
ICANN82 | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, March 12, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 PST

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Welcome back, everybody. We'll start in one minute. Please take your seats. Thank you.

GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU Hello, and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Wednesday, 12th of March, at 15:00 UTC local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form. With that, I will leave the floor over to GAC chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed your coffee and that you had time to refresh a little bit your ideas as regarding the drafting of the communiqué, especially Section 4.5, which is Capacity Development. We were discussing right before the coffee break the last paragraph there, the whole issue about the registrant's journey. During that final read, I found a couple of—I would say three or four times the word registry,

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.

registrant, registrar. Everything was registered during my reading, so we should do something about that. Fabien, go ahead, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

During the break, we, as support team, suggested a sentence to try to help, based on what was discussed. And at the same time, Brazil had also offered a proposal. That's why we have those two purple highlighted suggestions that take into account the discussion and our offer to hopefully solve the discussion here.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. Brazil, would you like to read that or do you want me to read it? Whatever you prefer.

RENATA MIELLI

Thank you, Chair. "The registrant's journey showcasing in an interactive session the life cycle of domains registration, enabling GAC members to engage and familiarize themselves with the options and decisions a registrant may encounter in the domain name registration process."

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Brazil. Are we okay with this text? Anybody against? Perfect. The motion passes. Thank you so much, Brazil. Fabien, if you could please clean up the text so that we can move on. Then the final part remains the same. The GAC thanks the gTLD and so on, and then the GAC leadership and underserved regions,

and so on and so forth, remains the same. Perfect. Thank you very much. I have Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chair. Actually, I have a suggested modification for the very last sentence. I was proposing to read the GAC leadership and Underserved Regions Working Group co-chairs will assess the results from the post session survey and work with the USRWG to propose future programming of this effort.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Could you please repeat that last part? Slowly, please.

MANAL ISMAIL

And work with the USRWG to propose future programming of this effort.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much for that, Egypt. Is everybody okay with the text? European Commission, go ahead.

[FABRIZIA BENINI]

I have a small question for my understanding. The Underserved Regions Working Group will work with the Underserving Regions Working Group? The co-chairs will work with the group. Okay. Sorry. That was my poor understanding. It's a little bit confusing, but now I understand much better. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. Yes. That's the way it is. Anybody against? We can apparently leave with this version of the text. Okay. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

During the break, we've received text in issues of importance on DNS abuse and there were also some edits on the new round of new gTLDs. We suggest we go to DNS abuse at this time and then we'll move our way back up to the communiqué. Issues of importance Section 4, DNS Abuse.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. For this, I will kindly ask my esteemed colleague from Colombia, vice chair, to help me with the reading. Thiago, over to you.

THIAGO DAL-TOE

I will need glasses for this one. "DNS Abuse. The GAC appreciates the perspectives on DNS abuse received in conversations with different constituencies at ICANN82. Specifically in meetings with the GNSO, CPH, SSAC, and ALAC. These interactions seem to reflect converging views on the relevance of newly available data and evidence, i.e. from the INFERMAL report, Domain Metrica, and the implementation of the DNS abuse contract amendments, and on the opportunity to plan further work on this critical public policy issue prior to the next round of new gTLDs. The GAC underscores

that it would be helpful to receive more information on ICANN Compliance's update on the implementation of contract amendments and their proactive efforts related to investigation and enforcement, such as audits of said amendments. At the same time, the GAC highlights the importance that all parties, notably all registrars, cooperate to the utmost extent in fulfilling the new contractual obligations, including duly and timely addressing of abuse complaints filed by law enforcement authorities. Furthermore, the GAC emphasizes a need for contracted parties to share information and evidence on DNS abuse within the community and encourages them to quickly act on DNS abuse reports. The GAC also values OCTO's investment in providing data points for discussion on how to address DNS abuse. This work from ICANN is helpful and conducive to better decision-making around potential next steps."

"The GAC discussed the results of an internal survey aimed at gathering input from GAC members on DNS abuse policies, practices, and expectations regarding future GAC work on this matter. Building on these results and on the newly available data and input from other groups, the GAC intends to deepen discussion on next steps regarding the prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse."

