
ICANN82 | CF – Joint Meeting: GAC and ALAC
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:00 PST

GULTEN TEPE

Hello, and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC meeting with ALAC session on Tuesday, 11th of March at 16:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put it in the proper form. Please remember to state your name and the language you'll speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. 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. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nigel Hickson, GAC Vice Chair. Thank you. Over to you, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON

Good morning. Well, I'm glad to see that the parties haven't affected anyone's-- I'm really a standing. I'm sure our chair will be with us in a second so we can play the games spot, Nico. Anyway, let me just welcome you to all this session and then Nico can take over. So yep, he's right there.

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.

So this is the GAC/ALAC session, just to make sure you are in the right session. And we've got a packed agenda involving discussions on the INFERMAL report, the GAC/ALAC priorities in the WSIS+20 context and Q&A and wrap up. So I'm sure there's a lot to discuss, so without hesitation, I will hand over to our chair, Nico Caballero.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I ask you to join us in a moment of silence.

NICO CABALLERO

All right. So welcome, everyone. Sorry, it's kind of difficult to have three jobs and only 24 hours in a day. Got stuck in a Zoom meeting with my capital back home. Apologies for being three minutes late. So let's get this show on the road. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Nico Caballero, and I'm more than thrilled to be here today.

And of course, welcome to our good friends from ALAC. We got a jam-packed agenda today, so let's jump right in first. First up, we'll have a quick hello and a bit of who's who from myself and the ALAC chair, my good friend, Jonathan Zuck. We'll try to keep it under five minutes, though. Let's be honest, we could probably talk about this all day, but we don't, I promise.

Then, we're diving headfirst into the INFERMAL report. Again, nothing to do with the translation, the hell translation in Spanish and Italian and Portuguese and so on. I know INFERMAL sounds like a particularly grumpy gobbling, I would say, but trust me, the

insights are far more enlightening, and hopefully less likely to steal your socks.

We'll have the authors give us a 20-minute rundown of the key takeaways, and I'm really looking forward to hearing what they've uncovered so far. So, following that, we're tackling the big one, which is GAC/ALAC priorities in the WSIS+20 context. And we have a very good team who will give us an update on that.

This is where we get to roll up our sleeves, so to say. And talk about multi-stakeholder governance, bridging the digital divide, building capacity, and most importantly, I would say, figuring out what to do next. So essentially, we're going to try and solve some of the world's problems in 30 minutes. No pressure, no pressure at all. And finally, we'll open the floor for a Q&A session.

This is your chance, as I always say to ask those burning questions, share your thoughts, and generally keep us on our toes. Our GAC/ALAC liaisons, Kristina Hakobyan and Joanna Kulesza will be on hand to moderate, and then we'll wrap up things with some concluding remarks. And again, my apologies, I got stuck in a phone call with my capital. With that, let's get started. Over to you, Jonathan. Welcome everyone, again.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Nico. It's great to be here. We always enjoy collaborating with the GAC because we're in the same positions on so many different issues. We're both looking to protect end users and enhance that experience, expand the number of people that are

engaged in the domain space, so we work together in the applicant support program and things like that. So there's a lot that we have in common.

And so we're always excited to be here. My job today is to talk a little bit about the INFERMAL report. You may not all be native speakers of English here in the GAC, but those of who you are, INFERMAL sounds a little bit like another word in English, actually, which is inferno. I wonder if it's a coincidence. The meaning of inferno varies depends on who you ask, there's a couple of definitions. The first is relating to, or characteristic of hell or the underworld, right?

Informally, it's irritating and tiresome used in emphasis. So we can sort of think of DNS abuse as the eternal infernal topic here at ICANN, right? I'm sure it's just a coincidence, but that's what I always think of when I think of INFERMAL. So this was a report that was commissioned by the Office of the CTO to look at the characteristics of registrars, sales, et cetera, that were more likely to lead to malicious registrations.

So when we're talking about DNS abuse, we talk about two different types. One is when the domain is registered for bad purposes in the first place, I'm registering this domain for the purpose of doing bad with it. The other is a compromised website wherein someone has managed to bypass the security of your website and install a farming page deep into your website, and that's the link that's in the phishing email that they go to, but otherwise, the site's operating normally.

