

KOBE - GAC: Inter-Constituency Engagement (3 of 3)  
Tuesday, March 13, 2019 - 10:30 to 12:00 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Please start taking your seats. We will be starting in a couple of minutes. Thank you.

We are pleased to welcome Julia Charvolen and here comes Petra Novakova too. Good morning. And the they are going to have a presentation for us. Welcome them please. I don't know if it is Katrina that starts.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. My name is Katrina Sataki. I have been called Christina before but never that. Thank you very much. Very pleased to be here with you. We have 45 minutes and actually, we proposed to cover three topics. First topic is our PDP on the retirement of CCT. We believe it must be great interest to all countries even though I am sure you all believe your countries will never need to retire their ccTLDs. However, let's give the floor to Stephen Dearhake. Stephen, the floor is yours.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Katrina. To my immediate right is Dr. Ebart who is the vice chair of the Working Group for the retirement of ccTLD. I

---

*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.*

---

thought I would give you context on how we got here today. Things go back to may of 94 when RC51 was published that defined the domain name system as we know it today including the definition of ccTLD, com, gov, net, and a few others like that. Very early on, the IANA decided they would not be in charge of this. And they deferred to the process of managing the assignment of two letter and three letter string do is country names. That happens that is how we got going. This does not work. Can I get the next slide? This doesn't seem to work. Where does it point?

OK. Back two slides, I think, is where we want to go. RC1591 left some details unsaid about TLDs and in particular there was a serious lack of detail in criteria for transferring control of a TLD from one manager to another manager. Historically the terminology was redelegation which is a phrase familiar to the GAC. The current terminology being employed through the CCT and ICANN org is known as revocation and transfer. There was a Working Group formed a few years ago called the framework of interpretation Working Group which did a deep dive n RC 1591 with the stated goal of trying to provide some interpretation to some of the ambiguity present in that document and indeed the FIO Working Group filled in many of the details in the final working product. Next slide please.

---

Historically there has been confusion with regards to revocation and transfers and primary this boiled down to inconsistent criteria used previously by the INNA for the transfers of domains over the last 15 years. Next slide.

What we did in the ccNSO is a long-term deep dive into the whole press and review the policies and see if we need to develop new coherent policies. Next slide please.

So, what we did was beginning back in about 5 6 years ago easily now, we launched the delegation redelegation retirement Working Group. Notice this Working Group was using old terminology at that point in time. What this Working Group was do a historic review of the transfers, revocation and transfers that was made since ICANN was formed, basically. Excuse me. And that followed that documented what happened in the past basically and that then got the framework of the interpretation Working Group which spent a couple years deep diving in the RC 1591 trying to provide consensus-based interpretation of what is meant by the various things in 1591. We had able GAC members working in that Working Group and that was a good thing.

That in turn has led us to the PDP retirement Working Group which is where we are today. We have been at it for about a year and a half, I think maybe a little longer. Work is ongoing as you can see. And there will be a follow-on Working Group which will

---

deal with the setting policy for an appeals mechanism which is called for in RMC1519 but isn't defined in any shape, manner or form and we need to provide ICANN and the IANA some guidance in that area. Next slide, please.

Our basic premise is must be removed after the code is removed from the active list. We need neither the IANA function or the ICANN control that. We are dependent on their behavior for what we have to do in response to their behavior. And it was the key thing that framework of interpretation did note in its final report that there is no policy for the retirement of TLDs and that is what we are trying to do, provide policy for the IANA operator to manage these particular circumstances. Next slide please.

We were chartered in April of 2017. We are actually getting close to coming up on two years. We have been meeting on a regular basis. We have teleconferences every other week and we have at least one face to face meeting at each ICANN meeting. We are chugging along at a fairly decent pace in the number of issues we have identified. Next slide please.

In Barcelona at our meeting we closed things and got consensus within the Working Group. We worked through the applicability of the overall policy and we got consensus on definition about the trigger event which is the removal of the country code from the

---

ISO list and we came to consensus as to how long we think the retirement process should take.

Since Barcelona we have got consensus on removal process and the duration. Can you scroll the slide down? Duration of removal process. Scroll it down. Next slide please.

So, this flowchart gives a sense of what the activity is with regards to retirement of a TLD. The trigger event in red at the top is the removal of the two-letter country code from the ISO table by the ISO maintenance agency. This in turn causes a notice of retirement to be generated by the IANA. There are two paths, the path to the left is one where the IANA function operator and the TLD manager sit down and come to an agreement with respect to how the retirement is going to be managed and they can put together a retirement plan and we have come to consensus that they will get at least five years to sort out how they will do the retirement. If they need to, the retiring ccTLD manager can ask for additional time up to 10 years to finish and wrap up the retirement of the TLD and that is primarily because we got a lot of registries offering multi year renewal some up to 10 years. There are all sorts of issues with regard to that.