"The GAC finds the INFERMAL report especially insightful as it contains findings that may further support the need for a targeted PDP on DNS abuse, something that was among the options for further work mentioned in the ICANN81 Communiqué. The GAC supports engaging in discussions with the GNSO Small Group on

DNS Abuse and other community members to determine whether any policy development building on these findings would be advisable. In particular, the GAC considers it important to look further into the topic of bulk registrations of domain names as one of the most correlated drivers to DNS abuse, according to the INFERMAL report.”

“The GAC notes that it would be worthwhile for OCTO to examine the common and underlying factors beneath various variables such as economic incentives, bulk APIs, etc. The GAC welcomes further discussion on other findings in the INFERMAL report, including the registration discounts and free services such as hosting work correlated with more abuse, and that contact information validation and registration restrictions were correlated with less abuse. In addition, the GAC notes the observation for multiple presenters that such discussions should include the economic implications for registrars and registrants, possible impacts on legitimate users, and corresponding deterrent effects. The GAC also considers that proactive practices for addressing DNS abuse, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, and links between addressing DNS abuse and work on domain name registration data should be further examined. Finally, the GAC encourages registrars to explore the use of AI-powered DNS abuse detection systems, and it invites the community to further discussions around privacy and proxy services in their role in DNS abuse.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Colombia, for the long reading. I would, at this point, just suggest, if you go up a little bit, the first reference to OCTO. We know what OCTO is, but five years or ten years from now, people reading this would say, “What on earth does OCTO mean?” Office of the Chief Technology Officer. No need to repeat that the second time we refer to OCTO. Again, that’s just my suggestion. The floor is open. Australia, go ahead, please.

IAN SHELDON

Just to support Fabien’s initial typing there, I think it might be worth specifying this is ICANN’s Office of the Chief Technology Officer. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. We’ll do just that. Okay, perfect. Thank you so much, Australia. Any other comment? I see no hand in the room. I see no hand online. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Next section would be new gTLDs. Sorry, there’s a hand up I’m told. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to comment on DNS abuse. I need to say that thank you so much for the authors of this. It’s such an important discussion we had this week and thanks for

those that coordinated that. I think this text well points out some of the main pinch points that we have on our agenda.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Indeed. Thank you, UK. Any other comment? Edits?

PRADEEP VERMA

Chair, can you scroll down before we go to the next topic? I think this will be useful to go paragraph by paragraph, because—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Good idea, India. Thank you. Benedetta? India, is that a hand up?

PRADEEP VERMA

Sorry. Just a thought. I think if you're bringing in the economic incentive for the registrars, will it be worthwhile also to kind of include the economic disincentive or the losses for the cyber frauds which normally citizen's face? I think this was also discussed in the meeting. Because that brings out only one aspect of the commercial incentive for the registrar as if that's a huge cost to put in the technology solutions for checking the mitigation of DNS abuse. I believe that those costs can... Anyway, I mean, not that they'll be borne by the registrars, but they'll be borne by the registrants who apply for these domain names. Maybe we'll propose some text, Chair. I think we seek more time on this.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. You will be preparing some additional text on this issue, right? In the meantime, can we... I mean, if there are no other edits or comments, maybe we can move on while India provides some additional text, and then we'll give it a final read if okay with everyone. Okay. Thank you, India. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

If we scroll back up, it's probably issues of importance. We have text on the next round of new gTLDs.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. I'll read that. "Next Round of New gTLDs. The GAC received a detailed update from the GNSO in anticipation of the new round of Generic Top-Level Domain names, new gTLDs expected in 2026. The GNSO provided updates on the important efforts undertaken by the Implementation Review Team (IRT) to implement policy recommendations for an updated Applicant Guidebook (AGB) by May 2025. These efforts cover topics of significance to the GAC and are critical for the successful launch of the next round. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement on the important topics highlighted below, including updates on the Applicant Support Program, application fees and refunds, and ICANN's global outreach plans."