So if you just go to the main page, it looks like a florist, but if you go to this deep link, it looks like it's your local bank, and that's a compromised domain. So this particular study was really focused on malicious registrations. What are the situations that are more or less likely to lead to malicious registrations? When we did the CCT review, the review of consumer competition choice and trust after the 2012 round, one of the things we saw was that a lot of DNS abuse ran over to the new gTLDs, sort of undermining some of the value of the GAC safeguards that had been recommended at the time in 2012.

And so, we already had conjecture about what some of these characteristics might be, and one of them was price, obviously. Some of these things are intuitive, is it price, if it's cheaper, will they go there? Well, of course. Well, now we actually have a study that kind of quantified the role that price plays in this. And also, it looked at other things like the use of APIs and bulk registrations in order to do sort of algorithmic generation so that if I want to get a domain that is called My Domain 001, My Domain 002, and get 10,000 of them.

There's also a high correlation there between that and the potential for malicious registration. So those were two big issues. The sort of API generated bulk registrations, pricing. And then there was a little bit also that there was a high correlation between the use of alternative currencies and malicious registrations. And some of these correlations were quite high. If you want to go to the next slide. One more. Thank you.

So, if you look at lower registration fees, each dollar reduction in registration fee corresponds to a 49% increase in malicious domains. Free services: the availability of free services such as web hosting drives and 88% surge in phishing activities. Discounts on domain registrations are often associated with a significant increase in malicious registrations.

On the flip side, the study also looked at sort of some best practices of registrars and the negative impact they had on malicious registrations. So the proactive measures such as stringent restrictions, implementing stringent restrictions can reduce abuse by 63%. And so a lot of this come from the GAC sort of suggesting that in highly regulated strings, for example, that there should be more restrictive access to those domains, and when you have that, there's less DNS abuse.

So friction decreases the number of malicious registrations. API access registers providing application, APIs led to a 400% rise in malicious domains. So that's a high correlation one might say. But also, verification practices, so proactive verification of registrant information such as an email or phone validation can significantly reduce malicious registrations. So they were looking at trends that led to more malicious registrations and best practices that would lead to less. Next slide, please.

Another thing they looked at was reactive measures. So, mitigation times, in other words, the speed with which after a report, a domain was taken down seemed to actually have a fairly low impact on malicious registrations. In other words, if a registrar had a rep for

taking domains down quickly, it didn't have a big impact on malicious registrations. And part of the problem with that is that you can accomplish so little in a fairly short period of time.

Once you put out a phishing email, you capture 10,000, even if it's shut down in a day, it's almost always done, its work. The concentration of abuse, malicious registrations are not uniformly distributed and tend to be concentrated in certain registrars and TLDs, again, because of the practices that we're talking about. Registrars offering lower prices and free services are more likely to attract malicious registrations. So it's also how they compete. So it's not an easy question. Next slide.

I think I have another slide. Do I, or is that it? That might be it. So those are sort of the basic findings of the document. And so, on cost, that's problematic because ICANN and the community that supports ICANN have repeatedly said that ICANN shouldn't be a price regulator.

And so that's a complicated problem. It also looks, though, in order to make the price high enough to really be a disincentive, it would have to be very high and would actually have a fairly dramatic effect on folks every day. Folks that wanted to register a domain, if you had to pay \$300 or something like that for a domain, which is the kind of number you would need to charge for it to really, truly have a real disincentive impact on it.

But what we do see is that those two areas, a little friction associated with bulk registrations. Now, there are perfectly legitimate uses for registering domains in bulk for special

purposes. Phone companies have done it and others as well. So nobody's trying to suggest that you should get rid of bulk registrations. It's more is there a balance that allows you to find a way to just slow down the process of registering a bulk perhaps through verification?

In other words, take a couple more fields and really verify their identity, verify their credit card, their phone number. Those kinds of things are all disincentives to those registration and malicious domains. And so, what I think we're interested in as the ALAC is maybe pursuing some a very, very narrowly focused conversation with the contracted party house on this issue of bulk registrations.

