DUBLIN – GAC Public Safety Working Group
Monday, October 19, 2015 – 17:00 to 18:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALICE MUNYUA: Good afternoon and good evening, everyone. This is a closed meeting of the Public Safety Working Group of the Governmental Advisory Committee. You're welcome. We would like to start by taking a round of introductions just to get to know each other. I'll start with myself.

My name is Alice Munyua, African Union Commission, co-chair of the Public Safety Working Group.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Wanawit Ahkuptra. I'm the GAC vice chair and then also the co-chair of [inaudible] working groups.

JOHN FLAHERTY: I am John Flaherty, National Crime Agency, National Cybercrime Unit in the UK.

NICK SHOREY: Nick Shorey, part of the UK [GAC] team.

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.

EVA PETSCH: My name is Eva. I'm coming from Germany from the [BK].

ALICE MUNYUA: Yes, sorry. It's a closed GAC Public Safety Working Group meeting.

KIMMO ULKUNIEMI: Kimmo Ulkuniemi from INTERPOL, Global Complex for Innovation.

[JOE]: Joe [inaudible]. Also from INTERPOL, but I'm based at the general secretariat in [Lyon] and France.

ANNALEISE WILLIAMS: I'm Annaleise Williams, the Australian GAC representative.

PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA: Hi, I'm Pitinan Kooarmornpatana from Thailand GAC team.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible], Thailand.

BOBBY FLAIM: Bobby Flaim, Federal Bureau of Investigations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Laureen Kapin, United States Federal Trade Commission.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Iranga Kahangama, Federal Bureau of Investigations.

STEPHEN TRUICK: Steve Truick from the MHRA in UK.

[THOMAS WALDEN]:   Thomas [Walden], Drug Enforcement Administration.

JIM EMERSON: Jim Emerson, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

MIKE FREEMAN: Mike Freeman, US Drug Enforcement Administration.

CARMEN ALVAREZ: Carmen Alvarez, Drug Enforcement Administration.

KARINE PERSET: Karine Perset, GAC support staff.

EN

RUSSELL RICHARDSON: Good afternoon. Russell Richardson, from the Information Technolog Authority in the Cayman Islands.

[ALEXANDER]: Alexander [inaudible], Organization for Security and Coordination in Europe.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible], chairman, GAC representative.

GREGORY MOUNIER: Good afternoon. Gregory Mounier from EUROPOL.

ADRIAN KOSTER: Adrian Koster from the Swiss Government Critical Information Infrastructure Protection Unit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. I'm an advisor to the Indian GAC representative.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. I'm an advisor to the Indian GAC representative.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Hi, I'm [inaudible] from Quebec Provincial Police.
CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:	Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, European Commission.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX:	I'm Fabien Betremieux from ICANN staff. I'm supporting the speculative insecurity framework initiative.
ALICE MUNYUA:	Thank you very much. I hope everybody has introduced themselves. Yes, please, introduce yourself.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I am Dr. [inaudible]. I am the cyber coordinator in the [inaudible] of India.
ALICE MUNYUA:	Is that everybody? Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. We've just come from a very interesting public session and I would like to thank everybody who presented there. Very interesting questions came up and we promise that we will respond to them online. So we are going to put that as part of our agenda to discuss how we are going to address that.

But very quickly, the agenda for today's meeting is first looking at our work plan, trying to complete that in any way we can between now and perhaps the short-term and medium-term. Then perhaps discuss participation in some of the PDP [sections], especially GNSO. And it's good to have one or two ICANN staff here so they can help us, perhaps. And Karine can help us think through how we may be able to do that so that we are working together with the ICANN processes, rather than reacting to them as part of the public comment.

Then the Affirmation of Commitments and looking specifically at consumer protection and competition, and issues arising from today's public session.

So I just want to hear from you that this agenda is acceptable, whether there's anything we need to add, any comments on the agenda. Bobby? No, okay. So shall we accept the agenda as it is? Okay, thank you very much. I'll hand over the first session to Thailand to chair.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: [Maureen], do you have the work plan to show?

ALICE MUNYUA: The work plan, yeah.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: [inaudible] just joined. I think the Public Safety Working Group, we have two or three [inaudible] or assignments that have been [inaudible] also with spec 11, that part of the very critical issues of us as well as the GAC advice from Beijing. We also have the privacy – proxy, privacy. Several aspects. We have [been making] presentations that several constituencies conduct. Several studies [inaudible] have quite concerns on how we bring the issues of public safety into all this work and look into the holistic approach more than look into bit and pieces, because they're talking about several issues, like IDN (Internationalized Domain Names), translation, transliteration, [inaudible] only some of the gTLDs and they have the thick WHOIS, they have WHOIS reviews.

Even the GAC. We put it in the communique in LA about, in fact, what it is that we need to [be] working on, because for us, we also [confused] actually what is the WHOIS that we're talking about. So I think the GAC work plan template that is showing you, I think we're working on the framework. The terms of reference is already done and we have been getting that GAC [approved] already. Is it not also in the communique? No, it's not yet. So WHOIS [inaudible] specification reviews and the public safety agency [inaudible] August 2015. [inaudible] and comment on the privacy-proxy accreditation service initial report of GNSO [inaudible] PDP working groups developed by Public Safety

Working Group approved, endorsed by the GAC, and submitted to GNSO PDP [SAI] PDP Working Group already.

So we have Next Generation Registry Directory Services should be on the way. There are some points that have been made by [inaudible] that GAC is currently working on on the Next Generation.

We have a second face-to-face meeting. Is that meeting in Washington, DC? Yes, we have on the [10th] of September. And we have participation [inaudible]. We have a [inaudible] half-a-day meeting there in the US.

We also submit [PSWG] in GAC for comments, approval. The [letter] of Number Resource Organization letter was approved and [announced] by the GAC [inaudible]. Not yet? Okay, but it's approved and we will submit to the [inaudible]. It should be on its way.

I think it's quite an important milestone because the IP is also very important, and to have the approve that we would try to submit the letter on the WHOIS [inaudible] on the address of the IP is critical to [PSWG].

Now I think we can go on to the case study of several areas including [inaudible] investments, scams. We need to have the

EN

detail, that what should be the outputs. [Alissa] will actually lead that case study. Do we have the names already? No, not yet.

They have the topic of [inaudible] closer cooperation among regulators [inaudible] support from registrar, registry, to address some of the public safety concern. This is ongoing and long term, and I think we need to find out the detail on the action what needs to be done. Is that correct?