We expect in that 5 10-year time execution of the plan and conclusion of the plan. As far as the IANA function operator is concerned they are done, and the final external event is the

---

removal of the ccTLD from the DNS root zone file and that is something for the IANA to sort out.

The right-hand side of the flowchart shows the circumstance where there may not be agreement between the IANA function operator and the retiring TLD's manager. If that is the case, they get five years to sort things out and at the end of that period if there is still resistance on the part of the manager one would presume there would be litigation but that is out the scope of our policy. Our focus is on the left path and developing the policy around what we hope to be cooperation between the ccTLD manager and the IANA function operator. Next slide please.

So, we still have a fair amount of work ahead of us. Topics like the oversight of the retirement process which we have begun work on. We are looking at the issue of exceptionally reserved country codes which is a separate category within the ISO table. And we are also examining what to do with respect to IDN ccTLD because they are associated with the ASCII ones and if they are being retired this has implications for the associated IDN and TLDs. We are diving into what happens if there is a change of ccTLD managers in the midst of the process. That would be the PLD is being moved from the university to a Telco or something. We are beginning to scratch our heads around that. As we get further along, of course, we are going to have to start stress testing this

---

model to see if it makes sense. That is where we pretty much are at the moment. Next slide please.

So, we would greatly appreciate input from the GAC. We had the framework of the interpretation Working Group and it was very handy. We don't want to get in a situation where we gave you surprises. So if we could get some input/help from the GAC It would be great to have some feedback from you guys as we go along. And that's it for me. Katrina, back to you. Any questions?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions? There usually are.

Thank you, Katrina, thank you Stephen for the comprehensive presentation. Sorry I don't have any assistance to provide but I would like to make a statement. Two statements. First in my capacity as the co-chair of the GAC underserved regents Working Group and secondly as in my capacity as the GAC representative from the Cook Islands. Number one, I just want to take us back to the work that the GAC underserved Working Group worked with CCTNSO in dropping a frequently asked question document on the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs. I think this is something we, the Working Group, need to go back to make amendments especially on the title right there noting the change in the redelegation term to revocation and transfer. I am also very much interested in this work because I think it is important for it

---

to be part of our frequently asked questions maybe some time later when you have completed your work in this policy, it will give us an opportunity to revisit the frequently asked questions. I also want to talk about the retirement of ccTLDs in my capacity as the GAC representative from the Cook Islands. Currently we are looking at a name change. Just looking at the diagram that you presented it is if a space of five years. This is something very new to my country that they are not aware of. I am very interested to follow this process, so I could link leadership from my country to the right people within ICANN to assist us with advice when it comes to actually changing the name of our country. I also want to go back to the first part. Sorry, we the Working Group will work with our liaison in following the work of ccNSO in this familiar instance. Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you for your comments. Cooks Island probably going to be one of the first applications of the policy. I am assuming when you do go ahead with a formal rename of the country itself that the ISO maintenance agency will propose a different two letter code and a different three letter code for the renamed country and at that point that will trigger the retirement of the existing two letter code used for the Cook Islands. I think in your case, it should be a fairly straightforward issue of taking all of the names in your country name space under your current two letter code and



---

flipping them over into a new name space with your new two letter code. And by all means, I would be lap happy to stay in touch with you and keep you fully informed as to our progress on this. If you could provide the Working Group with some sense of timing as to how quickly you might think this rename will take place that would be helpful for us. If there is anything we can do for you assistance wise, that would be great.

PAR BRUMARK:

We anticipate changes in names of countries in the near we heard about it. Macedonia and the British ocean territory have talked about. It is a retirement of the old name and delegation of the new name. In practice, it should be one to one, but our group is really only concerned with the retirement. We are not the IANA function operator and we can't tell you to take them over 101 without input. In a selection of a new delegation administrator. We only need to deal with the mechanics of retirement. We are fully aware that renaming is a special issue. We take care of while we consult and talk about this.

Thank you very much. Received a request from the secretary to be more clear we think this is important for GAC and why we believe that GAC represents who are interested in this should participate in the work of the PDP.

---

As you heard sometimes countries cease to exist, sometimes they split, sometimes they merge, sometimes they want to change their names. In all those cases there could be a situation when the ccTLD they are using at the moment needs to be retired because it's no longer in use. As you heard from Stephen's presentation, the triggering event at the moment when the country code is removed from the ISO list. This policy development process deals with situations like this. I hope that clarifies the significance of this. Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD BLOTCHER: This is always triggered by several steps of the government contract. That is why the government should be aware if they change their name and then request a change of the iOS code that this has a consequence for the TCV associated with this and because this is an event out of our control but is fully under control of the government of each country that request these changes it is important the GAC is aware of what we are doing and that is why we would like to have a GAC member participate in our thing so we can provide clear and early input and we get early warnings from your side that we don't go on the wrong tangent that we will later have to reverse when we propose this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Manal.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Katrina and everyone for bringing this to attention of the GAC. As you rightly mentioned, it is of special importance to the GAC and it doesn't seem as rare as we thought. We have the Switzerland case as well. It is good to have this documented in a FAQ as mentioned and that we keep it and documented and ready for any GAC members in case of the need.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. It is certainly my intention, if invited, to appear and give the GAC periodical updates as to how we are progressing. periodic. Further the Working Group would be happy to provide some input on your FAQ which is really an organic document that will be changing over time and as we flush out more of the policy, I would be happy to help you with your FAQ as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Peter, please.

