
ICANN83 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (4 of 6)
Thursday, June 12, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Welcome back, everyone. Please take your seats. We'll be starting right away. And as a matter of fact, we will start basically where we left off. You remember that little paragraph at the end of, can you scroll up a little bit? I'm sorry, I'm sorry. More time? Five more minutes? All right, all right, okay five more minutes, sorry. Stop the recording, please. We need five more minutes.

Welcome back, everyone, and thank you for being patient. But important, very important, and detailed, and nuanced discussions were taking place in order to try to reach some sort of agreement before moving on. So we'll start where we left off. So we'll read that part of that paragraph. We need it to read, and then we'll move on in order to see if we make good progress. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I just wanted to indicate that we've closed collaboration on the document at the end of the previous session. And as you may be aware, that's a step in the process that the GAC Chair recommends when we need to ensure the text is stable. There was one practical concern in the previous session. It was that there was a lot of selecting of the text by various participants in the document, and that made some of the reading a little difficult.

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 be aware that you still have access to the document in a reading mode only, and that we will continue to edit the text in a way that is still visible in the view mode. So just be aware that if you would like to suggest any contributions, please let us know, either via email or through the chat in the Zoom room, and we will reflect that appropriately. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Fabien. As explained during the prep calls leading to this meeting, you remember we had three prep calls for this, and we explained what the process would be. And then last Monday, at the very beginning of the sessions, we explained again that, again, for the sake of clarity and integrity, I would say, of the text we're dealing with in the communiqué, this would be the way forward. So with that, let's go back to the review part. And for that, I would kindly ask you to get specifically to the point where we left off before the coffee break.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So just to make sure it's clear, we are in the issues of importance subsection on the Applicant Support Program. Sorry, next round of new gTLDs, we were discussing the Applicant Support Program. There was initial suggestion of text at the very end, but the proponent of the text worked with the topic leads to remove that initial proposal and to instead add a few edits in the text above. So

our suggestion would be to go through the text of that section entirely and make sure there is agreement on it and move on.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. That seems to be a good way forward. And I'm glad the agreement was reached beforehand. So if you can scroll up a little bit so I can see the whole thing. I don't need to read the whole thing. I only need, Benedetta, could you please? Yeah, yeah, yeah, only the part where we have changes. So I'm going to read the whole paragraph in that case.

So the GAC noted the current statistics presented by ICANN Org on the status of ASP applications in process and, in particular, the very small number of completed applications submitted given that there are only about five months left in the 12-month ASP application window. Furthermore, the GAC notes concern that the current process may exclude potential applicants who are least connected to ICANN's processes due to systemic barriers. The GAC expressed concern that with the current pace of applications, there may be no opportunity to conduct a review or determine any adjustments to the current communications outreach and engagement plan before the ASP application deadline.

This review could identify the obstacles preventing applications from moving forward more rapidly and recommend appropriate mitigation activities, draft applications that may not be completed

before the deadline, and require targeted improvements to ensure the ASP achieves its inclusive purpose.

The GAC is, therefore, of the view that such a review should now be conducted immediately, rather than after 20 qualified applications, in order to provide sufficient time for any project implementation course corrections, including communications outreach and engagement adjustments necessary to maximize the number of ASP applications completed and submitted for evaluation before the deadline. Full stop.

That's the end of the text, right? So there we go. This is where we are. This is the agreement that was achieved. And let me pause here in order to see if there are questions or comments or edits before moving on. And there's a hand up from the CTU. Please go ahead.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimire from CTU. I would remove the word require from the third bullet. It'll read much better and convey the same purpose.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, CTU. Any other edit, comment, or question? And I see no hand. Is that an all-hands, CTU? Okay. So I see no hands online or in the room, and therefore, we'll be moving on. So thank you so much again for your time, your commitment, and your

patience in the wordsmithing process. Let's move on, Fabien. Back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So next subsection under next round of gTLDs, and that's GAC readiness.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. And for this, I will once again kindly ask my colleague from Egypt to help me with the reading. Would you please go ahead, Christine?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, sure. So under GAC readiness, GAC members highlight the importance of GAC readiness in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, notably regarding opportunities for GAC interventions after the reveal day of string applications. GAC volunteers are encouraged to collaborate with GAC topic leads to monitor timelines and milestones related to the next round applications process, including actively preparing for GAC early warnings, GAC advice, and other opportunities for input to applicants, the ICANN Board and ICANN Org.

