
ICANN85 | Prep Week – Geopolitical, Legislative and Regulatory Developments Update
Tuesday, February 24, 2026 – 08:30 to 09:30 IST

BECKY MCGILLEY

Hello and welcome to Geopolitical, Regulatory and Legislative Developments Update. My name is Becky McGilley, and I am a remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session, and I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Q&A pod will be read out loud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of this session. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. All are welcome to use the chat.

Please note that any private chats are only possible among panelists in a Zoom webinar format. Any messages sent by a panelist or standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session hosts, co-hosts, and other panelists. I will now hand the floor over to Jamie Hedlund, Senior Vice President for Global Government Engagement and Contractual Compliance. Thanks.

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.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thank you, Becky. And hola, everyone, and welcome to ICANN's government engagement pre ICANN85 Webinar. As Becky just said, my name is Jamie Hedlund and I'm the SVP for Global Government Engagement and Contractual Compliance. In today's webinar, members of the GE team will provide an overview of the latest geopolitical, legislative and regulatory developments.

In Mumbai, GE will also host a session entitled WSIS+20 Lessons Learned and Next Steps on Monday, March 9 at 13:15 to 14:30 local time. Several members of the community will provide their thoughts on the ING landscape moving forward. The panel moderated by my colleague, Janis Karklins, head of GE, will include Sally Wentworth, president and CEO of ISOC, Kurtis Linquist, president and CEO of ICANN, Chengetai Masango, Head, IGF Secretariat, Christine Arida, ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee Representative of Egypt, Chris Disspain, former ICANN Board member, and Amrita Choudhury, Director CCAOI and UN IGF MAG member.

We hope that some of the information provided today, particularly in the IGO space, will serve as helpful background for the Mumbai session. We also hope all of you will be able to attend and actively participate in what should be a lively interactive discussion of past and present challenges the community faces in internet governance. Thank you. And with that, I will turn it over to Janis.

JANIS KARKLINS

Yeah, thank you very much, Jamie. Hello, everyone. My name is Janis Karklins. I'm the head of Government Engagement at ICANN. So, I will like to briefly introduce agenda of the webinar. We will start today with a presentation of legislative and or regulatory initiatives in different parts of the world. Then we will turn to the updates from the different international organizations.

After all presentations will be done, the floor will be open for any comments that participants would like to make in this part of the webinar. Questions that will be put in Q&A pod will be answered. With this, I would like now to invite the Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement and managing director for Asia Pacific Region, Mr. Samiran Gupta, to start the presentation on the legislative and regulatory developments in India. Samiran, please.

SAMIRAN GUPTA

Thank you so much, Janis, and happy to get started here. So, India's digitalization evolution started in 2015 when the government's program that linked the citizens' telephone numbers to a unique identity number, which is also known as the ADHA and to the bank account, the Universal Payment Interface, or UPI was a unique initiative that safely connected users to their bank accounts for payments.

This trinity of initiatives was supported by another government initiative known as [00:04:56 - inaudible] Net that started rolling out high speed internet connectivity to village clusters across the nation. Internet usage gained momentum in terms over the period

and matured further during the COVID-19 pandemic. Today, India's massive mobile connectivity supports entertainment, e-commerce, banking, telemedicine, and education. As internet usage has increased, the numbers are 950 million users in 2025, regulations have been rapidly updated. In 2023, a new telecommunications act and a Digital Personal Data Protection Act were introduced.

The focus of new legislation and regulations have largely been related to content. Over the last decade, India has supported the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance and regulatory agencies regularly call for public consultations before proposing new regulations or amending existing regulations. Along with this rich digital growth, the government of India has focused on putting a supportive governance structure in place.

So, I'm gonna share a couple of examples of how this has come about. For example, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, while was enacted in 2023, the rules or the digital personal data protection rules were only put into use in 2025. Even though the supporting rules came out two years after the act, it was not because of slow reaction, but because the regulator wanted to be thorough in their consultations to ensure effective implementation.

