
ICANN80 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 5)
Thursday, June 13, 2024 - 9:00 to 10:15 KGL

GULTEN TEPE:

Hello and welcome to the ICANN 80 GAC communique drafting session on Thursday the 13th of June at 7:00 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 the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation and 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 leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Thank you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Gulten. Welcome, everyone, again. This is our last day of sessions. We have made good progress so far regarding the communique drafting. So if everything goes well, we might even (and I'm crossing my fingers) be able to finish by noon.

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.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: On time. Just say “on time.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Or on time at least. So welcome again, everyone. Please take your seats. We're ready to start. And so we'll be starting, Fabien (correct me if I'm wrong) directly in section number five, if I'm not mistaken. Right?—section number five, which is GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board.

Before we start, is there anything any distinguished GAC colleague wants to raise at this point? Anything you would like to comment on before we start? Are we okay to begin with the drafting?

No hands in the room, no hands online. That means that we're okay to go. So we'll be starting with topic number two, which is private. resolution of contention sets.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Proposed by the UK.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Proposed by the UK, by the way. And for this, I will have the invaluable help of my very esteemed vice-chair, Christine Arida from Egypt. Over to you, Christine.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you Nico, and good morning, everyone. Okay, and I will try to read slowly. So, number two reads, “Private resolution of contention

sets. So A) the GAC advises the Board, one, that in their consideration of the way forward in resolving contention sets, the Board urgently instigates a focused cross-community-wide discussion, including with GAC and ALAC. The discussion would, inter alia, identify alternatives to private auctions of last resort, which would be prohibited for the next gTLD application round.”

And the rationale reads, “The GAC notes the Board resolution of the 8 June 2024, as well as the update provided by the Board on its current thinking about resolution of contention sets in relation with the GAC consensus advice on the matter from ICANN 77 to take steps to avoid the use of auctions of last resort in contentions between commercial and non-commercial applications. Alternative means for the resolution of such contention sets, such as drawing lots, may be explored.”

“The GAC particularly notes that according to set Board resolution, the Board intends to take an action that is potentially inconsistent with GAC consensus advice. (Item 4.a.i) in the Washington, DC communique concerning auctions. In this regard, and with a view to identify alternative means to resolve contention sets between applications, the GAC advises that, before taking a decision and engaging in a potential bylaws-mandated process with the GAC, the Board initiates a focused, community-wide discussion, including ALAC, GAC and other parts of the community, in order to identify possible ways forward consistent with the GAC consensus advice that would address alternatives to the use of auctions of last resort in contention sets, which would be prohibited for the next gTLD application round.”

And I will pause here. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Egypt. So there you go. There you have (can you scroll up a little bit, please?) the advice and the rationale. Any immediate reactions? Any comments, anything you would like to add at this point?

And I see a hand from the UK. Please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning to everyone on our Thursday, the last day. So this is largely taken from the excellent text which we had in the issues of importance, and it just elevates it to GAC advice. So essentially it is new advice because it's slightly different from the advice that we gave before on contention sets and the need to differentiate between commercial and non-commercial applications. And the advice follows on from the discussions that we had with the Board, the discussions we had with the ALAC and other parties.

You'll recall, particularly in discussions with the ALAC, we focused on the potential way forward in terms of how this area or this issue, which is one of the so-called outstanding issues between, to resolve ahead of the publication of the guidebook at the end of next year or before the end of next year. And because this is one of the outstanding issues to resolve, there's a time impetus here because certainly the intention of the Board, the intention of ICANN Org, the intention of the GNSO is that these outstanding issues are fundamentally resolved before the Istanbul meeting in November.

So that's why we thought it was important to (or some of us thought it was important to) be very clear in what we want to see in this regard, this cross-community working group that will be established to find an acceptable way forward that wouldn't include the use of these private auctions that we talked about before. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, UK. I have India next. India, please. Go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL: Thanks, Chair. I think just a small editorial thing. And should it be “instigate” or “initiates”? I think we request the Board to urgently initiate. I think “instigate” is a bit of negative word.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, India. Well noted. [Dom], any other things you would like to add?

Okay, thank you anyways. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico, and good morning, everyone. So thanks very much to Nigel for this draft text. I'm still trying to digest it completely, and I feel at least that at first sight there is a bit of conflation between the two elements of our Washington consensus advice. So we have to remember that that had two elements. The first element is about disincentivizing. That's a difficult word. And private auctions take steps. I don't remember the exact wording, but we could look it up.