Some concerns were expressed within the GAC about potential increased spam and abuse in connection to the expansion of the DNS. It was suggested that the GAC consider, in advance of evaluating applications, how the committee should approach

discussions on early warning and other instruments at its disposal in order to protect the public interest.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. So we'll pause here in order to see if there are any further comments or questions or edits, taking into account that the extra time we took to start the session was precisely because 15 or 20 countries were getting together to discuss this text. So once again, this is one last chance to see if there's any kind of issue with the text. I see a hand up from Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just to clarify that we, the interested countries discussed this yesterday afternoon after the session, and this is agreed text of the interested countries. And later on, we can see the advice text, which is what huddled the 15 or 20 countries before during the break. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for the clarification, Switzerland. Any other comment or question? Okay, seeing none, let's move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So I believe now we've completed the review of issues of importance. So we're scrolling down to make sure. There was a, if

we, maybe just before we move on to advice, if you go on ATRT. No, if you go down, the last section of issues of importance. It was brought to our attention that ATRT, so in the title here, you see in the header, Deferral of the Fourth ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review. We had ATRT4 in parenthesis. The deferral being about the review itself. It's not about the review team. So ATRT stands for Accountability and Transparency Review Team. So that makes the contraction, the acronym, incorrect in reference to the title. So we suggest just try.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sure, or otherwise just put ATR, but.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

But that's not an acronym that you--

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Exactly, and we don't need to invent new acronyms. You know, to the acronym romance we already have in ICANN. So again, that's just a detail, but important to mention, right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So that's it for that. We just wanted to flag that. And so then we can now go to GAC consensus advice with the ICANN Board. Oh, there's wait, there's.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

There's a hand from the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, just to remind you that our Malaysian colleague is back in the room and we promised to revisit the RIR governance text. Well, he was still on his way earlier this morning. I don't know if you want to do this now or first handle the advice.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So is he in the room?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, he is here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so let's do just that before we review the text the consensus advice. So let's go back to the RIR part of the text so that we can discuss with our distinguished colleague from Malaysia in case there's any issue you might have spotted. Malaysia, please go ahead.

RUZAMRI RUWANDI

Okay, thank you for the opportunity, I appreciate it. This is an issue of the unilateral provisions in the draft of the RIR. The US and Malaysia have a consensus on this. So based on the proposed text, we revised it to make it more general to be incorporated in the GAC advice, in the GAC communique. It is hoped Mr. Marco or the GAC

members may consider on the revised text as I read it just a few minutes ago.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Malaysia. But I don't understand. Will you be providing some alternative text? Is that what you're saying? Or additional text or any?

RUZAMRI RUWANDI Yes, additional text. One sentence around this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Can we do that right now so that then we can move on? So are you going to be sending that or are you going to be reading for?

RUZAMRI RUWANDI I will be reading this additional text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Please read slowly so that we can.

RUZAMRI RUWANDI So I would like to put an additional para. The document should also not confer unilateral decision-making authority on matters that may have implications.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Can you go slowly, please? Slowly so that he can. Yeah, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX Or if you're reading from a piece of text that's prepared.

RUZAMRI RUWANDI Yeah, I made it already.

CHRISTINE ARIDA It was sent by email.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX Okay, so then let me pick it up from an email and put it in there. Is this the text?

RUZAMRI RUWANDI Correct.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay, so I'll read it. So after the full stop, after by the ASO going forward, I don't need to read the whole thing, of course. So I'll just read that part. And it says the document should also not confer unilateral decision-making authority on matters that may have implications or impact on the national laws and regulatory frameworks. Such decisions should involve meaningful consultation with affected governments.

And of course, we're talking about the RIRs, the Regional Internet Registries and everything that was discussed yesterday. We don't need to go over that again. That's why we have green light, highlighted text in green. So let me pause here in order to see if there's agreement in the room regarding that specific paragraph just added by Malaysia. And I have Egypt. Please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Can we maybe see clarification from our Malaysian colleague on the rationale behind the text? Thank you.