Because obviously, the topic of DNS abuse is eternal and infernal. But if we can really narrow it down and really talk about a very focused part of it, then we may come to some kind of an agreement with the contracted party house. And it won't be easy, it's not always easy for them. Even the amendments that were recently put in place in the registry and registrar contracts, we were all crossing our fingers that the contracted parties we don't see at ICANN meetings, enough of them would vote for those changes. And so it's something that they need to socialize. They need to you know, really strategize to get adopted across the Board.

And so, ideally some constructive conversations with the contracted party house about a very narrow focused area is where we think we might accomplish the most as the results from this study. So I'm happy to answer questions about it or get a conversation going. We'll probably meet with OCTO again about it

before Prague, and so we can get a lot of questions answered before we meet again. But obviously, anything we do, we hope we'll be back in this room attempting to partner with you to do it.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Jonathan. So the floor is open. Before we move on to the next discussion, which is GAC/ALAC priorities in the WSIS+20 context, I would like to open the floor, excuse me, to open the floor at this point for the discussion on the INFERMAL report. Questions, comments, thoughts in the room or online? I don't see any hand online. Any question or comment in the room? And I have Australia right there. Please go ahead.

INGRAM NIBLOCK

Hi, Ingram Niblock, Australia. I was just wondering what you personally or the ALAC think would be good next steps following this INFERMAL research?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Depending on the privacy of the room that I'm in, that answer changes. I think where we might end up is with a very, very narrowly scoped PDP to look at bulk registrations. But I think prior to that, informally, getting together with the Contracted Party House DNS Abuse Working Group and trying to see where the points of agreement are based on this report might be a way to start, because it won't get anywhere if we just start proposing it in

the GNSO. So I think the ultimate end goal is probably that, but the strategy to get there is probably less formal.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. I have Mrs. Hadia Elminiawi. I hope I'm pronouncing your last name. I'm sorry. Sebastien, I'm sorry.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you so much.

NICO CABALLERO

I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

So I raised my hand for two points. So as Jonathan pointed out that the report does show that bulk registrations are an issue, and so far, ICANN does not have a policy on bulk registrations. So would this mean like that the ICANN community can go ahead and start working on a policy that addresses bulk registrations? That's one point.

The other point is with regard to verification of data, and that also raises questions around the accuracy of the data. And again, this is an issue that the ALAC, the GAC, and many of the ICANN community have been speaking about. So would also the INFERMAL report act as a maybe a catalyst or a purpose for us to like raise the accuracy and verification issue again. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, certainly potentially. I mean, like I said, getting started on bulk registrations, we have to figure out what the most constructive way is to do that. Because not only do we not have a policy on bulk registrations, we don't necessarily even have a definition of bulk registrations, right? Is it 20? Is it a hundred? Where's that threshold? And because that wasn't built so carefully into this report, that'll be a topic of discussion as well.

When I was asked that question by the registrars in one meeting, I sort of tongue in cheek said, well, if they go to your page labeled bulk registrations, then we'll call it bulk registrations, but that wasn't well received. So I think there is work to be done there to really figure out what that threshold might look like and what the right kind of friction is to create that isn't just make it too easy for them to switch to something else.

I mean, AI is making these things that much more difficult. If I use my driver's license to verify who I am, the tools that are available now to create a fake driver's license for any state in the US or any country in the world are pretty sophisticated now. And it's a tough problem, it's one of these kinds of problems that is iterative and infernal, but I think we got to have to keep at it, and so we'll keep doing it.

But yes, the accuracy question is a good one. The validation isn't necessarily who is validation that I'm talking about, just validation

on their end as a sort of know your customer type of verification is what the report was talking about.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Hadia, for the question. I have Mr. Sergio Salinas next.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO

Thank you, Nico. Recently someone here from the audience handed to me something from the United Nations with regards to the rights of children and also with regards to the rights of digital life, so to speak. And Jonathan spoke about the INFERMAL report, and I asked myself, does a report talk about how to denounce these people or report them?

And those reports when they are gathered, is GAC doing something about that or the states, or based on the work that God has done? Are we doing something about that? Because I am thinking about the children and how the impact this has on the children. I come from an organization that has to do with civil rights in Argentina in my country.

