

GAC Working Group Meeting Minutes

31 October 2007

ccNSO

Keith Davidson, .nz (Co Chair)
Keith Drazek, .us
Annebeth Lange, .no
Paulos Nyirenda, mw
Oscar Robles, .mx
Hilde Thunem, .no

GAC

Martin Boyle, UK (Co Chair)
Lionel Choo, Singapore
Bill Graham, Canada
Janis Karklins, Latvia
Manal Ismail, Egypt
Peter Ulanga, Tanzania

Observer

Gabriella Schitteck, ccNSO Secretariat

Keith Davidson started the meeting by suggesting that a joint ccNSO-GAC email list should be set up so that the ccNSO and GAC group can interact between the meetings. Those present agreed on the idea.

The ccNSO Secretariat was instructed to set up the email list as soon as possible.

Keith then continued by reminding the group that in the past, joint sessions between the groups were arranged with presentations on the different cc models which had been perceived as useful by both sides. He asked what the GAC is interested in hearing from ccTLDs and what the ccTLDs would be interested in hearing from the GAC. He himself thought that cc's would be interested in hearing more on law enforcement on phishing and DDOS attacks.

Hilde Thunem pointed out that there are overlapping issues of interest for both groups, such as the issue of Participation, as both the ccNSO and the GAC are struggling to get people to participate. She pointed out that the newly created ccNSO Participation Working Group could present some of their findings, whilst the GAC could give feedback on their initiatives on the topic.

Martin Boyle said that in his opinion the case studies have always been the most popular presentations. He thought that it would be a good idea to blend case studies with a particular, topical issue, such as DNSSEC or the use and abuse of WHOIS data. Other issues of interest would be security and stability.

Janis Karklins noted that in the communiqué from the LA meeting, the GAC priorities for 2008 had been outlined where the IDN ccTLD issue takes absolute priority. Other issues are IPv4/IPv6 matters as well as the overall security and stability of the DNS. However, he underlined that it does not exclude that other issues will be addressed as well.

For the New Delhi meeting it was suggested to discuss IPv6, as it was felt that it would be relatively easy to assemble a variety of speakers.

The discussion then continued on more practical issues, such as how to set up a meeting room for the joint GAC/ccNSO meetings so that all people can have a dialogue.

Hilde noted that at the moment presentations more tend to be given to an audience, without any real possibility to interact. The parties should much more try to come up with presentations from both sides in order to encourage a dialogue.

Martin said that if presentations had to be given on more specific topics, such as law enforcement on phishing, special national agencies need to become involved. For this, firstly the people which are supposed to give the presentation need to be identified and alerted early enough.

Keith Davidson wondered if it would make more sense to have some of the sessions closed in order to get a real panel of experts to hold discussions.

Keith Drazek suggested that if ccTLDs give examples of experiences at one meeting, the following meeting could be devoted to government representatives to deliver input. This would also give time to identify the right people to come and speak and give enough notice for them to come.

Martin suggested bringing in some UK agencies to speak on a topical issue at the ICANN meeting in Paris, as it would be easier for them to come to a place not too far away.

The GAC was asked how much time the ccNSO could be given in the GAC agenda at the New Delhi meeting. Janis replied that the SO chairs will have to discuss this first in order to establish priorities. He informed that the GAC has planned to devote at least an entire day on discussing IDN issues internally. A suggestion would be to have a joint meeting with the ccNSO on the following day, which probably would be Tuesday. Alternatively, a one or two hour session could be held on Saturday or Sunday, depending on the subject.

It was pointed out that Tuesday would be more suitable for ccTLDs.

Hilde summarised that the two groups should try to come up with speakers internally as soon as possible for the New Delhi meeting, and to come up with an even more ambitious agenda for the Paris meeting. Time and dates should be decided early in order to notify presenters and counterparts well in time.

The Chairs then closed the meeting.