ICANN79 | CF – Joint Session: GAC and GNSO
Wednesday, March 6, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 SJU

GULTEN TEPE: Welcome to the GAC meeting with the GNSO session being held on Wednesday, 6th of March at 1300 UTC. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment as indicated in the chat. The feature is located at the bottom of your Zoom window. Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six UN languages and Portuguese. Participants can select the language they wish to speak or listen to by clicking the interpretation icon on Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand.

Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. 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. Please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. Finally, the session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. With that, I will hand the floor over to GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much, Gulten. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening for those online. Welcome to the session with the GNSO. I have the pleasure to introduce Paul McGrady, Tom Sling, Jeff Neuman, Greg DiBiase. Welcome and my distinguished Vice Chair Nigel Hickson from the UK and also Jorge Cancio from Switzerland. Tom Sling, I already mentioned him. Is that okay?

So welcome again. We're going to have a very interesting agenda for today. We're going to be talking about the next round of new gTLDs, sorry, SOIs, statements of interest, DNS abuse, and if time allows, if time permits, WHOIS. The idea is to go ahead with the presentations and right afterwards open the floor for quick, I hope, brief and straight to the point questions so that we can give the right answers or so that the GNSO can give the or us, depending on the case, of course.

And by the way, let me also tell you that we're working on developing some sort of KPIs for today's session. That's a work in progress. That was a joke, of course, in order to see if you're paying attention. That's just to check if your coffee this morning was good. So welcome everyone. With that, let me give the floor to Greg DiBiase. Welcome.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Nico. My name is Greg DiBiase. I'm chair of the GNSO Council. Thank you for having us. We're excited to be here. I'd also just like to note and thank the GAC for their participation, especially of late and a couple of GNSO initiatives that have given us really great

feedback on the GAC perspective. We have a couple of items to discuss today, Nico. Should we just jump straight into the agenda?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Of course. And for that, let me get -- unless you want to go ahead, I can pass it to Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Sounds great. If that's okay with you. Hello. Good morning. Jorge Cancio, Swiss government and also point of contact from the GAC to the GNSO. We organized together. Jeff and I proposed this agenda to our leaderships. And this is what we have today. If we go to the next slide, we can start with the points we have today about the new gTLD program and next rounds and perhaps the first round of the GAC meeting.

Perhaps the first point is that it's a very diplomatic way of saying that we would be happy if you give us an update from your work on the small team plus in preparation of the new gTLD program next round. And if you can elaborate whether there are any specific points where any policy decision is pending that would affect us. And of course, there is this question about the means of resolution of contention sets, but that is more on the on the board side. But if you could update us on this, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Paul, go ahead, please.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Nico. Paul McGrady here. I have the privilege of being the team lead for the small team plus team, taking a look at some supplemental recommendations to deal with some concerns that the board had with some of the policy recommendations coming out of SubPro. We have been diligently working the last several months. The good news is that we're on track. We're on time. And most importantly, we're in the home stretch. So that's good news. We have stable drafts of all the supplemental recommendations, which the small team plus is considering passing along to the GNSO Council for consideration and possible vote. We presented those in a week webinar and we will be doing a community consultation again on these supplemental recommendations at 1030 this morning.

We will run through them quickly because a lot of people did hear a more detailed presentation on them during the during the prep week, which was co-hosted by your very own Nigel and Justine Chew from the ALAC. We're going to go over those again. And then the primary bulk of the time later this morning will be for questions and answers from the community. The idea behind that community session is it's a great way to gather real time reactions to the proposed supplemental recommendations. And we are going to act, we're going to consider them, act on them, figure out whether or not we need to change course on any of these. The small team plus is actually meeting here tomorrow to go through the feedback that we get from the community. And we will then get them in hopefully final form and to the GNSO Council for consideration in their April meeting.

In terms of things that could affect the GAC, it's hard as a non-GAC person to know everybody's perspective on that. But I will take a moment to highlight one that is not necessarily in alignment with what the board concern was. And I just do this so that the GAC is not surprised by it. The board had concerns with the recommendation coming out of SubPro in relationship to Singulars and Plurals. Singulars and Plurals, the basically throughout almost all the SubPro work, there was community alignment that Singulars and Plurals are confusing of each other.