In our assessment, the data protection rules are comparable to international practices and should not cause contracted parties many barriers for implementation. Recent regulatory and

legislative developments in India seem to have focused predominantly on rules for the content level. This is quite aligned with the overall pattern that we see in the APAC region. For example, regulators have conducted public consultations on rules that seek to better address copyright issues.

In addition, amendments to the intermediary guidelines and digital media ethics code to address artificially created or modified content have been enforced just this month. Part of the code includes a requirement for internet intermediaries to take down AI generated or deepfake content within three hours if mandated by the government. Currently, legislative developments at the content level have not indicated immediate impact on the technical operations of the internet.

Nonetheless, ICANN will continue to monitor relevant developments and engage as required. We will avail ourselves to inform policy makers about technical realities of the internet as and when required. With that, let me hand over to Angela, who will talk more about the APAC region. Thank you.

ANGELA WIBAWA

Thank you, Samiran. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening for all. First of all, I'd like to echo Samiran that legislative developments at the content level seems to be a trend across many jurisdictions in the APAC region. Because content level matters do not fall within ICANN's purview, these types of

developments do not typically affect ICANN and our contracted parties.

Nonetheless, we continue to monitor them to make sure that regulators do not inadvertently try to leverage technical level approaches to address concerns at the content level. Some recent developments that personally have caught my attention includes those that's related to children's use of social media, and of course use on content itself. One example is China's draft law on prevention and control of cyber crime.

In this draft, China is planning to require providers of domain name registration to take action on malicious registration, or counterfeit names, including those domain names that have been used for illegal or criminal activities. So, including domain name providers as actors to help address, cyber crime is not very common in APAC, so we will continue to monitor the space and engage regulators where necessary.

In addition, there is also a trend where regulators from the Asia and Pacific region are focusing on reviewing or modernizing their cybersecurity rules. This is, of course, timely as cyber incidents nowadays are no longer just isolated technical matters, but could have massive impact on the livelihood of many people.

A few notable examples are China's cybersecurity incident reporting management measures, and the amended cybersecurity laws. Both are notable developments that operators in China should familiarize themselves with. Singapore also finalized the

amendment of its cybersecurity act, and Hong Kong implemented the protection of critical infrastructure ordinance. While the cybersecurity rules --

BECKY MCGILLEY

Sorry, Angela, sorry. Can you slow down just a bit for the interpreters? They can't keep up. Thank you.

ANGEL WIBAWA

Okay, I will try. While the cybersecurity rules that we have observed do not have direct impact on ICANN's operation, we advise contracted parties to familiarize yourself with the rules and how they evolve, because organizations would need to comply accordingly based on the fact that they provide ICT related services to jurisdictions.

And finally, in order to support the implementation of some of these regulations and ensure consistent application, some jurisdictions continue to put in efforts to develop or update their national standards. They do so occasionally by mandating adoption of some national technical standards. While ICANN cannot monitor every standards development, we occasionally come across some interesting ones.

For instance, China recently updated its national standards on public key infrastructure security management protocol. So, in conclusion, the APAC region is a dynamic region that continues to adjust itself to take advantage of digital development. While many

regulators in this region look to more established regions like the EU for trends in regulations, they do not simply copy paste.

Regulators typically prioritize topics that are of importance to their country and align with their priorities. This could differ from one jurisdiction to another. While for some economic motivation drives their priorities, for others, soft values to take precedents, and if necessary to move fast, they can do so accordingly.

As Samiran has said, we will continue to monitor relevant developments in this region, in the APAC region, and we will share relevant information with the community where available. And with that, I'll end my sharing and give the floor to Elena, an even faster speaker than me, so good luck with that. And thank you so much for this opportunity to share. Elena, please.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Angela. The good news is that I'm not speaking too much. So, bear with me for a little while. Turning over to the European Union and an area that we know produces a lot, and actually, if I may paraphrase the popular song, this period is a period where when it's raining initiatives in the EU, we would be reminiscent if we didn't just quickly refer to the prevailing themes; digital sovereignty of course, it's not a prevailing theme, not only in the European Union and Europe, but in other parts of the world as well.