RUZAMRI RUWANDI

Okay, on the paragraph 2.6, there's a specific sentence added complete descriptions on the NIR. So by having these unilateral provisions, it may affect other countries on their intention to establish its own NIR.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Egypt, are you okay with the clarification? You have any further question? Okay, thank you. Any other question, comment or edit? I'm sorry, I have the European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Chair. I have a bit of a problem with this addition. It's not because I have something specifically against the substance, but we didn't discuss this specific aspect as we didn't go into the details. I mean, we heard a lot of information from the ASO. We

had the opportunity to ask questions, but in the GAC, we didn't discuss positions. There is always the public comment avenue to have raised specific issues to the ICP-2 document. And I don't feel very comfortable expressing a specific comment on one part of the ICP-2 document on behalf of the whole GAC. I don't know how the others feel about that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. I have Netherlands, India and the USA. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, I think, speaking as Netherlands, I think I can echo our colleagues from European Union that I struggle a bit in finding the thin line between the public comment process that's already been closed and the communique. We might be perceived as bypassing that public comment process. To the subject, to the actual topic of the text, I sense here that we're addressing RIR policy. We're not addressing the actual topic at hand, which is the RIR governance, which is ICANN recognizing RIRs. I think this is too much about the RIR policy process itself and my sense is that they should be taking up the RIRs and it's not in ICANN's mandate, but I'm happy to further delve into the rationale if we have the time.

-
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Netherlands. I have India and then the USA. India, go ahead, please.
- SUSHIL PAL Thank you, Chair. I mean, we agree with the content, but we find the placement or this completely unwarranted. So we would request for its withdrawal or deletion. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. USA.
- SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, for the record. We support the comments of the European Commission and do believe that this is more of the territory of the public comment process. So just expressing support for that position. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much. And as a matter of fact, I was going to mention that as well at the beginning before your interventions. This pertains more to the comment period with all due respect to Malaysia, but I agree with the comments in the room from the European Commission, from the USA, from India, and from the Netherlands regarding the fact that it would have been better to have it sent during the comment period and not included here. So I would kindly request Fabien to put that in brackets and not to

include the text. Yeah, we're going to strike it out. Any other comment or question? Egypt, go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, while we do agree with striking it out and we agree to the view expressed by colleagues, just want to note to our Malaysian colleague that 2.6 actually does say exactly what is written in that text. So I believe that a thorough read of 2.6 actually goes along the point expressed here by our Malaysian colleague.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Malaysia, are you okay with that?

RUZAMRI RUWANDI

We have submitted our feedback to the public consultation. This is for more on our feedback or comment during the sessions with the ASO. So I hope it's reflected in the discussions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect, thank you very much, Malaysia. Thank you Egypt for the comment as well. Any other comment or question or edit at this point? We have already discussed this, it's in green so we should be able to move on without any kind of problem. So seeing no hand, oh there's one hand from the USA, go ahead please.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair. We have a comment but it does not regard number 4 in issues of importance. It's recently green text however under section 3b.

NICOLAS CABALLERO The ASP, the Applicant Support Program?

SUSAN CHALMERS Yes, just a suggestion for a slight wording change. And I believe this was recently submitted text but it deals with the systemic barriers. That phrase is very vague so we would suggest a slight adjustment to the text. So I'll just begin from the beginning of the sentence. Furthermore, the GAC notes concern that the current process may, and then we would say may not reach potential applicants who are at least connected to ICANN's processes. We believe that these amendments do not change the meaning and the impact of the sentence, and they also help us avoid using terms that are very vague and not specific. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you for that, USA. I'll read that part of the paragraph just in case in order to make sure that it's clear for everyone. So it will read, furthermore the GAC notes concern that the current process may not reach potential applicants who are least connected to ICANN's processes. Full stop. And then the rest of the text. I don't need to read the full paragraph right? So is that okay for everyone?

And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Perfect. So thank you so much again, USA. Let's move on Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So I believe we're going back to advice now with new text that was drafted before the start of the session. So you see so this is advice on policy development related to DNS reviews. The GAC advises the Board, number one is the original text that is suggested to be replaced by the text under number two. So we would strike the first bullet, and I just kept it for reference. So I'll just strike it now so that's clear and we're reading the new text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. And for the reading I will kindly ask help from my Australian colleague. Ian would you please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

Where are we? A. The GAC advises the Board to work with the GNSO council to initiate prior to ICANN84 targeted and narrowly scoped policy development processes to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrant accounts or other suitable methods domains associated with registrant accounts that are subject of actionable reports of DNS abuse.

Rationale. Before new strings are added to the DNS as a result of the next round, further work on DNS abuse is needed to stem the

increasing cost to the public of phishing malware botnets and other forms of DNS abuse. Further, the GAC encourages PDPs that are targeted and clearly scoped to achieve results according to shorter timelines. The GAC appreciates the wealth of proposals for further policy work recently expressed by different parts of the community and maintains they all deserve attention.