The SubPro working group attempted to deal with that by looking at the intentions behind the use of a particular string to make exceptions to a blanket prohibition. Ultimately, the board didn't like that intended use notion. And we're all really aware of all the conversations around PICs and RBCs and issues of use. And so they also were concerned about a blanket prohibition against Singulars and Plurals. And so they have not adopted that recommendation. It came back to council and it ended up in the work of the small team plus. The small team plus has basically taken out the content related to intended use. We added a little bit of clarifying content because the brands are needed. We needed some clarification around that. And you'll see that in the draft supplemental recommendation.

But we didn't really budge on the issue of Singulars and Plurals generally being confusingly similar to each other. It was some would argue it was a significant problem in the last round. And so as these make there, unless something changes in the next several days based upon community inputs, there's a very real possibility that these could go to the GNSO council and the GNSO council could either up vote what

the small team plus has done in this space or could down vote it. If the GNSO council up votes it, then it will go to the board and it will not be everything the board had hoped.

And so the reason why I highlight it is I'm just not -- I like surprise birthday parties and, I would love it if my wife would buy me a beautiful automobile with a ribbon on it on Christmas morning. Those are the kinds of surprises I like. I don't like other surprises. And so we just I think highlighted here so that the GAC isn't surprised by it. I hope I'm not taking too much time.

Lastly, and most importantly, I think is I just want to publicly thank your participants from the GAC, who have been very instrumental, very engaged, very helpful, giving us the GAC point of view and working with us all along the way. And so it's the usual folks in this new gTLD space, Jorge, of course, Jason, Zina, Nigel and Susan Anthony. So a big thank you to all of the small team plus members from the GAC room. We really appreciate that you are investing your time with us up front to get the best possible outcomes we can get. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Paul. Before I open the floor for questions, comments or any feedback, Jeff, would you like to go ahead?

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. And Paul has done an amazing job leading the small team. So you deserve a lot of the credit as well. I just wanted to add on the singular plural. This is an area where the entire community, the GAC,

ALAC and all of the GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups agreed with the prohibition against singular and plurals. But the board came back and they found that it was not in the public interest, which I think is an interesting issue we all should discuss if the entire community believes it's in the public interest, but the board does not. What do we do in that kind of situation? So, again, I think it's important that this is one of those issues where the GNSO and the GAC are certainly aligned.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Jeff. Certainly, an important point. Let me open the floor at this moment in order to see if we have any reactions, any feedback in the room or online regarding the first topic. I don't see any hand up, I don't see any hand in the chat room. That means we're okay apparently. So let's dive in. Let's move on to the to the second topic. Would you like to go ahead with that, Jorge, please?

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Swiss Government for the Record. Just before we finish the very first topic, as Paul has said before, we have the next session at 10:30 on these on the supplementary recommendations that they have been working on. It's on room 104ABC. The GNSO room. So as we have no conflicting session in the GAC, you are all invited to go there and participate in in that consultation. So let's move to the next topic on the SubPro. And this is the issue of Latin script diacritics in new gTLDs. We discussed this in Hamburg and we would ask you again to give us a status update on the work being done on your side on this issue, including a tentative timeline for decisions and actions. So I leave

it by that. And of course, as is mentioned in the question we sent you, this goes well beyond the specific case of .Quebec. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Jorge. This is Greg DiBiase. So we have been discussing as a council the best way to go about this and also did some educational sessions to understand the issue. We were putting together a request for a study to determine the best approach. As we were developing that, ICANN staff gave us feedback that they had been working on a couple of ideas for resolution and they hope to have that to us, I believe, by our April meeting. So we should have more concrete proposals to consider coming soon and we will determine the best way to address this issue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Greg. Questions, comments, any feedback in the room online? Excuse me. I don't see any hand up. I'm surprised. This is this is going smoothly. Very, very glad. So no questions so far in that case. And I have Indonesia, please go ahead.

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO: Sorry, I didn't put it in my in the zoom. My question is, you mentioned that what the language multilingual internet language, French, Spanish, German, Italian, Portuguese. Is it related to the use of alphabet rather than Latin? For example, in German, you have Urlaub, you have in Bosnia, you have S with something different, ABC. Now, like Indonesia, we use full Latin alphabet, ABC, DFE without any changes. Is

it not included in this type of what you call it related issues for the international alphabet? Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: It is specific to what is called a diacritic, which I think is similar to an accent on the E, for example. Maybe one of my counselors with better expertise can explain.