So on private auctions, it's to ban or strongly disincentivize private monetary means of resolution of contention sets, including private auctions. So that's one element. And on that element, we have heard from the Board that basically they agree in trying to do something about it.

The element where there is apparently an intention to disagree from the Board is the first element, the Romans 1, from ICANN 77, which was to take steps to avoid the use of auctions of last resort, which are different to private auctions because auctions of last resort are those organized by ICANN itself. And in that advice piece from Washington, we were really asking the Board to avoid the use of such ICANN auctions to simplify in contentions between commercial and non-commercial applications.

So if we want to react really on the substance of the Board resolution past five days ago, we would really need to be specific that we are referring here to the auctions of last resort, the ICANN auctions of last resort. Or either the alternative is that we deal again with both issues, but we have to be very specific, very clear.

So I would suggest that in the title of the advice, we use the same language as in the Washington advice. And Fabien will surely pick it up: “Auctions mechanisms of last resort/private resolution of contention sets in new gTLDs.”

And then in the device itself, in miniscule roman 1, it should be something like “In their consideration of the way forward in resolving contention sets, the Board urgently”—and on “instigates,” I'm flexible—

"initiates a focused cross-community-wide discussion, including GAC and ALAC."

And it's really in the second sentence where we have this reference to private auctions of last resort, where we are conflating the two concepts. And we should talk about alternatives to auctions of last resort.

I'm sorry, because I'm digesting the matter as I speak, and I could imagine if we want to talk again about private auctions, that we could do second Roman and include there a text in the sense of that they're asking for urgent feedback from the Board on where they stand on the specific issue of private auctions. But there I'm not so sure because I haven't read the report that the Board has published recently in detail.

So I'll leave it at that, and I hope this is helpful for the moment. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Switzerland. No need to apologize. On the contrary, we greatly appreciate your input. Certainly it's something to take into account. We should try to avoid any kind of confusing message, anything that might cause confusion or difficulty for the Board to understand. So again, thank you, Switzerland.

Before I give the floor to China UK, do you have any immediate reactions to Switzerland's suggestions?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I agree. The language has to be precise. And there were elements in our advice before ... There were two distinct elements. I think what we were trying to pick up here ... So we would just need to reflect whether the language that says ... “which would be prohibited” probably needs, in the way it's now phrased, to come out, and we need to perhaps reflect in A ii or wherever. We're not trying to prohibit all alternatives to auctions of last resort. There might be some alternatives which work. What we're trying to prohibit, as we said before, where we said “prohibit” or “disincentivize,” is private auctions where, as we discussed yesterday, money is put on the table by the competing parties, and then the person that puts the most money on the table wins that private auction, and the others are compensated. So it's that particular type of auction which was the subject of our discussion with the ALAC yesterday.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, UK. [“]Does the ICANN 77 communique[”]... Just in case you have it on the screen ... Just for your reference. So any specific changes you might want to make at this point, UK, or you're okay with the text as it is?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, I think there will need to be a couple of changes, but perhaps we ought to listen to other reflections and then we can try and make it clearer for the next read through.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you very much, UK. Okay, I have China next. Sorry to keep you waiting, but these were important details we needed to deal with. Go ahead, please, China.

WANG LANG: Oh, thank you, Nico. Just a little literal suggestion of the sentence, the last sentence of our advice, which would be prohibited for the next gTLD application round. I was wondering if there is necessity to add the word “new” before “gTLD” to distinguish from the traditional one: “next new gTLD application round.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, thank you very much, China, for the suggestion. It's already been included, so thank you again.

Any other edit? Comments?

I don't see any hand in the room. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So just a consideration in terms of formatting. Usually we try to formulate an advice starting with an action; so “The GAC advises the Board to.” And so we would suggest to consider rephrasing the first sentence so that it would read, “The GAC advises the Board to urgently initiate a focused cross-community discussion,” and then we’d possibly move the first part of the sentence to after that action. So just a formatting suggestion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: That would totally make sense. It's up to you, UK. Do you prefer we move so that we can give you time to work out the—

NIGEL HICKSON: I think that's the best thing. But I mean, perhaps, yeah, we can look at the text on the Zoom/Google document and make sure it's right there and then we can come back to this if that's okay with you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Sure, sure. Of course. So let's park this if everybody agrees, and then we'll come back to it after we deal with the other sections, so that in the meantime, the UK has time to fine-tune the wording. Would that be okay to everyone?