The GAC supports multi-stakeholder action to achieve consensus policy outcomes and encourages for the time being prioritization of specific issues such as malicious use of bulk registrations. Given this timeline, the GAC encourages progress on commencing narrowly scoped PDPs between ICANN83 and ICANN84.

Where's the first time we've used the PDP acronym? Where's the first? No, no, no. Perhaps we might need to add PDP after policy development process in the advice. Just there. If that's the first time we've used policy development process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Even though I don't think our distinguished translators and interpreters are so happy with the speed at which you read. But anyways, please give thumbs up or down if we're doing, and this is for the interpreters. I see some thumbs down. Apologies, apologies. So there it is. Let me open the floor at this point for comments, questions or edits. And I have the USA, and then India. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. And taking a look at the text on the big screen. I think we would just suggest a slight tweak in the language to spare an extra conversation about procedural correct process. I would just say to urge instead of work with. I believe that this could help us save some time in discussions about what work with means. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, USA. And I'm very supportive of more specific language by all means. So I have India next. Please, go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you, Chair. I think we are okay with the text. However, we would want to include one more area for this narrowly scoped PDP, which we think is an important area for the subdomain abuse, especially from the platforms that allow third party use like hosting service providers and website builders. And therefore, we propose an addition in the end after DNS abuse, semicolon. To examine binding contractual requirements for the registrants offering subdomain services to monitor, mitigate and report DNS abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Could you repeat that?

To monitor, mitigate and report the DNS abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So I'll read the whole paragraph for the sake of clarity, given the fact that there were some edits. So it would read, the GAC advises the Board to urge the GNSO council to initiate prior to ICANN84 targeted and narrowly scoped policy development processes, PDPs to address bulk registration of malicious domain names, and the responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrant accounts or other suitable methods, domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS abuse. Examining binding contractual requirements for registrants offering subdomain services to monitor, mitigate and report DNS abuse.

And I'll pause here in order to see if there are further comments or questions. One thing that is not clear, and maybe it's just me, but it says the GAC advises the Board to urge blah blah blah and then there's a semicolon malicious domain names and there's a semicolon there. And then there's no verb. It just says and the responsibility of registrars to investigate and da, da, da, da. Maybe it's just me, but yeah, CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Yes, thanks. Nigel Cassimire speaking. I'm intervening to help you. The way I understand it is, you say there's no verb. I think the verb is back where it says to address. So now it's called policy

development processes to address and maybe bullet points might be more useful here. And you see all the things that it's going to address. One is bulk registration. The second is the responsibility of registrars to investigate. What's the third one? The third one would be the addition by India.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. It makes more sense to me now. And, again, sorry for my utter ignorance here, but it didn't make sense to me. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. And just to provide a bit of thinking about the structure here. The intent of the proponents of this advice text is to suggest issue areas that have been thoroughly discussed. The community hasn't together come around specific issue areas. These can be interrelated. For example, PDPs that address the bulk registration of malicious domain names could also be related to, and have cross cutting issues with PDPs addressing the second set of subject matter areas that we've put there.

So, our intent was to avoid bullet pointing the different subject matter areas, because we are seeking to allow for some wiggle room so that we're not trying to bake things, bake a PDP into communicate advice because discussion is still ongoing. So that's why we did have one just general paragraph. I just wanted to provide that background. I have a question to our colleague from

India regarding the recent addition that we see on the screen, which is by subdomains, is India referring to second level domains, third level domains, fourth level domains? It would be helpful to just understand a bit more. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, USA. Before I give the floor to the Netherlands, India would you like to respond to that?

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, thank you, Chair. I think it may refer to the second and third level. I think we cannot, but the idea is it has been clearly brought out in the NetBeacon report that it is an area of concern and is not at all covered by the present contract or present agreement of the contracted parties. So that is for the PDPs to examine, whether it will cover the second, third and to what level, but that is definitely one of the as potential area as any other DNS abuse matter and therefore we would request for its inclusion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. USA, are you okay with that?

SUSAN CHALMERS

I think we might come back and suggest some edits, but in any event PDPs when achieved through consensus policy automatically become binding. So I would suggest that we don't need to include that text as it regards the addition of subdomains.

If we could just, please, have some time to consider how we may be able to weave that into the advice. We just need a minute.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, USA. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Marco for the record, speaking for Netherlands. I think I'm more or less along the lines of the US. I struggle a bit.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Marco, could you please speak closer to the microphone?