JEFF NEUMAN: This is Jeff Neuman. It's dependent on the language tables in the particular language and script. So in the Latin script, the accent mark over the E would not be considered a variant. But in other language tables, it's possible that they are considered variants. It's just completely dependent on the language community and what they put into the tables themselves. I can't answer on Indonesia or Indonesian. But in the Latin script, for whatever reason, those that worked on the Latin script did not include the or the accent mark as variants of each other, which we're not exactly sure why that is.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Jeff. Thank you, Indonesia. Any other question or comment? I don't see any other hand up. I don't see any hand in the chat room. So for the next topic, which is SPIRT, I don't know, SPIRT charter, which stands for Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team. Let me give the floor to my distinguished vice chair, Nigel Hickson, from the UK. The floor is yours.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Well, I don't think I'll have an awful lot to add to this, but is it spurt? I quite like the word spurt, but perhaps we can't use it. I don't know. But perhaps it would be really useful for the for the wider GAC. If you don't mind, Jeff or Paul, if you could just -- we have discussed this in the GAC, but it was it was at our previous meeting. This is a team that's going to be set up. And perhaps you could just give us the 32nd version of what this might do.

JEFF NEUMAN: It is pronounced SPIRT. Even though it's not spelled that way, there's a silent I.

NIGEL HICKSON: Of course.

GREG DIBIASE: I think we might have had Anne participating remotely that can give more background on this effort.

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: Sure. Thanks, Greg. This is Anne and hi, everyone. I'm sorry I can't be there, but the SPIRT team is a charter drafting team of council. The team itself will not come into play until after the round opens. And it's designed, of course, as everyone in the GAC knows, I believe, to address issues that arise after applications are received during the process of granting those new applications. And so what we've seen from the 2012 round is that issues can come up later and that those need a quick

resolution. And so the SPIRT is designed to be a mechanism that works with the predictability framework that is also part of the subsequent procedures.

Final report that predictability framework is out for public comment right now. And the SPIRT charter drafting team and council has only really had one meeting and our next meeting is not until March the 18th. And so we're certainly hoping that a couple of GAC participants will step forward. I know that the GAC has raised the question of the SPIRT and how it will operate in connection with, I think, important issues to the GAC. So we certainly welcome your participation as soon as possible. And our second meeting will take place on March the 18th, and it's likely that meetings will occur every two weeks, possibly once a week, if necessary, to complete the work on time. The work is anticipated to take three months. So we welcome you. Please come soon. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that. Before I give the floor to Iran, I think at this point it would be very important for the GAC, to have an overview, of the timeline, the output and approval processes and expectations from members. Is there anything quick you could mention in that regard, Greg or Jeff or Paul? Anne, do you have any feedback on this point?

ANNE AIKMAN SCALESE: I think that staff may have, ICANN staff may have provided some information directly to the GAC with respect to the timelines and the requirements for time commitments. I think that rather than my speculating further, my understanding, again, is it is about a three-

month commitment that the meetings are planned for every two weeks, but could if the work doesn't get done quickly enough, could be occurring once per week.

And there's a lot of drafting that will go on in between these meetings because staff is producing a draft that will be reviewed by the team. And the team's role is to provide comment on that in light of the very specific guidelines in the annex to the SubPro final report, which very clearly lay out how the SPIRT team, the SPIRT team will interact with the predictability framework.

So a great deal of this work has already been done in subsequent procedures. There's an annex that specifies and there are, I think, just some limited questions about how that will move forward and interact with the predictability framework that the SubPro IRT has already drafted. So I would say the time commitment is not massive. And I would ask ICANN staff to provide more detail directly to the GAC regarding that time commitment.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much for that. Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: So according to the latest work plan that was presented at the first meeting, it's my understanding that it's intended to be finalized and presented to the council in August. And remember, this is not the actual SPIRT team. This is just the drafting of the charter. And an actual SPIRT team will not need to be in place until the guidebook is finalized and

released. So that's essentially not until six months prior to the opening of the round.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Thank you for that, Jeff. I have Iran. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. Good day to everyone. During the PDP, this issue was raised and there was a lot of concerns about many people. Predictability in simple language means that if you have a procedure and at a later stage something come up, you need to address that issue. Unfortunately, it becomes under the term of predictability. And now the SubPro has been agreed or being agreed by the entire community in a legislative manner. But now we transfer the responsibility of the community to a small group, even if the small group comes to the GSNO Council and so on and so forth, there would not be the same opportunity for the entire community to many or one or two or three public comment to talk about this unclear situation of predictability.

