ICANN80 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 5)
Thursday, June 13, 2024 – 13:45 to 15:00 KGL


DANIEL GLUCK:           Hello and welcome to the ICANN80 GAC Communique Drafting session on Thursday, the 13th of June at 11:45 UTC.  Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.  During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. Remember to state your name and language you'll speak in case you'll be speaking a language other than English.  Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking.  You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.  With that, I will leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nico Caballero.


NICOLAS CABALLERO:      Thank you very much, Daniel.  Welcome back everyone.  I hope you enjoyed your lunch and the excellent Rwandan coffee.  I am enjoying some excellent Rwandan tea myself.  So here we go.  Fabien, would you please walk us through the next steps?


FABIEN BETREMIEUX:      Thank you, Nico.  So we ended the previous session with ongoing discussion on the capacity development subsection under internal matters.  I understand that various parties gave some thought to it and my understanding is from the Underserved Regions Working Group co-

chairs is that the text be kept as it is proposed by Lebanon.  And so hopefully, that's a path that is agreeable to all the involved parties.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:    Thank you so much for that Fabien.  Thanks to Lebanon and to the Underserved Regions Working Group chair and vice chairs, sorry co-chairs, co-chairs, that's the word.  So I'll give it a read in order to see if we're all on the same page.

So the capacity development section would read, the ICANN80 GAC capacity development session provided ample information about what are ccTLDs, how they are managed, the role of the managers within their community and relation with ICANN Org and IANA/PTI, as well as on the evaluation criteria for ccTLD managers, string eligibility, incumbent consent, public interest, local presence, stability, operational competency, the different forms of assessment for delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement and evaluation and transfer processes.  The GAC would like to thank ICANN Org and IANA/PTI for their contribution and efforts for the success of this informative session.

So there it is.  This is a consensus text we have so far.  I'll pause here in order to see if we have any reactions from the floor.  And we seem to have agreement on this, which is really positive.  Once again, anybody against? Any strong feelings? I don't see any hand up.  I don't see any hand in the chat room, which means that we're okay with it.  Perfect. Thank you so much. Adopted.  Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:      Thank you, Nico.  Next is a question we have for the committee on issues of importance under auctions, mechanisms of the last resort, private resolution of contention sets in new gTLDs.  We wonder if this text is now duplicative given the advice that was proposed.  So we'd like clarity on what to do with this part of the text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:      Thank you for that, Fabien.  And I have the UK.

NIGEL HICKSON:      Yes.  Thank you, Chairman.  And my fault entirely for not addressing this earlier.  I think we've covered these aspects in the advice, so I think it will be duplicative.  Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:      Thank you, UK.  I agree with you, but let's see if we have different opinions from the floor or online.  Does anybody disagree with the UK and with me, by the way, because -- erase this.  Because given the fact that is obviously duplicative.  Any opposition?  Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:      And Nico, in the context, I think the text was initially proposed as issues of importance, then it was advice suggested reusing most of these texts, so it's a timing consideration.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:    But again, the floor is open.  I don't see any hand in the chat room. Any strong feelings in the room?  Any opposition?  Any better idea? Otherwise, we can go ahead with the UK's proposal.  And I see support for the UK's proposal.  So done.  Thank you so much again.  Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:    I'm scanning through documents to verify, but I believe we have now read and agreed and we have read and received agreement on the entirety of the text.  There is one edit that was suggested in the introduction as it relates to the HLGM.  So that's one edit and we have provided in a few areas some edits ourselves or questions for clarity in the interest of ensuring that the text is clear.  So I don't know if you want to look at those specifically or if you'd rather go through review, the final review of the text and address those at that time.  So it's really how you prefer.  So then let's go to the first suggestion from Rhonda in the HLGM text, which I think we have on the screen now.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:    Perfect.  Thank you, Fabien.  So I'll read the whole paragraph for the sake of clarity so that we're all on the same page and the text would read, high level government meeting.  The GAC expressed its sincere appreciation to the government of Rwanda for hosting the fifth high level government meeting on 9 June 2024.  The meeting was attended by 81 delegations, including 12 intergovernmental organizations, and

provided a valuable forum for ministers, vice ministers and senior officials to address a range of issues, including the importance of multistakeholder model of governance of the Internet, the necessary cooperation between policymakers and the technical community for effective governance of new technology.