MARCO HOGEWONING

I struggle a bit in terms of what we're asking process wise, because we're asking for contractual requirements, but this paragraph opens asking for a PDP, and I don't think we need a PDP to alter contractual requirements. That's for the Board. So as much as I like the addition, I think we need to start this sentence with another sort of operation, because the initial part of this paragraph asks for some PDP to be initiated, and the addition suggested by India asks for contractual changes, and those are two different processes. So with the US, maybe park this for a bit and have a good look at what we're asking here, and whether that fits the process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Netherlands. India?

SUSHIL PAL

Just for clarity, I think we're also asking for a PDP on the responsibility of the registrar to investigate. I mean, do we not see it already covered? Are we assuming that the registrar is not responsible as of now to investigate? I mean, during our conversation with the colleagues here, I think we were told that that's not specifically spelled out in the contractual agreement. I mean, there is a contractual agreement and the registrar are actually bound by the contractual agreement to actually check and mitigate the DNS abuse. To what extent? That has not been spelled out clearly, and the NetBeacon report points out that this is one area which is completely untouched. Right?

And asking for a PDP on the responsibility of the registrar, I think, I find that honestly not so material, because I think he's bound by the contractual agreement any which way. But if it's an assumption, he is not bound to investigate the matter though. I mean, registrar is not investigated any which way. I think that is not. His job is to just check that, and mitigate the DNS abuse, and investigation is a part of the process of DNS abuse mitigation or DNS abuse prevention.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Mr. Chairman, we're obviously in your hands and not to prolong the argument, but to clarify, I think we should be, especially since this is advice we should be really clear whether we want a policy to be developed or whether we want contractual changes. And I think this is this is too ambiguous. It sort of asks for a policy to change contractual requirements. I think we should pick one of the two.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. And on the other hand, it says examining binding contractual. We're requiring the Board to examine binding contractual requirements and so on. So, I recommend we part this. We have a good discussion during the lunch break. Can you put brackets in the meantime Fabien, so that we can-- at least let's just review the part that is already agreed, and then we'll discuss including or not including depending on the conversations during the lunch break. And I say lunch break because we're nine minutes away. I don't think we'll reach consensus in this regard in only nine minutes.

So, for the time being, let me just read again the part that has actually been agreed upon. So it would read, to urge the GNSO council to initiate prior to ICANN84 targeted and narrowly scoped policy development processes PDPs to address bug registration of malicious domain names, and the responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrant accounts, or other suitable methods, domains associated with registrant accounts that are the

subject of actionable reports of DNS abuse. Full stop, for the time being of course. And I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Two things. First is do we have the stop at 12.15? Yes. Okay. So maybe we have a couple of more minutes, but I don't want to stand between us and lunch.

The other thing is, at least if I understand the different complex systems here in ICANN correctly, by policy, when it's within the so-called picket fence, you can establish binding obligations. So maybe, and this is to also react to our Indian colleagues, maybe we don't need the mention of contractual. We can say examining binding requirements. And so we avoid mentioning contractual, because if the policy is within the mission and the restrictions that are established in the bylaws, the provisions of the policy are binding on the contracted parties. So just wanted to throw that into the discussion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Switzerland. So before giving the floor to Janos, to the PSWG co-lead, India, would that be okay? If we strike the word contractual, and it would potentially be examining binding requirements for registrants, would that be okay with you?

SUSHIL PAL

Perfectly fine, I think. I mean, the idea is that it is an important area, and this should be captured when we are advising the Board or the GNSO to develop the PDP process. That's the idea. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, perfect. So we have a potential way forward here. Thank you so much for that. And thank you, Switzerland, for the suggestion. I have Janos, please go ahead.

