
ICANN75 | AGM – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 5)
Thursday, September 22 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

GULTEN TEPE:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ICANN75 GAC Communique Drafting session being held on Thursday, 22nd of September at 07:00 UTC. Recognizing that these are public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance, the GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC members to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pod. This is to keep the accurate attendance records.

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

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand via Zoom room. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor. Remember to state your name and the language

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.

you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. With that, I would like to hand the floor to Manal Ismail, GAC chair. Over to you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Gulden. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone in the GAC room and on Zoom. Welcome to the fifth and last, I hope, communique drafting session. This session is scheduled for an hour, and first apologies if we're not seated exactly in the center of the room, but we are trying to get closer to the screens displaying the communique, so that's why we are trying to follow the screen.

So if we can get the communique on the screen, please. Meanwhile, I would like to thank everyone who participated in drafting the communique. I know it's been tough also with the different time zones, so yes, sincere thanks to everyone. So can we scroll down and just stop whenever we have edits or things to approve?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Manal, this is Fabien speaking.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please, Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Should we start with the new text? We do have a new version of the DNS abuse mitigation text in the issues of importance. So that's one where there is substantive [00:03:33 - inaudible]. There are also some adjustments, they are not too substantial, but still in the accuracy text. So we may want to review those and maybe then we can go through the entire communique. There were a few suggestions here or there for clarifications or readability, and so maybe as part of that final read, we can get those sorted out in the second page. So just a suggestion for [00:04:05 - inaudible].

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Fabien. Makes sense, and we will start by DNS abuse mitigation and the new text. Again with sincere thanks to everyone who participated. It reads, "The GAC appreciates the efforts carried out to advance proposals to mitigate DNS abuse, and while looking into the many avenues available to combat this threat, we highlight ICANN's technical role in finding solutions and look forward to the GNSO Council's small team final report on the subject in order to discuss subsequent steps.

Mitigating DNS abuse continues to be an issue of concern for the GAC, and we emphasize the importance of building on the current work, which includes effectively preventing, reporting, and responding to DNS abuse. This topic is especially important given the ongoing activities related to a next round of new gTLDs. The GAC has previously stated that "DNS abuse should be addressed in collaboration with the ICANN community and ICAN Org prior to the launch of a second round of new gTLDs," and expressed its support for "the development of proposed contract provisions applicable to all gTLDs to improve responses to DNS abuse."

For example, those identified in SSR2 and the CCT review. The GAC has also recognized a potential role for "targeted policy development processes" to yield contract improvements at ICANN74. The GAC recognizes voluntary initiatives from the community to address DNS abuse and looks forward to seeing the output of these and how they can be effectively used to reduce DNS abuse. In particular, the GAC welcomed the many activities taking place across the ICANN community to address DNS abuse, including the Draft DNS Abuse small team report to the GNSO council, a forthcoming discussion paper from the contracted parties house on malicious versus compromised domains, a review of recent abuse reporting and highlight of voluntary initiatives on measurement and reporting.

One GAC member provided a presentation that focused on the problems of repeated registrant abuse in moving from domain name to domain name, and noted that a lack of clarity within registrar contracts makes it more difficult to ensure there is an effective response to such abuse. There was also a discussion about potential work across the community that could focus on developing improved contract provisions for ICANN's consideration and on the scope of DNS abuse that may be addressed within ICANN's remit Discussion on a potential PDP could proceed in parallel with the advancement of these efforts." So this is the end of the text and I'm looking to see if there are any comments from the floor or on Zoom. I see. Yes, Paraguay. Please, Nico, go ahead.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a minor change. I see the reference to the -- Can you scroll down a little bit please? I see a reference to the small team report group. DNS abuse small team report to the GNSO council mentioned twice. I don't see the need for that because it was referred at the beginning in the first paragraph. I'm okay with it, but I just don't see the need to refer to it twice. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Paraguay. I'm just trying to see. Yes, US, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS: Thank you, Chair. I think that was because that sentence we had in the previous text, we had deleted it, and so defer to other colleagues on the list if we need to retain it, but I just wanted to give that context. That's all. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, US. So does this mean the repetition has been deleted and the first sentence was-- I mean the first occurrence was deleted. I'm a bit lost. I'm sorry. Okay, thank you, Fabien and Benedetta? Yes, Gemma, please go ahead. I'm sorry.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Good afternoon or good morning, depending on the time zones. Thank you, Manal, for giving me the floor. So I think it can be considered a bit redundant and at the same time this we refer in the paragraph where there is reference to the draft report. I think it's just recollection of the important efforts taking place now, while in the beginning there is the reference to looking forward to the final report. So it is a bit redundant, we could go without it, I think.