PETER: We realize that this might not always be the most accessible topic for us ccTLDs. It is so fundamental we gladly take the extra effort to make a deep dive into this sort of terminology. We understand and are aware it might be less obvious for all ACs and other SOs. If I remember correctly, we had a more basic introductory presentation about ISO country codes a couple back. If there

---

would be interest from our GAC counterparts we could provide a more basic introductory presentation on this topic as well whether it's the PDP mechanisms within the ccNSO, whether it is around terminology, this PDP is specifically focused on retirement but the broader terminology also encompasses transfer and delegation and there is a difference with the old terminology so that adds up to even more confusion. If there would be an interest, we are more than gladly prepared to give a more basic introductory presentation for GAC members and perhaps more outside of the GAC ccNSO session.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please.

JORGE: I think that is a perfect proposal. As I was listening to the presentation, I was wondering how does it fit with bits and pieces of the GAC principles on ccTLD and delegation? I don't know what its terminology was at the time. And the work that you made there after consolidating all the different papers, so I think that would be very useful because some questions came to my mind. For instance, it seems that we part from the basis that once you change the name you don't want the old name anymore. That you are really you phase it out but there could be perhaps other instances where the government and the community wants to

---

maintain the old ccTLD. How is that considered? All those aspects would be interesting.

KATRINA SATAKI: We will take that into account and think of ways to give you more information about the terminology. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Quickly, the short answer with that is that if the country code is removed from the ISO table it seizes to be a country road under the definition currently in use for about 30 plus years.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Sorry, I think we need to move forward. Next presentation is a little bit unusual because it is slightly more technical than the presentations we usually do. Here I would like to give the floor to Peter Van Roste who is the general manager of one of the regional organizations of ccTLD. Peter, the floor is yours.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you so much. I am a lawyer, so I won't be too technical. About six months ago they asked me to look into DOH and the more I looked into it I am here I am very happy to take you on the journey. I hope this presentation raises more questions than

---

provides you with answers, but I hope you get the proper background. Let me check if Kim's magic works outside the meeting as well. Yes, it does. Just to get to know a little who knows what DOH is? DOH there have been a few good presentations about this during the ICANN meeting but typically hidden in a smaller room downstairs.

So, starting this journey, this is how the DNS querying works today. As technical as this presentation gets. The end user asks the question to resolve WWW.EU example. It is asking for an IP address. Importantly is the operating system of your computer who typically does that. That question does not go out in the world. It typically goes to the resolver of your ISB. The ISB's name server is suggested as the place where you resolve your DNS queries. This is an important part of the story.

That I Speed DNS is over and then asks the questions to the root. That is where it starts. Where can I find the .EU because I need to resolve the question of where can I find the example of www.example.eu. The root server provides the information where to find that and the journey begins. You understand the principles. Your high-speed name server asks the question to their DNS system and hierarchy based starting at the right end at the top-level domain level and the name server is going to ask the question for the second level domain. It provides back an IP address basically.

---

Importantly all of that is visible. The queries are sent in clear text across the lines and people, men and women in the middle, could see those queries and those answers. What is the OH? It is a protocol. It is approved in the IKF and became a standard. It resolves the name in a slightly different way than what I just showed you. It is not your ISP that resolves the name, but your browser takes care of resolving your name in collaboration with typically one, possibly more, partners. We will get back to that part.

There are only a few organizations in the world that can provide robust, reliable resulting services for the whole population. Importantly, if you look at the browser market, because of the browsers who are going to make that decision whether and when to implement DOH and how to implement DOH, the browser market is not that diverse. Five browsers make up 93%. This is even a stat from 2017. I am pretty sure the situation has not improved since then. Five browsers make up 93% of the browser market. That is an important part of the story.

What does DOH look like from the outside? Remember the picture I showed you earlier. This is DOH. Nothing is visible between the user and the third-party resolve. If you remove that, obviously you are still using your access provider, but he doesn't see anything anymore because the DNS query is encrypted and part of the HTTPS layer. It has a couple of important consequences. It is safer

---

because nobody can mess with that traffic. It provides you with more privacy. Nobody can see that you are looking to buy particular type of property or scanning for some medicines. It provides you with more privacy. It cannot be blocked because it is part of that HTTPS layer. You would have to block HTTPS in order to stop DNS traffic. This is the last point I am parking for later but, again, this is a very important point. It cannot be blocked unless you block HTTPS which, I think, we all understand would be quite unreasonable.