JANOS DRIENYOVSKI

Thank you, Nico. This is Janos Drienyovszki, European Commission. Don't want to prolong the discussions too long. Just wanted to suggest maybe to revert to the work with reference instead of the urge, just for the reason that it implies a more active role also on the side of the Board. So this is just a suggestion. As urge really, for us, sounds a bit that the Board is a bit passive in that and just urges the GNSO to do something. So working with is a bit of a, implies a more active role for the Board as well. Small suggestion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that. But it is my understanding that that was precisely the point, because work with, yeah, we can work with it in six months or maybe two more years. I don't have a problem with that. Again, I'm okay either way. But yes, go ahead, European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Nico. Very quickly. I mean, it's not a big deal. Just to mention in relation to what we have been discussing previously about the fact that ICANN Org could issue an issue report so that ICANN would do some work themselves directed by the Board beyond asking the GNSO to do something themselves. But it's not a big deal. And I mean, if colleagues prefer urges, we will go with that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. I would go with urge. But again, I have no hard feelings in that regard. It's up to you. Sorry, I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. We would prefer to stay with urge if that is acceptable. And regarding binding requirements for registrants, we should be very clear on the contractual arrangements that ICANN maintains with different parties. We would suggest that in lieu of requirements for registrants in this language, we consider how to include just this issues within the set of PDPs that we've suggested already, which there are two of them.

First, bulk registration of malicious domain names. And second, this associated domain check. And there could be a way through to see how we could incorporate subdomains as a subject matter area. But I think it would be, it would behoove us, if we want to be

effective in our request, not to address binding requirements for registrants. There is no way to bind a registrant through the current way that the contracts are structured. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. And again, that's precisely the reason why I said we should talk about this during the lunch break. And I made a mistake there. We still have 15 minutes, 17 minutes. As a matter of fact, this is a 75 minute session. My apologies for that. So we still have time, in other words. I have China next.

GUO FENG

Thank you, Chair. Guo Feng from China for the record. I just have a little problem with the wording here. Now we have a three sub-sentence. The first one is to address bulk registration. And the next one is the responsibility. Previously someone said the verb should be addressed. But we have a third one starting by examining. So I think it's a little bit weird here. Perhaps we can change the examining to perhaps to examine or the next, the second one to add to address the responsibility. Perhaps that makes more sense to me. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, China. Very good catch. But again, given the fact that the third one is not officially included yet, I didn't care or we didn't care that much about that little editorial. Yeah. And you're right that the second should also be an infinitive, right? And

to address their responsibility, blah, blah, blah. So yeah, after PDPs, right? So it says targeted and narrowly scoped policy development processes, PDPs to address bulk registration of malicious domain names, their responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrar and so on and so forth. So let me pause here again in order to see if there are further edits or comments. I see no hands online. USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Advice language is very delicate. We want delicate. We want to be intentional and focused so that the good community progress and momentum that is already underway outside of the GAC room continues to move forward. So I would suggest that those who are interested in this issue convene during the lunch break and work further instead of trying to wordsmith through from the floor.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, USA. You took my words. As a matter of fact, I mentioned that before. So let's do just that. Let's part this here. Please try to get together during the coffee. I mean, the lunch break and see if we can make some progress back to you. Fabien, can you walk us through the remaining.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So we have unresolved sections of text in internal matters. So if we scroll back to maybe since we were on DNS abuse, let's go to the

PSWG report where we had a paragraph that referred to DNS abuse and was parked to be revisited after issues of importance was discussed on DNS abuse. So maybe this is a good time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. And for that, I will kindly ask our colleague from Lebanon and former vice chair to help us read the full paragraph, I would say, in order to refresh our minds and give us some more clarity before we actually start editing. So, Zeina Bou, could you please go ahead?

ZEINA BOU HARB

GAC Public Safety Working Group, PSWG. The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. In the weeks prior to ICANN83, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest. The PSWG contributed to the GAC discussions on DNS abuse mitigation and on WHOIS and registration data issues, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work.

Key takeaways involving PSWG work streams included potential topics for narrowly scoped policy development processes, PDPs, to address DNS abuse, law enforcement authentication, the next steps regarding the Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, and continued progress on work related to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data.

The PSWG appreciated the various presentations on anti-abuse practices from the local country code top-level domain, ccTLD, and of Interisle and NetBeacon concerning phishing campaigns and bulk registered domains, which provided valuable input for progressing the work on addressing DNS abuse, and particularly those ideas highlighting opportunity for a more proactive stance on mitigating DNS abuse harms before they occur.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. So, the last paragraph is what we need to address at this point. Are there any comments or edits regarding the last, the one in brackets? I'll open the floor for edits, comments, or questions. And I have Papua New Guinea, please go ahead, and then the European Commission.