Comments, questions before I read the next. I think we have already read the ASP, right? Or no? No? Okay. If there are no comments or edits or anything to modify there, I'll continue

reading part A, which is the Applicant Support Program, ASP. Can you scroll down a little bit, please?

Here we go. “The GAC welcomes the launch of the Applicant Support Program and the engagement of ICANN Org with the GAC on its progress. We welcome the monthly updates received on numbers and regional diversity of applications. We would, though, as discussed, this week, wish to see equitable participation in the application process, and thus, the GAC requests a clearer picture of which specific countries within the broad categories of ICANN regions are actively applying.”

“Knowing the precise distribution rather than relying on general regional data, we’ll empower GAC members in underserved countries to partner with ICANN Org and the broader community to significantly boost outreach and engagement efforts in specific countries. This more granular data, which as indicated, is available through ‘applicants’ primary place of business information’ is critical for targeted action.”

“Furthermore, the GAC expresses its concern with the low ‘submitted and in review’ rate of applications currently in ‘draft’ or ‘initiated’ status. With just over 10% of applications progressing to the ‘submitted and in review’ stage to date, the GAC strongly recommends that ICANN Org urgently identify the obstacles preventing these applicants from proceeding forward with their applications. With this information being made available, the GAC, ICANN Org, and the entire community must collaborate to develop and execute strategies that expedite these applications to the

submitted stage. This will allow for timely assessments, decisions, and resource allocation to be made based on available budget and resources, ensuring the process remains efficient and effective. Understanding how many successful applicants there have been also will allow the GAC to discuss and consider whether the ASP fee reduction should ultimately be set at 75% or 85%. Some members noted that specifying an 8% reduction now might encourage further applications from underserved regions.”

I’ll stop here in order to see if there are reactions. I see India and Switzerland. India, please go ahead.

PRADEEP VERMA

It is old hand. Sorry.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. First of all, let me recall the comments made before. It’s late in the day, and this is very substantive. Maybe we need a little bit more to digest everything. But just as first comments, I’m not sure whether something we normally do to put a text in italics so I would suggest that we revert to normal text in the first paragraph.

Then we have also text under Applicant Support Program where we talk of we as subject in the sentences, which is not our practice. We should reformulate that into the GAC as we do normally. Then at

least I see some very strong language. For instance, it struck my eye, the use of must in the third paragraph. If you scroll, “that the GAC, ICANN Org, and the entire community must collaborate.” I’m not sure whether we have discussed that and that we should use such kind of language. Maybe we should use something softer. I reserve my further comments. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. Can you scroll up a little bit all the way up to the first paragraph? As a matter of fact, where it says, “The GAC welcomes the launch, blah, blah, blah, and then we welcome the monthly updates.” Maybe that’s something that we also... or use and instead of the... “And welcomes” something like that. “The GAC welcomes the launch of the Applicant Support Program and the engagement of ICANN Org with the GAC on its progress and welcomes the monthly.” If okay with everyone. I just came up with this on the spot, but it would make more sense. Instead of repeating the GAC, the GAC, the GAC many times in the same paragraph. Do you agree with that? Okay. Thank you. I see nodding in the room. Apparently, we’re okay with that first paragraph. I have the UK next. Nigel, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Many thanks for this. I just was going to correct something at the bottom of this where it calls... It should say 85. I think you read out 8% because we hadn’t changed it. It was just an error. Thank you. That’s fine.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, UK. Any other comment? Edit? Okay. Can you slowly scroll down a little so that everybody can give it a final read before we move on? Netherlands, go ahead, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I wonder the opening of the third paragraph a bit in line with what Jorge earlier said, “The GAC expresses its concern,” I find that language quite strong and I’m not sure we actually discussed this as a common position. Maybe some members of the GAC expressed would be more appropriate formulation of this part.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Before I give the floor to Australia and then to the UK, we see some editing taking place online. It would be good for the sake of clarity if you could speak on the microphone at this point regarding whatever edits or changes you might be proposing. Again, that’s just for the sake of clarity so that we’re all on the same page. I have Australia, the UK, and Denmark. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. I just had a question about—where are we? I think the paragraph above. Granted, I haven’t had a discussion with the drafters of this text about it, but I’m not sure if the GAC, as a collective, have decided to push getting more information about specific applications. I understand ICANN had a little bit of a pushback around the privacy implications of requesting more of

the specific information. I think I probably appreciated discussion about some of that complexity before we're comfortable moving ahead with this.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. I don't mean to contradict you, but as a matter of fact, I do remember that we had discussions in that regard. I was in the room for sure because I was running the session. But again, my opinion is irrelevant. UPU, give me just one second. I have the UK, Denmark, and then the UPU.