And I see nodding in there. Anybody against? I see no hands up. Okay, good to move on. Back to you, Fabien, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So then we're going to move to follow-up on previous advice and consider new text that was proposed on urgent requests by the European Commission, India, the UK, and the US.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Fabien, and for the reading, again, I'm going to have the very valuable help of my vice-chair, Christine Arida.

CHRISTINE ARIDA:

Thank you, Nico. So, number two reads: “Urgent requests. The GAC takes note of the letter sent by the Board to the GNSO Council concerning the dialogue with GNSO Council on EPDP phase one recommendation 18[:] urgent requests. The GAC appreciates the acknowledgement from the Board that the proposed timeline, whether one, two, or three business days, does not appear to be fit for purpose and that a much shorter response timeline (that is minutes or hours rather than days) would seem to be more appropriate for situations that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily harm, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation. The GAC appreciates that, absent authentication and validation, it may be difficult for registrars to determine whether requests are who they claim to be. It is the GAC’s understanding that the GNSO needs to provide input on the next steps, building on the Board’s conclusion that the proposed urgent response policy is not fit for purpose and must be revisited.”

“The GAC urges the GNSO Council and the Board to take any necessary steps in an expeditious manner to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on urgent requests for domain name registration data, given the vital public safety interests related to such requests, as per the San Juan GAC advice. Appreciating that input from law enforcement authorities will be needed to address some of the Board’s concerns, the GAC stands ready to contribute to the work of the GNSO in relation to possible solutions for authentication of requesters via the work of the Public Safety Working Group PSWG, which has already started.”

“The GAC highlights, however, that discussions on the authentication of law enforcement agency requesters and on the response time for urgent requests should proceed in parallel and commence before ICANN 81 to address the issue of urgent requests as soon as possible.”

Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much. At the end of the first ... Just a little edit here: “requesters.” At the end of the first paragraph I think I heard “requests,” but just in case, the word was “requesters.” I just wanted to correct that for the record. So thank you again. Egypt.

Let me open the floor here for comments, questions, edits.

So everybody seems to be all right. I don't see any hands in the room. Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And this is just to highlight that we've edited the title of this subsection: “Urgent request for disclosure of registration data.” This is just for clarity and consistent with the title that we had used in the ICANN 79 communique.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that. Fabien. Any other comment, thoughts, questions?

I don't see any hand in the chat room. I see no hands in—oh, I have Benedetta Rossi. Please go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: On the last line of the first paragraph (“The GAC appreciates that, absent authentication and validation, it may be difficult for registrars to determine whether requestors are who they claim to be”) I don't know that that sentence is reading correctly. Should it be “that, in the absence”? I don't know. It doesn't read correctly to me: “that, absent authentic, it may be difficult.” “ in the absence” ... I don't know. “in the absence of authentication and validation.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Benedetta. Is that okay with everyone? We're entering the Shakespearean field now.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: [inaudible]

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much. Is that an old hand? Okay. Any other edit?

Okay, so thank you so much. We're okay to move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I believe we have received text on a number of issues of importance. So if we go back to section four of the communique, we can maybe go from the top on the high-level government meeting. We understand that there's text in preparation that may be coming later in complement to what was moved into the introduction of the communique.

On section five, DNS abuse, we've received text from the topic leads, which we've added here. And then we have text on a number of registration-data-related issues.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So let me read then DNS abuse—sorry?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And I'll just note in this section that we also have text that was discussed yesterday, which was proposed by India on WHOIS accuracy in DNSSEC. So it wasn't exactly clear where it should be located. It was put under DNS abuse. So I'm just reminding us of the fact that there are two sections of text in this DNS abuse subsection. There's the two top paragraphs provided by the GAC topic leads on DNS reviews and then text that had been proposed by India yesterday. Just for clarity.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, so I'll read. I'll read both pieces of text and then we will need to decide if we combine them or if we use either one. So here we go. “DNS abuse. The GAC welcomed a session focused on DNS abuse issues and trends in Africa. Speakers representing regulatory agencies and ccTLD operators in the Africa region share the view that given the growth of the number of domains in the region, DNS abuse will likely become a growing challenge and priority. Speakers shared different examples of phishing cases in the financial sector. One speaker noted that the recent DNS abuse contract amendments at ICANN for gTLD registries and registrars will likely have a positive impact on mitigating DNS abuse in

the region. Speakers in the session also urged further collaboration across the African region to address DNS abuse, including among ccTLD operators.”