Challenges and initiatives to ensure digital inclusion and meaningful connectivity to the Internet. Furthermore, the GAC expressed its sincere appreciation to ministers, vice ministers and senior officials who attended different sessions during the ICANN80 policy forum. And I'll stop here in order to see if there are any comments or edits at this point. Seeing none -- sorry, CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you very much, Chair. Nigel Cassimire. The importance of multistakeholder model.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: A good point, good catch, CTU. Well noted. Thank you. The importance of the multistakeholder model. UK.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, sorry. We normally talk about multistakeholder models. I'm not suggesting it's so we talk about multistakeholder processes or multistakeholder models because there are different models. But obviously it's up to others to thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     I don't have any kind of strong feelings in this regard in adding the or not adding the.  But I'll leave it to you.  Seeing none -- sorry, US, go ahead please.


SUSAN CHALMERS:     Thank you, Chair.  We would be supportive of the existing text.  But there was discussion during the HLGM about the system of internet governance.   So one option for consideration would be the multistakeholder system of internet governance.  However, we would be very happy with remaining with the text as drafted.


NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, USA.  As a matter of fact, I totally agree with the fact that the multistakeholder model at this point is actually a system.  Any strong feelings?  And I see Egypt online.  Go ahead, please.  Egypt.


CHRISTINE ARIDA:     Thank you, Chair.  Actually, I think models is I'm sorry to disagree, but I think models is closer to the terminology that is being used.  And I was going actually to suggest for internet governance as well.  I think it doesn't read that well of governance of the internet.  I don't know.  So I was suggesting it be the importance of the multistakeholder or without the if you're going to put the S of multistakeholder models for internet governance, because I think this is one of the messages that were mentioned actually by many of the participants of the HLGM. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, Egypt.  I'm okay with that.  But again, it's up to you.  Any other comment?  Are we with the way it is?  So let me read that part of the.  I have.  Mauritania.  Please go ahead.


MOHAMED MOHAMEDINE:     Thank you, Chairman.  I do concur with the view of Egypt that we are still at the model level, even though the idea that we are transitioning to a multi-stakeholder system is probably taking place.  But I think it would be very early to embrace this transition right now.  Thank you.


NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, Mauritania.  So seeing no other hand at this point, let me read that part of the paragraph.  I'm not going to read the whole thing for the sake of time.  So it would read and I'm going straight to the second part of the paragraph.  Right after the semicolon.  So and senior official.  So the importance of multi-stakeholder models for governance of the internet.  The necessary cooperation between policymakers and the technical community, et cetera, et cetera.  Are we with the wording?  Anybody against?  Sorry.  US?


SUSAN CHALMERS:     I think if we'd like to be traditional and we've always just referred to the importance of the multi-stakeholder model.  I've never seen it pluralized.  So I think just it could be useful to just retain the original

text, but add the word the as suggested by our colleague from the CTU.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, US. So I'll read that part specifically again. So the importance of the multi-stakeholder model of governance of the internet, the necessary cooperation between policymakers, et cetera, et cetera. Are we okay? Can I see noting in the room? Anybody against? I don't see any hand in the chat room. No strong feelings. Egypt?

CHRISTINE ARIDA: I thought we were reverting back to the model and keeping the for or we're also reverting back from for and keeping off. I'm just seeking clarification. This is what our colleague from the US suggested.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So it would read, according to your suggestion, Egypt, it would read the importance of the multi-stakeholder model for governance of the internet. Is that correct? Is everybody with that? USA, any strong feelings? No problems. Then adopted. Thank you so much. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So next, we are going to internal matters, GAC Underserved Regions Working Group. And this is a remark from the GAC support team as it relates to the first sentence under the direction of the GAC

Underserved Regions Working Group, the capacity development and African engagement sessions were held. We have usually, we've looked at the precedent and the formulation is usually shorter. It's the Underserved Regions Working Group held a capacity development session. We were just wondering, and also because the notion of under the direction is unusual for the communiqué. So we just wanted to flag this and consider maybe under the initiative or revert to the simpler formulation of the Underserved Regions Working Group held a capacity development and engagement session. So just for consideration.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     I will go with the latter. But again, that's just my opinion because it was obviously an initiative of the full GAC and the Underserved Regions Working Group that that's for granted. So let's keep the traditional wording, Fabien.

