



Paris, 26 June 2008  
**GAC Communiqué – Paris**

**June 2008**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Paris, during June 22-25, 2008.

52 members, 7 observers and one invited country, Russia, participated in the meeting.

The Governmental Advisory Committee expressed warm thanks to the AGIFEM Committee and the French Government for hosting the meeting in Paris and ICANN for supporting the GAC meeting.

## **II. IDN ccTLDs**

The GAC welcomes the results of the IDNC Working Group towards the development of the “fast track” methodology to allow on an exceptional basis the introduction of a limited number of country code IDN top level domains. The GAC believes the IDNC WG report and the recommendations contained therein provide the basis for the development of an implementation plan, and encourages the Board to initiate that process. The GAC looks forward to contributing to these implementation proposals.

The GAC would like to stress its support for a continuation of the multi-stakeholder approach for the consideration of these matters to date, which has been useful in identifying many of the key issues in the IDNC Working Group report, issues which now need to be addressed in order to achieve the early implementation of IDN ccTLDs.

The GAC also recalls its agreement in New Delhi that the substantive public policy provisions set out by the GAC in the *"Principles and Guidelines for the delegation and administration of country-code Top Level Domains"* (adopted by the GAC in 2005) are equally relevant to the introduction of IDN ccTLDs, in particular the principle of delegation and re-delegation. In this respect, the GAC emphasised that it is primarily for the local Internet community, including the relevant government or public authority, to determine the manner in which a string should be selected, the manner in which a registry operator should be selected and the registry policy that should apply for the selected IDN ccTLD.

The GAC also feels that it would be inappropriate for new IDN ccTLDs to be obliged to enter into contractual agreements with ICANN, not least because this could introduce further significant delay to the implementation process.

The GAC believes that, where it is appropriate for an applicant to provide authentication of the meaning of the selected string from an internationally recognised organisation, UNESCO could be one such organisation.

The GAC is willing to contribute further to the process of developing the IDN ccTLD general policy, which will replace the fast track in due course.

The GAC welcomed presentations by UNESCO and ITU representatives regarding proposed collaboration between their organizations and ICANN to advance multilingualism and its contribution to promoting inclusion, the development of local content and increased global access to the Internet. The GAC also notes the value of such cooperation among all relevant entities toward this goal (eg. ICANN, ISO, national and regional linguistic bodies).

### III. New gTLDs

The GAC discussed the recommendations of the GNSO for the introduction of new gTLDs. The GAC welcomed in particular the extensive efforts by the GNSO to respect and incorporate the provisions of the "GAC Principles regarding new gTLDs" in their approach.

During its discussions in Paris however, the GAC expressed concern to the GNSO and to the ICANN Board that the GNSO proposals do not include provisions reflecting important elements of the GAC principles, in particular sections 2.2<sup>1</sup>, 2.6<sup>2</sup> and 2.7<sup>3</sup>. The GAC feels that these are particularly important provisions that need to be incorporated into any ICANN policy for introducing new gTLDs.

In particular, given the existing levels of concentration in the gTLD market, the GAC reiterates that ICANN needs to adopt an implementation procedure that further facilitates new entrants to the registry, registry-services and registrar markets and avoids unduly favouring those existing registries and registrars involved directly in the Policy Development Process.

---

<sup>1</sup> ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names, and country, territory or regional language or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant governments or public authorities.

<sup>2</sup> It is important that the selection process for new gTLDs ensures the security, reliability, global interoperability and stability of the Domain Name System (DNS) and promotes competition, consumer choice, geographical and service-provider diversity.

<sup>3</sup> Applicant registries for new gTLDs should pledge to: a) adopt, before the new gTLD is introduced, appropriate procedures for blocking, at no cost and upon demand of governments, public authorities or IGOs, names with national or geographic significance at the second level of any new gTLD; b) ensure procedures to allow governments, public authorities or IGOs to challenge abuses of names with national or geographic significance at the second level of any new gTLD.

#### **IV. JPA mid-term review assessment and post JPA arrangement**

The GAC appreciates the efforts of the President’s Strategy Committee in preparing the recently published reports “Transition Action Plan” and “Improving Institutional Confidence in ICANN” as well as “Frequently asked Questions” outlining key areas that need to be developed in order to complete ICANN’s transition process. The GAC notes that the report covers a wide-range of issues and constitutes a useful basis for discussion at this time. While it is open to individual governments to provide comments, the GAC will aim to formulate a contribution, including on the role of the GAC, in the context of the reports by the Cairo meeting.

#### **V. WHOIS**

The GAC reiterates its strong support to the ICANN Board for the initiation of studies of WHOIS gTLD data to create a factual record that documents the uses and abuses of WHOIS data recognized by the GAC WHOIS Principles. The GAC also conveyed its position to the GNSO Council, which is considering whether studies should be undertaken and, if so, what aspects of WHOIS data should be studied. The GAC requested clarification from the Board whether its request for studies would be contingent on the outcome of the GNSO Council decision, and will continue to advocate studies of WHOIS data.

#### **VI. IPv6 deployment and IPv4 depletion**

The GAC is thankful to representatives of Australia and Japan for sharing their national experiences on transitioning to IPv6. The GAC also appreciates the presentation from the OECD on the current trends and challenges IPv6 deployment faces worldwide. The GAC also thanks the NRO for their considered response to questions raised by the GAC on IPv4 depletion and IPv6 adoption and appreciates their ongoing work in raising awareness of necessity of

the transition to IPv6. The GAC will continue to monitor developments in this regard, as well as on the allocation and management of the remaining IPv4 addresses in light of public interest.

## **VII. ICANN meeting reform proposal**

The GAC considers that the ICANN meeting reform discussion should be linked to the fundamental issue of the form and method of interaction between and among different constituencies within ICANN. The GAC supports more frequent and effective interaction among stakeholders and will work to submit proposals to achieve that goal.

\* \* \* \*

The GAC listened with interest to a presentation from the representative of the Netherlands on safeguarding the .NL domain.

The GAC warmly thanks all those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with GAC in Paris.

The next GAC meeting will be during the period of the ICANN meeting in Cairo, Egypt.

---

Paris, 26 June 2008