And then outreach to the members of developing countries [UCOAS] GAC. Public safety agency in developed regions. I think this is part of the critical work that we're identifying as well because most of the problems that we also face is also coming from – the [target] is to the developing countries, like Thailand is also one of the targets that have been in the new gTLD security framework spec 11. Fabien is sitting here, so he'll [inaudible]. That is the first page. So it should be…

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Wanawit. I would like to suggest up until the face-to-face meeting 10 September, I think those are activities that have already taken place. So going forward, the next ones we do need to discuss the letter to the NRO that was circulated to the list, and perhaps I may ask Bobby from the FBI to quickly give us a quick update, especially on the rationale, so that this group can then – we can then send it back to the list for approval. Because I

would like to send the letter to the GAC by the time we finish this meeting. So Bobby, please?

BOBBY FLAIM: Sure. One of the rationales for doing this is that we've had the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. We're working with the registries right now on domain name WHOIS, which for public safety organizations, is very important. But what is actually even more important is IP address accuracy, which we don't necessarily discuss here at ICANN. That's really discussed at the Regional Internet Registries. But the rationale is that the Regional Internet Registries such as RIPE, ARIN, APNIC, AFRINIC, and LACNIC activity do gather here under what they call the Addressing Supporting Organization. And they work with their… It's the same organizations. It's the Numbering Resource Organization.

So what these groups do together as they're representing all of the five Regional Internet Registries is that they work on global policies, because the way the Regional Internet Registries work is they have a contract that they sign with organizations asking for IP addresses. They call them different names and the individual regional registries. I know in RIPE, LACNIC, and AFRINIC, they call it a Registry Service Agreement (RSA). I think

it's a Membership Agreement in RIPE. And apologies I can't remember what they call it in APNIC.

But these are basic contracts that they sign with any organization such as an Internet Service Provider, a local Internet registry, that allocates IP addresses throughout their respective regions.

But what those RSAs or contracts are supplemented by – and this is very key – are policies. Kind of like how ICANN comes up with policies that the GNSO or ccNSO works on here, the Regional Internet Registries have IP policies.

So I know in our region and also RIPE public safety agencies have tried to encourage WHOIS accuracy. This is becoming even more important as we go from IPv4 to IPv6, and more importantly Internet of Things. Everything from your phone to your TV, you name it, is going to have an IP address. It won't necessarily have a domain name, but will have an IP address and that's an important piece of information insofar as attribution and transparency on the Internet.

Some of the other things that are going on that kind of dovetail with this is that the IETF (the Internet Engineering Task Force) actually have drafted a new WHOIS protocol called RDAP, which is Registry Data Access Protocol. And they've already had meetings here at ICANN on how that is going to be implemented

on a policy level on the domain side. But what's already happening is on the Regional Internet Registry side, that is already being deployed, the RDAP.

That's key because it's a centralized database of WHOIS information and what goes into it relies upon the policies of either ICANN on the domain side or the Regional Internet Registries on the IP side.

Therefore, what we're trying to do is have more of a holistic and concentrated approach on WHOIS and the IP addressing is very important. So what we wanted to do as the Public Safety Working Group is present a letter to the Numbering Resource Organization, which includes all of the five Regional Internet Registries stating that we at ICANN have some domain name WHOIS accuracy requirements, voluntary practices, and it would be very helpful to public safety agencies if that could be mirrored on the IP addressing side.

So the letter which you have received and also the background information, which was distributed by yourself, Alice, last week kind of explains why we need it and the very nice request to develop global and consistent IP WHOIS policies so that when public safety agencies are looking for that attribution on an IP address, we'll be able to find it.

Some of the issues and why we're doing that is right now you don't have that WHOIS accuracy. A lot of times when the Regional Internet Registries provide IP addresses to Internet service providers or local Internet registries, those organizations assign or reallocate IP addresses down the line. And once the do that, you further and further away from WHOIS accuracy because a lot of that is not necessarily reported. So that's the rationale.

I hope that clarifies. It's a little bit of a convoluted process, but one that's very important because we here at ICANN are focused on domain name WHOIS, but what's even more important is the IP WHOIS, which isn't nothing necessarily addressed at ICANN, but the regional Internet registries are part of the whole Internet governance ecosphere, if you will. And now with IANA and the transition, this will be even more important as well.

I hope that was a good enough description, and if anyone has any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Bobby. Any comments or questions? Yes, please, India?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a very quick comment. It's not even a question, but rather just to add on to what you were saying. One thing that we have observed – and I think there have been comments to this effect in other fora that have been put forward. When it comes to IPv4 numbers, because almost all of the RIRs, except for the African RIR, have run out of IPv4 numbers.

There is now a very robust secondary market in IPv4 numbers which has further degraded the quality of the IPv4 WHOIS tables across all RIRs. That's something that needs to be addressed and needs to be addressed through global policies, perhaps which regulate the transfer of IPv4 addresses on the secondary market, which is a daunting task but definitely something that's important.

BOBBY FLAIM: Yes. I think initial request of the Regional Internet Registries will be a long process, probably a couple of years. The other thing that I failed to mention is that the difference between IPv4 and IPv6 is the fact that IPv6, the blocks of IP addresses are going to be much, much larger. And with that, the allocation is going to be larger so there's going to be more sub-levels of allocations and assignments that will go down and down and it will be hard to keep that straight and keep that accurate. So we're trying to

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

get a jump on it and be a little bit proactive as IPv6 is being deployed.

ALICE MUNYUA: Any other comments or questions? Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Just one, Bobby. In terms of the reassignment of IPv6 space and the attribution and traceability that we look for, we've done a lot of extensive research on RIPE WHOIS. I don't know if this is part of the letter to influence, but there's some quite good reassignment WHOIS at the sub-delegation level coming out of hosting providers. So if you're looking at slash-29, a few IPs that have been reassigned. I think the RIPE policy is you don't have to show the sub-delegation record, but most of these hosting providers that have this reseller WHOIS information that we're looking for, this delegated record, quite well granularly populated and the WHOIS details look [inaccurate]. But it's a start and it's a lead like the domain WHOIS because we're going to get web mail e-mails in there.

The recording and the population of small blocks of IPs and diversified bullet proof host infrastructures, for example, is there. There's only so far a [inaudible] company can go to know your customer over someone from [South Russia].