KAREL DOUGLAS:     Sorry, Nico, Karel Douglas for the record. Turn it out on to be good front row. Just to say, yes, I agree. Over here, Nico. Just to agree with the modification of the text to save the underserved without the direction or directive or anything further. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you so much for that, Trinidad and Tobago. So the idea is to maintain consistency according to the precedence we have. So thank you for that flexibility, Trinidad and Tobago. Any other comment in

this regard?  So let me read at least the first paragraph.  The first paragraph, as a matter of fact.  So it would read the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group USRWG held capacity development and African engagement sessions on 11 June 2024.  But it's kind of weird.  We need to work it out a little bit.  So let's read it as it is again.  The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group, USRWG, held capacity development and African engagement sessions on 11 June 2024, being the first ICANN, et cetera, et cetera.

Is that better?  Is that okay with everyone?  Any strong feelings at this point, or we can move on?  So we're good.  We're good.  I don't see any hand in the chat room.  I don't see any hand in the room.  We're okay to move on.  Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     Thank you.  We are going down to.  I believe, GAC consensus advice to the ICANN board, auctions, mechanisms of last resort, private resolution of contention sets in New gTLDs.  So here in the second part of second Roman numeral, we reread the sentence and including finding alternatives didn't refer what -- it wasn't very clear.  So because we're talking about urgently initiating a focus community wide discussion on the resolution of contention sets.  And so we thought that it may be useful to talk about finding alternatives.  As the objective, using the word including didn't seem most appropriate there.  So this is one suggestion.

And then as far as ICANN auctions of last resort, since this is the previous GAC advice related to the use of ICANN auctions of last resort

for commercial and noncommercial applications, when commercial and noncommercial applications are in a contention sets. So ICANN auctions of last resort are broader scope than the scope of the GAC advice. And so we were wondering if it should be clarified here. Finding alternatives to private auctions and ICANN auctions of last resort for contention between commercial and noncommercial applications.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. You always are good at pointing out these things. But in this context, I think perhaps we should be broader because we don't exactly know the objectives of how a cross-community group might be. And it might look at a whole range of things. I think we should keep it broad in this sense, if you don't mind.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So I'm going to read the -- So thank you for that, UK. Thank you, Fabien. So I'll go back then to auctions mechanisms of last resort/private resolution of contention sets in new gTLDs. And I'll go directly to Roman numeral two. To urgently initiate a focused community-wide discussion, including with the GAC and ALAC, on the resolution of contention sets with a view to finding alternatives to private auctions and ICANN auctions of last resort before the ICANN board takes any action in a manner that may be inconsistent with the ICANN77 Washington, D.C. communicate GAC consensus advice. And I'll pause there in order to see if we have any immediate reactions. And I see Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO:    Thank you.  Thank you, Nico.  Thank you, Fabien.  This was following up on Nigel's intervention.  I agree that as we have seen, the board has a problem with this distinction between commercial and noncommercial.  That's why I think it makes sense to broaden the scope a little bit and put all the options on the table.  Yes, I think that's the idea.  And I hope that the wording covers, for instance, alternative auction models as the ones proposed by ALAC so that they could be part of this dialogue.  But I stand to be corrected if that's the case.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:    Thank you, Switzerland.  Would you like to answer to that, UK?  You're fine.  Thank you, Switzerland.  Thank you, UK.  Any other comment or question?  Any reactions online or in the room?  Seeing none, then it is adopted.  I don't need to read the whole thing again.  Correct?  Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:    One last suggestion here in the rationale.  Because the rationale now quotes the entirety of the text of the previous advice, it seemed redundant to refer on the matter.  So that's just a very slight clerical suggestion.  And then we were wondering if the second sentence of the first part of the advice could be excluded from the quote just for clarity.  While this is obviously part of the advice, this is not something that is discussed specifically.  So it just makes it a little heavier to read.  And so if that part of the quote is not necessary, it could be…