Why are you mentioning this in the context of the session? Well, first of all, it would not be a geopolitical updates session if we didn't mention the top theme on everyone's agenda. And then, of course, there is also very discussion. It's not about us, it's about AI, it's about cloud, it's about chips manufacturing, but here and there, in some cases, very rare cases, we see the acronym DNS being brought in.

So, as it regards the European discussion, because it's a discussion now, it's not a definitive or anything of the like, we did so the Euro stack report among others referring to the DNS, but it was just a reference. Stemming out of digital, we have a lot of supply chain security measures put forth. And another prevailing thing in the European Union right now is simplification, so not more legislation, but simplify.

I will hand it over to my colleague, Dimitris, who will give you updates for individual initiatives. We are mentioning those initiatives to you because they either do reference, particularly the DNS or they may need to be taken into consideration in relation to ICANN community work, or they might be relevant to the technical underpinnings of the internet. Thank you. Over to Dimitris.

DIMITRIS ZACHARIAS

Thank you, Elena. Hi, everyone. My name is Dimitris, and I will try to keep it slow as well. We start with the first, a regulatory initiative that we have observed that we find relevant to inform you on, and that is called the Digital Omnibus Regulation. It was proposed in

November 25 and includes a set of technical amendments to legislation such as the GDPR, for example, and it's aimed at optimizing the application of the digital rule book in the EU.

The main objectives of the regulatory proposal are to simplify existing rules, and as Elena mentioned, on a wide range of topics from artificial intelligence to cybersecurity and data. And proposes the harmonization of multiple existing digital laws in the name of simplification, and to reduce complexity for entities to comply with those obligations in the European Union.

The digital omnibus proposes clarify definitions of personal data and pseudo anonymized anonymization. I'm sorry, to the interpreters for that, under the GDPR and expanded delegations for special category data. The initiative also establishes a single-entry point at the EU level for incident reporting under different pieces of legislation, whether it pertains to personal data or the privacy and protection framework or cybersecurity in the EU.

On top of the digital omnibus regulation, in January, this January, the European Commission proposed it's a new cybersecurity package, which included two initiatives, both regulatory. The first one is a targeted amendment to the NIS2 directive, a directive on cybersecurity with specific reference to the DNS. And the amendment compliments, the single-entry point, which was set up by the digital omnibus regulation we mentioned before, and it aims to increase legal clarity and facilitate the supervision of cross border entities within the EU.

The amendment extends the general size cap rule that was introduced with the NIS2 directive to DNS service providers. What that means is that with the proposed amendment, which is not finalized, it's the beginning of the legislative process. The directive will not apply to DNS service providers that do not qualify as medium sized enterprises or exceed the ceilings for that classification based on EU secondary law.

The second part of that package is the new Cybersecurity Act which is a regulation and focuses on three main areas, establishing an ICT supply chain security framework, proposing new European Cybersecurity certification framework to simplify and make it faster, and reinforces the agency, which is tasked with cybersecurity in the EU, which is called ENISA. The proposal furthermore recognizes the criticality of the public core of the open internet, its main protocols and infrastructure, and the DNS, which according to that regulation, is considered a core network function of mobile and fixed electronic telecommunications networks.

The call for feedback on all of those three regulatory initiatives is open from the European Commission for interested stakeholders, and all of that information together with the active links will be available on the ICANN webpage very soon. Next slide, please. Thank you. Moving on to the last regulatory initiative we would want to bring to your attention the Digital Networks Act, which is also a regulation.

So, it has a lot of force legally which was also introduced in January by the European Commission. And the aim is to update the current rules on connectivity networks. The DNA proposal, the Digital Networks Act proposal aims to replace the current communications code, which is the governing framework for electronic communications in the EU and address fragmentations in the internal markets.

The proposal maintains the principles of neutrality, and it also includes a mechanism to clarify open internet rules for innovative services. The DNA introduces also a conciliation procedure between entities through a dispute resolution mechanism in the EU level, which will result in a binding decision of the regulator, which revives and reinvigorates the network fees debates that we have seen in Brussels and across the EU.

Moving on to non-regulatory initiatives that we would also like to highlight, we start with the commission's proposed action plan on fighting online fraud which was there was a call for evidence to which ICANN participated by submitting our input. The action plan is intended to support fraud prevention measures, and the plan, as we saw the commission's call would look into abuse of the domain name system among other areas.