I think it's good to maybe show them what we're doing well, and we want more of that in an IPv6 [space] because [they're] trying to do that in IPv4.

Yeah, absolutely. There are already some existing policies within some of the Regional Internet Registries. And I think, to your point, what we're trying to do is highlight if those are good practices and they are working and to make sure that they're global.

So we may be going to some of them, and they're like, "Well, that's very nice, but we already have that." And that would be great. That actually might be the starting point for some of what we're trying to accomplish, which is globally coordinated policies that would look alike in all of the international Regional Internet Registries.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. Any other comments? Yes, please? UK.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Alice. Just without wishing to get too big in terms of our blue sky thinking, I think it was a really interesting point you made, Bobby, there regarding the inter-dependency of these different organizations or bodies of organizations with respect

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

to a cybercrime investigation, for instance. The different types of solutions that might be available in the broader perspective.

So just for the benefit of those who weren't in the public session a short while ago, in the UK we set up a UK sub-group, so we brought the broader spectrum of public safety bodies who might have an interest in this area together and we have meetings in London once a month and we discuss the issues that come out of this group.

But as an inevitable consequence of the enthusiasm of all of those people, the discussion topics then kind of invariably go off to, "Well, there's this standard that this RFC that's been developed which could help us – if implemented more widely, could help us sort of secure e-mails from being fraudulently faked when sending out spam.

As you say, there are things that we could do with the Regional Internet Registries for improving their WHOIS. There's best practice work that's going on within the Internet Governance Forum. I don't want to drag on too long, but one of the things I've been trying to do back in the UK is do a bit of a coordination piece because there are other sort of government departments or areas within my own department who have more of a focus on the IETF. The home office have a clear interest in this area.

So I've been trying to do a bit of coordination and find out who's doing this or who's got an interest in this area elsewhere, and how we might be able to bring that forward into a broader thing. It's not been easy. It's sort of like running down rabbit holes sometimes it seems.

That's certainly the comments that have come up in our group about the DNS is one element, but there's a broader issue and it's all to tackle the overall problems of maybe cybercrime. You can do one thing, but you've got to do a sort of collective thing. It might be something for consideration maybe if people around the room [inaudible] chat about it.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. Bobby, do you have any other comments? Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the accuracy of the registry information is very important and I think on the floor in the previous session there was a question on the recommendation. How do we verify the information? I'm new to this working group, so I'm not sure if that's included in the literature in the NRO. If not, then how can we provide them with recommendation at the policy level, or do we recommend them to do it in their own working group to

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

come up with a way to standardize verification method for the accuracy of the WHOIS information.

BOBBY FLAIM: I think it's up to the individual Regional Internet Registries on how they would verify the information. I know ARIN in North America actually sends out an e-mail to kind of verify the point of contact. So they send that out once a year. But the thing is that a lot of people actually don't answer that.

One of the challenges that we are going to have, as long as we go into this with eyes wide open is the fact that, kind of like ICANN – and it's a little bit frustrating to us, but it's not just ICANN. It's a lot of the Internet governance organizations is that there's really no enforcement mechanisms. So they can ask and they can ask very nicely and they can ask nicely twice and three times, but you won't necessarily get the information or the verification on the validation in which you're asking for.

But, we have to start somewhere and it's the idea that we're asking them trying to come up with – like John is trying to come up with voluntary practices on the spec 11. Asking them to maybe adopt voluntary policies and enforcement mechanisms and maybe shine a light on this in which we would be able to actually do that. That's one of the reasons here. We're hoping to incrementally get to that point.

EN

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Bobby. We'd like to close this now. I think we have agreement generally on sending the letter. So we're going to give our colleagues who are not present in this meeting another couple of days for any comments they might have on both the draft letter and the rationale [we've] provided.

Then towards the end of the week or beginning of next week, we're going to send it to the GAC for approval endorsement, and the letter will be submitted to the NRO. So we're in agreement with that? Yeah. So we give ourselves another couple of days for any comments and the letter will be sent off. Okay, thank you.

On the work plan, the next issue here is the case studies in several areas. This issue was identified during our face-to-face meeting September 10th. I think I'd like to invite Laureen and Bobby again to just take us through very quickly some of the areas that were identified where we may need as a group to have case studies. So again, either Laureen or Bobby.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We're still in the midst of figuring out the best way to go forward on this. But basically, for those in the room who were in the last session, which I think is a good many of us, many times we are faced with questions, the gist of which is, well, why is it so

ICANN | 54
Dublin

important, all this WHOIS stuff? Has that ever saved anyone's life? Has that ever stopped any crimes?

Of course, as those of us who are on the front lines of investigative work, we know that, as Greg pointed out, WHOIS is a piece of the puzzle that we use to figure out who is behind – hence the name "who is" – behind elicit activities. And to the extent we can draw on our own experiences and those of our colleagues who are on the front lines of investigations in consumer protection matters, in criminal matters, in child exploitation matters and share those stories. And to the extent we have, if there's data to share, how many cases are your investigators working on matters? We're looking at WHOIS as a standard part of their investigation. That's useful information to get out there and share with, shall I say, the more skeptical members of the multi-stakeholder community.

That's really what we discussed as an idea, as a plan, in our September 10th meeting. As you can hear from questions in the room, it's not as persuasive to just tell people, "This is our position. We know what we're talking about." People want to know why. People want to hear actual examples. Also, people long to hear stories. They want to hear, "This is the story of a bad person who was trying to rip off consumers," and how investigators at the Federal Trade Commission did WHOIS searches and reverse WHOIS searches and put data together to

find a commonality that pointed to the one person behind the e-mail address and then was able to stop an advance fee loan scam that was targeting people who were in financial distress.

That's much more compelling than "This information needs to be accurate because we're relying on it in our investigations." That's the gist. If you want to add anything, Bobby?

BOBBY FLAIM: No. I'll just echo what Laureen said. Greg today did a great job in providing EUROPOL examples. That's why we really do need international examples, because I think people think that it's just reserved to a certain region. And the one great thing about being a public safety agency is that we all pretty much are on the same sheet of music, especially law enforcement, which is to find the bad guy. And people do want to hear the stories.

When we came out with the law enforcement recommendations, it's like, "Why? Prove it. Please demonstrate the need."