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. So it would read in the rationale, it will be shorter and would read only to take steps to avoid the use of auctions of last resort in contentions between commercial and non-commercial applications. Is that for everyone? Any opposition? Any strong feelings? Any edits? I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see any hand in the chat room. That means that we're okay to move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Nico. And this is it as far as we're concerned in terms of our review of the entirety of the text. So I believe unless there are any other comments or questions, we have a text that's ready for final review.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Yes, before we do that, I have Egypt. Go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Chair. I'm just referring to my comment of yesterday on follow-up on previous GAC advice. And I think it was regarding applicant support. I'm sorry I didn't have the chance to discuss thoroughly with the UK in advance, but I'm just wondering whether the three requests in the three paragraphs, are they new requests or reiteration of previous GAC advice? And I stand to be corrected. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, Egypt.  And I would defer that to the UK.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH:     Thank you, Chair.  Is topic lead for the applicant support section and having consulted with GAC staff before we proposed text and with the wider small team.  I do believe it's quite a late stage in the negotiation to suggest moving around advice.  I believe the advice we'd gotten from GAC staff was to include this part here.  Because actually in earlier discussions, we had moved up one piece to new advice.  So we'd already concluded those discussions.  The purpose of the text here is referred to things that were asked for.  And just to explain that a discussion should take place around this.  This is all in regards to topics that were previously asked for.  So I'd conclude my comments there.  But thank you for the question.  And I do apologize.  I don't think I heard it in the room yesterday.  Otherwise, I would have followed up.  But I do think at this late stage, it would be a lot to change around wording and move to an entirely new section.  Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, UK.  Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL:     Thank you, Chair.  And actually, it's my fault.  I told the GAC Chair that I will approach you and I didn't have the chance to.  So apologies for that.  I'm speaking in favor of what's already written.  If it is a new GAC advice, it might be missed in the section of follow up on previous GAC

advice. But if colleagues are okay and our topic lead is okay, I'm flexible. I was just advising in favor of what's been requested. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Thank you, Nico. And as GAC support staff, we would like to thank the UK and the topic leads on this matter to reach out to us. We were in fact challenged to advise what should go in follow up and what shouldn't. So in this case, I think we're reaching a result where the first two paragraphs specifically refer to previous advice and sort of put emphasis on parts of that advice. So it felt quite tightly connected with previous advice.

The third paragraph was a little bit challenging because there's an element of novelty, which is requesting for engagement between ICANN Org and the GAC. But at the same time, it is quite connected with those two issues and sort of it could be more confusing to have it somewhere else. So we're hoping that this reaches a fairly good balance that is clear enough for the ICANN board to process in a way that the GAC would like to see this process. So I suppose we'll learn from this experience and continue to sort of create the precedence of how the communication structure is used for the needs of the GAC.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Fabien. I have the UK and then the CTU.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thank you to GAC support staff. I think it is a useful conversation to know when things are referring to matters of advice that have been discussed. But maybe there's a discussion around that because there are blurred lines here and appreciate in that. I do think in this instance, because the discussion we're having about the follow up advice is about advice that was already issued. It does make more sense to include it in the section in this case, but appreciate that in other circumstances. It's worth having a discussion perhaps at the next meeting about how we review scenarios like this, but on balance because the meeting would be specifically pertaining to items asked for. It would be most appropriate here. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much UK. I have the CTU next.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Thank you Chair, Cassimire speaking. We didn't get the chance to look at this section at all today and if something occurred to me that I thought maybe we could consider. This is a section on strategic plan.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Excuse me?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: The GAC strategic plan. So strategic planning I think is what the section was called.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     Internal matters, we're going there.  Internal matters.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:     GAC strategic planning.  Let me see where it is now.  One second.  Yes, the second paragraph where it says GAC expects these plans will serve to bolster and so on, and also increase community readiness for very timely and effective advice and policy input.  This last part, and to assist in communicating the GAC's priorities with higher levels of governments and ICANN stakeholders.  It occurred to me that but this would also be very useful to new GAC members.  So I was thinking, would we consider putting in after governments, higher levels of governments, new GAC members, and ICANN stakeholders.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you very much for that, CTU.  Very useful indeed, I would say.  Any opposition?  Any objection at this point?  I don't see any.  So adopted.  Thank you so much, CTU.  So let's go back, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     Maybe while we were on the GAC strategic planning, I just want to mention in the footnote here, our plan is to annex to the communiqué the strategic plan, which is a two-pages document, and to refer to a resource on the GAC website, as I had mentioned, where both documents will be posted.  It sounds like it seems to us that the strategic plan is of sufficient importance and sufficiently concise to be