There may be other way to do that. There may be some rules, for instance, for IRP in the bylaw, there are very few things, but in the IOT implementation review team, we are establishing the rules that if something happened, some action to be done. I don't understand the way that GNSO proceed with this issue or has been mentioned by this predictability. I am very worried that our concerns may be not addressed because the entire right of the entire community will be transferred to a small group, even if it is agreed by the GNSO Council. So we need to be very, very careful about that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Thank you for that, Iran. Jeff, would you like to go ahead?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, thank you, Kavouss. This is Jeff Neuman. The role of the SPIRT team once that is put together is not to solve any of the issues that necessarily come about after the round opens, but rather is there to help coordinate where the resolution of that issue lies. And so if it is appropriate for the entire community to have input on the issue, then that issue will be referred by the SPIRT to the entire community, or if it's appropriate that it's the GNSO, it'll be referred to the GNSO. And so this SPIRT team is not solving issues that arise, but merely a conduit to figuring out fairly quickly how that issue should be resolved.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Jeff. Thank you, Iran, for the question and comment. Any other feedback in the room online? I don't see any hand up, which means that we're to move on. And for that, let me turn it over to you, Switzerland, regarding SOIs, statements of interest. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. If we go to the next slide, please. Thank you. Well, this is about transparency. And you've heard this already a couple of times at ICANN76, ICANN78. And we are discussing this also this time inside the GAC, because it's very important to us as a precondition for accountability and legitimacy of the policy development process we have here in ICANN, as the SOIs

affect us all, all those participating in policy development processes. We have raised this with the board yesterday in our interaction with them. And the board also shares this view that we have to continue community discussions.

It might be a difficult issue for some in the community, but we have to put the issues really under the sunlight to see what are they really, and what is the question and how can we address it. And we have also sent, and it's available in the ICANN correspondence, a letter from our chair, of course, after going through the GAC to Tripty on this matter, raising its importance to us. So I won't elaborate on the bullets you have before you. You saw that, but this is a dynamic conversation. And we would really welcome you elaborating where you stand, what are the positions within the GNSO community as well, and how you think we can make progress on this issue. Because especially this year and next year the wider internet governance community is watching us. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thank you, Jorge. This is Greg DiBiase for the record. There are various views on this issue within the GNSO. We had gone through an effort to amend our SOI through the CCOICI process. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach consensus on amendment. However, that does not mean that we would not be interested in participating in a community-wide effort and continuing to look at the issue and participate in that conversation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Greg. Let me open the floor at this point for questions or comments from the audience. And I already have Mr. Arasteh from Iran. Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I think in the presentation by the board, in our meeting with the board, a percentage of 0.03% was mentioned. It is not clear whether it is an overall percentage or percentage of what. However, I am asking myself as an engineer, are we looking for the zero percentage? Absolutely nothing. Zero threshold? That does not exist. Whole perfection does not exist anywhere. There is a threshold.

Then the question is that what are the subjects that create this problem for one country that came to the GAC and pushed the GAC to have What are the examples of that? And what is the advantage of this advantage to put a lot of effort to bring 0.3% to 0.1% or 0.00%? So I think we should be realistic and not drill into the poppy. However, I think GNSO will do the best, but I don't believe that we come to the zero percentage at all. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Iran. I'm not sure I entirely agree with you in that regard. But anyways, my opinion is totally pointless at this point. I have the UK, the United States and Egypt. UK, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Your views are certainly not useless at all. I really just had a question on this. We've had a quite

extensive dialogue on this in the last two or three meetings. And we know that the GNSO went through a process, a due process under their governance arrangements, which we, of course, fully respect. We also, of course, have had exchanges with the board on this issue. And the board have come back and said that they're very, if you like, sympathetic to the notion of transparency and that statements of interest should be given for any participation in policy development processes or the like. We had a discussion this week with the Contracted Parties House.

And they were very, and I was going to use a word, but I don't know how to spell it. So my English is not very good. The Contracted Parties House were very sort of adamant. Yes, thank you. I always find that the Swiss adaption of English helps such a lot. But the Contracted Parties House came across as if they were adamant that there shouldn't be an exception at all for statements of interest. I think the question for some GAC members, and I know one or two approach me, because sometimes people think that I have answers and they don't approach me again.