“GAC welcomes such learning opportunities from regions on good practices to prevent/mitigate DNS abuse at future ICANN meetings. The GAC looks forward to continuing discussions on DNS abuse before and during ICANN 81, where it expects to receive updates from ICANN Compliance on the implementation of contract amendments, and from SSAC on name collisions and its impact on the next round gTLD, as well as on advances in DNS abuse mitigation.”

I'll pause here before I read the other proposed text in order to see if we have comments or edits or anything you would like to add at this point.

And I see Australia. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON:

Good morning, Nico. I just had a comment about the WHOIS accuracy piece. I didn't have any comments on the sections you just read. Minor suggestion. Scrolling down, I can see WHOIS accuracy. I can also see a section later down on registration data accuracy. I thought there might be some value in merging those two sections, so perhaps there might be some sense in picking that paragraph up on WHOIS accuracy and moving it down to the registration data accuracy section, and then we can look at trying merging those two pieces together in the interest of simplifying this broader section.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, thank you so much for that, Australia.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So then we so we've moved, as suggested by Australia, the WHOIS accuracy text that had been proposed by India in the DNS abuse section. We moved it from here to the new section that's proposed on WHOIS accuracy. And so that leaves us with a paragraph on DNSSEC that had been suggested again by India that is located in this DNS abuse subsection.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay, thank you for that, Fabien. Thank you, Australia. Is that an old hand? All right. All right.

So let me read then, the DNSSEC text proposed by India. “GAC understands the importance of choice regarding DNSSEC for individual registrants. However, the use of DNSSEC by organizations, both financial and non-financial, should not be undermined as the content on said websites are accessed by various users, trusting its legitimacy. Therefore, GAC is of the view that ICANN Board should deliberate on the potential for making DNSSEC mandatory for organizations.”

And I'll stop there in order to see if we have reactions. I have the USA. Susan, please.

SUSAN ANTHONY: Thank you, Chair. If I recall correctly, we had an exchange with the Board on DNSSEC, and it was not in the context of DNS abuse. And as

we know, on DNS abuse, the work that we're focused on right now is focused on implementation of the contract obligations that pertain to proactive solutions for registries and registrars to disrupt or mitigate phishing, pharming, malware, botnets, and spam.

So that's not to say that at the broad level, DNSSEC is not an important topic, but for that reason, we might suggest that DNSSEC have a separate section altogether as an issue of importance.

As regarding the content proposed, it seems to seek to capture a problem that is much broader than ICANNs remit. With some of the issues that we deal with in terms of standards and security of the DNS, there is a point where ICANN's authority ends and the rest of the Internet's (Internet service providers, individual registrants, etcetera) begins. And it does not seem that the text suggested is fits within ICANNs remit.

That being said, we really acknowledge the importance of DNSSEC adoption. I know that's being dealt with at the national level through the encouragement of different policies, standards, and procurement policies. So we think it would be appropriate to make mention of the importance of DNSSEC adoption. But perhaps so that we're presenting texts that can really be actionable within a communique, they can focus on capacity-building and encouragement of adoption of DNSSEC instead. And perhaps ICANN can play a role in that regard. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, USA. India, before I give the floor to the Netherlands, anything you would like to say in that regard?

SUSHIL PAL:

Yeah. Thank you, Chair. We are okay with Australia's proposal of moving the threats to the other part of the communique. In regard to this aspect, I think, just before this, if you follow up, throughout the discussion on the DNS security or DNS abuse, this is one of the most important aspects. And I'm not very sure whether this is within the remit of ICANN or not. I mean, it is obvious that the various countries or the nations within their own sphere will take necessary actions. But the issue is whether every country is aware that that DNSSEC needs to be deployed for at least organizations and financial and the non-financial institutions. That is the primary issue.

I'm not asking that ICANN makes it mandatory. Maybe what we're requesting is that ICANN vote to at least to deliberate upon this. They can come out with some kind of a best practice so that it's right in the front of the various countries' Internet governance bodies [inaudible]. Making DNSSEC mandatory would definitely help them, at least for the organizations. I'm not suggesting this for the individuals at all. I think it's purely for the organizations which various citizens access, believing it to be true. And these can be banks, these can be non-governmental organizations, these can be philanthropic organizations. And, many a times, the citizens are taken for a ride and make contributions or subscriptions which they are not aware of.

So on the question of what Susan has been raising for the remit of it, I'm not saying that ICANN makes it mandatory, but definitely ICANN should take some action to bring it on the forefront, differentiating that DNSSEC is preferred to [be made] mandatory, at least for the

organizations which are accessed by those websites which are accepted by the public and not for the individuals.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, India. So in the meantime, would you agree to fine-tune the text so that we can include it anywhere we decide to finally include it?