So that's kind of a seed that we want to put in people's heads, that these examples – these war stories, if you will – are needed. They don't have to be voluminous. You don't have to necessarily come up with stats detailing every instance. But a few stories would go a long way on many different issues – botnets, child exploitation, kidnappings, murders, robberies, consume fraud,

public health issues where you're talking about illegal or counterfeit, more importantly, counterfeit, drugs being sold that are doing harm or even killing people.

These are very dramatic examples and they highlight the need for what we're doing. So we wanted to highlight that and get the thought process, or at least the thought in people's heads, that going forward we're going to try to present these as we go and ask for these things, such as WHOIS specification or proxy or DNS and IP accuracy, so on and so forth, because that ties in. There's a reason for why we're asking for what we're asking for.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Maybe we can even… I'm just curious. Just an informal poll. Who in the room is representing an agency that relies on WHOIS information for their investigations? So, most of us.

If that's the case, then we're asking all of you to share your goodies with us. Share your good stories. If WHOIS is a part of your investigative checklist, let us know that. We all know what goes on in our own agencies, but it would be great to share that information so that we have some persuasive narratives to share, as I said, with more skeptical members of the community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Do you want information regarding how privacy-proxy is now coming in and being used by the criminal groups as well?
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yes. And thanks for emphasizing that, because of course that is so connected to WHOIS because it's a mask over the WHOIS information. We know that some of the privacy-proxy service providers, some are more responsive to law enforcement requests than others.
BOBBY FLAIM:	And we did that. I mean, I did that in the FBI where people would poke me in the chest. "Criminals don't use privacy services because they have to pay for it." I was like, "Yeah, but they do." That's why you're able to counter that and actually know specifically.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I would say… I deal with the medicine side of it. Of the new cases I'm investigating, I would say it's up to 90-odd percent of them are now using a privacy-proxy service. It's very rare that I actually see a WHOIS record. In fact, when I do see it, I tend to instantly know it's a lie. But at least it's not a [privacy] [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a small factual point to add what you were saying. I think that now domain services – Google Domains comes to mind – are offering privacy protection proxy services for free. So you don't even have the issue of a criminal having to pay for it. It's part of the basic package.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay. Thank you. So we agree that this is one of the areas that we should work. What we're going to do [inaudible] is completing this document. We'll come back to all of you and ask whom has case studies that we could share that would build the case.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Alice, it would also be very helpful is for someone to volunteer to spearhead and organize this particular activity, because as we take on more work, we're going to have to divide and conquer. And to the extent we can utilize the talent in the room, so that people take ownership over different projects, that's going to help us all be more effective. So what would be extraordinarily helpful is for someone to volunteer to take the lead on this effort.

EN

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Laureen. Do we have a volunteer who would be…
                       Oh, great. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For the record, Greg has volunteered and we are very thankful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's the timeline for submissions? Are we keeping it fairly
                       tight?

ALICE MUNYUA: We have it as ongoing, but I think it'll depend on what work
                       we're… What we're focusing on and where we would need the
                       case studies to provide evidence. I think it's ongoing. And as we
                       identify the areas that we're going to be working on, then [we'll]
                       come to you.

                       Yes, Greg, please?

GREGORY MOUNIER: I think we could have a document available to pretty much
                       everyone where we contribute stories that we can use. It would
                       be kind of a database where we would just tap into. I mean, now
                       I've got two or three cases because I've done the work last week,
                       but I've heard many other stories. Proxies as well.

I think it's great. It even helps everyone else to develop some kind of a narrative that we can use with stakeholders whenever we [meet] them. And at least as a non-expert by looking into those cases and sitting with my colleagues, then I feel more confident as well to argue for our main points, basically.

But yeah, I'm happy to start the document. Then you can send me your stories and then I can contribute.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Greg, is it possible to have an update on every meeting? Is that too much? Every ICANN meeting we're coming up with the update [versions].

GREGORY MOUNIER: Yeah, of course. If that's what we need, yes, I suppose.

One of the things that we did at the Los Angeles meeting – and I don't know how this would work. I was talking about this to Cathrin. We kind of had a 101 book on the law enforcement, but now it's Public Safety Working Group. Yes, please, Exhibit A.

That may be one of the tabs that we can have a hard copy and also a soft copy where we may be able to update it periodically to ensure that it's a fresh document and it's also archival so that

if anyone meets an untimely demise that we would have the information there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We expect you to live a long time, though, Greg.

GREGORY MOUNIER: But no, that was just one idea that just led me. So I think what Wanawit was saying is very good insofar as that we can maintain it for each meeting. Also, as things arise for certain specific requests – maybe for the proxy we have one example. Maybe for IP addressing we have another example. Maybe for the WHOIS specification, another example, and so on and so forth.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to say I'm going to pass it around so everybody can take a look. I find it's super helpful. Thanks again to Bobby and Laureen, who I suspect put it together.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, Council of Europe?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm just wondering how we can be useful, as Council of Europe, particularly the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime can be

useful, because it has a number of countries which meets as the committee of the parties to the convention. But also you will know my colleagues – and some of you are probably already involved.

But also there's a lot of outreach activities with developing countries. There's also the Octopus Conference on Cybercrime which happens.

I just wonder whether… I haven't spoke to my colleague, but I wonder whether we could outreach to these groups to invite best practice or case studies that you're referring to?

I'm not sure whether these issues actually have been addressed by colleague in these spaces yet directly, and I would defer to you to see whether we can discuss that further. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was going ahead in a similar direction. One of the individuals in the previous session raised a question for the working group as to whether there had been collaboration with the security community.

What I was going to suggest was increasingly cybercrime becomes a function of public-private coordination. So an organization like NCFDA might elicit some case studies where people on the security side of the table are equally – if not more.

EN

The [inaudible] people are day in and day out reliant on WHOIS information for their work as well. So side by side, they may be even more compelling.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. And I think Greg, who's leading this, if you could just put them in touch with Greg and he'll be able to manage all of that. Thank you. Please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a quick comment [inaudible] regional working group meetings for the cybercrime [inaudible]. Next meeting is going to be in Africa in two weeks. That's definitely a message we want to pass to countries and ask their experience from Africa. And the following meeting is going to be beginning of December for Middle East and North Africa. Very good opportunity to collect experience and some examples.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, thank you. The next item is encouraging collaboration among regulators to solicit support from registrars and registries to address public safety concerns. I don't know how we'd go about this. Any ideas from any of the working group members?