But if the Contracted Parties House came to the meeting, if the board comes to the meeting and says this should happen, then where is it? Who is it in the GNSO that's saying that there shouldn't be statements of interest given in policy development processes? So perhaps we could, because if we could have a dialogue, because perhaps we are missing something. We're just public policy officials and we don't necessarily understand all the implications of the actions of lawyers under US statutes or whatever.

And so perhaps we ought to understand a bit better and then we could perhaps come to some sort of understanding and that might help in our deliberations on this. But it needs to happen urgently because it needs to happen before Kigali. We need to be able to say before our meeting in Kigali, which is a high-level government meeting where we have ministers present, we need to be able to tell our ministers we've solved this problem.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, UK. Great. Jeff, Paul, Tomslin.

GREG DIBIASE: As I said before, there is a variety of perspectives on this issue within the GNSO. We could take that back to see if one perspective could be elaborated and share that. I'm sure some of the stakeholder groups may be willing to do that, but that's something we could look into.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Greg. I have the USA. Please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Good morning and thank you, Chair. Well, I'm not an engineer, but I do know that point 0.3% is not full transparency. And full transparency is a tenet of the multi-stakeholder approach and something that is very important at ICANN. It's enshrined in its bylaws. I think that looking at this issue further, especially as my colleague from Switzerland has mentioned in this very crucial time frame for the multi-stakeholder

approach and the latter half of this year and going into 2025 and beyond, this is certainly, I think, a very straightforward issue for the GAC. Not all issues are straightforward that come across our collective desk, but I do think this one is pretty simple. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, US. Any feedback from the GNSO?

GREG DIBIASE: I think just that we're willing to continue to work on this issue and whatever the next vehicle, whether the CCWG or some other community effort, the fact that this particular amendment was unsuccessful does not mean that we're not ready to continue to work towards resolution.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Thank you, Greg. Before I give the floor to Egypt, how long do you think it might take? In other words, do you think anything might happen before ICANN80 in Kigali? Let me be straightforward and direct here.

GREG DIBIASE: I do not think at the GMSO level, but I really can't speak to a broad effort because we would just be one of the constituencies, so I think that's a conversation for the community.

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

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you, Chair. I think I'm not going to add much to what my colleagues from Switzerland, UK, and US have mentioned, but I believe maybe at this point it would be good to understand. Greg, you mentioned there are diverse views. I think it would be good to understand at least what is the rationale behind those diverse views, because that would give us an opportunity to actually discuss in more details across the community. So that on one hand. On the other hand, you mentioned, and we thank you for that, that there is a willingness to move towards reaching a resolution. Maybe if you can elaborate more on the mechanism to do so, how do we anticipate this to happen? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: I can certainly take that request back to elaborate on what the diverse viewpoints are. Regarding the mechanism, I'm not sure what it would be. Speaking in my personal capacity, there are reviews, there are CCWGs, perhaps that's a method, but I don't think as one of the SOs of many that we could say with certainty what the right path is.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you. Thank you again, Greg. Thank you, Egypt. Any other comment or question before we move on? I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see any hand online. That means that we're to move forward. Topic number four is DNS abuse mitigation, potential post

contractual amendments, policy developments on DNS abuse, including botnets and phishing. And for that, let me give the floor again to the UK. Please go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Chair and Mr. Chairman. So we're on to DNS abuse mitigation. And the first part of this is, as you've seen, the post contractual amendments, policy developments on DNS abuse. Perhaps before we get on to that and ask our distinguished guests for their views about how this might move forward, we heard earlier in the week about the fact that the contract amendments, which of course we were very pleased that were agreed to come into force, I think, in the next couple of weeks in early April. So that's excellent news.

We heard in our discussions that obviously the contractual compliance folks in ICANN and no doubt other bodies will be looking at the effect of these amendments very carefully to judge their effectiveness and etc. But in the GAC, we had looked before the amendments were fully affected at the next steps.

And from time to time, we had had discussions helped by our colleagues in the public safety working group on what might be the next steps in terms of what nets or phishing or other small little bite-sized policy development processes. I remember various colleagues in the GNSO talking about these bite-size, it sort of evokes quite a nice sort of visual sort of representation. So perhaps we could invite our distinguished guests to talk about how you envisage taking this forward, whether in some sort of policy development process, expedited development process or whatever. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Nigel. This is Greg DiBiase. So, as you mentioned, the GNSO is always considering how policy development could improve efforts in this area. We note the amendments, which are a rather significant change in the structure of the agreements. So, as an initial issue, we think there could be valuable data on the impact of the amendments. I think that's one of the things that we're looking at. We're looking at data that we're getting from the amendments that could inform our scoping work on what policy development could be appropriate. When scoping our potential policy development, data is very helpful.