Why the change? We covered a bit of that. Hides the HTTPS and DNS traffic. Unblockable. We know there have been security and privacy issues with the DNS for three decades. There have been very brave attempts in solving those. Deprive being one. Queue name being another. DNS sector is trying to solve part of the men and woman in the middle attacks but even combined these solutions never got to the heart of the problem. DOH does. On a technical level, DOH solves some of these well-known issues and it is encrypted and secures the path.

What I am most interested in, and what Sandra is most interested in is the policy. DOH is not controversial. I think everybody agrees the orders of the draft did a good job, but the devil is in the implementation and the implementation comes with a ton of policy questions.



If you look at the landscape? Who likes DOH? A large part of the user community. It provides them with more privacy. That is actually if you rely more on the privacy policies of that resolver and again there will only be a handful compared to your local ISP which is new dealing with your queries. Journalists in oppressive regimes like DOH because their traffic cannot be blocked. A browser vendor has more control. The DNS querying is now part of their system, they can protect their users and do all types of good stuff with it. Those selected resolvers, getting one example but I don't want to point them out or blame them, but they are the only ones talking to us and that is a combination of Firefox, Mozilla, and Cloudflare where cloud fair was the chosen resolver. They got the data that was otherwise passing through these resolvers on an ISP level. They promise they will never sell the data but that doesn't mean that data is not available in a jurisdiction that is typically not yours.

Who hates it? Users that don't like central control points or those users that trust their ISP more than a U.S. based resolver that is going to answer their queries. If you look at those stats I showed you, market share, Google Chrome has 93% of the market. That will be resolved by Google giving them much more relevant, interesting data than they have now so for them that is a clear advantage. ISPs hate it too. They lose control over their network traffic. You hear the saying my network, my rules? Well that will

be difficult as of now unless they think it is a good idea to block HTTPS which means they will probably not keep their users. ISPs lose data because it will be the resolvers who have access to that data. And ISPs can't protect their users anymore. I used to work for a long time in the ISP industry. That is a general problem. Traffic to Malware sites can't be filtered out. Law enforcement and courts once they start understanding that lots of what they are doing now blocking an order to a local ISP is pointless. Once they start understanding that they might not be too happy with DOH. An organization like internet watch foundation and organizations providing resolution services at a special fee. In the U.S. you have organizations and even ISPs who offer different options. Plain old DNS or DNS where we watch over your security and safety. If you do so you will pay a few more bucks everything month. Certs are worried. There was a meeting of the European certs in Brussels and the point they highlighted was there is a security issue because there is no visibility anymore on the network. They are worried about privacy aspects especially now that we have the solid GDPR regulation in Europe, what is happening with the privacy of users whose data gets sorry. That is my timer. And there are a few technical issues you might have heard about the split view. Typically a company could have internet.center.org. I would get straight to the network resources but from the outside it will provide me with a different view and ask for a password or behave differently when I am outside or

inside my network. With DOH there is no inside network. All the queries go to Cloud Fare or another provider. Are Firefox users seeing the same internet as a Chrome user? Could it mean the end of the universality of the internet? A big question and this are, I will get back to that in the conclusion, but this is the key point. We do not know enough at the moment. Being a lawyer, and being slightly careful and conservative, I would rather assume that the choices that the browsers and the resolves are going to make are not going to be in our interest but in their interest. I would encourage to speak up on crucial points. Will users have the option to turn DOH on or not? Will it be baked in by default? If they are using DOH will there be a list of resolvers, they can choose from? A national resolver? A European resolver? A resolver that is taking the Internet Watch Foundation might have one. Will the resolver be put in hard coded by the browser so that there is no choice? These are crucial questions.

On jurisdiction one minute? OK. On jurisdiction, will a German court be able to dictate the resolving situation for the rest of the world? How will this change the balance of power in the industry? Of course, it is farfetched but imagine a handful of resolvers decide it is good idea to add .Amazon because Amazon is a member of their group. These are voluntary standards, but they would be serving 95% of the globe with that answer. I hope this shows you this is a topic we should pay attention to. On ccTLDs