SUSHIL PAL: The text is not to say that ICANN makes it mandatory. I think they should deliberate upon this, and if the ICANN Board deliberates, they can come out with action, whether it's required to make it mandatory or not. But the text still doesn't say that ICANN makes it mandatory. I mean, it says “deliberate on the potential for making it.” So that is enough. There's enough room. I mean, it's no way suggesting that you make it mandatory.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Okay. Thank you, India. I have the Netherlands and then Pakistan. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. I agree with, well, most of the comments made by the US and India. DNSSEC is a really important topic. I do have a bit of issue with the current text, but as I understood my in your colleague correctly, he's not insisting on making it mandatory. I do see a bit of problems because technically the only

one that can enable DNSSEC will be the registrant, and they are mostly out of reach of ICANN.

But to make matters short, I have an alternative text that I would like to propose that is slightly more generic. If I hit the button now, it should show up in the comments section, but also I'm happy to read it out loud here if I can find it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: So as an alternative, "GAC understands the importance of choice regarding the application of DNSSEC for individual registrants. However, we encourage all registrants to enable it, especially those who operate important or critical services. To this means we ask ICANN Board to consider how registries and registrants can be involved in ensuring that everybody can enable DNSSEC for their domain name registrations."

I think with that we have something that is actionable, like the US suggested, but also very generic, because I also find it hard to understand how ICANN distinguish between particular registrants.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so very much for that, Netherlands. So it would be a matter of reaching some sort of agreement between the text India proposed

and the new text proposed by the Netherlands. So thank you again. I have Pakistan next.

ZAKIR SYED:

Thank you, Chair. We do not disagree with this topic of DNSSEC being here, per se, because this is a topic of importance when it comes to the security and stability of the DNS systems. And as Susan pointed out, it would be sort of beyond the scope of ICANN to make it mandatory for the registries to be DNSSEC-enabled, particularly in the case of ccTLD registries, because it's completely beyond their scope.

So making DNSSEC mandatory for organizations would fall within the remit of local policies, domestic policies, and regulations. Only those countries can enforce it and make it mandatory.

And as our colleagues from India agreed, we want the ICANN Board to continue to deliberate, so maybe we can slightly modify the last sentence of this paragraph by saying not, “Therefore, GAC is of the view that ICANN Board should deliberate on the potential for making DNSSEC mandatory,” but we should say something like, “ICANN Board should continue to deliberate on the adoption of DNSSEC, both at the gTLD and ccTLD- registries level—

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Can you repeat that but a little bit slower, please, so that we give him time to write it down?

ZAKIR SYED:

[“]So the view that ICANN Board should continue to deliberate on the adoption of DNSSEC[“]. So in the case of ccTLDs, it would be maybe

reaching out to ccNSO, and even the GAC reps can reach out to the registries back home and make it sort of mandatory at that level. But saying that ICANN Board should make it mandatory would be beyond the scope of ICANN. So thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that Pakistan. I have India and then the Netherlands. India, please.

SUSHIL PAL: Thank you, Chair. I think, as I said, I mean, the text by Netherlands seems fine, but just in the last line, it gives an impression as if we are treating all the domains at the same level. And that is what we want to differentiate. I mean, we want a greater cognizance of the fact that DNSSEC needs definitely a higher priority or a higher treatment when it comes to organization, or the deployment of DNSSEC needs a more higher priority when it comes to deployment of DNSSEC for the organizations as compared to when it is it relates to the individuals. I mean, if that aspect is brought out, I think we are okay, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. India. Pakistan, is that an old hand? Okay, so I have Netherlands and then Japan.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you. Somebody already pointed me out that I made a small typo. It should be “registries and registrars.” The text currently says

“registrar,” but that's a small typo to the intervention of my Indian colleague. I fully understand and I hear his problems. There are certain sites where you would rather want to have DNSSEC enabled. My problem is that it's ... And sorry for going a bit more into the technical thing, but when a domain name is registered, even as a registrar or a registry, I have no idea what this will be used for. I cannot assess the situation. The only one who can do that is to registrant, who knows why he's organizing that domain name.

So in line with the earlier intervention of Pakistan, I think that's really up to local and national authorities to determine what is critical or what is not. I do acknowledge the fact that there are distinctions between websites, but I hope that in my first sentence, where I say “especially those who open important and critical services” gives some entry point. And I hope this will satisfy our Indian colleague in making the distinction on who or who should not.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. I have Japan and then the US. Japan, please?