The only element I would consider in favor of keeping it is that this is a very important report, and while we acknowledge the work

that has been done, it's would be good to have it in the recollection. So here, we are including all the main activities that's taken place. So I think in the first place we are looking forward to the final report and in the second part we acknowledge the important work that has been going and led to the draft, so.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Gemma. I see nodding here in the room, and indeed if drafters are okay with the text as is, I'd rather keep it. I also read we at some place. Yes, it's highlighted in yellow, and we have agreed to refer to ourselves as GAC rather than we, So maybe if we can do this very minor amendment. I see Abdalmonem. Egypt, please.

ABDALMONEM GALILA:

Thank you, Manal. I see that many of the region talk about DNS abuse in different statements. So, the mitigation of DNS abuse, could you consider that statement inside this communique? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So, do you mean we reference community statements here?

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yes, as this statement reflects the views for these reasons, I think it's better to consider that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Abdalmonem, but we normally here, try to reflect the views of the GAC. If there is something specific that we would like to reference in other communities input, we can do that, but I don't think we have looked into the statement, so it would be difficult to reference it here without discussing it or at least without knowing what has been shared. So I see you nodding, so thank you for your understanding. I see Jaideep's hand up, so India, please.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Just a small one. I think on the second line also we have the we, so we can replace that also with-

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Jaideep. So second line, we highlight ICANN's technical role, so if we can replace it with the GAC as well. Any further requests for the floor? If not, then I think we are good to accept all edits, and I'm glad to see that we have arrived at consensus text on DNS abuse. Thank you very much, everyone.

Once we finish accepting the edits, I think we can move to the accuracy part. The text under Accuracy of Registration Data reads, "The GAC having actively contributed to the work of the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, reiterates the importance of addressing efficiently and in a timely manner, the issue of accuracy and reliability of domain name registration data.

The GAC takes good note of the recommendations of the interim report on assignments one and two and encourages the scoping team to continue its work while ICANN awaits feedback from the relevant data protection authorities regarding its legal basis for processing data for the purposes of measuring accuracy. Regarding recommendation one, the GAC stresses the importance of encouraging the widest possible participation of registrars to the registrar survey and welcomes the exploration of approaches to incentivize participation in it, as well as consideration by the scoping team or the GNSO Council of the use of a third-party to aid in its design.

The GAC notes that recommendations two on registrar audit and the part of recommendations three relating to proceeding with the data protection impact assessment may lack the necessary clarity and detail regarding their envisioned implementation. This was confirmed also by the exchange with the GNSO during ICANN75. Further, the GAC highlights the importance of

concluding swiftly the data protection agreement between ICANN and the contracted parties as part of recommendation three.

Finally, the GAC urges the scoping team to accompany their recommendations with an explanatory note elaborating further on how these recommendations are envisaged to be implemented." So any comments on text under Accuracy of Registration Data? I'm seeing none, so great. Let's please accept the changes. Afterwards, I would say we can go through the communique quickly on any other edits that are pending approval, and then we can do one final reading of the communique. Under GAC Public Safety Working Group, I'll go through the edits only, I think. Let's read the text.

"The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG took part in the capacity building workshop orienting new GAC members to the issues of WHOIS in DNS abuse. The PSWG also led a session to update the GAC on DNS abuse that included, one, references to recent studies showing rising rates of phishing and malware threats and their impact on internet users. Two, updates on various initiatives from the community to support the mitigation of DNS abuse.

Three, a follow-up presentation by a GAC member highlighting the need for action to improve the specificity of standard contracts. Also, suggesting information sharing at a registrar level to allow for proactive measure to combat forms of malicious activity by registrants. Four, looked at how potential contract changes may be used to incentivize or reduce the burden on contracted parties in carrying out DNS abuse, preventive, and mitigation measures. The PSWG indicated its intent to work with the GAC and various stakeholder groups to find common ground and measures to improve contracts."

So, any comments on the first paragraph or shall we accept the changes? Seeing none, I think we can accept the first paragraph. So before we move on while we are on the first paragraph, I just noticed that we say the PSWG indicated its intent to work with the GAC and various stakeholder groups and it just sound like the GAC and the various stakeholder groups are on one side and the PSWG on the other side. So maybe we can say the GAC PSWG. Any suggestions for drafting? Yes, Nico, please. Paraguay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is Nico Caballero from Paraguay. Could you please show on the screen where exactly?