---

very limited and probably positive since we would get less queries. There is only a handful of resolvers that would ask us question. The main impact is political and affect on the balance of the ecosystem. I hope this leaves you with many questions, but I probably won't have time to go into those.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Peter. Sorry I had to act as another timer. Are there any questions in the room? Wait a minute. Before we go to that, we are running out of time. We will have to finish soon but we still have one question we would really like to address. I propose that we address the last question and then we go back to your questions. Is that OK? Will that work for you? I will explain what is the last question we have. The last question we have is we received a request, it is our under understanding that normally you meet with others on Sunday and with us you meet on Tuesday or Wednesday because those are our constituency days and member meeting days. We discussed with our community how they see the possible change and their view was that very often ccTLDs are thought here on Sunday, but they come to our meeting days on Tuesday and Wednesday. So for them it would work better if they could come here to your room, meet with you during the meeting days, but if you don't think it is necessary for ccTLDs to be in the room when you meet with the council, yes, we can move it to Sunday. It is really up to you. I just gave you an

---

argument why ccTLDs would prefer this to remain the way it is. I think it is something you could think about and then just discuss. Sorry, now we go back to your question.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. Olga Cavalli from Sri Lanka. My question is, will the DNS third party servers in the browsers be communicating to the root servers?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Yes, they would take the role of a pure DNS resolver and act element identical. On a technical level, I don't know if Paul is in the room. Paul Hoffman, one of the members of the draft and an ICANN member, he confirmed the technical implementation is very light.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please.

Thank you, Peter for the explanation. What is the idea within the ICANN environment? To review this within a Working Group? What is the outcome of your reflections and root presentation?

Peter: For me, the most important thing is we are watchful on this. It could have an impact on the existence of ICANN. It is something

---

we should take into account. There is definitely a call in the community to have a broader discussion we are having allowing for policy aspects to be discussed. In the question we need to bring in the key players and provide us with answers or the start of the answers. I suggested to make this into a high interest topic for one of the net meetings, but I think we will have to work with the programming committee on that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Quickly, I want to thank Pete for bringing this important issue to our attention and making a technical topic very GAC friendly. It was simplified and very well understood. When you started the presentation I started thinking about my questions and then at the end I found them all on the very last slide, but unfortunately, unresolved; but it is an important topic and thank you for bringing to it our attention. Thank you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are there any more questions? Yes, please, Par.

---

PAR BRUMARK: The presentation will be available at the CC N web page because it is highly important the implications it will have for law enforcement and et cetera,

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just a quick acknowledgment on your request. Katrina, we will look at the schedule and see what we can do. Actually, we are meeting the ALAC today as well but we met the GNSO on Sunday so there is no fixed pattern. Obviously, we only have four days and we will look into it and get back to you. Thank you very much.

Thank you very much for this. Your questions will be very happy to meet in Marrakech or at any other occasion.

Thank you for a great presentation.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Sorry to keep you waiting. We are just waiting for ALAC colleagues

Thank you, everyone. We are now starting our meeting with the ALAC. We have already a full, full agenda, so thanks to our points of contact, Yrjo in Portugal and Charlotte and Anna who is not here but I really acknowledge the work they have both done inter-sessionally for our meeting today. So, thank you, both. Maureen, shall I hand it over to you?

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: My profuse apologies. We were so busy making our point known to the financial team downstairs that we lost track of time. Sorry. But, yes, I do appreciate the work that is being done on our behalf by Yrjo and the GAC team for putting this team together and I think it is a really good agenda.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Maureen and while you settle down let me start with the agenda for the sake of time. First on the agenda, we have there potential ALAC GAC statement on EPDP and I understand, Alan, you will be talking to this? OK. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The suggestion had been made a few weeks ago that we work on a joint statement and I guess both the ALAC and the GAC know the history at this point. One of the GAC representatives, the EPDP did the initial draft. We have done a revision; a third revision has come back. The last I heard you might be considering some additional minor changes. At this point, the ALAC has seen it. We haven't had a chance to discuss it, but I am not expecting a lot of controversy on our side. There is not a lot more to report. I am hoping by the end of today we will have a statement that both of us can live with and we will publish it and I think it is great tradition we should continue. Thank you.



---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Alan. Likewise we didn't have the chance to go thoroughly into the statement. I mean, again, it was not discussed here at the GAC. It was circulated but we didn't have time so maybe this afternoon we can, again, look more closer into the language. I have already checked what we have done with our joint statement before. It was on lowering barriers to participation at ICANN. And I think we extracted a couple of highlights that we included in our communique and just referenced to the statement. Maybe this would give GAC colleagues some flexibility that we do not need to wordsmith the statement. If it is OK, we will find a way to reference it. Any comments on this? I understand we still need to talk about the details of the statement but in principle if there are any comments. OK. If not, then we will have our discussions and we will keep you posted, and we hope likewise the ALAC will keep us posted as well.