NOBUHISA NISHIGATA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. And maybe I have a couple questions for both India, and thank you for the alternate the proposal from Netherlands. And maybe let me start by the question to India. In the paragraph say that the later part after the “Therefore the GAC is of the view that ICANN Board should continue to deliver,” blah, blah, blah, I'm not really sure that we are ... I mean, the GAC is of this view at this moment. Particularly hearing from my colleagues, Susan said that

maybe these DNSSEC issues (some of them at least) are out of the I can remit. So I'm not really sure we can take this view as a whole GAC. So then I'm not very clear yet. So in that sense, until the discussion is solved, then the Japan cannot support this text, particularly after the "Therefore."

Then the same type of the question goes to the Netherlands. I'm not really sure the consequence that if GAC asked the Board to consider the things, like how the registries and register can be involved in the natural DNSSEC adoption, those kind of things. So if we are not sure of the consequence of our request to the Board, then we shouldn't request to the Board to do things. So then I need to be clear of the consequence of our request from the GAC for the Netherlands. But I don't have the answer for myself, so I appreciate that some other colleagues can help me.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, Japan Indeed, just so that we're all on the same page, nobody is against DNSSEC. I guess we're all in favor, 300% in favor, of DNSEC. Just, just to be clear. The thing is how to implement it within ICANN's remit. That's the key point, I guess. But I'm just, I'm just the GAC Chair.

So I have ... Is that an all here in Japan? Oh, all right. So I have the US. Please go ahead.

SUSAN ANTHONY:

Thank you, Chair. Having listened to this excellent discussion, which I found to be very productive and very valuable, a few thoughts have come to mind that I'd like to share. I think that when we talk about ICANN's remit and we talk about asking the Board to do or not do things that pertains to ICANN's remit and what the GAC can ask of the Board, as my colleague from Pakistan noted, DNSSEC, generally speaking, it does pertain to the security, stability and resilience of the domain name system. Listening to the comments from my colleague from India, I think what seems to be of the greatest import is that the GAC recognizes and acknowledges that the broad adoption of DNSSEC is important.

So perhaps to weave all of these together, and just in light of the comments from my colleague from Japan, it could be possible to add a sentence to the proposal from the Netherlands, which could be in addition to, or in place of, the last sentence, which is a statement by the GAC to the broader community that it is important that all parties work together to promote the adoption of DNSSEC. This way, the statement is a general statement. It could also be useful to acknowledge the role of local and national bodies to promote DNSSEC development, since there really is a role there.

So that would be my suggestion to try and weave all this together. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, US. So the sentence would read, "The GAC emphasizes" ... And again, we'll have a discussion here about "emphasizes" with S or with Z. Nigel, I don't know what you think about that, but anyways, "it's

important for all parties to work together”—maybe, right?—"to promote the adoption of DNSSEC.”

And I have Netherlands, Australia and India. Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Thank you for the US for suggesting this alternative. I'm happy to accept that as an alternative. By no means am I fully attached to asking the Board. So I think this is a reasonable alternative.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Netherlands. Australia?

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Chair. Just listening to Japan's intervention, I think I'd support the US's alternate text here. I'm not sure we're quite at the stage where we'd like to ask the Board to consider anything, particularly considering we as a collective haven't really discussed this depth. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I have an important question for you, though, Australia. Do you think we should use S or Z there?

IAN SHELDON: It's the king's English. It's S, very clearly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Thank you so much for that. I have India and then Switzerland.

SUSHIL PAL: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for all the colleagues for making this contribution. Not very clear about the Japan's questions. I'm okay with the diluted text but we just cannot keep on emphasizing the importance of DNSSEC. We need to take more concrete actions and we feel that ICANN, being a body which is there [to] guide us on the Internet governance policy and, whenever it comes to any actionable item, we just cannot pull our hand back. At some point in time we need to take more concrete step forward rather than being only professorial or sermonizing things what should be done, what should not be done. And it's not for countries like us. It's more for the countries like those in Africa which are not even aware. But at least if some way, ICANN must treat the DNSSEC of individuals, registrant, and the organization separately because both these bear different risks to the citizen. So that's the point you want to I wanted to make.