MANAL ISMAIL: Can we highlight the part, please? It's the last sentence in this paragraph. Yes. The PSWG indicates its intent to work with the GAC and various stakeholder groups. So it looks as if the PSWG is going to equally work with other stakeholder groups and the GAC rather than being part of the GAC.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: I guess I would suggest saying as well as with various stakeholder groups or something like that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I was looking also for something that could put the GAC and the PSWG as one entity.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Manal. Can I suggest?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: I think we can use the same terminology. Like on the first line, you have used GAC PSWG, we can do the same. The GAC PSWG indicated to work along with stakeholders.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jaideep. Yes, this was along my thinking too. Any objections or any comments? So the GAC PSWG indicated its intent to work with the various stakeholder groups to find common ground on measures to improve contracts. So going to the following paragraph.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry. US?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, US, please. I'm sorry.

SUSAN CHALMER: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I think that works. It is assumed that GAC members can participate in those efforts as well, and so I think the suggestion is probably the simplest.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you for confirming, Susan. So moving to the following paragraph, it reads, "The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small group through participation in the phase one implementation review team, the SSAC small team discussing ICANN Org's operational design

phase, WHOIS Disclosure System design, and the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team.

The PSWG emphasized the importance of accurate registration data to better investigate DNS abuse. The PSWG participated in the update to the GAC on domain name registration data issues. With regard to ICANN Org's proposed design of WHOIS Disclosure System, the PSWG noted that this could be a valuable addition that could reduce overall risk through the use of a prototype to reduce the unknowns for specific technical and operational concerns and reduce the burden on users in accessing the right contact point.

However, the PSWG also noted that this effort must inform and not replace more comprehensive system on access to registration data." So any comments on the shown edits? Okay, seeing none, I think we can accept the edits of the second paragraph. The third and last paragraph reads, "As per its work plan, the PSWG continued its outreach to public safety bodies and shared amongst its members its 2022, 2023 work plan, which it hopes the GAC will affirm before ICANN76. The PSWG also held discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN." Any comments on the third paragraph? Yes, India, Jaideep, please. Go ahead.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Some other sentence, I mean as per it's work plan, the PSWG continued and its members is 2022, 23 work plan, which it hopes. It's reading little odd actually.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Jaideep. Yes, I agree. As per its work plan sounds as if there is already a work plan we are referencing, and then from the rest of the paragraph, looks like the work plan is yet to be confirmed, right?

JAIDEEP KUMAR: It is discussing among its members then, which it hopes. Maybe we could reduce a bit.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, okay. Yes, Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, thank you. Chris Lewis-Evans for the record. So yes, we do have a 2021, 2022 work plan, which the outreach is part of, and obviously, the 2022/2023 is an updated one, but I think for [00:28:01 - inaudible], maybe we don't need to iterate that it's part of the work plans, and maybe just the PSWG continued its outreach and then continued from there might make it read easier. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Chris. Very helpful. So the text now reads, "The PSWG continued its outreach to public safety bodies and shared amongst its members its 2023 work plan, which it hopes the GAC will affirm before ICANN76. Any comments? Us, please, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMER: Just a question. The last sentence, the PSWG also held discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN, was that part of the-- I know the PSWG holds by-lots and the lead up to ICANN with some different groups. I'm just seeking clarity if this sentence refers to the pre-ICANN by-lots or does it inform the work plan paragraph or if this is during ICANN? Just a question for clarification please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Susan. So can we seek clarification from the PSWG whether the reference here is for prep work or activities that took place during the meeting or something else? Yes, Laureen, please, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, the by-lots are scheduled both before and during, depending upon the availability of the different stakeholder groups we meet with. So this is a separate topic and doesn't necessarily relate to the work plan. It is just a separate update that part of our work, both in the lead-up and during the meeting involved our bilateral discussions. I hope that that clarifies.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, Laureen, so could it then fit maybe better in the previous paragraph for where we are reporting? Yes, I'm sorry, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, perhaps we can move that sentence to the previous paragraph and just have a standalone sentence about the work plan.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Laureen, because yes, it sounded to me as if it was just out of context since we are talking here in conclusion about the work plan, so.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Yes, the juxtaposition is confusing. I think that placement you've suggested works better.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Lauren. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. Continue.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, please go ahead. I see Chris has another comment to make.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, sure. I was going to give him the floor. So, Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Thank you, Manal. Chris Lewis-Evans for the record. I think the only reason we put it here was it was part of the outreach. So that was the reasoning for the position, but happy to move it if it fits better. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. thank you. Thank you Chris. So would you rather keep it with the outreach? So shall we change the wording to say that the PSWG will continue? I'm sorry, I cannot think of some quick language now, but if you don't mind moving it to the previous paragraph, then I think it's good. If it is related to outreach and