NIGEL HICKSON

I'll defer to the UPU.

TRACY HACKSHAW

I just wanted to respond. Tracy Hackshaw to the record. The issue that you just raised, Ian, ICANN Org did in fact respond to us when it was raised by confirming that they can provide information to the GAC specifically, which is what we're trying to convey there. We want to tweak that to reflect that we didn't really want to make it sound so specific. They said they would not publish the details, but their staff would reach out to the GAC members, etc. So it's reflected there. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

All good, Australia? Okay, so let me give the floor—is that an all hand, Australia? Sorry. Okay, I have Denmark next.

FINN PETERSEN

Thank you. Finn Petersen. As you wish, I have put a smaller edit in the chat, but I will read this here. Second sentence, “this week” should be replaced with “during ICANN82.” Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Denmark. I have Bangladesh next.

DR SHAMSUZZOHA

Thank you. This is Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. The first sentence of the third paragraph, I think something is wrong here. Furthermore, some members of the GAC express their concerns with the “low submitted and in review rate.” I think “submitted and in review rate” or “low rate of submitted and in review application,” I think. Because “submitted and in review rate” I think it’s a bit problematic.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I see your point, Bangladesh, but that’s the way that category is actually called. There’s no way for us to change anything there, even though... That’s why it’s in quotation marks.

DR SHAMSUZZOHA

No, it’s not with the name, but low rate. We are referring the rate, right? The low rate of submitted and in review application. It’s not—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay, okay. Yeah. Thank you for that, Bangladesh. That's been fixed now. Any other comment before we do some clean-up so that we can give it a final read? I don't see any hands. All right. Fabien, back to you. Can you clean up the text so that we have a clear final version?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I think as the discussion was going on, there were several edits in various places. I wonder if it might not be... I'm not sure which of the changes should be accepted. We, ourselves, factually checked in the introduction here the updates were received from ICANN Org, another GNSO. We just made that change. I'm not sure how you want to proceed in terms of what changes we accept and what—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

So far, all the changes have been accepted as per the GAC's input. It is my understanding that everybody agreed with the changes. I didn't see any objections so far. Please correct me if I'm wrong, but that's the impression I got.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

For instance, I think there was an addition. In the first paragraph of Applicant Support Program, there was this sentence added, "The GAC is eager to see the ASP play an important role in making the upcoming round successful." I think that was added as there was

discussion on the parts of the text. That's an example. I wonder if some of the other edits were done in the same way in the further paragraphs.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Let's go one by one then. In the first paragraph, is everybody okay with that addition? "The GAC is eager to see the ASP play an important role in making the upcoming round successful." Any strong opposition to that? Okay. Thank you. The motion passes.

What's the next one, Fabien? Before I forget, the third paragraph, where it says, "Furthermore, some members of the GAC expressed." There should be an ED at the end of—in the past tense. But before we move there, the second paragraph is okay for everyone? Okay. Sorry. I have Canada and Australia.

DAVID BEDARD

Thanks, Nico. Just to follow through on what Tracy said. I do understand that this text is highlighting the GAC's desire to have a breakdown of the applicants per country. But the way that it reads, though, is that—I just think we need to be clear that we want that to be provided to the GAC and not publicly available. Right now, that's not clear.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Canada. Any suggestion that you can provide at this point in order to make that happen?

DAVID BEDARD

I was worried about that. Let me think about it and then—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

All right. I'll give the floor to Australia and then I'll get back to you. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Sorry. We raised the same point as Canada. We're still grappling with where to put that additional little bit of extra text to specify where it goes to the GAC. But we did have a point on the next paragraph, though, so we'll get to it in due course.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. Brazil?