And based on that work that I've done, and in the work that we've been doing to avoid people being able to access children through their pornographic contact, I've noticed that with the DNS abuse, it's even deeper than that. I remember in a case with Disney, maybe for example, Latin children, they didn't know how it was written, and they didn't realize that Disney instead of being spelled with a Y

was spelled with an I and they didn't realize that they were going to a bad site.

And this isn't only through just plain pornography, but also child pornography. So DNS abuse not only impacts things that have to do with finances for the people, there's also deeper things like, for example, access to child pornography or access that children have to pornography, what do we do so that parents also can help their children for them to be able to have a better experience and protected experience in their digital life.

But now we have another issue, which are the games online, especially for our teenagers and children. So again, my question is, is GAC doing something with all this information that's being gathered or is work happening within states so that we can stop this type of cybercrime? That's it. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Sergio. I'm gonna answer in Spanish if you allow me, given the fact that the long question was asked in Spanish. Thank you, Sergio, for your question. This is a very important question. As a matter of fact, there's different approaches to this depending on the government.

There isn't a GAC approach in general with regards to that topic, with the exception of the urgent requests that it's been already happening for a long time, and it would have to be resolved as soon as possible because this is an issue that impacts the examples that you gave. And I totally agree with you.

And there's another initiative that the governments are taking at an individual level, for example access to social media when you get to a certain age. But that's not the focus of the GAC itself except for when it comes to urgent requests and with accuracy, because obviously, as Jonathan just explained, it's very important.

In other words, just the fact that you have a telephone number registered and an address, and if some way this clashes with some kind of privacy issue or something else, and especially from the point of view of the law enforcement agencies, it's an important topic because if we're gonna talk about it dramatically, it's very difficult to save a life or save a child from some type of abuse if we don't have the proper tools.

And so we can't ask for miracles if we don't have those tools, not only with regards to police or any other agency or any part of the world. In other words, it's a compromising situation for the governments. And I really appreciate your question, it's a very good point, it's very interesting, and we definitely want to find a solution with regards to that in what has to do with DNS abuse.

So I'll go back to English now. Thank you again for the question. I have the European Commission, and then I have Mr. Alan Greenberg. I'll have to close the queue at that point because we need to go on with the presentations. European Commission, please.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Good morning, everyone. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. Thank you, Nico, for giving me the floor, and thank you for the interesting presentation just to not following this session. We have the DNS abuse session, where I understand we'll discuss more the INFERMAL report including with the OCTO, if I'm not mistaken.

So we'll have more opportunities to go through this topic. I wanted to note two things that in the GAC positions on DNS abuse, at the time of the public comment on the public, on the contract amendments, and following those discussion, the GAC has been inclined to give positive views to very narrowly scoped policy development process that were mentioned to address remaining issues that may not have been addressed in the contract abuse amendments.

Among those, there was a reference to the important on exploring proactive measures, because now I see on screen one of the findings, the limited impact of mitigating measures only. And then we discussed with the SSAC, this was the other thing I wanted to note, and they gave some insights regarding the fact that the use of API, per se, it's not a problem, but the issue, or for example, that it's difficult to put a cutoff price after which domain names would not be registered for maliciously purpose.

We also want to avoid the market distortion that we have very high prices to buy domain names because low prices incentivize abuse. So it's really important that, I guess, to get good feedback from the commercial practices from the registrars. So two questions. One,

have you had the opportunity to get feedback from the contracted parties, and in particular from the registrars on this point? And second, is there an intention from the ALAC to work together with other constituencies, including the GAC, towards pushing for this mini PDP? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you for the question, and yes informally, we've gotten feedback from the contracted parties and I think that's how those conversations should go initially because it keeps the temperature down in those conversations. But as we near the possibility, then yes, it is definitely our intention to partner with both the GAC and the SSAC and potentially the business community.