we need it in the last paragraph, then maybe we can rephrase it differently.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Manal, I support, I think we should take it to the next paragraph for the outreach one only. We can take this line to the original place itself.

MANAL ISMAIL: To the original place, then maybe we can work on-

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Some connecting line, maybe.

MANAL ISMAIL: Exactly.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: Further, something like that.

MANAL ISMAIL: So maybe the PSWG continued its outreach to the public safety bodies and discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Sorry, Manal, can I jump in?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, if you can help, I would appreciate. Sorry, Fabien, I overlooked your hand. I'm sorry.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Maybe I can say to Fabien because sometimes he has better ideas than me on wording even though I am a native English.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: No, please go ahead, it's 2:00 AM here, so I would rely on your awakesness.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, thank you. So I just wonder whether we continued its outreach, and then holding discussions with a number of constituency groups within ICANN and with governmental public safety bodies, which it shared bits of 2023 work plan. That was probably far too fast, so I apologize.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I do apologize for both of you for the difficult time zone. So just to make sure we got it right, Chris, the PSWG continued its outreach and its discussions

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: And held discussions.

MANAL ISMAIL: And held discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, sorry. Instead of and held, holding.

MANAL ISMAIL: Holding. Okay. We should delete and as well

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, that's right.

MANAL ISMAIL: The PSWG continue to outreach holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies, right?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, perfect

MANAL ISMAIL: And shared amongst its members it's 2022, 2023 work plan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Shouldn't it just be a new sentence?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Perfect. Apologies for the live drafting.

MANAL ISMAIL: So Chris, Lauren, and everyone, of course, would you mind splitting it into two sentences? So maybe and shared amongst its members. Can we start here a new sentence?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, that would make sense. So remove the and put sharing to start the sentence, sharing.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. So one more time before we accept the changes, the PSWG continued its outreach holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies. The PSWG shared amongst its members its 2020, 2023 work plan, which it hopes the GAC will affirm before ICANN76. Any comments? Yes, Susan, please. Yes, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMER: Just a quick question on the work plan, which was shared. Was that shared during this session or on the email? I'm so sorry, I can't recall.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Both, Susan.

SUSAN CHALMER: Okay, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So Chris, if you can repeat, we missed what you said and it was not reflected in the transcripts either, so sorry.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, no worries. So yes, that was shared both on the email list and in the session.

JAIDEEP KUMAR: So then my point is if it's shared with the GAC, then why are we saying shared among its members? Are we referring to GAC as members, or? Because we are hoping that if it's been circulated internally among its members, then we are hoping GAC will reaffirm it. So if it's been put up to GAC then we can say it was shared with GAC.

MANAL ISMAIL: No, I don't think it-- it was shared with the PSWG members, right? Is this accurate, Chris, Lauren? Yes, Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Chris Lewis-Evans for the record. Yes, so it was only shared with the PSWG mailing list, not the wider GAC mailing list, and [00:38:35 - inaudible] PSWG bilateral.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Chris. So, it was shared amongst the PSWG members and it will be shared with the GAC, hoping that it could be affirmed before ICANN76. So Egypt, please. Christine, go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: Thank you for the questions, Scott. I had the same questions, but I thought maybe I missed it being shared on the GAC. I think if it wasn't shared yet by the GAC, then it's worth saying which will be shared by the GAC to be affirmed or something like that before ICANN76.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Which will be shared or maybe which it hopes the GAC will affirm once shared. Okay, let's try the first formulation which will be shared with the GAC.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, I think we could write which will be shared with the GAC for its affirmation before ICANN76