And taking a lead from what my colleague from the Netherlands was saying (that that the registrar is actually not aware whether this domain name is for an individual or for organization), would it not be appropriate that when the registrants apply, there is some information to the registrar that it's for the organization or for the individual? I mean, should that not be a policy consideration for ICANN to look at going forward? These are the issues we want to raise, I think, in some point in time, because definitely the organizations have more liability. They are affecting users. The users are more at risk when they approach

the organizations rather than when they follow the individual size. I mean, the language part, I think, is okay, but I think maybe if it's okay with the chair and the house, we would like to insert maybe some country, or if you want to name the country of India, you can say that [both are of the view that] the DNSSEC enforcement or implementation for organizations need different treatment than the DNSSEC implementation for individual registrants. Thank you, Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, India. So if I understood correctly, you're okay with us moving the text to a different section? Did I understand correctly?

SUSHIL PAL: A different section meaning by a different section under DNS security?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Correct.

SUSHIL PAL: That's okay, I think. It would definitely fall within the larger DNS abuse. I'm of the view that it should be within the DNS abuse because that's one of the measures to contain or to check DNS abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you very much, India. Thank you very much. I have Switzerland. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, Nico. So thanks very much to my colleagues for the good exchange. I think if we take the alternative text proposed by the Netherlands as a basis, I feel that we could be a bit more ambitious in the last sentence. And instead of such a general reference to the importance of working together, etcetera, we could get a little bit more specific, more operational, a little bit in the sense of what Ian is mentioning in the chat.

And this goes in the direction that we have many players in this ICANN community that are contributing in very different manners to the promotion of the adoption of DNSSEC. And what I feel is a low-hanging fruit is really to invite the community to dedicate some space, some time, to discuss these issues and to sit together and listen to each other exchange on how different ccTLDs or gTLDs or other actors go about. For instance, in Switzerland, we are applying at the level of the ccTLD financial incentives for promoting the adoption of DNSSEC. And it's working quite well and it's something that we would be happy to share with other colleagues.

So maybe in this sense, and if this makes sense for colleagues, we could have a sentence in the direction that “The GAC invites participants in the ICANN community to exchange on good practices and approaches to promote the adoption of DNSSEC.” And maybe we can pick this up for the agenda planning of ICANN 81 or ICANN 82 and have some cross-community session or similar to discuss this. Hope this is helpful. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Switzerland. As a matter of fact, I was going to ask Trinidad and Tobago. Is Karel in the room? Trinia and Tobago? Underserved Region's Working Group? Any representative?

Not in the room. Too bad. Well, anyways, that would be an excellent suggestion, Switzerland: to have that included. As a matter of fact, I think it is part of the capacity-building program, if I'm not mistaken. And I'm sorry I wasn't there because I was sick, so I couldn't participate last Tuesday. Was it last Tuesday? But certainly it's something that we can perfectly include for the capacity-building sessions for ICANN 81.

I would also suggest we include manners and Kind DNS and some other topics. But anyways, for the time being ... Sorry. CTU, please go ahead. And then I have India.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you, Chair. Morning, folks. I had just put up my hand to see what I could take a message on for the chair of the Underserved Regions Working Group on the matter. So I'll take a note and pass it on. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for that, Nigel. I have India. Oh, sorry. That was an old hand, India. Sorry about that.

So let's try to wrap up this part of the text. I'm a little bit confused. We have two proposals here. We have the text proposed by India on top. And then right underneath we have the alternative text proposed by the Netherlands. What should we do? The floor is open. US, please go ahead.

SUSAN ANTHONY: Thank you, Chair. The United States proposes the following: that we create a new section dedicated to DNSSEC which could follow the DNS abuse section. The title of this Issues of Importance section would be DNSSEC. And we propose to accept the alternative text proposed by Netherlands with the additions of the United States and Switzerland. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, USA. Anybody against? Any strong feelings, comments, thoughts, questions, edit? India, please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL: Thank you, Chair. I think we are okay with the proposal for creating a separate section which follows the DNS abuse. We okay with that. And somehow the alternate text is more moderated. It's pretty generic, but then, it only say it says what we're already doing. There's no additional thing. There is no new action we are kind of trying to [straighten out] or we trying to come out with. It's just a repetition of whatever is being done.

Just a thought, but can we have some language as to, as we said ... The importance of DNSSEC for the organizations ... I agree with my Netherlands colleague that it's not possible for the registrar to differentiate. But then this conversation needs to come into place. The countries who are not very aware about the Internet governance need to be aware that there is a larger liability or there is a larger obligation

on the organizations to maintain the DNSSEC rather than on the individuals. If this idea can come in the alternative text, I think we are okay. If this idea can come in the alternative text, I think we are okay, but this idea somehow is not getting reflected in the alternative text. Maybe I would request my colleagues from US and Switzerland and the Netherlands if they can contribute because I'm sitting at the airport but I have to log off in a few minutes. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you India. Well noted. We'll ask the US, Netherlands and Switzerland if they can contribute with some additional text. For sure. I have Japan next.