And on that, ICANN submission recommended distinguishing between the core enablers of fraud and ancillary technical components that play a more limited role like the DNS. And as regards harm perpetrated through the DNS, ICANN highlighted the

community's work to fortify DNS protocol security and address misuse of the domain names referred to as DNS abuse.

Another non-regulatory initiative is the BEREC, which stands for Body of European Regulators of Electronic Communications which launched the call for input on guidance on 5G Network slicing. ICANN submitted a contribution to BEREC emphasizing how the current model of the internet remains relevant in a 5G world, and the risks of leveraging 5G network slicing on the identifier system.

Three final things before moving on to another region. First, we have the evolving discussions at the EU level with regards to curbing unauthorized retransmission of sports and live events focusing on prompt take downs and the use of dynamic injunctions to blog illegal content. There is a lot of conversations happening at the national level from different member states of the EU, and normally they lead to a lot of the same discussions around DNS blocking and IP filtering.

Furthermore, we wanted to bring to your attention the work that is currently undergoing in the multi-stakeholder forum on internet standards deployment, which was launched by the European Commission in accordance with the NIS2 directive. And it has begun its meetings in its various work streams. We know that several members of the community are active in that forum.

And I will finish off with a research project that the European Commission has taken on with regards to web 4.0 and blockchain based naming services. The work in that study report is currently

undergoing, and it will be focusing on evaluating risk scenarios for the deployment of blockchain based naming services. With that, I hope I made things simple, and looking forward to any questions you may have. And I would pass on the microphone over to Jamie. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thank you. So, just a few updates for the United States. One item that we've reported on before is something called the Cyber Incident Reporting Act passed back in 2022 at a very high level required operators of critical infrastructure to report cyber incidents to department of Homeland Security, CISA, within 72 hours. That legislation was not self-executing. It required DHS, Department of Homeland Security, CISA, to develop a rule which would then become effective.

That rule was supposed to have been published and finalized back in October of last year, but has been delayed at least until May. Before the Department of Homeland Security recently shut down due to budget issues in Washington, they had planned to offer workshops for entities that would be impacted by a final rule. Both the publication of the rule and the workshops themselves may be further delayed.

But as of right now, there is still no final rule. And of course, as we mentioned before, under the proposed rule, ICANN, IANA, RIRs would be exempt from the requirement to report cyber incidents to

the US government. Those entities would, of course, still report on cyber incidents but just not to a single government.

Just another quick thing that might be worth reporting on is NTIA, the Department of Commerce Agency that has been most involved with ICANN over the years and the State Department have continued to show support for ICANN and for the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance during the UN WSIS+20 discussions in New York.

Last December, assistant secretary Ariel Roth from NTIA gave a speech to an ITU partner to connect meeting in which she specifically cited this administration support for the multi-stakeholder model. She and state are also continuing to campaign for the renewal of Doreen Bogdan-Martin for a second term, Secretary General of the ITU. ICANN has collaborated well with ITU and with Secretary General Bogdan-Martin particularly when she was head of the D Sector.

And so, we see these as positive signs of continued US government support for our model of internet governance and for ICANN generally. With that, I turn it over to Elena, who will talk about developments in Canada.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Jamie. And I will be very, very brief. As we mentioned at the beginning, one of the trends worldwide is the so-called digital sovereignty debate. As I said again at the beginning, this is

not really about us, our layer of the internet, if you will, but here and there, there are some mentions of DNS. We put Canada there because we wanted to bring to your attention that some months ago there had been a letter from various stakeholders to the prime minister of the country calling for this sovereignty. And in there, there was a tiny teeny, but there was a tiny teeny, a reference to DNS. Thank you. And now we'll turn it over to my colleague, Alexey.

ALEXEY TREPYKHALIN

Thank you, Elena. And hello everyone. Alexey Trepikhlin for the record. From March first 2026, Roskomnadzor, which is an agency monitoring the internet in Russia, will be responsible for the centralized management of the Russian segment of the internet in case there will be threats to the integration of the Russian segment with the internet located on the territory of one or several foreign jurisdictions, or if there are threats to the Russian segment of the internet functioning in own jurisdiction, or the threats are directed at the integration of the technical networks that have the autonomous system numbers located in the regions of the Russian Federation, causing the failure to connect.