I think there's consensus among what might be considered the majority of the ICANN community, that that more needs to be done. And even the contracted parties can see that the amendments were just a first step. So it's all about just finding the right balance with them and then going into a limited PDP with our eyes open and really managing the scope.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. Thank you, Jonathan. I have Mr. Alan Greenberg, but before I give the floor to Alan, we have a quick question online. Christine, can you read it, please?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes. Good morning, everyone. So the question is, "Does the domain registration process require bulk registrants to be pre-approved in some manner to be presented with the bulk registration interface? If not, what is the difficulty in distinguishing the average registrant up to 10 names and a bulk registrant when clustering them to a separate class. For example, somewhere between the average registrant and the reseller, though a bulk registrant does not register for reselling." This is the question.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, right now, the practice varies from registrar to registrar about whether or not there's a registration process necessary for bulk registration. So that is one of the proactive measures that could help to create friction, and thereby limit malicious registration. So that would be part of the discussion for sure.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you. Alan, sorry to keep you waiting. Please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG

Not a problem. Just a very quick comment on bulk registrations and the implications of it. If we were to get a PDP that, to put some limits and some restrictions, some rules, there is no flag in the WHOIS in the record to say it is a bulk registration. So you now have a compliance problem of how do you recognize that a domain which you're now having a problem with was from a bulk registration.

The only way you know is if the registrar voluntarily tells you that. And so again, it's easy to say, let's have a PDP, and if you know your customer, you'll allow them to do bulk registrations, but the issue is some registrars are likely to not comply. And how do you deal with the compliance issues afterwards? It's a messy issue.

NICO CABALLERO

Indeed. Thank you, Alan. Any other comment or question before we move on? I don't see any other hand. So at this point we're gonna move ahead. Please, go to next slide, let's get ready for the discussion on priorities in the WSIS+20 context. And for that, I will handle the floor, I understand, to Christine. Please, go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, thank you very much, Nico. I think the first part will be covered by Amrita. Amrita, the floor is yours.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you so much and thanks for having us here. There's been a lot of discussion on the WSIS+20 and the next steps. So from At-Large, we thought while we've been having discussions, perhaps we could have more open discussions on how the end user community from At-Large could be kept better informed on the intergovernmental developments, because normally it's the governments who come to know about things first, we come to know later, so how can we have better channels of communication?

The second is, if we can explore the WSIS+20 agenda or the action lines is a lot, and we may agree on many things, we may not agree on many things, but can the GAC and At-Large come to some common points, which we could take forward in our own way? The third is, can we explore about a communication feedback loop, which we could create?

The wish list is high, perhaps in each country where the At-Large and GAC can work together on discussions vis-a-vis WSIS+20, or even if that is not possible, can partnerships be forged at the regional level, or even if there could be three, four pilots where based upon this exercise, if we see we are gaining success, we can replicate it elsewhere so that this partnership can work better.

So these were few things we thought may be areas we could discuss, and I guess Christine and Ana have some presentations, which they would be sharing, but these were food for thought for more discussions. Thank you so much.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much, Amrita. I think that part of the session is meant to be a dialogue, an open dialogue between both constituencies. But before we move into that, I think it's what we are going to do, me and Ana, is just to present to the ALAC community, the modalities that we have in the GAC for internet governance, which WSIS+20 fall under, and then we can open up maybe the floor for discussion with all members.

So the WSIS+20 is among internet governance, which is on the GAC strategic plan 2024 to 2028, and the objective of this strategic objective eight, is to actually keep GAC members aware and appraised about the development and the challenges in the IG ecosystem which impact specifically the Internet's unique identifier system.

And the annual plan 2024-2025 has identified a couple of outcomes in that area. Some of them are actually communication among GAC members, relevant to you is the internet governance group that was set up for interested GAC members to discuss, and the group has already done a couple of activities and is meeting later today again, in plenary but most importantly- sorry, I will go slower- but most importantly is the idea to facilitate a cross community exchange on IG related topics which include obviously the WSIS+20 with other SO/ACs with the community At-Large.

I think worth reporting maybe to everyone here is the webinar that we have had prior to ICANN82, and I will give the floor to Ana to talk about that. And Gulten, can we have the next slide, please? Ana, the floor is yours.

ANA NEVES

Thank you very much. So I would like to thank Amrita for her questions, and we are working together in several settings. So it's more than normal that this issue is raised here in ICANN where GAC and ALAC can work together. The point is that in these meetings, it's not so easy to, well, to find common positions. So I think the

main issue here is to find common understandings. So that's why this webinar for the GAC was arranged.