annexed to the communiqué.  So that's going to be our plan when it comes to publication in the coming days.  And other than that, Nico, I think we're ready for review.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Just one second.   Unless any distinguished GAC colleague tells us otherwise.  Is there any problem about including the strategic plan?  I don't see any opposition.  So back to you, Fabien, sorry.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     I believe we are ready for a final review.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Perfect.  So let's do just that.  And we're going to do it the way we did it the last two, correct me if I'm wrong, the last two times.  It was Hamburg and San Juan.  Washington?  No, no, I think in Washington I read the whole thing.  No, we started in Hamburg.  Hamburg and San Juan.  So for the sake of time, we're not going to be reading every single word in the communiqué.  So we're going to do it Nigel Hickson style, so to say.  Over to you, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Yes, thank you very much.  And just to explain.  What our chair means is that we're not going to go through word by word.  We'll go through paragraph by paragraph.  But please, if something you spot that we haven't got an S for a Z or we haven't got a Z for an S or something like that, please do put your hand up and intervene.  And this really is a

way of allowing you to eat more cake.  Nothing else.  So, without further ado, so here we have the GAC communiqué, Kigali Rwanda, just to check we're in the right place.  Well, we're in the right place.  We've got the right date.  I suppose the date's in yellow in case we didn't finish till tomorrow, is that right?  If you want to go on for another day or something.  That's Monday.  Yes.  Anyway, so the first bit is in italics.

And as you will see at the end of this paragraph, we have this clause in highlighted.  No objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication, as Fabien and Rob explained earlier in the week when we started this process.  Of course, there is a process whereby this gets published in draft for final approval or any final objections.  One dot introduction.  This just tells us where we are sort of thing.  This is a meeting of the GAC in hybrid setting.  We will insert the number of GAC members and observers attending the meeting and the GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN policy public forum.  All plenary meetings and working group were conducted as open meetings.  I suppose that's something that comes as obvious now to many of us GAC members but some of us will remember when that wasn't the case.

High level government meeting.  We've just gone over some of this so I think we can go through this reasonably quickly.   This is the appreciation to the government of Rwanda for hosting the fifth.  Yes, the fifth high level government meeting on the 9th of June.  And you can see we describe what it covers as well.  On to the next paragraph, which is about the ICANN CEO.  We discussed this a bit yesterday.

Effectively, we're conveying congratulations to the ICANN CEO. Mr. Kurt Erik, Kurtis. Yes, so I suppose in future we can just call him Kurtis. A bit easier I suppose. And we look forward to engaging with him. Some excellent text there I think suggested by our US colleague.

On to inter constituency activities and community engagement. Again, this this bit is very factual, but it's worth having a look to make sure that we didn't miss anything. Usually, we don't. So the meeting with the ICANN board and then the meeting with our friends at ALAC where we discussed contention sets and the new application support program. Meeting with the GNSO. We could go down a bit. Thank you. Thank you so much. Just recalling what we did there. What issues we touched on there.

Cross community discussions. Just go off a bit. So this so the GAC members participate in relevant cross community sessions scheduled as part of the agenda, of course. This one here navigating the multi-stakeholder approach. So I just wonder, Fabien, whether it's a sort of GAC members participate in relevant cross community sessions. It's in the plural, but I'll leave that to you. It's not a matter of great, great importance. Internal matters.

So this is where we again, this is all factual. It records that Libya was welcomed during the -- or wasn't. Anyway, perhaps we forgot to mention that Libya was mentioned during the Anku meeting and Bolivia during the ICANN77 Washington meeting. And this time around, we mentioned we welcomed the Principality of Liechtenstein. So that's really good news. So 183 GAC member states. So that's the

figure that you need to remember when you're talking and you're talking about the GAC. You have to say 183 and 39. We used to say 38, so it's now 39 observer organizations.

GAC election. This is something that will be touched on, no doubt, perhaps in our plenary session later on. So the election process, the positions of GAC chair and GAC vice chairs will be initiated. Again, that's very factual. The GAC working group. The GAC notes and welcomes the appointments, which we've mentioned before. I think we've been through this very recently. If we can go down a bit. We welcome the appointment of Tracy to the co-chair of the Underserved Regions Working Group. And we express our appreciation to Tepua Hunter. Great. We're on to the PSWG report, which we looked at this morning. So that's colleagues can just look through this, but hopefully all this makes sense. We made a couple of changes to some of this this morning.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:        Story to interrupt you, Nigel. We have Canada.

CANADA:        Thank you, Chair. Just a minor suggestion for clarity purposes in the PSWG session. Perhaps we add the word 'technical' between 'against' and 'abuse' so that would read, 'shared global fight against technical abuse categories such as fishing, botnets, and spam'.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you, Canada, for that.  I have Trinidad and Tobago as well.