Also, the government recently published draft rules for the Russian ccTLDs on domain name registration. One of the draft provisions still in the public discussion stage concerns coordination centers. Point 35 of these new rules says, in case of threats to the functioning and security of the domain name registry and or .ru, .rf,

and .su DNS top level infrastructure, coordinator has the right to delegate the technical center to suspend the access to the domain name registry, or temporarily limit activity within the domain names indicated. This wording is still a draft, and we're watching the developments closely. Thank you. And I will pass over to Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Alexey. If we can move to the next slide. Thank you. So, GE, Government Engagement, covers a lot of intergovernmental organizations and my colleagues will talk about two of them that we follow very closely in a bit. We follow these organizations closely because they either have discussions that have the potential or just directly touch on ICANN's mission.

These are the United Nations and the International Telecommunications Union, but there are also other organizations, and I listed only one, UNESCO, but we have also the WTO, WIPO, UNDP, UN DESA, [00:31:51 - inaudible], ECOSOC, all that, and now all these variations means something for us and they not necessarily will mean anything for some of the participants in these seminars.

But all of those organizations and many others are engaged in issues that more or less have something to do with ICANN's mission. GE partners with our colleagues at the global stakeholder engagement, the office of the Chief Technical Officer, the COMMS teams and others to make sure that we are covering these in other organizations with adequate resources and provide feedback when

possible, all briefings when needed to the member states which participate in these intergovernmental organizations.

This has proven to be a very successful approach that has resulted in some positive outcome. Jamie mentioned a little while ago the WSIS+20 negotiations which is the outcome of which was the WSIS+20 outcome document, which was very good from ICANN's point of view.

And last but not least, we also are engaged in working with our supporting organizations and advisory committees who are very active during the WSIS+20 process, and who we hope will continue to partner with GE in the years to come. Now back to my colleagues for some more concrete information about the UN and the ITO. Alexey, I think it's your turn.

ALEXEY TREPYKHALIN

Thank you, Veni. We're looking at the permanency of discussions and deliberations at the UN on cyber ICT and digital issues in the first three UN general assembly committees. In the last week of January, we observed the work of the first session of the conference of the state parties of the Global Cyber Crime Convention that did not reach consensus to develop the rules of the conference.

The discussion on this may continue this or next year to adopt these rules. There is also a new global mechanism on developments in the field of ICT in the context of international

security and advancing responsible state behavior in the use of ICTs. It'll have its organizational session at the end of March, and it'll also adopt a decision exactly when the first substantive session will take place.

We hear that it will be held in the summer of 2026. The discussions in the second committee with the ECOSOC mandate are always a priority to ICANN because we're a member of ECOSOC and we will continue following them, especially those concentrated within the CSTD mandate.

And last, but not the least, is the new permanency of the IGF. And with it comes the issue of its funded. That is why we would also be interested to see how the discussions on these will pan out in the UN General Assembly fifth committee, which discusses the issues of the UN budget. Let me stop here and turn over the floor to Elizabeth.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thanks so much, Alexey. Hello, everyone. And next slide, please. Before I touch on some of the key engagements at the ITU this year, I want to reflect on the World Telecommunication Development Conference 2025 in Baku, Azerbaijan. ICANN had a small delegation in Baku that consisted of Janis, Angela, and myself.

Our goals were clear, promote the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, advance digital inclusion, and strengthen our partnerships with the ITU and ITU member states and sector

members. I'm pleased to report that the conference concluded with positive results for ICANN and the global interoperable internet. I just want to highlight a couple of key outcomes.

First, the Baku declaration, which is a non-binding political commitment, reinforced the multi-stakeholder collaboration as an essential driver for meaningful connectivity and referenced multilingualism as a factor amongst others to address the internet usage gap. Second, the WTDC resolution dealing with multilingualism and IDMs was revised to emphasize universal acceptance and email address internationalization, or EAI.