So the point was not to have any outcome of the discussion, but to make everybody aware of what is at stake and what will be the work until the end of this year on the internet governance issues, which implies different settings, different meetings, but all in all, what we want, I think it's to achieve a very good result with WSIS+20.

A lot of GAC members, they are not, as far as I understood, not involved in the WSIS+20 discussions. So I think it's a work that we, together with ALAC, can proceed with in order to have this common understanding. And when we arrange this webinar, we tried to have inputs from the main players in all this game if I'm not playing cards.

But this was really the objective was to have good input, neutral information of where we stand and where we are going. Interesting to notice that some of the presentations from these entities during the webinar, it seems like they are talking about the same things, and some of these inputs are confusing the community.

So I think that from now, so we are in March, we have some work to do until Prague, and it'll be very good if the GAC IG group, IG, Internet Governance Group, together with ALAC, if we could work internally until the Prague meeting even because after we will start the negotiations of WSIS+20 review. On the GAC IG group, well, we

didn't have so far discussion, we didn't discuss among us what will be the next steps.

We'll have this meeting as the last point of today's work. But I think that we are more than open to work together with ALAC because we have so many points in common, and I think it'll be very rich for GAC and very rich for ALAC if we start this kind of dialogue and intersectional work. Thank you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much, Ana. Gulden, if we can go, please back to the previous slide. Right, so at that point, Nico, I will be turning it back to you so that we can discuss with the floor the three points just to recap. I think the points are how can the At-Large community be better informed of intergovernmental developments exploring common grounds and also modalities for communication and feedback loop also on national levels. Nico, back to you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Christine. Thank you, Ana. As a matter of fact, the three main points here are, apart from the specific questions or topics that are on the screen, we have basically discussed the multi-stakeholder governance, the digital divide, and capacity building according to our agenda at the beginning.

Those are also three topics anybody in the room or online can talk about. And we already have a queue. I have Switzerland first, and then the Netherlands. Please go ahead, Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So it's an important discussion and happy that we are engaging on this one more time. Perhaps something that is relevant, and I think Ana and Christine mentioned it somehow, is to note that the GAC is not in the business of establishing or developing common GAC positions on WSIS+20, because that's not our function.

Our function is to be an advisory committee and part of the empower community in ICANN. So just wanted to note that reality not to create expectations. At the same time, some of us in different degrees have a role in WSIS+20 negotiations, so that's why we are also taking the opportunity, having an informal group, exchanging information, networking, et cetera. And of course, that's also useful and that's also something we can share with you, with ALAC members to the level that is allowed for each delegation. Of course, it depends on each delegation, what they want to share and with whom to what extent.

Having said that, it is also, and this is something we have discussed in the GAC. Maybe it's important for us as GAC members to look into coordinating with colleagues in other departments and ministries in order to have a whole of government approach. And if that is the case, it is easier for you ALAC members to touch on the GAC member because the GAC member will then know whom to refer to if there's anyone to refer to in the national administration at stake. At least in our case, and I speak for Switzerland, we have

that approach. And if you have any interest, you know who I am, it's an easy thing.

And then on the third question, and also just sharing how we do things, we of course have the Swiss IGF where we discuss many things amongst others, the international developments, and most probably we will have some discussions also this year, depending on the bottom-up process of selecting the topics.

And we also have a platform, reunite assembling around between 300 and 400 stakeholders in our country that are interested in digital governance, AI governance, and there we update people and we discuss with people, and maybe there are some ALAC members or in any case, they are invited to join if they are based in Switzerland on how the WSIS+20 and other discussions are evolving. I just wanted to share that. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. I have the Netherlands, the UK, and Brazil. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. It's Marco for the record for Netherlands. Yeah, I think I can align what my Swiss colleague just said to the point of building common ground. I do believe that that's certainly not in the remit of the GAC to find common ground. We are busy in New York trying to find common ground amongst member states of the UN. So the process should take place. That of course doesn't preclude that I'm eager to hear

if ALAC has a position on a particular topic. I think it's well word for ALAC to transmit those positions to the GAC for us to take on board and then take back to New York. Which kind of comes to the first point of keeping each other better informed.