NOBUHISHA NISHIGATA: Thank you. I was just looking at the chat pointing out that there is DNSSEC in our strategic planning. Then I was not sure how we can deal with or accommodate this discussion to our activities in the forthcoming. So that's my first question.

Then the other point is (maybe before I should say this before my Indian colleague has to leave for the airport) that, if we are going to be engaged in DNSSEC in the near future at an ICANN meeting then, I can support the alternate text by collaboration of the Netherlands, USA, the Switzerland, etcetera. Particularly the later part of the proposal from Switzerland is very nice to me, and Japan can support it. But before expressing the support officially from Japan, Japan would like to hear some commitment or proposal of what they are thinking from the distinguished Indian colleague on how they proceed on the promotion

of the DNSSEC issues to the whole ICANN community. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Nobu. India, would you like to say anything before you board your plane? Please go ahead.

T. SANTHOSH: Thank you, Chair. [inaudible].

NICOLAS CABALLERO: We can't hear you, Santhosh. Can you speak louder please?

T. SANTHOSH: Yeah. So what is happening basically is in order of not having DNSSEC implemented across the first level, second level, or at the any levels of domain, whenever an Internet user types a domain, it goes to some other sites and it leads to phishing, pharming, and whatever DNS abuse. That is why my superior [sir] has mentioned the importance of UNSECO. And this has been an issue for the past [30-odd] years. So this is a high [inaudible] actionable item has to be made [inaudible] ICANN along with IETF has raised those issues several times. Hence, we request the colleagues of the GAC to emphasize the importance of DNSSEC as ICANN [inaudible] to do the necessary action to include the organization, which are mostly [inaudible] [UNESCO]. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you very much for that, India. So what I could understand was that you want the whole GAC to emphasize the importance of DNSSEC. And I guess everybody agrees on that. Again, 200%. We all agree on that. I wish we could all enforce (I don't know how) for everyone to have DNSSEC implemented. And by the way, I would love to see manners, mutually agreed norms for routing security, also implemented in IPv6, and peace in the world, and so many other things. But unfortunately that's beyond the GAC and ICANN's remit. So in order to try to be more realistic, I guess we will go back to our esteemed colleagues of the US, Netherlands, and Switzerland in order to fine-tune the alternative text proposed by the Netherlands.

So let me read it again for the sake of time. We only have two more minutes. So if everybody agrees, I'll just read the alternative text and we'll take it from there. Would that be a good way forward? And I see nodding in the room, so I'll do just that. So the text would read, "The GAC understands the importance of choice regarding the application of DNSSEC for individual registrants. However, the GAC encourages all registrants to enable it, especially those who operate important or critical services."

And the last part is, "The GAC invites participants in the ICANN community to exchange on good practices and approaches to promote the adoption of DNSSEC." That's one possible sentence. And the other possibility is, "The GAC emphasizes that it is important for all parties to work together to promote the adoption of DNSSEC."

So there it is. Which one of the two last sentences should we include? Christine? Egypt, go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: I would suggest taking the first sentence. And I also think we should take out the word “however” in the second sentence. I don't think it makes sense to say “however,” because we are saying the same thing, not “however”. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Does everybody agree? Any objection? I have the Netherlands and then the CTU. Bear in mind, we're already out of time. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING: Happy with the deletion that Egypt just proposes. But I don't see the last two sentences particularly conflicting with each other. So I'm fine taking them both.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you Netherlands. That makes sense. Thank you so much for that. CTU?

RODNEY TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I agree that we can take both, but we can link them. “The GAC emphasizes it's important for all parties to work together to promote the adoption of DNSSEC and invites participants in the ICANN community to exchange,” blah, blah. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much, Netherlands and CTU. That would solve the problem, right? Combining both ideas. So let me just read the last part then, the last combined sentence, which would be, “The GAC emphasizes that it is important for all parties to work together to promote the adoption of the DNSSEC and invites participants in the ICANN community to exchange ongoing good practices and approaches to promote the adoption of the DNSSEC.”

Would that be good for everyone? And I see nodding. I'm so happy. So we'll leave it there.

There's no more time. I need to wrap up the session. We're already over time. Thank you so much for your participation. We'll have a short coffee break now for 30 minutes. Please be back in the room at 10:45. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]