So maybe we can move to the second topic on subsequent gTLD procedures and whether they are in line and I think Jonathan you will be speaking to this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you for having me. I know there were discussions with Laureen earlier this week and there was some controversial on the board's reaction and a new way of dealing with them. I can

---

tell you we have begun meetings with the board and there will probably be a meeting of all current reviews, including work stream two, together with the board to try and come up with a more strategic way of handling this, in a piece meal way, the fact so many recommendations are coming at once. I mention that about the CCT review since that is very topical at the. With referring to Subsequent Procedures, the answer is perhaps somewhat more complicated because we have been as the CCT Review in constant contact with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group and have been making recommendations along the way that they have taken on. So there are many things in our final set of recommendations that are not news to the Subsequent Procedures team. This had to do with working on how to do better applicant support, for example, issues related to community priority evaluations. There were a number of things we reached conclusions about sooner and got into the queue right away and to that extent they have begun working on them although there were still a lot of unanswered and still open questions in that work product from that Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

So, one of the things I think we need to confront, and I think they are beginning to confront is that Subsequent Procedures and the Subsequent Procedures Working Group are not necessarily the same thing. In other words, I think we are carrying a perception

when they finish their work that triggers the launch of Subsequent Procedures and I think they have some to recognize that that's not possible. They had too big a mandate. They have been in panel for four years at this point ETC just from the standpoint of being a GNSO PDP, I think there is a belief they need to take the subset of work they completed and put a bow on it and put it back in front of the GNSO council and that will only represent what needs to take place prior to the procedures. Those are no longer a one to one correlation that we have come to know and fear. If they don't figure out absolutely everything things move forward with unresolved issues. What I think they are thinking about at this point is to find the thing as they have reached consensus about with a series of recommendations for further work discussions and research that needs to take place before any actual Subsequent Procedures are to happen. So, from that standpoint, some of the recommendations from the CCT Review that came to the work group late in there in panelment had to do with results of our DNS abuse study and other areas there. I think it is unlikely they will prior to the closure of their PDP manage to deal with the recommendation that the board just forwarded to them from us with respect to managing DNS abuse. I think what is more likely and they will be part of a set of recommendations that needs to happen perhaps in more granular PDP processes rather than this all in one process that has become too wieldy. I think they have put in an earnest effort

---

to address the comments and have an open conversation. There are parties within the Working Group that are fairly motivated to have subsequent rounds, but I believe there is a recognition that they are not close to answering the questions put before them that are prerequisites to any round taking place. That is what is going on with respect to the CCT Review and the Subsequent Procedures process overall.

Are you resuming the things that are not tie said up are not deemed to be policy and have to be done at an implementation phase?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank for the question, Alan. I don't have a clarity to say that definitively, but I suspect there will be smaller, more refined PDP that needs to take place before Subsequent Procedures. That is my belief about what will happen. They will take what they have to get things going and get some recommendations so implementation on those things can begin but in parcel to that will be a series of things that still need community consensus, further study, research, et cetera, that will happen in a policy or non-policy context. I don't know the breakdown of that but that is my impression of what will happen. I believe there will be further PDPs but not of this four-year nature but more refined. That is my understanding.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you John, and thanks Alan for the interesting question. Any other questions? OK. If not then thanks, again, John and we can move on to the GAC ALAC coalition and capacity building. And I think Pua Hunter from the Cook Islands you want to speak to this?

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Manal. Pua Hunter from the Cook Islands. Thank you to the liaison officers. The topic of the GAC ALAC cooperation has been in discussions at the meetings between the GAC and ALAC since June of 2017 during ICANN 59 in Johannesburg. It was initiated as a result of a broad statement in the GAC 59 communique stating that a corporation on policy development work of mutual interest in underserved regions and subsequently during ICANN 60 GAC and ALAC discussed the preparation of a joint statement that largely focuses on lowering barriers to participation in ICANN processes and I think that will be part of your agenda. This statement is one of the objectives of the underserved Working Group capacity development initiative. At ICANN 61 in San Juan the GAC and ALAC discussed and focused the broad statement to cooperation in capacity building in underserved regions. In addition, the meeting discussed the follow up to the joint GAC/ALAC Statement from ICANN 60 in Abu Dhabi on enabling inclusive and informed participation. The term of the joint GAC ALAC statement serve the underserved Working Group initiative. At ICANN62 held in Panama, the GAC and ALAC

---

discussed ICANN's information transparency initiative and how it relates to the joint GAC ALAC statement on lowering barriers. Subsequently during ICANN 63 held in Barcelona, the GAC and ALAC agreed on a follow up joint statement on enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation in ICANN. Again, this joint statement resonate would the intention of the capacity development initiative. Given this brief background of discussions between GAC and ALAC since ICANN59, five ICANN meetings ago, I believe that the time has come to put into action what has emanated from these discussions and in particular that statements captured in the GAC communique since Johannesburg. I would like to commonly propose establishing a smaller focus group of representatives from both GAC and ALAC to progress the joint initiative on capacity building with the composition of this grouping to comprise of relevant stakeholders. And accordingly, I welcome input from both GAC and ALAC on what I have proposed in this instance including any constructive ideas or suggestion said to move this initiative forward in a timely and positive manner. Thank you very much.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Pua. Any immediate reactions from GAC or ALAC?  
Maureen?