This was a proposal from the Organization of American States, and I think it's got more to do with outreach. And I suppose it's something we could think about in terms of how we're going to engage with outreach, and I think one of them is, for example, INTERPOL holding the event in the Africa region. And then in Marrakech, perhaps ensuring that the African Union will try to get as many law enforcement agents from the Africa region as possible. So in a way, we are encouraging the collaboration and capacity building and outreach as well.

Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a comment again. We shared information to all 190 member countries about ICANN meeting in Marrakech, and also possibility to apply fellowship grant.

ALICE MUNYUA: Yeah. So that would be a good opportunity to continue this discussion, and perhaps concretely come up with activities. Because the work plan will be required by the GAC to identify whether we require any resources for every event or every activity we are identifying here. But we can continue these discussions, unless anybody has any comments on this. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd like to propose something concrete. Is it possible that in every meeting that that normally at the host country and experience of stakeholder that [inaudible] that country may be different from one to another. Can we have the session of [inaudible] to working with that host country and we see the structures, how could they work and working out the problems? Is that possible? So then we have a clear agenda that we invite the stakeholders, and then we share the experience we have and ask them what they're doing and we can know that this country is doing this, and then we move to another country. So then we can have a kind of document. Okay, we talked to the local host. Is that possible? Otherwise, we don't know what would be the target, [inaudible] stick to the host country one by one. And then [inaudible] invite stakeholder that [inaudible] to that country, invite them and have special session on host country together with [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Apologies for taking the floor again, but we're not just talking about law enforcement. We're talking about other actors, too, aren't we? For example, I have colleagues who deal with pharmacies, and online pharmaceutical care and things like this. I've [got] information regarding different consortiums which could be approached. It really depends how far you want to go,

EN

what's the scope. And also, do you want to invite certain groups to come in? Explicitly invite them, for example.

ALICE MUNYUA: Oh yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I spent all my life trying to establish relationships with registrars and registries around the world. We have a very good relationship with the UK registry, NomiNet. And I think we have a good – not a bad relationship with a number of registrars around the world. We're always trying to push the boundaries, but it's all down to trust. It takes time to build up that trust.

One of the problems is that we're all giving them a different type of information when we want something. So if we want, say, a suspension, the way I would go around a suspension of a domain name may be different from another countries'. I think we need to start looking at standardization of requests.

One of the things I know that registrars come back to me on is, well, we've just done some work with the Americans or we've just done work with Russians or whatever, and you're all asking for a different level of information or you're asking for a different request. I think we should look at trying to standardize exactly what we want from the different organizations. There may be a

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

EN

need for a conduit, whether that's through INTERPOL or EUROPOL or something like that, but it's something I think we just need to take a step back sometimes and look at how we're doing it. Can we do it on a templated form that we can all agree to for a standard – either it's a WHOIS request or whether it's a domain suspension. We should be trying to do it off the same kind of hymn sheet. And that's the way I would take it forward.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: I'm just kind of looking at this one and I'm picking on the point the Council of Europe made there. Yes, it's not just law enforcement agencies within our subgroup. We've also got intellectual property people and we've got the data protection people as well.

Quite a few of the comments and the questions that were coming back in that earlier session were about the concern of a public WHOIS database. They say a WHOIS database is public. The lady right at the end who made the quite valid point that they made some public comments to the privacy-proxy PDP. And then in retaliation, I understand that – I'm not sure if I heard it correctly, but I understand they made some public comments that privacy-proxy thing. And in retaliation, they then found that WHOIS data was published online by people in retaliation.

A lot of concerns seem to be around this issue of – this perception of maybe there should be… That this working group would just be all about trying to get a public WHOIS.

I don't think that's necessarily the case, [inaudible] certainly from the UK. I think what this group is trying to do is ensure, with respect to the WHOIS, that it's accurate, that it's actionable. The feedback I get from my people is that they don't necessarily mind there's a private WHOIS in some cases, as long as when they need to make a request, they can get accurate, actionable information in quick time.

Just pick up on your point that certainly I'm taking a broader look at this and I think there can be some sort of join up around that to help present the case.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I try to formalize [inaudible]. Whether it's possible to look at like as UK already [initiate] to have the PSWG coordination in the country and then Thailand will try to follow. We try to working out. Mark has mentioned that it's possible for us to. Is it possible to look at, like we try to educate, to help this [inaudible] in that country instead of [inaudible] closer cooperation, like try to share the story of PSWG and bringing stakeholders that would comprise [inaudible] in Marrakech, and then we all share the experience and we can say at least we know that this is how the

role of [inaudible] in that country and we [move] from one meeting to another. Maybe at the end we can form the [inaudible] or coordination work among countries from every ICANN meeting. Is that possible? And can you [inaudible]? If you can help.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. One of the things, in the last meeting of the UK team that I've got, they mentioned it be [really great] we just have hour long meetings or so on a Monday morning at 9:00. It's not very good.

One of the things they said, look, we'd really like to spend a whole day on this and we would like to get the regulators in and we would like to get the registrar communities in and do workshops and that. So we've already been talking about it in the UK. I'm sure the next time we have a catch-up in the UK… We're planning to develop those ideas further and we can share them with the group.

ALICE MUNYUA: Yeah. That would be very helpful if you could develop the ideas [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I put Thailand also? So Thailand and UK, can you both help on this aspect of this item?

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, so Thailand and UK will lead this aspect. Okay, thank you. Bobby, did you have a comment?

BOBBY FLAIM: Oh. No, the only thing I was going to say is that in the past we have done it Wanawit was talking about where the country that we go to, we try to get participation from that country. We did it in Buenos Aires where we had all the different – well, it was focused on law enforcement at the time, but we had all of the law enforcement agencies from Argentina come – the Argentinian GAC and the respective regulatory and police agencies.

Yeah, it would be great if we used Marrakech I guess as our initial fora into doing that.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, thank you, everyone. So we have UK and Thailand leading this [inaudible] provide us with a way forward with this item. All right. The other one is outreach to member countries from developing countries. It's somehow similar to the other activity,

so we may want to perhaps combine those two. Because this goes beyond just collaboration. It's outreach. So we may want to see how ICANN can also help us as part of their broader outreach activities. We've got ICANN staff here, so you may want to speak to that. UK, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. A couple of things. I went [inaudible] obtain – for the benefit of the GAC members here. I'm [inaudible] obtain a list of law enforcement agents from that perspective who have been involved and participated in this Internet governance issues previously.