It also referenced ICANN's annual UA readiness report. For the first time, we saw a significant shift in government awareness of IDMs and UA. This recognition is a result of various capacity building work done by our GSE and IDN teams, as well as our colleagues engaging in the WTDC regional preparatory meetings. On the ground in Baku on digital inclusion, the Internet society and ICANN jointly co-hosted a coffee social reception on the Coalition for Digital Africa.

This was well attended, including by ITU Leadership and Coalition Partners. The BDT Director, Dr. Cosmas Zavazava, and Secretary General of the Africa Telecommunication Union delivered keynote remarks emphasizing the importance of partnerships in achieving meaningful connectivity in Africa.

Now, turning to the year ahead, the slide reflects a roadmap of our ITU engagements in 2026. I won't go through them. A key

takeaway is that ICANN has a good collaborative relationship with the ITU. Now, you may recall we partnered with the ITU to co-host briefings for diplomats in New York and Geneva as part of the ITU demystifying digital series last year.

We hope to do the same this year as well. We are collaborating with the IT regional office for Africa and the Africa Telecommunication Union this week on a joint webinar for African governments and stakeholders this week. And on March 24th, we'll be participating at the European ITU Regional Development Forum in Prague, Czech Republic. Next slide, please.

Now, one of the most significant dates on our 2026 calendar is the ITU Planning Potentially Conference, OPP26. To understand why this matters, we have to look back at last year. Following the UN General Assemblies WSIS+20 review, we saw positive outcomes for ICANN and the ICANN community. The multi-stakeholder model was reaffirmed and the internet governance form was given a permanent mandate.

Now, PP26 will be a test case. It's the first major intergovernmental meeting in the ITU since the WSIS+20 review at the UN General Assembly. And it's where governments will start to integrate some of those global commitments into policies or actions. For those less familiar with the structure of the less familiar with the planning potentially, it is the supreme decision-making body of the ITU.

It only happens once every four years, and it is a treaty conference. It will take place from the ninth through the 27th in Doha, Qatar.

This meeting sets the ITU strategic and financial direction for the next four years, so, 2027 to 2030. They will elect new leadership and adopt resolutions that determine the future of global ICT policy.

ICANN's objectives, well, this is a meeting amongst governments only. As a sector member, ICANN will attend as an observer. Given our mission at our PP26 engagement seeks outcomes that support the multi-stakeholder model and maintaining a globally interoperable Internet. We are watching a few key areas very closely. Specifically plenty, potentially resolutions dealing with internet governance, internet resources, including domain names and IDNs. Success in Doha doesn't happen in November. It really begins well in advance.

A significant amount of work is done at the regional telecommunication organization's preparatory meetings. ICANN is participating in some of these regional meetings. We are active participants in the APT, which is the Asia Pacific Regional Group, CITAL, which is the Americas Group, and we're attending as observers at the African Telecommunication Union, the African Group, and the European Group, CPT.

Our goal here is really to lend our expertise and inform the technical and policy related aspects of the DNS and the internet. So that concludes my update, and I'll hand it over to Becky for questions.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thank you, everyone, for such a great presentation. So, we'll be answering questions now from the Q&A pod. Right now, we have two questions. The first question is from Joanna Kulesza from ALAC. "Is ICANN engaging with the new UN permanent mechanism established following the conclusion of the open-ended working group on the security of and in the use of information and communications technologies in July, 2025? If so, what is the current status of preparations for its launch in March and what role will ICANN play?"

ALEXEY TREPYKHALIN

I can take this question. And thank you for asking Joanna. The new global permanent mechanism has not started its work yet, so all the parameters are still not established, and we do plan to participate in the organizational session where all these parameters and the future framework will be discussed. So, our plan is to participate and observe as stakeholders from the technical community. Thank you.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thanks, Alexey. Our next question is from Anne Aikman-Scalese. "Are there GAC members who are supporting the multi-stakeholder model and ICANN in the ITU meeting in Doha in November?"

JANIS KARKLINS

Maybe I can take this one. So, Anne, thank you very much for question. Indeed, there are a number of GAC members who are participating actively in different international gatherings. Some of them will be participating in our geopolitical panel in Mumbai talking about WSIS+20 review process lessons.