---

**MAUREEN HILYARD:** Thank you very much and thank you Pua for that overview of the process with regard to GAC. I really do appreciate the opportunity to be able to collaborate. We have since appointed a new Co-Chair of our capacity building Working Group. I have Joanna Kulesza here and she will explain the strategic plan they are looking at which incorporates our work with the GAC.

**JOANNA KULESZA:** Thank you very much. I apologize for arriving late. I am a newcomer to the community but eager to support it. I enjoy the class that was granted to me to build capacity At Large and I look forward to working together with the GAC on building capacity in terms of underserved regions. We welcome the initiative to create a smaller focus group. The plan we have in terms of capacity building for the coming here, but it will likely be more long-lasting perspective focused on three points. In the short-term perspective, we are working on atlas3, the third addition of global meetings of ALS representatives. We are looking to welcoming in Montreal 60 community leaders and teaching them about becoming even better community leaders within the regions. In that sense, we welcome the opportunity to educate those incoming leaders so to speak about underserved regions. Our second prerogative is providing capacity building materials primarily through ICANN learn but we will have a series of initiatives. I am happy to engage in conversations about using our

---

plans and initiatives to combine efforts. With resources of various character, we welcome the opportunity to work together with the GAC and to use the capacity that GAC has to offer for the purpose of the At Large community. Our third primary objective is what we like to call hot topics. So, this part of our agenda includes reaching out to the regions, the five At Large regions trying to get a sense of each of them and this will be done through a list of hot topics. This work is mostly done. Each of the regions has a list of what we call hot topics and they are representative of that region.

The issue of underserved regions pops up in each part At Large. It might have a different significance. We are looking to have a global list of hot topics. Shouldn't be too long. We welcome looking into position of underserved regions within that set of themes and then we are going explore throughout the year and if the need persists, we will take that plan further. That is me briefly explaining our capacity building plan.

I am happy to answer questions.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Joanna and thank you for bringing this to the attention of the GAC as well. I hope we can have fruit full cooperation. I have Charlotte. Go ahead, please.



---

CHARLOTTE: Thank you. Thank you Pua for your proposal. I want to build on what was said and to highlight that the objective here is to move forward in a particular way and to have this likeminded group with the GAC and ALAC members to work in between meetings inter-sessionally to start preparing the agendas of the joint meetings, the plenary, and the possible outcomes. We would like to start exploring we have identified capacity building as a common issue, but we would like to start exploring other issues also where we could have likeminded groups starting so we can continue this conversation in Marrakech, but this is just to point out that it is important to also think about other issues and to put this in practice. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Charlotte. And yeah, Yrjo, please.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Manal. There is one more aspect to our developing corporation and that is the GAC and the ALAC are the only ICANN entities that have feet on the ground in more than 100 countries. In the case of GAC, I think it is 170 something. What I hope is that in this process, also the GAC reps or various governments, and the At Large people, and the same countries would get to know each other and help each other in matters that relate to their role alike. Thank you.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Yrjo. We look forward on some more inter sessional work as Charlotte mentioned and we will definitely revisit the issue in Marrakech. Any other immediate reactions or comments? OK. If not, then looking at the agenda, we have the reaction to President Macron IGF speech and Ghislain De Silins.

GHISLAIN DE SILINS: Thank you very much. My colleagues shared the English transition of President Macron speech last November. It is a very long speech but if you haven't heard everything at least some parts. It was a suggestion from ALAC to discuss this speech as food for thought for the GAC ALAC meeting so thanks ALAC for the proposal. I will pass the mic to you soon, but I would like to make a few points first. I think it is important to note the speech was about internet governance in general in a broad sense. It wasn't about the DNS or ICANN in general but rather about the challenges raised by digitalization and the impact of social networks and how we can address those challenges. I think we will try to discuss what we can discuss specifically. From a point of view there is at least a few important things we can discuss.

First is the need to rethink the importance of stakeholders coming together to design fair rules. As you might know, we celebrated the 30-year anniversary of the World Wide Web yesterday. Back then, regulation was you know KS, seen as a

---

mostly negative thing and 30 years later the internet as a global public good is threatened by many things. Security threats. We saw recent cyber-attacks targeting the DNS specifically but also risk on privacy, the spread of fake news, hate speech online ETC. It is not much about ICANN but the platforms. We cannot afford to say regulation is wrong. It has become necessary for coregulation. By the way, you might be aware that Tim Berner Lee was talking about the 30 years of the web.