And I do hope, and I'm not sure whether they're in the room, but I'm gonna push them under the bus anyway, that the ICANN GE team can help us here and sharing the information flow goes both to the GAC and ALAC, I think that's the most efficient way of tackling this topic. So I hope that ICANN Org can take that on board.

Yeah, and similar as with what Jorge says, every country has different methods. I personally also, I'm lucky that I'm pretty close to the negotiations, pretty close to my team in New York. I can only emphasize and recommend to my fellow GAC representatives to build those connections. Find out who is in New York, find out who is dealing with this in your MFA, and make sure you are in the loop. And similar then try to work at the national level with interested stakeholders. Jorge mentioned the Swiss IGF, we're obviously in the Netherlands also looking at the Dutch IGF to do similar things.

So maybe there is some room for GAC and ALAC to maybe also see if we can quickly sort of put down some best practices or show a few use sample cases where you think it's working fine, and then for us to learn and copy. That would be my points to these questions. But I think they're good questions, so thank you for that.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands, and thank you, Switzerland. To that point, I would also add, as regarding the first bullet point there, the problem, that most, not all governments, but unfortunately some governments have regarding the issue of the silos, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the one hand, the ICT Ministry on the other hand, the telecommunications regulator, and so on and so forth, and they don't always, unfortunately, work together.

So you have different versions coming from the same country about the same topic, not everywhere, not all the time, but that's another challenge we have to deal with. So thank you again. I have the UK next.

NIGEL HICKSON

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And three points if I may. First of all, thank you very much, ALAC, for putting this on the agenda. And as you can see, and as you know, it's a topic that not just the GAC is discussing, but is being discussed across the ICANN community, the ccNSO have a special group that discusses it, and GNSO also discusses the WSIS+20.

In terms of the information flow, in terms of for those that are new or whatever, in terms of where to go for information, there's a WSIS+20 sort of network, if you like. The government engagement team run with lots of postings on lots of information about events coming up, whether they be at the UN or whether they be elsewhere that's discussing the WSIS+20.

So that's a good network to be part of. I think the second point I wanted to make is on process, if you like, away from ICANN. So we've been discussing WSIS+20 for the last, perhaps, two to three years, and for many people that work on many other subjects, one can fully understand that when they ask the question, well, when are the actual final discussions?

And get told, well, probably December, 2025, they think, well, let's worry about it over the summer then rather than worrying about it two years or one year in advance. But let me say two things about that. One is that the process rolls on, if you like, and only yesterday there was an agreement at the UN on the way that the actual discussions at the UN will take place.

The so-called modalities, the way that sessions will be conducted and the way negotiations will be taken forward. There's been the appointment of so-called co-facilitators. These are UN representatives, mainly based counselors, mainly based in New York representing countries. And this is an important point because these two individuals will now start going, and some of them will have been already to some of the key events.

So they'll go to the UN Internet Governance forum in Norway, they'll go to the UN CSTD discussions in April in Geneva, they'll go to discussions being held by UNESCO. And it's important that, because in those discussions, although they're not negotiations, they're like this, if you like, people come forward with ideas, they will be able to sense of what the views of people are. So those discussions are important then.

And then, of course, they will create what's called a zero draft, which is a draft of what the resolution might say. The resolution could say, well, we've had enough of internet governance, let's do something else. It probably won't say that. It can say things about the IGF, thank you very much, but let's call it something else or whatever, or let's extend its mandate for the next 25 years or 50 years.

It will say something about the overall WSIS process. Does there need to be some other process involved? So that will be very important. And finally, and sorry, Mr. Chair for going on, is where our roles come in. We, as GAC representatives, have a very important role. We are picking up as GAC representatives, what you are saying here, we're picking up what other community members are saying in the community.

We pick up what other people are saying outside these communities, and we have to ensure that we engage, as Marco said, with the relevant people in our authorities to make sure that the views are right. I was told the other day that a government representative was at a national IGF, he was invited to a national IGF, and someone stood up at the IGF and said, will you be insuring, sir, that when you are in New York or when one of your colleagues are in New York, you will vote for the extension of the mandate of the IGF.