So, certainly, we are in close contact during the meetings with those GAC members because not necessarily our representatives can access the meeting rooms where negotiations are taking place. So, therefore, these are our liaisons and we get information through them what is happening during the negotiations. That concludes the answer, Becky.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thank you, Janis. And thank you for your questions. So, it looks like we do have some time to answer some live questions. Michael, we will let you unmute and ask your question.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Sure. Thank you. Michael Palage for the record. Jamie, this question is to you. In connection when ICANN submits public comments whether with the most recent commission comment on fraud or the notice of proposed rulemaking in the US, those comments are basically submitted on behalf of ICANN, but currently they appear to only be drafted by ICANN Org or Staff. Do you think it is possible consistent with article three, that those comments might be able to be shared with the ICANN community

to get feedback before they are submitted? So, that's the first part of my question.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thanks, Michael, for the question. We're always looking for more opportunities to engage with the community. Lots of times when we participate in proceedings, we believe that the comments that we're going to submit are fully consistent with the bylaws and ethos of ICANN. And so, we go ahead and submit them and share them with the community.

Obviously, those proceedings are typically open to the entire world and would welcome others from the community also submitting responses. I know from my own experience in government engagement that when ICANN goes and participates in a rulemaking proceeding or talks to policy makers, that we are always stronger when other members of the community also participate.

If there is anything in this most recent submission or any submission that we make that you object to or you think that there should have been greater reflection and input sought from the community, I hope you will, and I know you will, will raise that, and we will look for opportunities to do that. But our motivation is to participate constructively in these proceedings, represent what ICANN's views are and to support the community and to be transparent about that.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thanks, Jamie. And that actually dovetails in nicely with the second follow-up question. So, with regard to the commission's comment on fraud, I believe there were ICANN, registries, registrars, and then I believe the business constituency all submitted. And I did note a bit of a divergence or non-alignment in sort of the business and what the contracting party submitted.

And this actually leads to the second question. I noticed that I believe your staff reached out to some members of the community. I saw that at least in the contracting party. Does ICANN uniformly contact all stakeholder groups or only select stakeholder groups in regard to these comment periods?

JAMIE HEDLUND

So, I guess it would depend on the comment period. There certainly is no interest in leaving anyone out, and that is why we are always very transparent about our comment submissions. And in fact, I believe with this one and with comment submissions, generally we preview for the community that there is something that's open and we provide the deadline. And if we fail to reach out to particular members of the community that may have an interest, we hope that they will reach out to us having learned about this proceeding or open comment period and provide input.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thanks, Michael.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thank you. Okay, we do have another hand raised. Robert, if you'd like to ask your question.

ROBERT GUERRA

Sure. I posted my question in the chat. It's Robert Guerra, speaking of my own personal capacity, though, I'm a member of the SSAC as well. Something that hasn't been covered, and I'd just like, as much as people could answer the question is, the US government has changed its foreign policy and changed its funding policy greatly over the last year.

They were a big supporter of a lot of different fora and supported a lot of engagement in internet governance. And so with that funding gone, I'm just curious what ICANN and the panelists on this call think how that might impact things and is there a role for ICANN to possibly fill the gap that now exists in regards to the US government role in supporting and protecting the multi-stakeholder model that we have at the moment? Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thanks, Robert. Thanks for the question. Indeed, there is a lot of concern about changing government priorities on funding. As I'm sure you know ICANN participates in government discussions and

issues based on what's within our bylaws and remit. We would not normally weigh in on government funding decisions that don't have any direct impact on ICANN.

We accept no funding from governments, and so we don't get into those sort of financial budgetary appropriations type discussions. Whether ICANN could or should take up or try to fill any gaps as a result of cuts to government fundings of programs and organizations, that really is a question for the community.

There is the grant program, it's possible some requests could fit within that. But otherwise, I would think, look, for the community to direct us on using ICANN fund to make up for any of those gaps.

ROBERT GUERRA

If it's possible, just a quick follow up on that.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Sure.