RENATA MIELLI

Nico, I'm sorry. Regarding the first paragraph, just language observation. "The GAC welcomes the launch, da, da, da, and welcomes the monthly," maybe we can cut the second welcomes. "The GAC welcomes the launch of the Application Support Program and engagement of ICANN Org with the GAC on its progress, and the monthly updates received on members in regional..." Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Brazil. Very good catch. The second welcome. UK?

NIGEL HICKSON

Nigel Hickson, UK. I'm all for simplifying text, but this is different. "The GAC welcomes the launch and the engagement of ICANN Org, blah, blah, blah, and welcomes the monthly updates." I mean, you could have a launch of the program and you could have updates that took place every 15 years. It's a different point. I mean, it's not going to make a great difference, but grammatically, it's a different point.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. I'm not going to argue with you in that regard. I'm not going to discuss grammar with you, but if you say so, I take your word for sure. I would have concurred with Brazil in that regard, but again, we're not the experts here. We're fine. I mean, Brazil, are you okay? Any strong feelings? No? Thank you, UK. Thank you so much for that.

Going back to the second paragraph. Is everybody okay with it? We erased the must, we softened a little bit the tone. Australia, go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

Perhaps I can suggest amending the sentence beginning knowing. Maybe we can insert a reference there to providing information to the GAC. Providing precise distribution data to the GAC and then remove "knowing the precise distribution" and then keeping all the

rest of it. I think it provides a little bit more clarity to where that data should be going.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

UPU, would you be okay with that? Thank you. Thank you, Australia, for the edit. Is everybody okay with the paragraph now? Any strong feelings against it? I don't see any hand. Let's move on to the third paragraph, please, Fabien. Any modification there? Anything you would like to change at this point? Are we okay with the language, with the tone, with the vocabulary, and grammar, by the way, given the fact that we have very good experts in the room? Australia, please go ahead.

INGRAM NIBLOCK

Ingram Niblock for Australia. Just on the first and second line of that third paragraph, I'm just a little bit unclear. Some members of the GAC express their concerns with the low rate of submitted and in review applications. There's one of those currently in draft or initiated status. It seems like the submitted in review are currently in draft or initiated, but they're quite different status in the ASP program statistics. It seems like the draft or initiated status applications are currently submitted and in review.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Which is exactly the situation according to my understanding. UPU?

TRACY HACKSHAW

That's why the original wording was there. Is your rate of the applications that were in that status? When it was changed, it threw off the meaning. Is that what you're saying? You were saying the rate of the applications is something... It was supposed to say the low submitted review and a low rate of applications currently in draft. It's a different meaning. So when it was changed, the meaning has changed. That's to be rebooted now to get back to the original meaning. Because right now, it doesn't make sense now. Long story short.

You have to read with it. If you're using lower rate of submitted review applications, that are... maybe that's our end draft or initiated status. I'm trying to get good English here. I'm just thinking. Maybe a suggestion is keeping the original correction with the lower rates of submitted and review applications that are currently in draft or... That hasn't worked either. It was working before.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Think about it a little bit, UPU. In the meantime, I'll give the floor to Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I think it's not all right. It's the number. But I also feel that this is a bit cluttered now with all the submitted in review and draft. Maybe if I may make an editorial suggestion and I'll try and go with dictation speed, Fabien, "Some members of the GAC express their

concern with the low number of applications progressing beyond...”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Hold on. Let’s give him time to write down.