And this individual had no idea that there were gonna be such discussions or that the mandate for the IGF is on the agenda, but it is, and things we hold dear, we have to do things about. And that's

why this conversation is so important and the ALAC role is so important as well, because you go to these meetings and you see these government representatives, challenge them saying, what are you gonna be doing in New York? Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, UK. For the sake of time, we'll need to close the queue right now. I have Brazil and then Egypt. Please keep it brief, sweet, and short. Please go ahead.

RENATA MIELLI

Thank you, Chair. For the record, I'm going to speak in Portuguese because I'm more intelligent in Portuguese, so I completely agree. Oh my God. I'm going to speak Portuguese. I really agree with what the representative from Switzerland pointed out on the function of GAC. It's not having a proposal or an opinion on the current discussions on the WSIS.

We have a role, as representatives of our administrations, which is very important in this discussion because as others said, each country has its own dynamics, and most of the times, we representatives of the GAC, we are not the ones that negotiate this in the international arena.

And today, in this discussion, what we have is an important part of the countries in the world, and these discussions may not be appropriate here, considering the multilateralism against multi-sector realism. As something that is contradictory, multilateralism and multi-sector realism, we should go deeper into this discussion

considering these mechanisms of discussion and participation and decision making should function together.

We cannot have multilateralism that is well-informed, making, taking decisions without considering the multi-sector realism, without the participation of the technical community and civil society. So this is one of the current discussions we see today, and that we saw in the negotiations process in the Global Digital Compact.

This tension between multi-sector realism and multilateralism, so we have a role here, and each representative here should try to discuss this with their own ministries and entities who are responsible for the digital agendas. In Brazil, for example, we have different ministries in charge involved in this agenda, and we need to have some sort of articulation regarding these discussions. This is very important, and the GAC may have a fundamental role here.

And then let me say that we have just now published in, how many languages, six, the UN languages plus Portuguese, we have the guidelines of the NETmundial+10 in Sao Paulo in 2024 with some proposals for refining multi-stakeholder processes. And I'd like to make them available for those countries that may be interested in them. We have a webpage and we can offer this document, which can be very useful for such discussions, it's netmundial.br. Thank you, Chair.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Brazil, and I'll give Egypt the privilege of closing the comments. Egypt, please go ahead.

JOANNA KULESZA

Thank you very much, Nico, and I'll be very short, conscious of time. On the first point, I mean, I agree with all my GAC colleagues on the role of GAC members here. But I think we have already experience with ALAC and that be the regulatory development briefing series which we did on WSIS+20 discussions back in January.

I think in terms of battery informed and the first point, we can have activities like that. So I'd like to thank the points of contact here for organizing that, and I think we can maybe work on similar activities. Thank you very much.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you. I need to close the queue here, but going back to your questions on the screen regarding the first bullet, the answer would be yes, on behalf of the GAC. Hopefully we can work in a better-informed way. The second bullet point is more challenging, I would say, no, in a very straightforward way.

There's no way the GAC can have common ground given the fact that we're 184 countries, it's impossible, different approaches. And the third bullet point, I totally agree. Hopefully, we can create that communication feedback loop in order to better work. And I think we have already had a conversation about that, Jonathan. Any

final words, we're absolutely running out of time? Any final words, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, I think we can always explore regional level relationships with individual countries and we'll continue to do that. So just in closing, thanks for having us, we look forward to working together with you on these issues. Thank you.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you so much. We'll have a 30-

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Nico, a common point is having all stakeholders at least be able to present their views. I think that's a common ground we have. In a multilateral system, somehow there should be some place where we could at least state some things, if not in the final, that could be some common ground.

NICO CABALLERO

Thank you. Any other comment, Joanna, Jonathan, anybody?

GULTEN TEPE

Just very briefly to put this in the chat, we're always happy together with Kristina to facilitate both communities working together, whether through the regulatory briefings or any other format. Thank you. Very informative session.

NICO CABALLERO

Okay. So thank you very much. We'll have a 30-minute coffee break now. Please be back in the room at 10:00 o'clock. Thank you so much. This session is adjourned. I'm sorry, 10:30, 10:30? Yeah.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]