MANAL ISMAIL: ICANN76. Yes, exactly. I see Christine nodding as well, so yes. Yes, Paraguay, please go ahead.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is Nico Caballero for the record. Again, we would be repeating the word shared way too many times. Maybe it's just me, but it would read the PSWG shared among its members it's 2022, 2023 work plan, which will be shared with the GAC for, so maybe it's just me. I'm happy if you want to leave it like that, but I would recommend using a different wording. Thank you, Madam chair.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Nico. So can we say the PSWG shared amongst its members its 2022, 2023 work plan and will be seeking GAC affirmation before ICANN76. Yes, Egypt, please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA: There was a language that was being typed maybe by Fabien, he was saying, which will be circulated I think that addresses.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, this is also good. It would spare us a repetition of the word share. So final reading of this paragraph, the PSWG circulated its outreach -- I'm sorry, "The PSWG continued its outreach holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies. The PSWG shared amongst its members

it's 2022, 2023 work plan, which will be circulated to the GAC for affirmation before ICANN76."

I see nodding here, so thank you very much, everyone, and thank you Fabien. I see you are doing great at this early hour, so. So let's accept the changes and move on. Yes, so this sentence reads, we are under WHOIS Disclosure Systems, and the sentence reads, "The GAC recommends ICANN Org engages with PSWG to further discuss the issue of how confidentiality of law enforcement requests will be insured and how the metadata of all the requests of law enforcement agencies are handled."

I was suggesting to insert the GAC PSWG or the GAC/PSWG. Will this work for everyone? I see nodding in the room. Any comments? So let's accept this and move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Manal, this s Fabien speaking. I see a hand up in the queue, but I was going to just say that we're not seeing further edits to review.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, this is great news. Let's give the floor first to Chris, and then we plan the way forward. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS: Yes, thank you, Manal. Chris Lewis-Evans for the record. Sorry Fabien, can we go back to the WHOIS Disclosure? It's just the GAC PSWG. I'd just recommend removal of the slash so just put a space in there because otherwise it looks like the GAC or the PSWG rather than-

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, we'll do, and we were just discussing the same here that maybe we should be consistent throughout, so noted. Thank you very much, Chris. So if there are no further changes to be adopted, maybe we can make one final reading of the communique hoping that we can furnish it in the remaining 13 minutes without speeding up for the interpreters. So let's see if we can hit the right balance.

So this is GAC communique Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, the Kuala Lumpur communique was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the ICANN75 annual general meeting with some GAC participants in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and others remotely. The communique was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC members and observers to consider it before publication bearing in mind the special circumstances of a hybrid meeting." Then no objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication.

It's highlighted in yellow and we will unhighlight it in due time if we can have the text slightly bigger, I would appreciate it. Then under introduction, the Governmental Advisory Committee, GAC, of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, met in Kuala Lumpur Malaysia in a hybrid setting, including remote participation from 17 to 22 September, 2022. X number of GAC members and X number of GAC observers attended the meeting. Again, this will be inserted before we circulate the communique.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of ICANN75 annual general meeting. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings. Then under inter-constituency activities and community engagement, first meeting with the ICANN Board, the GAC met with the ICANN Board and discuss collaborative actions, the community board and Org should be undertaking to further progress achieving strategic priorities. GAC advised global internet access and connectivity, WHOIS Disclosure System, and proof of concept design paper, DNS abuse, mitigation and compliance enforcement.

ICANN Board responses to the GAC's questions and statements presented during the meeting are available in the transcript of the GAC ICANN board meeting annexed to this document. The meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee, the GAC met with

members of the ALAC and discussed internet fragmentation, the DNS and ICANN, subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and closed generics including participation in the facilitated dialogue with the GNSO Council, local cross community cooperation.

Then under meeting with the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed WHOIS Disclosure System subsequent rounds of new gTLDs including the operational design phase, the GNSO guidance process on applicant support and closed generics, DNS abuse and accuracy. Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization, the GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed ccPDP three on review mechanisms, ccPDP four on internationalized domain names, and ccNSO domain name system abuse standing committee.

Under cross community discussions, GAC members participated in relevant cross community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN75 including internet fragmentation, the DNS and ICANN. Under internal matters, we have first GAC membership. The GAC welcomed the kingdom of Saudi Arabia as a member. There are currently 180 GAC members states and territories and 38 observer organizations.

Then GAC elections, the GAC elected Nicolas Caballero, Paraguay, as chair for the term starting after ICANN76, March, 2023 and

ending at the close of ICANN82, March, 2025. The GAC elected as vice chairs for the term starting after ICANN76, March, 2023 and ending at the close of ICANN79, March, 2024, Francis Olivier Cubahiro, Burundi, Shi Young Chang, Republic of Korea, Zeina Bou Harb, Lebanon, Nigel Hickson, United Kingdom, and Ola Bergström, Sweden. Under the GAC working groups, we have first the GAC Public Safety Working Group.