So we're looking at, hopefully, data we're getting from the amendments, which could come from ICANN compliance, we are liaising with a contracted party house abuse small team. That's the registries and registrars. They have a dedicated small team on abuse, and they have been having bilateral meetings between the contracted party house and the other various stakeholder groups within the GNSO to understand their concerns, issues they're seeing with DNS abuse. And hopefully, that's another source of data that we can use to consider this.

I also saw on the slide, there was a question about the GNSO small team on abuse that is currently paused pending the data from these sources. We hope that we can take this data back, start to consider the issue again, and then determine what, if any, policy development might be appropriate to address gaps if they're identified.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Greg. As a matter of fact, that was the next question, the update on GNSO council small team on DNS abuse. So thank you for mentioning. Any comment, any question before we move on? Is there anything you would like to add, Jeff, Greg, Paul, Tomslin, no, we're good. I don't see any hand up. Sorry, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: I just want to note that, although the small team is paused, this work is not stopped. That this is just, we're waiting on more data while other initiatives to gather valuable feedback are being undertaken.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you again, Greg. As I said before, I don't see any hand, any requests for the floor, which means that we're okay to move on to the topic number five, which is WHOIS data protection, data accuracy and data processing agreements between ICANN and contracted parties. So the guy would welcome a status update from the GNSO council on where we stand on these issues, where the GAC has repeatedly stated its concern. Would you be so kind as to provide some sort of update?

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Thank you. So as context, there was a scoping team looking at the issue of data accuracy to determine if there was a problem that can be properly addressed through policy development. One of the notes from that team was work would be more effective when data processing agreements were in place between ICANN and contracted parties. In other words, establishing a basis that data could be shared

between ICANN and contracted parties. So we had paused that work pending those agreements. Those agreements have still not been completed. We are hearing updates that may be imminent. So it is currently paused until August.

However, we are bringing the issue back up in June because we understand the concern and we want to get ahead of this issue. And if the agreements are concluded earlier, then this will go onto our agenda quicker. The last thing I would note that I think is relevant to this issue is that ICANN did an assessment of what registrant data can be shared for the purpose of assessing accuracy. And they concluded that ICANN does not have a legal basis for collecting data in bulk for the purpose of assessing accuracy. So that speaks to one of the open issues on the scoping team. We're determining if there is an issue to be addressed. And so I think it's important to add this as something relevant that will be considered in our determination of how we tackle this issue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much for the detailed explanation, Greg. Comments, questions, thoughts? I don't see any hand. I don't see any hand online either, which means that we're getting, and I'm surprised that we're getting to a super-efficient meeting. So glad. To the AOB section, any other business? The first topic there is that the GAC welcomes a GNSO council update on urgent requests and highlights the need to start work as soon as possible on this very important issue. What is the timeline contemplated for this work? Jeff, Greg?

GREG DIBIASE: So this issue is currently with ICANN's board. They flagged this as an issue they had concerns with, but we haven't had sufficient elaboration to effectively plan on what the next steps might be. So in our last board session, we raised this and said, we're anxious to hear their feedback. And so we're waiting. And when we hear back from the board, hopefully we can address this constructively.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you again, Greg. And I have a queue. I have Iran and then Indonesia. Iran, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, chair. I have a general comment if the distinguished representative or chair of the GNSO and colleagues allow me. I request the GNSO, during the last 10 years, most of our concerns relates to DNS and associated matters. The DNS growth model is administered and governed by GNSO and its sub constituency. What course of action GNSO suggests in order that we increase the level of collaboration, cooperation to minimize the problems, that difficulty that we have and improve the manner to also improve the efficiency.

Do you have any suggestion that we could take on board? I know, or we know that every GAC consensus advice will be scrutinized and analyzed by GNSO, which does not any other supporting organization make, but nevertheless, that is your right. However, what suggestion you can make in order that we improve the situation, collaboration, and so on and so forth. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: So, I think I heard that question on how GAC and GNSO collaboration can be improved. So, you mentioned the GAC communique, but we've also been working towards establishing more informal channels, relying on liaisons like Jeff here. And then I'd note there's been participation in the various policy efforts, for example, the small team pro on the next rounds that have been really fruitful. So, I think it's establishing the more communication, the better. And we've been working on improving and expanding those channels.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you again, Greg. Thank you, Iran. I have Indonesia.