Every year in London they have this law enforcement e-crime Congress which officers attend. They have an Internet governance session. There's a list of those attendees who participated in that. I got it last week, so I'll circulate that with the members of the GAC. If you haven't been able to make contact with your law enforcement people, for instance, there's a list of people's names who were involved in this Internet governance bit as well because they've been [in things].

Then, just quickly, in terms of the outreach element, the session that you organized in Washington, I thought it was really, really good and really helpful. So thank you very much for that. I noted

that the Organization of American States participated as well and that was really great.

There's an awful lot of work here, and I think maybe it's possibly another intersessional meeting between now and Marrakech because there's quite a gap, would probably be good I think maybe to [inaudible] some point on this.

I don't know. I'm happy to, as part of this engagement thing, maybe in the run-up to that, to see if either we could host a meeting – just a day meeting – to get people along, if that would help them. Or if there's something that we can do through EUROPOL or European Commission or Council of Europe maybe, because they have lots of links into these countries. If people aren't able to actively participate, they can reach out and get engagement [inaudible] might be something else we want to look at.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, UK, for offering to host an intersessional meeting before Marrakech. For the African Union Commission – and I'll speak here for my colleague and he may add something – we already have an African Union Convention on cybercrime and personal data protection. And in doing that, we actually had to work with a lot of our own law enforcement agencies at Africa Union level.

So we had a [inaudible] meeting where there was an agreement that we are going to be reaching out to all our law enforcement agents and trying – and working towards… Bringing them to the meetings as well as capacity building. And so that is something we'd like to coordinate with the UK as well in terms of how we go about that. And also before the intersessional meeting to make sure that we already have reached out to our African members. [inaudible], do you have anything add? Yeah, okay.

Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not sure what [inaudible] definition of public safety organization is. Does it include non-law enforcement organizations like [CERT]? So when we talk about involvement, maybe where it's suitable we use public safety organizations that would enlarge the communities?

ALICE MUNYUA: Any other comments?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is a Budapest Convention Cybercrime meeting towards the end of the year which will bring together all those different [inaudible] countries. I don't know if there's something could be

[thought] about the back of that. If there's a lot of people coming together anyway, it could be sort of a back-to-back thing. I don't know. I'm just brainstorming with you in case it's a possibility. I will go back to my colleague and ask whether any outreach could be done in the context of that particular meeting, if that's what you wish.

ALICE MUNYUA: What we'll do is leave it to the UK and Thailand who are coordinating this, and then they'll come back to us and we can provide all of these ideas so that they can coordinate us better. Is that okay, UK and Thailand?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My department is involved in Council of Europe stuff, so we can certainly reach out to them and see if they might be able to facilitate or help out.

ALICE MUNYUA: The next one is new gTLD from [inaudible] spec 11.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just for clarification, in terms of our outreach, I think we can reach out to non-governmental entities. It's very informative, especially the [CERTS] and those involved in fighting malicious

conduct. But in terms of who's actually members of the PSWG, that is government folks. So I just want to make sure that there's clarity on that point.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you for that. Any other comments? Okay, we can move to the next one, spec 11. John Flaherty?

JOHN FLAHERTY: Thanks very much. Just a very brief background on spec 11. There was a Registry Security Framework group formed around August 2015 that was addressing a specific part of an ICANN registry agreement, for those registries who bought new gTLDs. Specification within the contract talks about a best practice requirement for registries to respond to security threats as part of the agreement and protect their brand security threats within spec 11 [inaudible] defined as common ones we face, malware, botnets, and phishing. And a mandatory requirement to report the risk profile of a registry new gTLD to ICANN periodically.

Registry agreements got signed without the framework being in place in 2013 and onwards. And now we're I think around 1400-1500 new gTLDs. This working group aims to provide an outcome – i.e., a security framework to design and refine and address exactly how a registry responds to those threats.

August to date, progress has been very slow, to be honest. It's hoped that a slow start will result in an accelerated finish to a deadline of a final draft document at the end of January 2016.

Currently, the PSWG and the GAC Working Group have come forward with some content and that has been our view of a request – a requester of [inaudible] information or sharing information or asking for coordination from a registry of the types of requests we put forward. We developed an options paper around common FAQs into registries. That's not in itself a framework. The framework is how a registry will respond to such requests and manage their brand in the meantime. That's the obstacle so far in that we've not had the registry response. We've not had anything in writing. We've had a lot of concerns from registry and the registrar co-chairs of this group in terms of fears around what the framework is, what it isn't, what its limitations are, what its scope is, how it shouldn't be a lever for a framework to bypass any legal obligations and some fears around reputational risk of that brand. And ICANN reporting as well.

There's been more questions than answers on spec 11. Last week and this week an increased emphasis on face-to-face discussion I think has contributed to a pre-determined agenda for Wednesday's public session for spec 11 where we're probably going to put our cards on the table, respectively, and we're

going to talk about from each area from a registrar and a registry and the PSWG what the framework should accomplish, what we expect each party to bring to the effort and what we expect to bring from this effort.

When you start talking to the registry community about voluntary process and best practice responses, you get more traction and more coordination. So engagement and collaboration and a very loose generic framework maybe with more formal refinement around day-to-day requests, that we may go into them in a very non-prescriptive flexible framework around some of the complex technical analysis that these registries do might be the way forward.

So the agenda on Wednesday should bring out all that learning, all the collaboration that we can do. We're on the outside looking into this process fundamentally. We're the requesters, not the responders, to this and we don't pretend to know a registry's business.

But at the same time, we know that registries are diversifying and they have commercial models now for cybersecurity. They're not just selling, wholesaling, domain names as a registry. And they've got their own business model, so to define this in a wider framework has been primarily a concern.

The registries are looking at the life of a domain name and the ecosystem of that and designing a flowchart to define a framework of when to engage them, what they can do, some of the products and case studies that they'll bring to the table. We'll tell you, for example, how they've been very influential in botnet investigations. That will be met by the PSWG on Wednesday talking about case studies and best practice of [when we've] used registries and just trying to promote a very productive relationship post-framework as well, which [inaudible] a lot of – I think it was Greg's presentation and [Elliot] from Tucows who wanted to know about relationships with the registrars as well as the WHOIS research. So making this a two-way process and talking best practice I think is the way forward rather than a very formalized, prescriptive, itemized approach to a framework.