We recently launched the web foundation and process to design a new contract for the web whose goal is precisely to propose new rules for activities on the internet. So, France and Germany are two governments that are part of that along with many organizations and companies. Maybe It would be a good way forward. The French government also launched in November the Paris call for trust and security in cyberspace. That was supported by hundreds of stakeholders, governments, companies, and organizations like ISIC. Not ICANN yet but maybe. One last point which I think is important in the speech is a need to invent new ways for sake stakeholders to cooperate and ICANN is an example of that, but it only works with the DNS and specific TLDs. The question is for us, and I might, you know, end with this question, how do we collectively invent mechanisms for fruitful multi stakeholder corporations especially for end users like ALAC members to be engaged in the processes and how do we make

---

sure the processes deliver results? I am of course looking forward to hearing more from our ALAC colleagues. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ghislain. Any comments? Yes? Maureen please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that input. We actually did have someone who is going to respond to this, but he has been called away on a coaching thing, but we do have a stand in. We have Olivier Crepin Leblond is going to speak on his behalf.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: I have listened to President Macron's speech and been in the room at the time. I guess the ALAC has been discussing this internally and the At Large community has been discussing this internally and I guess one of the phrases that, of course, is part of a 75 minute speech, just looking at that one phrase, was the one which basically said, well, you have got the Chinese internet on the one side and you have got the I am paraphrasing and the California internet on the other and everyone knows that ICANN is headquarter in California. There was some question as to where this would go but obviously the gist of the discussions that we are having with ourselves is whether some degree of regulation is indeed required and to what extent that goes. When it comes

down to ICANN's activities as we know this is a private sector led organizations and the GAC has its place at ICANN within the ICANN bylaws and so the question is whether there needs to be any changes to this or whether the speech affects the activities of ICANN and itself and we wondered as a group whether the GAC had discussed this with its different members and so on? We have started a discussion, of course, it is early days, but it is the start of the process that will continue. We understand the speech at the IGF was a kickoff speech for a longer process of study and so on. We are basically taking note of it and really the question is the GAC also taking note of it and is there anything we should discuss even perhaps in future meetings with regards to this topic. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much. We haven't had the chance to discuss this, so It would be very difficult for me to speak for the GAC, but the floor is open and if anyone wants to weigh in any immediate reactions or views. Yes, Olga, please. Argentina.

ARGENTINA: There have been several times the GAC has discussed similar things to what President Macron express in this speech. I think we remember the conflicts of the resource round and the role of the governments there. Our advice towards the ICANN Board and

---

then the community on accountability where some governments represented a descanting opinion of the documents that were agreed at the end. I think it could be interesting for the GAC to make a deeper revision of this very important speech by President Macron and perhaps there is some space for interaction with the ALAC. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Olga. Any other comments? Yes, Yrjo, please.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Manal. Perhaps It would be fitting to end this part of discussion with a quote from President Macron's speech which actually was a quote from the secretary general of the U.N. It is quote "to cope with internet in our lives, we need to be at least as creative as those who invented it" I think it is a fitting quote for today which is the 30th anniversary of the World Wide Web.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Yrjo. So, any other requests for the floor? OK. If not, then, thank you all very much.

---

Now the last agenda item for today and it is following up on the GAC ALAC statement on informed participation in ICANN. And Yrjo would you like to speak to this?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Manal. The statement which was made, joint statement made at the Abu Dhabi meeting and it went back and forth after that between the board and the GAC and ALAC. Finally, today, we can say in a way our mission has been accomplished because on January 27th, this year, the ICANN Board passed a resolution that acknowledged this initiative and now we are more or less just waiting for the results from the board. The either follow up is, of course, something that was referred to by Pua and I think that as she said that statement actually reflected on this work, we are going to start with the inter sessional work in capacity building and possibly other areas. So, I think that we can be pretty happy so far with the follow up to this statement. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Yrjo. So, any comments from GAC colleagues?

Yes, Maureen.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to make a follow up statement on the GAC ALAC statement that was proposed and which the board was very supportive and has, you know, put in place sort of like directors to ICANN.org to ensure our communication process is put in place to do exactly what we wanted. It is not just for GAC. We sort of felt it was important to make sure that our individual members within our community also get that similar quality of understanding of what it is, what is involved in the policy, and the policy issues that we are discussing. We want more people to be engaged in the work that Jonathan does and the consolidated policy Working Group. We want more voices coming to those discussions and I am sure it is the same with the GAC. You know, that is not going to be possible unless we get a deeper and more diverse understanding of what the issues entail. So, I am really pleased with the developments that have actually happened and that we have got the board's support for that to happen as well. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, Maureen. And yeah, indeed, we are aligned on this and thank you Yrjo, we can definitely work also inter sessionally between yourself and our point of contact and I can see Pua also nodding so that we can move things forward. Any comments? Or questions before we conclude? Any final remarks from anyone? OK. If not, then thank you very much for our meeting and thanks



---

to our points of contact and thank you all. For GAC colleagues we will be reconvening here at 1:30. Enjoy.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]