MARCO HOGEWONING

“Beyond the draft or initiated status.” Full stop. And then we continue, “With just over 10% of the applications in the submitted and in review stage to date,” I think then we have a much more easy to comprehend sentence. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Australia? Sorry, I saw your hand. That was an old hand. Thank you so much. I’m a little bit confused at this point. Can you do some cleaning so that we can read the paragraph in its semi-final version? Let me read it as it is in order to see if we have agreement here. “Furthermore, some members of the GAC expressed their concerns with the low number of applications progressing beyond the draft or initiated status. With just over 10% of applications progressing to the submit and in review stage to date, the GAC recommends that ICANN Org promptly identifies potential obstacles preventing these applicants from proceeding forward with their applications. With this information being made available, the GAC, ICANN Org, and the entire community are invited to collaborate to develop and execute strategies that expedite these applications to the submitted stage. These will allow for timely assessment, blah, blah, blah.” Are we okay with it

now? Now it's a little bit clearer in my humble opinion, but again, I defer to the experts in the room to decide. It sounds good to me. Let me just tell you that. Any strong feelings against the way it is drafted as of right now? I don't see any hand online. Go ahead. Mozambique, right?

LOURINO CHEMANE

Yes. I think that perhaps we should remove the "the" in the first line because I think it is redundant. And we can just say "GAC members" without that word.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Mozambique. "Express their concerns with the low number and so on." Would that be okay with you?

LOURINO CHEMANE

I think that we should delete the word "the."

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Fabien, maybe we can clean up the text and move on. Over to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

There is a sentence at the bottom that was edited, probably slightly. At least, I recall the percentage was changed. Our understanding of this topic, that is the level of reduction of the ASP fees is set in the rule of the program. Do you want to speak to that?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Fabien. This is Benedetta for the record. We were just flagging that in the last sentence. I'm not sure if we are missing something, but it seems that the way that it is currently worded, it seems to say that the GAC has some sort of role in deciding whether the ASP support range should be 75% or 85%. In terms of clarity, the range was developed by the GGP and the Implementation Review Team following the public comment. We just wanted to make sure that that's clear in the text.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Benedetta. I have the Netherlands, the UK, and Colombia. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Maybe to address the concern just expressed by Benedetta, if we say some members suggested that specifying instead of noted. In terms of the GAC can always suggest, it's for the Board to consider.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. UK?

NIGEL HICKSON

Thank you, Mr. Chair. One appreciates the complexities of this, but the GAC has a role. It doesn't have a unique role, but it has a role. These figures were put in as a range and the IRT process is still ongoing. Before the final Applicant Guidebook is launched, depending on what the evidence is there, we could push for a specific 85% level. The problem you have got here is chicken and

egg. On the one hand, if it's 75%, then if you get a lot more applications that pass the process, then we are going to have to go to the ICANN Board with a bucket to get more money, although they have said they might have more money. But for the potential applicant in an underserved country, having 85% there might be the trigger point as opposed to 75% to actually put an application in.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, UK. Colombia?

THIAGO DAL-TOE

Thank you, Nico. I agree with Nigel in this last point. What we are trying to put here is to clearly mention that this 10% increase, let's say, or guaranteeing that the 85% reduction in fees would maybe be the trigger for some applicants in underserved regions to actually go ahead and complete their application. We understand the complexities and what was explained by Board members yesterday, but I think this 10% would indeed make a difference in some of our countries. Thank you so much.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Colombia. Let me read that last paragraph once again. "Understanding how many successful applicants there have been also will allow the GAC to discuss and consider whether the ASP fee reduction should ultimately be set at 75% or 85%. Some members

suggested that specifying an 85% reduction now might encourage further applications from underserved regions.”

Let me stop there in order to see if we have an understanding here. I see the Netherlands. Go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sorry to take the mic again. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, I think on second reading, I see the point that the staff is making because indeed it's not for us to discuss and consider the fee. That's the task for the Board. Maybe replacing that first sentence. If we say, “The GAC notes the ongoing uncertainty on whether the reduction of the fee will be set at 75% or 85%.” Then we follow with, “Some members suggested that specifying the 85%.” We skip that part. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. I'll read it as it is in order to see if we have an agreement. “The GAC noted the ongoing uncertainty on whether the reduction of the fee will be set at a 75% or 85%. Some members suggested that specifying an 85% reduction now might encourage further applications from underserved regions.” Shorter, simpler, sweeter, I would say. Can we leave with this drafting? If not, please go ahead. I see Colombia and the UK.