So we're hoping, in terms of deadlines – just bear with me one second – to try and stick to the pre-agreed ICANN deadlines. So we're looking at on Wednesday also finalizing the… Sorry, we haven't got them, Fabien, do you? The days.

We're looking at mid-December for a first draft document, the beginning of January for a final draft document, and the final document for public comment in the first quarter of 2016 after the comments. We're totally dependent on the registries being good to their word after this week's session. So three or four

weeks after this week's session we should get [inaudible] of framework which we can contribute and complement to leading us to that mid-December day.

So I would just encourage you, if you can, to come on Wednesday half 11:00 to quarter to 1:00. They are preparing their response tomorrow and the registry attendance will be very, very heavily packed in the room. There will be a big presence. They do have sensitivities around this. So it might be 50 against three people. If you can come along, that's great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A couple of questions. One was the date the first draft and the date of the second draft is obviously taking the Christmas and New Year holidays into account. That doesn't give a lot of people a lot of time to come back with suggestions [or] drafts.

I take it is the finished document going to be released before the Marrakech meeting or after?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: This is Fabien Bertremieux from ICANN staff supporting this initiative. I think it will depend on how fast the review cycles can go between the different parties involved, so the registries, the registrars and yourselves. But given the fact that we would like to run the document for public comments before it becomes

final, I don't expect that we'd have the time to go through review cycles among the parties plus public comment before the Marrakech meeting. So hopefully by the Marrakech meeting, we might have a draft in public comments. That currently is the target, I believe.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Okay, thank you. And thank you, UK, for leading that.

The other issue is the ICANN fellowship program. I think we've dealt with that, unless there are any comments. Yes, Bobby, please?

BOBBY FLAIM: The only comment I would have… I did close, but that's another way for outreach, especially for underserved regions. The fellowship program is for kind of the underserviced regions, the developing world. So they come out… The one from Marrakech has already closed. They closed last week. So they usually do it a few months ahead of time, but that's something I think that we can always ensure that we sent out that hyperlink to encourage people from the developing world who don't ordinarily come to come. So we could do that on a periodic basis for each meeting,

because I think that would be a great way to get more participation as well. So I just wanted to flag that.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. All right. The next item or activity is the addendum for illegal and counterfeit [draft] reporting. Bobby, again, please.

BOBBY FLAIM: Well, it actually… It originated from the Federal Food and Drug Administration. But they were doing it in conjunction with a few other countries. I know Steve Truick has been part of it, and also Italy was part of it as well. So that's something that they're considering. And it goes to a provision of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement called 3.18 which is the enforcement of violations. Steve, I don't know if you wanted to add anything to that.

STEVE TRUICK: I need to speak to, obviously, Nick regards to [inaudible] we would support it. Anything which puts more pressure on the registrars in some respects to take the decision to act I think is a good thing, especially when it comes down to the medicine side of it, because it is so blatant and 99.9% of the time, this is not a hard one to show people. I can give you the same website, the same template, being used 1,000 times by some of these

criminal gangs. And when we point that out to the registrar sometimes they still will not take action.

I think the frustrating thing for me is when we actually go to ICANN Compliance, we're still sometimes getting the information coming back saying they're not going to take it any further and the registrar has investigated. The site's still up. But there's now information flowing back from ICANN Compliance.

Now, we took it up at the last meeting and I think things are going to change there.

But with regards to this addendum, I would actually [back it], yeah. And I know the Italians are backing it as well.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think what's going on is I guess we're waiting to maybe finalize it, and then I think it will be presented to the PSWG in written form formally.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay. Who's taking the lead on that? Is it Italy or it's the US? I can't recall.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. It'll probably be Dan Burke from the Food and Drug Administration.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay.

LEE HIBBARD: Just to mention that we have a convention on [inaudible] crime which deals with these issues both online and offline. So I know there are capacity building projects happening I think on these sort of issues. And we also have this body which deals with pharmaceutical care issues and health issues.

Not only from the question of law enforcement, but also raising awareness about access to drugs. There will always be illegal drugs online. If you close it down in one place, it will reopen in another place. So the question of information, raising awareness and about how to identify what's credible from what's not credible is also very important.

What I'm trying to say is that there's colleagues working on these issues in the Council of Europe and [inaudible] and they have networks. So once again, I don't know whether this is part of the outreach that you may wish to have.

I also note, as I mentioned earlier, there's private consortiums gathering pharma industry, pharmacy associations, Google and other actors. There's also a European Association of Mail Service

Pharmacists. So there's lots of different networks there, which could be tapped into if that's needed.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The overall aim of [inaudible] makes perfect sense and I think that everyone would agree with it. One, perhaps minor issue, which should be flagged which should just be kept in mind is that when we're talking about illegal and counterfeit drugs and if there are any definitions that are created or that are used here, we just need to make sure that genuine generic drugs are not unfairly [caught] in any of these definitions.

Because, I think especially from an Asian and from an African perspective, that's something that's quite important.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay, thank you. I think point well-taken. And as we look at the document that's going to be presented, it's going to come back to the PSWG and if there's any comments, obviously, they can be made before it's sent to the GAC.

If there are no other comments on this, the last item I had was there was quite a number of discussions coming from our

meeting – the GAC meeting with the GNSO – yesterday. And we had some comments today from the public session regarding how important it is for this group to be getting involved quite early on during some of the PDPs or some of the policy processes.

So I've put it as one of the items on our work plan. What I'll do is I'll encourage our very great, wonderful, supportive GAC secretariat to help us with this to identify, to help us keep track and identify any policy processes or any issues that require the GAC to respond to and that need to come to the Public Safety Working Group earlier on, so that then we are able to identify leads, people who are able to have the time, skills, and resources to contribute as the lead on our behalf on some of these working groups.

So if that's okay, we'll put that on the agenda as well and we'll ask the GAC secretariat to help us with that. We have Karine who's going to be helping the Public Safety Working Group specifically on our work going forward. So if that's agreeable… Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. I just have a really small point on that. I think it's excellent idea and we were actually… When I was looking at this work plan, I was thinking so much of this is very ad hoc because

we don't know what's coming up and the work plan is very concrete and have all these processes that we are already aware of. But it might be completely different already in two months.

