? And I take note of the national region and I think we should correct the order. So, maybe go global, regional or the other way around. Thank you. So, I have Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I think I suggested the second line with relevant ICANN constituencies. Relevant ICANN constituencies. And then I asked, do we need and? We don't need and.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: So, Iran, if I understand correctly, you want to change stakeholders to constituencies?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. because the stakeholders have a broad meaning. But what you said or someone said that the issue is ASO and possibly ccNSO and so on and so forth. So, it's not the entire stakeholder. Is it relevant ICANN constituencies? Yeah. If you want to give examples, e. g. ASO and so on and so forth. But it's very broad ICANN stakeholders. Because ICANN stakeholders is private sectors. ICANN stakeholders is non-governmental, is many things. But we are talking of constituency which

are relevant. And we thought that perhaps the most relevant one is ASO and sometimes some other constituencies. But I'm asking, do we need the word and? Thank you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you. I will hand back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Egypt. So, let me read it again for the sake of clarity. So, it would read, the GAC recognises the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and looks forward to continuing discussing with relevant ICANN constituencies at a global, regional and national levels, any policy options to incentivize and to expedite the adoption of IPv6. I have Australia.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Chair. I'm largely comfortable with this. Just a minor suggestion to improve the readability of the sentence to potentially move the portion from any policy options onwards to after discussing. I think that will help with the flow of this sentence a little better.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Australia. So, let me read it again. The GAC recognises the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and looks forward to continuing discussing any policy options to incentivize and to expedite the adoption of IPv6 with relevant ICANN constituencies at a global, regional and national levels. Is that an old hand, Australia?

Okay. So, thank you. So, there we go. Any reaction? Are we okay with the text as it is? Egypt, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry, I'm a bit confused. Are we leaving the end or deleting it? Because I think we need it, especially after we said constituencies rather than stakeholders.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: And I agree with you, but let's see if there are any other comments. Thank you for that, Egypt. Any other reaction? I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see-- I'm sorry, USA, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. And just to note that I do share the kind of the concerns of or would like to support the previous intervention from Australia, because I'm wondering, I think the GAC can certainly engage with ICANN constituencies, but the GAC as a body in and of itself does not engage with constituencies or stakeholders at national levels. The GAC doesn't engage at the regional level. Rather, GAC members certainly can engage at the national level or at the regional level. But I just would invite further wordsmithing to recognize that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, USA. As a matter of fact, you're right. I was thinking more about kind of like ISOC chapters and those kinds of things, but I

don't know. You have a point. You have a point there. Brazil, please go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA:

Perhaps there's, I don't know if there's ambiguity in the text. It depends on whether you think the end at global, regional and national levels refer to the adoption itself or the process of engaging with those constituencies. So, I don't know if just a comma instead of the end wouldn't be sufficient with relevant ICANN constituencies comma at global, regional and national levels, because you can understand that you continue to discuss any policy options with the relevant ICANN constituencies to incentivize and expedite the adoption at global, regional and national level. Not necessarily saying that we are having this kind of conversation with national entities or representatives or something. I think there's certain ambiguity there in the text in that regard.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Brazil. There was a suggestion from Australia as well, stating that maybe we should stop right after constituencies, like full stop after constituencies. I don't know. So, let's read from the beginning. So, it would say, the GAC recognizes the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and looks forward to continuing discussing any policy options to incentivize and to expedite the adoption of IPv6 with relevant constituencies. Full stop. That's Australia's proposal. Are we okay with it? And I see some nodding in the room. Thumbs up. I see thumbs up. More thumbs up. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, sir. Still, I have a problem. The discussion with the ICANN constituency, the relevant ICANN should be after discussion. Discussing with relevant ICANN constituencies for different options and so on and so forth. So, I have difficulty to bring this relevant ICANN constituency and so on. So, I have no problem to delete at the regional, global and so on and so forth. But I still have a problem. Where we put these discussions? Before adoption? After adoption? So, I think this discussion with relevant ICANN constituency should be together.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, would you propose, Iran, would you propose any specific text at this point?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. I say discussing with relevant ICANN constituency, different policies and so on and so forth.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. So, let me read it again. So, the GAC recognizes the need for accelerated deployment of the IPv6 protocol and looks forward to continuing discussing with relevant ICANN constituencies any policy options to incentivize and to expedite the adoption of IPv6. Are we okay? Can we leave with this text? Any strong feelings? Any other suggestions? Australia, would you be okay with this wording?

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Chair. I think it's a little grammatically awkward, but I'm comfortable with the essence of the sentence. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Australia. So, I see some traction here. So, no other hand up. I see no hands. Oh, I see a hand over there. Argentina, please go ahead.

LUCIANO MAZZA: Thank you, Chair. Well, in order to avoid the repetition of IPv6, maybe we could say it's just a detail of wording and to expedite its adoption. I don't know what are your views on this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Argentina. As a matter of fact, I was going to mention exactly the same thing. Thank you very much for that. But again, I don't have any strong feelings. I'm perfectly okay with your suggestion. I don't know if there's any opposition at this point. Iran, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Chairman, it's not opposition. One ministry for the affairs of a big country mentioned this is constructive repetitions. So, I prefer to repeat IPv6, not it. I'm not opposing to distinguish friend from Argentina, but this repetition is constructive and brings clarity. So, I suggest that we maintain IPv6. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran. Argentina, would you be okay with it?

LUCIANO MAZZA: Yes, it was just a suggestion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Argentina. So, any other hand? Are we okay with the text as it is? I don't want to read it again, please. Please don't tell me to read it again. Because, you know, I'll have nightmares with this paragraph. Okay. So, again, for the sake of time, we have exactly one minute. Any final word, any final comment, anything you would like to mention at this point? Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Maybe I can speak of the menu for tomorrow.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And maybe if we just for everybody's awareness, it looks like we've covered the entirety of the advice portion of the communiqué. We've covered all the issues of importance. I don't see any. No, we just have a few things to look at from a clerical standpoint. And so, for tomorrow, we'd have internal matters with reports from the working groups, and GAC operational matters with three themes, strategic planning, high-

level government meeting preparation, and GAC open microphone session. So, that's our menu for tomorrow morning.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Fabien. So, I'm very happy that we're finished. I'm sorry, Rwanda, go ahead.

CHARLES GAHUNGU: Yeah, sorry, I may have missed something. I'm not sure.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Can you speak closer to the microphone, please?

CHARLES GAHUNGU: Yes. I may have missed something on this, on the communiqué. There any part mentioned about like the next ICANN80 or with HLG?M?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Yeah. We'll deal with that tomorrow, Charles, if you don't mind. We're absolutely out of time. Any other thing you would like to add, Benedetta, Fabien? Voila. There we are. Thank you so very much. Get some rest. We'll reconvene tomorrow at 9 a.m. in the morning. We'll be dealing with the last, hopefully the last two communiqué sessions. Thank you so much. The session is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]