THIAGO DAL-TOE

Thank you, Nico. I just think that at the end of the first sentence, we maybe have to specify that it depends on the amount of

applications received. Currently, the way it is, “The GAC noted the ongoing uncertainty on whether the reduction of the ASP fee will be set at 75% or 85%, which ultimately will be determined by the amount of applications received.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Colombia. I have the UK next.

NIGEL HICKSON

Yes, I think that works. I think I’ve said enough. I think Ian put something in the chat. I think it might be a range, but most people are talking about 75% or 85%. But I’m sure that there could be an argument for 80% in the end. Given that people are already making applications, then that’s why there’s a certain degree of urgency here.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, UK. Colombia, is that an old hand? Okay. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Just a note, I fully support the idea that would be great to give now the indication that there is a reduction of 85%. But if you read the entire paragraph, we are saying that the rate of reduction will be determined by the amount of the application. Then we are asking still, we want that you tell us now. We are a bit contradicting ourselves, so we understand that the total number of applications will have an impact on the percentage

of the reduction of the fee. But even if we understand it, we want that they give now the precise figure. This is perhaps a bit inconsistent. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. UK, is that an old hand? The floor is still open. We still have three minutes to discuss. Or maybe we should stop here, go get some good coffee, and come back in one hour. But I would like to at least try to close this part of the discussion. Sorry. I have Egypt and India.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Chair. Christine Arida for the record. I think just to address the comment that Ian has put in the chat, I think we should change, will be set at 75% or 85%. It is arranged; we should choose a language that indicates that. I mean, it could be 80%, it could be 78%.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Do you have a specific suggestion at this point? You want to put somewhere between 75% and 85% or something of the sort?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, something like that. Between 75% and 85%.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. India?

PRADEEP VERMA

I don't have a specific query on points on this paragraph, but I would like to suggest, could we add the topic 15, which is under public comment? I have drafted some text which I have just put in the chat box. Can you please read that chat?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Where should I go, India?

PRADEEP VERMA

I have put some text on topic 15 in the chat.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I know. But where do you want to put it? Where exactly? At the end?

PRADEEP VERMA

In the last paragraph.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

After regions?

PRADEEP VERMA

Yes.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Can you scroll down a little bit? It says, “The GAC also notes that there has been a positive development in terms of qualified ASP applicants receiving the same percentage reduction as they received on the gTLD evaluation fee for certain evaluations referred in the draft topic 15 of the Applicant Guidebook currently open for public comment such as Community Priority Evaluation (CPE), Community Registration Policies Evaluation (Specification 12), Geographic Names Evaluation and Reevaluations as a result of application change requests. The GAC, however, urges ICANN Org to acknowledge the need to publish the estimated costs which such evaluations entail well in advance for the sake of complete transparency and visibility of the financial obligations that a new gTLD application may be required to bear.”

We’re running out of time. I’ll give the last two minutes to the Netherlands and Jose A. Lay. Is that Timor-Leste?

JOSE A. LAY

Yes.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate fellow members adding text. But as I said, as much as colleague earlier on already mentioned, this is quite a substantive addition quite late in the game, so I would like to reserve my thoughts on this and then let it sink in to the more

immediate point, I think, where it says “the GAC also notes” and “further on, the GAC however...” I’m not sure we had in-depth discussions about this topic. Again, the suggestion to say some members instead of the whole GAC, I’m not sure this is reflected as common position. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. You would say the second part of that paragraph, instead of, “The GAC however urges,” “Some members urge,” is that your suggestion? Now, the word urge I think is a little bit strong, but again, my opinion is irrelevant. Sorry. I have Timor-Leste. Please go ahead.

JOSE A. LAY

Thank you, Chair. Jose A. Lay, Timor-Leste, for the record. I proposed in the chat and also put that in the Google Doc a reference specifically to ensure that the application from underserved regions receive adequate support and opportunities to participate fully. I leave it there for considerations are proposed to be added to whether the first or the second paragraph. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Timor-Leste. Let’s stop here. We have a coffee break right now. We’re going to do some cleaning. We’re going to arrange the drafting. Please come back at 4:30. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]