KAREL DOUGLAS:     Thank you, Nico.  Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago.  As I have your ear going on Canada in respect to the CEO, there was a part that said that we would like to.  So I think is that we transmit.  And likes to.  So just remove that to say, 'and transmits its felicitations'.  Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you so much for that, Trinidad and Tobago.  So if there are no other observations, I'll get back to Nigel.  Go ahead, please.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Yes, thank you very much, Nico.  Apologies for not seeing the flags earlier and just waffling on.  So we're on that paragraph.  Fabien, you got some changes that we made to this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     Thank you, Nigel.  So on this last paragraph in the PSWG report, we've just received some improvement suggestion from the PSWG co-chairs to align the tone of this section with usual practice.  So using sincere instead of profound and removing the notion of the successor rising to the occasion and also adding an element of precision mentioning that both Cathrin and Janos are from the European Commission.

| NIGEL HICKSON: | Thank you very much for that.  So any comments on that?  On those changes?  Don't see any comments.  Thank you so much Fabien.  So if we can go to the next paragraph.  So this is the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group we had.  Again, we had some discussion on this earlier.  Thanks to colleagues in the room and Zaina remotely.  I don't think there's been any changes since then.  But if we could go right through the text.  It talks about the excellent work that took place here.  The information from Smart Africa and the Coalition for Digital Africa. |
|---|---|
| | Can we go down further?  Is everyone else okay with that?  Yes, I think they are.  So we're on to GAC strategic planning.  I think we touched on this just earlier this afternoon.  And of course, we had a full session on this earlier in the week.  So is that all that okay?  Any problems with that?  Nico hoped he could reopen the strategic plan and have a four-hour discussion now.  But we persuaded him that would be might be – |
| | Anyway, so let's go on to capacity development if we could.  We discussed this earlier as well.  This was an incredibly useful session for those that were able to make it.  All GAC members should know, I'm sure, and observers here that all these sessions are recorded.  So if you did have a swim during one of our sessions, well, you won't get paid so much.  But you can always catch up on the Zoom links. |
| | We now go on to issues of importance to the GAC and the first one with statements of interest and code of ethics.  This, again, we discussed yesterday.  Everyone okay on that?  I don't see any hands in the room.  We the go on to registry voluntary commitments, public interest |

commitments in new gTLDs.  This you remember was information from the board that was new to us all about their board resolution that came out of their discussion on the 8th of June.  This is important work.  This is I think this text reflects some of our discussions on this.  No doubt this might be returned to in due course.  With the first second paragraph.  Anyone with comments at all on this?  Raise your hands.  All good.

Number three, new gTLD subsequent procedures and implementation refuting the IRT.  This refers specifically to registry service provider fees.  Everyone good with this?  On to DNS abuse.  We had a good discussion on this earlier.  Thanks to a number of contributions we had from GAC members.  First paragraph, second paragraph.  We look forward to continuing discussions and I think we have a flag up from our friend Russell.

RUSSELL WORUBA:    Thank you, Chair and Nigel.  I'm just thinking whether the DNS abuse DA should be capital or can be small in the text.  Just a minor one.  Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:    In the context of high game discussion, it is generally capitalized so we'll make sure that we catch the consistency.  Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Is that okay, Russell?  Thank you, Fabien.  Yes, the first paragraph here I think talks about some of the concerns that were raised by the GAC members and that we look forward to the second paragraph, that we look forward to continuing discussions.  So I hope that's clear.  We then have a paragraph on DNSSEC.  If we could just scroll down a bit.  Thank you.  Thanks so much.  Nigel, sorry, I missed your flag.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:     Yes, thank you, Nigel Cassimire from CTU.  Just on that question of, if we slide back up slightly to the number four section, the capitalization in this last paragraph.  And we're talking about ICANN compliance on the implementation of contract amendments.  I don't know if we need to capitalize that.   So from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, that's fine.  On name collisions, I don't know if you need to capitalize name collisions.   As well as advances on DNS abuse mitigation.  I'm not sure about the M in mitigation either.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     On the name collision specifically, we would need to verify and we will verify.   But I believe this is such a specific concept in the ICANN context, I wouldn't be surprised that it's usually capitalized.  We have not capitalized that before, so it would probably be consistent to be lowercase and mitigation as well.  So we'll make sure this is consistent with the usual practice.  Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you so much, Fabien. Thank you, Nigel. We'll look at those. On the contract amendments, of course, these were the specific contract amendments that took place, came into force on April the 4th. But anyway, Fabien will obviously look into that. Can we go on to DNSSEC then? This is the text that we had a good debate on. Any further points on that? Have we got the capitals right? I always have problems with DNSSEC, I think it's got too many S's in it. But I'm sure it hasn't. Thank you very much. Registration Data Request Service, RDRS. This is again a text that we looked at earlier today. So, can we go back down to the text or up to the text?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: We were having an incident with us. It seems the disappearance of advice for some reason, so we're trying to understand what's going on here. And so, can you go back? Maybe I'll take care of it. I'll try to understand what's going on.