ROBERT GUERRA

So, great. Thank you for that. I think the other aspect was more how does you and others believe how that change or that gap, how will that impact perhaps over the next year going forward in terms of their role being changed, ways that ICANN and others in the community need to try to perhaps advocate more strongly at fora with the champion kind of missing in the room?

JAMIE HEDLUND

I guess I'm having trouble understanding the question. If the question is does ICANN analyze individual government spending decision --

ROBERT GUERRA

No. Sorry, let me just try to rephrase the question and I don't want to belabor the point is that big supporter of the model can change its role, it's a bit more absent, and so that changes how things need to be done. So, I'm just curious if there's anything that can be shared in regards to how ICANN needs to engage with other stakeholders in a more robust fashion, given that one of the actors' roles changed.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Sorry, which actor are you referring to, if you can?

ROBERT GUERRA

The actor being the US government.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Okay. So, stakeholders change their level of engagement with ICANN constantly. And so, where we identify a gap, we try to figure out how to fill it in. We're always looking for more engagement rather than less engagement. And the retreat of one actor can also

have the effective leaving space for others to become more active and hopefully in a constructive and supportive way.

If particularly a government stakeholder for whatever reason reduces its participation, we'll try to understand it, but we're unlikely to launch a campaign to get it more engaged. The model welcomes everyone to participate and it particularly allows those with the greatest interest to participate at the highest level or highest capacity, and we'll always encourage that. I don't really have more to say on that, but if you do have ideas or concerns, please do share them with us and we'll look at them.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thanks, Jamie. Thanks, Robert, for the questions. We have one hand raised. [00:54:34 - inaudible], go ahead, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

[00:54:40 - inaudible].

BECKY MCGILLEY

Sorry, [00:54:51 - inaudible]. It's coming in a little choppy. Would you be able to speak maybe a little louder if you can?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Good evening, ma'am. My name is [00:55:01 - inaudible]. I am working as an internet governance intern. Is it audible now? Hello?

BECKY MCGILLEY

Yes, it's a little bit more clear now. Yes, just please a little slowly and we can hear you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Yes, ma'am. Ma'am, I just wanted ask, I'm currently researching the DNS abuse section, and I have found two terms which are not currently under the ICANN umbrella of DNS abuse, are DNS tunneling and amplification attacks. So, could you please guide me if this question is relevant or if these topics like DNS tunneling and amplification attacks can be raised or talked about to someone in ICANN.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Hi, this is Jamie Hedlund again. I apologize, it was really hard for me to understand a lot of what your question is. I gather it's about DNS abuse and possibly expanding the definition to include other types of abuse. Is that correct?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Yes, sir, it's pretty correct. Actually, are DNS tunneling is an attack in which [CROSSTALK].

JAMIE HEDLUND

DNS tunneling. Right, yeah, okay. So, DNS tunneling is not included in the current versions of the agreements we have with registry operators and accredited registrars. There is a policy development process ongoing looking at, I believe, two additional

potential requirements for registries and registrars in stopping and mitigating DNS abuse.

DNS tunneling is not included in that, but I would encourage you to participate at ICANN particularly in the GNSO discussions and to articulate your concern with DNS tunneling and make your argument for why that should be included as part of the obligations to stop and mitigate DNS abuse.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Thank you so much, sir. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thank you.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Thanks, everyone. It looks like we have no more questions in the queue and no more hand raised. Janis, I'd like to turn it over to you for some final remarks.

JANIS KARKLINS

Yeah, thank you very much, Becky. I think that what would be my task now is first and foremost to thank my colleagues for their presentation and all participants. And we counted there were more than 140 participants following this session for their interest in the topic.

We will continue geopolitical engagement sessions also at ICANN85 meeting in Mumbai as Jamie already said at the opening. Please join us on Monday 9th March at 1:15 pm local time in the plenary hall for the conversation about the lessons we have learned from the WSIS+20 process, and how these lessons could be used going forward. Unlike this webinar that was intended to provide updates to the community, the session in Mumbai will be more of a dialogue with community.

So, you heard we have a lineup of distinguished panelists. Please join us at the session. But in the meantime, thank you for your interest and I wish you a very good rest of your day. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

I look forward to seeing everyone in Mumbai.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]