RUSSELL WORUBA

Thank you, Chair. This is not a substantive contribution, but just for from the local country, would it be of benefit to include CZ.NIC in this? Just for specificity, yes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Papua New Guinea, for the suggestion. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Chair. The proposal is to remove the text in brackets for the simple reason that there is a strong overlap with the text of the

issues of importance on DNS abuse, where the whole of the GAC, I mean, PSWG is part of the GAC, expressed appreciation for the presentations from CZ.NIC, the Interisler, the NetBeacon, and the whole, I mean, basically, we say it with different words, the same. I mean, I have Janos next to me, is he okay with it? I don't know if there is anyone else from the PSWG, but the proposal would be to remove it to avoid repetition.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. So, if it is okay with the PSWG topic leads, we'll erase that part. Would that be okay? Anybody against, in other words? It's already been explained by the European Commission, so I don't need to repeat the rationale behind. So, okay, I see no hands, so we're going to strike out that part of the text. Thank you so much again, European Commission. We have seven minutes to go. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So GAC operational matters, we've just made some edits, staff just making a little precision in the text regarding the term limits of the GAC chair and term limits of the GAC vice chairs, and not just the term, but the term limits. And then we are suggesting just removing the second paragraph we had initially proposed, but which is duplicative with the Section 2 of internal matters, which refers to the GAC elections, the next cycle of GAC elections. So, it makes this paragraph not necessary. And as far as the impact of this vote and the change of term limits on the terms of the current

chair and vice chairs, that will be addressed in a minute. So, that would simplify the text here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that. And I totally agree with it, the same way I agreed with the European Commission's comment before. The simpler, the better, I would say, or the shorter, the better. In this case. So, if everybody agrees, we'll do just that. I mean, we struck out. So, thank you so much.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And then finally, a proposal by Egypt in the last section here in capacity development at the end of the text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So, Egypt, would you like to go ahead with that part of the text?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes, sure. So, I just added the sentence to capture what we talked about in terms of regional capacity development. Should I just read the one in red? Okay. So, in that context, the GAC also learned about regional capacity development activities that took place in the LAC region and agreed to encourage similar activities in other regions. Short and sweet.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Short and sweet. And this is referred to the conversations we have with our Brazilian colleagues regarding the regional engagement. Okay. Thank you, Egypt. Comments, questions? UPU, please go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW So, did it take place already or is it still to take place? The capacity development you're talking about is Brazil, it happened already or it's still to happen?

NICOLAS CABALLERO No, it's a reference to something that happened already. And that we intend to encourage similar activities to take place in other regions as well, based on the successful activities already developed with Brazil at the regional level. But again, I mean, if you have any addition--

TRACY HACKSHAW I think it wasn't clear when you were saying that it actually did happen already. I thought it was you're planning for it to happen. Before, when you were spoken last, I thought you were saying it was you're planning for it to happen, not it happened already.

NICOLAS CABALLERO No, no. Yeah, but that's why it's in the past tense. Also learned about regional and blah, blah, blah that took place in the region.

TRACY HACKSHAW Capacity development took place already. So, I'm trying to understand that the capacity development you're talking about, was it planned to happen or is it that it happened already?

NICOLAS CABALLERO It happened already.

TRACY HACKSHAW Right. Because I think that wasn't clear when you said it before that would happen already.

NICOLAS CABALLERO If you have better text, more than welcome to provide it. Yeah. And there's a good idea here, to your point, UPU, that are taking place, maybe, and use the present continuous tense, so to say. Is that present continuous? My grammar is a total disaster. But anyways, whatever it is that are taking place in the LAC region, would that do it? Okay. So, let's change that. Brazil?

VINICIUS WAGNER OLIVEIRA SANTOS Thanks, Chad. No, just to clarify that, what Nico had mentioned was an experience that has already happened in the past. And because of this, he was proposing new activities, including in the LAC region, and now other regions as well. So, both situations are

true. So, things that already happened, but are ready to happen in the region as well.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Yes, thanks. That was my understanding. That was to happen as well. So, I think that is good text. Yes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UPU. Anybody else? Any other edit? I don't see any hand online. And I don't see any hand in the room. No need to artificially extend for three more minutes our session. So, let's just stop here. And we'll come back. And after the lunch break, and I hope that the interested countries will have the chance to get together and discuss the details and whatever potential agreement they might reach us regarding the text for advice. Can we get to that part?

Yes. So, it's basically the second paragraph there. The GAC advises the Board that, da-da-da, da-da-da. But we'll leave that for lunch break conversations. So, in terms of housekeeping, we'll reconvene here at 1:45 p.m. So, let's stop here. Enjoy your lunch. And again, we'll start at 1:45. Enjoy your lunch.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]