NIGEL HICKSON: I hope someone hadn't deleted the text. Someone wrote it down on paper.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: The Google Doc should help us maintain the full history of the text, so we'll recover if we need to.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Thank you, Mr. Google.   Anyway, Registration Data Request.   I just want to put this on the screen just to ensure that everyone had seen these, well, they've seen these paragraphs to make sure they're okay.   Any comments by anyone on any grammar or anything that needs to be changed?   Let's just go down a bit then or up a bit to look at the final paragraphs here.   Thanks, that's great.   We have the paragraph on Privacy Proxy.   That's fine.   Thank you very much.   Number seven, Registration Data Accuracy.   Thank you for those that contributed to this text.   It looks fairly self-explanatory.   And we discussed it earlier today.   DPS, does that need to be spelled out or we don't usually spell it out?

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     It is already spelled out.   If you can scroll up a little bit, please.   There you go.   It's Data Processing Specification then we put DPS.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Yes, you're right.   Sorry, I just hadn't read it properly.   That's great.   So everyone knows what that is.   Then number eight, this is the IRT work that's now going to take place.   And I think this is what this text says.   So let's scroll up a bit, down a bit.   So that was all there was on age.   So we're now going to GACs and Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board.   So we've got these two sections, GAC Advice and a follow on to GAC Advice.

And the first one is on Applicant Support Program.   First, let's just go through the first two or three paragraphs on this then.   So this is the

new advice. And these are the paragraphs that we looked at yesterday. Paragraph one, paragraph two, paragraph three. Any comments at all on these paragraphs? Paragraph four. Let's go to the rationale. So there's quite a lot of text here, but this is a very large piece of work on applicant support.

Paragraph one, paragraph two, paragraph three. Any comments? I can't see any flags at all. So it must have been well written. Paragraph four. Let's continue to go down if that's okay, lovely. So the text has come back.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: And I had to go back in the history to pick it up. I'm not sure what happened, but the text got shuffled somehow. It's close for editing, so it must be coming from one of us somehow. Not sure.

NIGEL HICKSON: It's an internal job. And we were thinking it was. Auctions mechanisms of last resort, private resolution. We've been through this text a number of times. Consists of the two, the advice, Romans one and two, which we discussed just now again. And then we go into the rationale, which consists of references to previous GAC advice on this issue. And a bit more explanation of how we'd like to see the work being taken forward. Any final thoughts on this? Thanks so much.

Let's go down a bit more then. Thank you. Follow up to previous advice. And here we have the Applicant Support Program again. So this is where we're expanding on some of the advice we gave in the

San Juan. So if we could go through the paragraphs slowly so we could just anyone pick up any edits or any concerns if the English is not very good English. Sure it is. So that's the Applicant Support Program. I think those three paragraphs, if that's okay.

We then get on to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. And here we have a couple of paragraphs here. So this was something that is explained. We worked on the floor. So the first two paragraphs and the third paragraphs, the GAC coaches, the GNSO Council and the board. So there's that paragraph there. The last paragraph. Any comments at all on the last paragraph?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: There seems to be a little problem. Let me check. We will be needed. No, it's okay we'll be needed to address some of the board's concerns. I thought it was a grammar problem there, but no, it's fine. So back to you, Nigel. Sorry.

NIGEL HICKSON: It's quite a long sentence. But thanks so much.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I apologize for raising this display in the process, but as we reread the advice and the follow up on previous advice on the Applicant Support Program, I'm wondering if it would be useful to refer also to new gTLDs to provide slightly more context for potential readers of the community who are not familiar with what the Applicant Support

Program is.  So I'm looking at how we've referred to this in the past in the Washington communiqué.  We talked about in consensus advice application applicant support in new gTLD applications.  And in the ICANN79 communiqué, we only use Applicant Support Program.