In the spirit of raising awareness also within the GAC of the work we can do and the service we can provide, I was thinking… I understand there's one set format for this that we shouldn't deviate from, but whether it would make sense at the beginning to just reiterate our areas of interest as identified in the TOR, so that we can raise awareness within the GAC also that they perhaps think of us when these processes roll around and somebody drops us a mail or something. But also just to keep educating people because I think another thing that was [displayed] at the public session today is that there's still confusion in the community as to what role we have, what purpose we serve, and I think this work plan is another opportunity just to educate everybody around us on what we can do and what we cannot do.

ALICE MUNYUA: Agree. Any other comments? Okay, so that will go onto the work plan as part of an ongoing activity, identifying areas that we need to… And we will present this to the GAC as well on Tuesday, just to… The work plan itself is going to be presented

to the GAC on Tuesday for their information and endorsement of course. Thank you.

I'll hand over to Wanawit now.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Karine, you have the issues on the Affirmation of Commitments on the [inaudible] consumer trust and consumer trust review. Is that correct? Can you walk through us on that issue?

[KARINE PERSET]:   So basically, on October 1ˢᵗ there was a call put out for volunteers for the Consumer Trust Competition and Consumer Choice review under the Affirmation of Commitments to take a look at the new gTLD program and really assess how it's worked through the lens of these consumer protection and competition issues.

It's our hope that we will get someone from the PSWG on that group. I am planning on submitting an application myself. That's not to the exclusion of anyone else. But we want to make sure that our group has a role in that implement review process. This would be an example where we'd want to have someone on that group early on so we're not behind the eight ball, so to speak, and just reacting when positions have already solidified and taken on a shape and firm structure of their own.

Really, what we want to do is be in a position to help influence the process from the start so that we can make sure that our perspectives are taken into account.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: [Laureen], you will circulate. Because there is an e-mail coming [as I'm aware], like from AP. They're [inaudible] circulate this invitation to be volunteers and there is a web page on the call for volunteers that they need to go through review, circulate. [inaudible]

[LAUREEN KAPIN]:   Yeah. I'm happy to circulate the link. It's a formal application process. They're seeking people to apply. And my understanding is 15 people will be selected. There's a certain process that needs to be followed. I can circulate that link.

ALICE MUNYUA: Okay. Thank you very much. Yeah, we'll support making sure that there's a member of the Public Safety Working Group on that review. I don't know whether – Olof, maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong – if the process of identifying members to review teams and that the AOC has changed, because previously I think the GAC chair and the chair of the board would be the ones

selecting the final list. Olof, maybe if you could help with the clarity around that. Thank you.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, chair. Olof Nordling, ICANN staff, for the record. Well, for the AOC reviews, it's typically so that the final selection is made by the selectors which are, for the AOC, ATRT review. It's the board chair and the GAC chair. And for the other reviews, it's the CEO and the GAC chair. So this would qualify us [inaudible] other reviews, if I recall it right.

The process is that, well, people self-nominate. The deadline for that is the 30th of October. Then in certain cases – and that's really up to the SO and AC whether they want to have a qualifying session, provide SO/AC support for particular candidates. The GNSO has done so in the past to my knowledge, but this predates my arrival to the GAC. The GAC has not used that opportunity. It is open for doing so.

Basically the quick way is that who are interested, they nominate themselves and fill out the form. Then there's the selection by the two selectors. At any rate, it is the GAC chair who is one of them. Is that clear enough, although it's late in the day?

ALICE MUNYUA: Yes, thank you. My memory serves me right, yes. We've had other reviews previously and the GAC chair did… The GAC did propose a name for other reviews. I remember the WHOIS – the security, stability… I think it was Australia and then Kenya for the Security, Stability. So if that process is still the same, I think we could perhaps make this presentation tomorrow and say the Public Safety Working Group thinks and does believe that we do need a member from this working group to be on the review team and see how we can ensure that there's a member from this team on the review team. Thank you for that clarity.

Any other comments, especially on the work plan? If there's anything we missed or any other activity that you think we may need to include that we may have missed. Council of Europe?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is there [inaudible] to discuss any cooperation/coordination with the other working group on human rights and [inaudible at all?

ALICE MUNYUA: Do you mean within the GAC?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Between the two groups. Because there are issues which may be common to both which needs to be discussed.
ALICE MUNYUA:	I'm sorry, I don't understand your question. Which working groups?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	The GAC Working Group on Human Rights and International Law.
ALICE MUNYUA:	Oh yes. We had the first meeting yesterday. Thank you very much, Cathrin. You had identified the overlaps and possible areas of conflict. I raised that with the GAC chair and we had a meeting with all the working group chairs yesterday, and we agreed that this is an area that we need ongoing collaboration between the working group chairs.

But we also take note that the GAC has not yet discussed the terms of reference for the human rights working group. So we still have to discuss that. So once that's discussed, then the two working groups will then discuss any areas where we might need to work together or where one working group may need to take one issue and the other another. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I just say that, yeah, one can take the idea of safety in one direction, but there's also a need to consider human rights issues there. The balance between those issues, which were mentioned by the commission, actually, is very important to strike.

For example, some of the most recent work of the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime is article 15 safeguards on human rights regarding law enforcement. So it's very important to start [inaudible] in ensuring the safety, but with a balanced approach. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Yeah. And I think that's for the GAC to decide. We're still going to have to discuss the terms of reference of the Human Rights Working Group, the Public Safety Working Group. The terms of reference have already been endorsed and accepted. So we will see how that discussion goes. I think it's going to be on Wednesday.

If there are any other areas that any of you – any colleagues here identify that may have overlaps. Not just the human rights group, but other working groups. I'll be grateful if you bring them to our attention because the working group chairs are

going to be meeting quarterly to discuss some of these issues. Thank you.

I think it's time. If there's any other business? No other business, okay. I'd like to thank you all very, very much. I think this is our third face-to-face meeting. It's been great all the work that's been done and the collaboration and I look forward to the next intersessional meeting that's going to be hosted by the UK and working towards that. On Tuesday, tomorrow, I will be presenting [our] work plan and the work that we've done so far to the GAC. I'm not sure whether the GAC is going to be endorsing the current work plan because I think we still need to work on some areas where we require resources and the GAC leadership is going to have to help us determine where we're going to get some of the resources for some of the activities. It might be accepted on principle, and then having to work on the details.

Thank you very much, everybody, and have a good evening. See you tomorrow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Alice and Wanawit, for all your support.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sorry, can I just make a personal comment? Somebody has Bobby's [Bible] which is mine and I really want it back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that an official term, [Bobby's Bible]?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]