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG took part in the capacity building workshop, orienting new GAC members to the issues of WHOIS data and DNS abuse. The PSWG also led a session to update the GAC on DNS abuse that included, one, references to recent studies showing rising rates of phishing and malware threats and their impact on internet users. Two, updates on various initiatives from the community to support the mitigation of DNS abuse.

Three, a follow-up presentation by a GAC member highlighting the need for action to improve the specificity of standard contracts and also suggesting information sharing at a registrar level to allow for proactive measures to combat forms of malicious activity by registrants. Four, looked at how potential contract changes may be used to incentivize or reduce the burden

on contracted parties in carrying out DNS abuse, preventive, and mitigation measures.

The GAC PSWG indicated its intent to work with the various stakeholder groups to find common ground on measures to improve contracts. If you can scroll down, please. The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC small group through participation in the phase one implementation review team, the SSAD small team discussing ICANN Org's operational design phase, WHOIS Disclosure System design, and the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team. The PSWG emphasized the importance of accurate registration data to better and investigate DNS abuse.

The PSWG participated in the update to the GAC on domain name registration data issues. With regard to ICANN Org's proposed design of WHOIS Disclosure system, the PSWG noted that this could be a valuable addition that could reduce overall risk through the use of a prototype to reduce the unknown for specific technical and operational concerns and reduce the burden on users in accessing the right contact point. However, the PSWG also noted that this effort must inform and not replace a more comprehensive system on access to registration data.

The PSWG continued its outreach, holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies. The PSWG shared amongst its members its 2022, 2023

work plan, which will be circulated to the GAC for affirmation before ICANN76. Under the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group, the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group held a well-attended capacity building weekend on Saturday 17 and Sunday 18, September, 2022 on a variety of topics aimed at giving GAC participants an opportunity to learn or increase their knowledge on the basics of the GAC.

The capacity building weekend included issues facing the GAC, ICANN's multistakeholder model, structure and operations. In addition, it allowed GAC participants to become acquainted with different community groups to facilitate future dialogue, share experiences, and enhance GAC internal collaboration. The capacity building weekend focused on the following main topics of interest to GAC participants. One, onboarding basics, example, describing the GAC, its operations and its place in the multi-stakeholder community. Two, key GAC topics, example, subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, DNS abuse, and WHOIS.

Three, overview of the DNS, example, introduction to ccTLD and gTLD registries and registrars role and responsibilities. The capacity building weekend received strong positive feedback from both GAC and non-GAC attendees. An evaluation survey will be issued to GAC participants to assess the pertinence and relevance of the sessions for future capacity building activities. It is envisaged that topics covered at a high level during the

capacity building weekend will be elaborated in the lead up to ICANN76. We are just at the hour, so maybe we can have the 30-minute coffee break and then we can -- Yes, Brazil, please.

LUCIANO MAZZA:

Sorry, just a very candid comment. Do you really need to go through the communique all over again? Sorry. Because I think everything was agreed and that's just asking. No, problem at all, that's the usual practice of GAC, but just to --

MANAL ISMAIL:

It's a very valid question, and this is how we normally do it, so one full read through at the end. This is not casting stone, it could be changed. During the wrap up, if there are any suggestions or feedback, we can take this into consideration, and we are already documenting the communique drafting, so it's also timely if we would like to modify the process. Yes, mindful of the coffee break. Yes, Karel, please.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Yes, mindful of the coffee break. Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago. I just wanted to thank you for reading it over just because I saw a little minor, not an error, but if you go back to the Underserved Regions Working Group, it should be rules and

responsibilities, so we do have a minor correction of roles and responsibilities. If you scroll, just past it there. Yes, I think -- yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Number three. It's number three.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Rules and responsibilities.

MANAL ISMAIL: gTLD registries and registrars roles and responsibilities.

KAREL DOUGLAS: If you go to the paragraph, the first paragraph, the last line, it speaks to share experiences, and enhanced. So could you just remove the comma because that comma is not needed there since that's the last and. That would be it for me. Thank you so much.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much Trinidad and Tobago, and thank you very much, everyone. Let's meet back here at half past. We are going to finalize the remaining part, and then we can start our wrap up. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]