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO: Yes, thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia for the record. I want to get information on this program, GDPR, because previously I can have a legal case with EPAG in Germany regarding to GDPR. Now, I want to know if there is any other legal case like that. Now, I'm asking this because in Indonesia, we have just released our new law in data protection. GDPR is one of the references. I don't want to have a problem like that. Like in Germany, I can have with EPAG. I want to avoid this one. Try to do the best to not to have legal case, which I can also. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: I think responding to new legislation, ICANN policy is not typically developed in response to legislation, but rather to address community

wide issues that are identified. However, we work, for example, we get briefings from ICANN on new developments that may be relevant and we always consider, but I don't know of specific regulation that we're discussing at the moment.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you again, Greg. Thank you, Indonesia. I have India. Please be brief and straight to the point. We only have eight more minutes and two more AOB questions. Go ahead, please, India.

T. SANTHOSH: Thank you, Chair. I would like to know from the GNSO whether they are contemplating on the implementation of DNSSEC. Why? Because DNSSEC will provide authenticity as well as integrity, while each user goes to a particular URL or any website. So the uptake of the DNSSEC, which is a standard in IETF, is not much happening. So is GNSO contemplating to bring DNSSEC at all levels of the domain? Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: There's not a current policy effort related to DNSSEC. However, in the registrar accreditation agreement, there is a clause in which that registrars must provide, I believe, DNSSEC capabilities. So I believe it is addressed in the accreditation agreement. And, if raised as an issue, that could be something that GNSO addresses in the future. Jeff?

79 | COMMUNITY FORUM

JEFF NEUMAN:

So all contracted parties, registries and registrars are required to implement DNSSEC. Those are the only, the registries and registrars at this point in time are the only parties that have contracts with ICANN. So the GNSO policy effort really couldn't cover any other entities other than registries, registrars, and of course resellers of registrars. So ISPs, application providers, anyone else on the chain would not be impacted by GNSO policy or, frankly, any policy that came out of ICANN. So I'm not sure that there could be a policy effort, because everybody that a policy effort would impact has already implemented it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Jeff. India, is that a good answer? Are you happy? Thank you for the thumbs up. So any other comment or question? We have five minutes to go. And two more questions for the GNSO. Those questions being, when will work begin on assessing what policies remain fit for purpose in light of other policy developments related to GDPR and what is the timeline contemplated for this work?

GREG DIBIASE:

The privacy proxy accreditation recommendations final report were adopted by the board, I think, in 2016 before GDPR. GDPR necessitated a temporary specification and related policy work. There is a new policy called the registration data policy that is moving forward. And so ICANN has recently informed the GNSO that work can begin on privacy proxy accreditation implementation. There are a couple issues to sort through here, whether it can proceed in an IRT if there are recommendations that need to be recommended, but that is now something we're considering. It is no longer on hold by ICANN and a

problem we're working towards addressing. I'm not sure on a timeline. I know, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Paul McGrady here. So not sure about the timeline, but I do know in my calendar, at least, that there is an informal session on this today at noon in room 208A. And so I think there's going to be an opportunity for us to ask staff to confirm that they don't, either they are going to need recommendations supplemented in some way, or they're not. What is the timeframe for the implementation work? There's a lot of questions that have come up this week. And so I'm glad they're having that informal session. I don't know what the GAC schedule is, but I know that a lot from the GNSO will be there. I wish you could ask us this question tomorrow because we may know a whole lot more.

GREG DIBIASE: And I'd also note that I believe ICANN staff has published or will shortly publish a document on potential issues on proceeding with the IRT.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you again for that. Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Greg. Any final short and sweet comments? Because we only have three more minutes from the floor at this point or online? I don't see any hand up. I don't see any hand online, which means that we're closing. And thank you so much again, Jeff. Greg, Paul, Tomlin. Thank you to the GNSO. We'll be in touch for sure. Thank you to Switzerland and to the UK for the help. The session is closed. Just a couple of housekeeping details for the

distinguished GAC members. We'll reconvene here at 1:15, correct me, Rob, if I'm wrong, 1:15 right after lunch. Enjoy your fantastic Puerto Rican food for lunch. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]