So it's just that when we read the new advice in this communiqué, as well as the follow up on previous advice, it may not be immediately clear that we are talking about new gTLD applicants in the future, new gTLD application rounds.  So I'm just sharing this for consideration.  It may not be critical, but it is just that from an outsider's perspective, it may just be a little challenging to understand what this refers to.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:      And you're referring -- thank you for that, Fabien, and you're referring to the title we used in Washington and the title we used in San Juan, is that correct?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:      Correct.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:      So my suggestion here would be the simpler, the better.  I don't know if you agree with me, but I don't know what the rest of the of the GAC thinks about this.  But number one, I don't think it's that important.  And number two, I think we should keep it as simple as possible.  But again, I'm just saying, I'm just the GAC chair.  UK, go ahead, please.

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH:     Thank you.  picking up on that point.  I didn't think I had noticed it was different before now.  I do think the simpler, the better Applicant Support Program, but it's not a strong view.  I do know we did, in fact, use a different heading in the ICANN79 Communiqué Applicant Support Program in next round of new gTLDs, I think.  But no strong view from me either way.  I might lean towards simpler, but also appreciating the consistency point.  So welcome to hear from others as well.  But I think no strong view from me here.  Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you for that, UK.  And I'm perfectly okay with that suggestion as well.  So let's just do that.  just include the whole thing.  We'll go with a longer version.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Thank you very much for that.  Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     I suppose we'll take you offline and try to suggest what's the best, ensuring that we keep Applicant Support Program, because I don't want to try to create something on the fly right now.  So we'll just…

NIGEL HICKSON:     No, thank you.  Rose, did you want to come back?

ROSALIND KENNYBIRCH: Thank you. I would say I'm not necessarily comfortable taking it offline and agreeing a new title without the GAC. That's the one thing I would say. So if that is the plan, I'd rather do it here or just keep Applicant Support Program on the board or exactly the heading that was used in San Juan. Just for transparency.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, UK. I'm okay with that as well. Any objection from the floor? I don't see any objection. So we'll do just that. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Let's keep it as it is for now. And maybe in the future, we'll consider a clearer way to refer to it if needed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect. Then Nigel, back to you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much indeed. We're nearly there, actually. So although there's a lot of new text to follow. Let's just go through. Where do we get to? We passed all this, didn't we? Sorry. We've done follow up advice. We're just going through urgent requests. We did. So this is the contentious sentence. So get ready to put up your flags. So if anyone wants a meeting sooner or later, just let us know. We can. No, in all seriousness, this is the last step. And it relates to the next

meeting in Turkey, Istanbul.  This is where Nigel comes in and suggests something revolutionary.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:          Yes, thank you, Nigel Cassimire.  Just before we let you off the hook Nigel, I just wanted to consult with the King's English experts in the HLGM section.  If we could just go back there.  There was a reference to means and ways.  Was that, did I get this section right?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:       I believe you're referring to the ICANN CEO section.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE:          The ICANN CEO.  Sorry.  Yes, it's the ICANN CEO section.  And just wondered if means and ways is the normal way of saying it or the ways and means.

NIGEL HICKSON:            I think you're right.  I think it's usually ways and means.  So I don't think there's a lot of difference.  But we usually talk about ways and means.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:        Thank you again, CTU.  Good catch.  Good catch indeed.  So here we are.  Here we are.  Can we scroll down?  Where?  I think we're done.  I

think we're done unless anybody tells me there's anything you would like to.  Is that an old hand, Nigel?  So we're good?  Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:     I just want to mention in reference to the date on the communiqué to make sure it's clear.  The reason why we have the date of Monday is because this is after the three days, 72 hours review period, that we will proceed to publishing the community assuming there are no objections.  So that's why there is that date, not necessarily because we're planning to spend the weekend drafting the communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:     Thank you so much for that.  Any other comment or question at this point?  I think we're ready to adopt the God communiqué.  Is that correct?  Thank you so very much.  I think we deserve a big round of applause for ourselves.  Thank you so very much.  We'll have a coffee break now.  And we'll reconvene here at 3.30pm for the wrap up session, which might be shorter than expected if everything goes well.  So enjoy your coffee.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**