
ICANN82 | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (4 of 6)
Wednesday, March 12, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 PST

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Welcome back, everyone. Please take your seats. We're starting in 30 seconds, I would say. Julia, please go ahead, or Gulten.

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Hello, and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Wednesday, 12th of March, at 16:30 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. Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation and make sure to mute all other devices when you are 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, Nicolás Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Gulten, welcome back. I hope you were able to manage to get some coffee somewhere because I couldn't. There

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.

was no more coffee outside. So my caffeine levels are extremely low at this point, which is precisely when we need it the most, or I needed the most, at least.

So we'll continue where we left off. One thing, though, I would kindly ask you is to try to—and with all due respect, but if we start submitting new text other than the one over which we already have agreement and which we have already discussed, it will be very difficult not to finish today or tomorrow, but within this month. So please try to keep whatever additions you might have at this point, short and straight to the point. This in no way precludes participation from any distinguished GAC members. Please don't get me wrong. All I'm saying is that, for the sake of, on the one hand, clarity, and on the other hand, I would say simplicity, let's try to stick to what we already have unless it is new text that we're starting to discuss. That way, we might be able to finish within the assigned timeframe. So having said that, Fabien, can you please walk us through the sections to which we need to work a little bit more on?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So where we left it is in issues of importance, Next Round of New gTLDs, Applicant Support Program. And we're at the bottom of that section. If you scroll just a little bit more, yeah, there we go. So the first on the screen right now, the first paragraph. On the first paragraph, we had a friendly amendment by Egypt on the text proposed by Egypt regarding the range of 75 to 85% of reduction. Then the sentence highlighted between the two paragraphs is a

suggestion by Timor-Leste, if we understood correctly, of where it was meant to be placed. Then the second, the last paragraph on the screen is a text that was provided by India in the chat, and that was discussed, to some extent, as something that reflects the views of some members and not the GAC. And so this is where we are at the moment.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much for that, Fabien. I have Switzerland and Germany.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Chair. As I've taken the floor many times before, I would like to defer to Germany. Thank you.

RUDY NOLDE

Thank you. Rudy Nolde from Germany for the record. On the last paragraph, which starts with some GAC members also noted, I feel a bit uneasy with this section for two reasons. First, I don't remember it being discussed during the GAC sessions, and I think we should refrain from including something in the communiqué that, as far as I know, has not been discussed in this detail.

And the second point is that this paragraph takes a position on draft sections of the Applicant Guidebook that are currently in a Public Comment Proceeding, I think, until April. And so I would suggest that we take this paragraph out of the communiqué and

maybe take a bit more time to digest it, and then we may revisit it as a potential GAC submission to a Public Comment. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Germany. As a matter of fact, I totally agree. But as I always say, my opinion is irrelevant because this is your decision. Switzerland, would you like to take the floor now before I give it to... Sorry, that's your hand. Go ahead. Go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Actually, I was wondering or I was having doubts myself in a very similar direction as Rudy just mentioned. At least my recollection is not that complete and I don't recall that we discussed this, and our standard practice is normally that we have to have an anchor in plenary discussions. So I don't know if maybe topic leads or our very able secretariat could illuminate us whether we had this discussion during the plenary and whether it's fit to be included in the communiqué, because after all, the communiqué is there to reflect GAC discussions according to our operating principles. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Right off the bat, I can tell you that I don't recall having discussed this. CPE, Community Registration policies Evaluation (Specification 12), and so on and so forth, Geographic Names, I don't recall. And I stand to be corrected, of course. If

anybody in the GAC room can point us to. I don't see anybody. Anyway, UK, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also don't think we specifically discussed this when we discussed application fees. I mean, what this text is saying, if you take out the things like the welcomes and whatever, which is difficult because we didn't discuss it, is that in the current draft of the Applicant Guidebook, there is a consideration that the fee reduction level for the overall application fee also applies to other additional fees, which applicants might have to pay if they're going through community priority evaluation or some other process, or a geo name, or whatever. So it's highlighting that this is one of the issues. As our distinguished German colleague, I think rightly said, this is something that GAC would need to reflect on in giving its response to this Applicant Guidebook. But I think it's good that our colleagues from India highlighted it because it is important because it's not just one application fee. It goes on depending who you are. So grateful for the text, but perhaps at this time of day, it's a step too far.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UK. So from a procedural point of view, and taking into account that we didn't actually have discussions on this, I kindly recommend not including this. Would anybody strongly disagree with me? I mean, not including this paragraph, given the fact that, as I said before, the GAC didn't discuss it at

length. Is it India that provided this text? Thank you very much. So my distinguished colleague from India, is it a life or death issue to include this paragraph?

[SUSHIL PAL]

During the plenary, it was raised by the India. But however, it's up to the GAC members whether to put or not.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, India. So I would kindly ask Fabien to put brackets there and so that we have full consensus.

Now, can you scroll up a little bit? Just let me be clear here. I'm going to read the last two paragraphs just to make sure that we all agree on this, and then we'll move on. It reads, "The GAC noted the ongoing uncertainty on the reduction of the ASP fee which will be set between 75 and 85% determined by the number of applications received. Some members suggested that specifying an 85% reduction now might encourage further applications from underserved regions. This approach is particularly crucial to ensuring that applicants from underserved regions receive adequate support and opportunities to participate fully." Full stop, right?

Do we have an agreement here? Anybody with strong feelings about this? Can we move on? I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Okay. So let's move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The next subsection under the Next Round of New gTLDs is Application Fees and Refunds.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Benedetta. And for this, I will kindly ask our distinguished vice chair from Lebanon, Madam Zeina Bou Harb, to help me with the reading. Would you please, Zeina?

ZEINA BOU HARB

Sure. “Application Fees and Refunds. GAC members continue to have concerns on how the applicant fee level will affect applications from underdeveloped and underserved countries. Some members also cleared the level of applicant refund, especially where an application is withdrawn early for various reasons. In such circumstances, a refund category above the planned 65% would perhaps be applicable.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. Let me stop you there, Zeina. Thank you very much. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I was just wondering on the last sentence, if we are reflecting on the applicability or whether we are suggesting that it should be appropriate. I’m not sure whether we have doubts whether 65% is applicable or not. And that would be, I guess, an operation of looking into a rule and seeing if it’s applicable or not, or whether

we are suggesting a change or softening of the rule or whatever. And in that case, I think applicable is not the right word. It might be appropriate what we are trying to say. So I just wanted to put that for the consideration of the proposers. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Thank you for that. As a matter of fact, I don't agree at all with including the whole sentence because we don't have anything to do with the internal procedures and operations. But again, this is just my opinion. I have the UK next.

NIGEL HICKSON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I think I agree with our distinguished—I mean, I drafted this, but my English is not always brilliant. Yeah, appropriate. Probably it would perhaps be more appropriate. Just on the substance here. I mean, Nico, this is something that's gone out to consultation in the Applicant Guidebook and the levels aren't set. There was no policy process that set these levels at all. So we're not going against policy. It's just something the applicant process came up with different levels, 65, 35, and I think 20. So there's no set levels at the moment.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UK. Just to be clear, I don't have any kind of strong feelings about including or not including that sentence. Should we leave it there? Anybody opposed? I don't see any hand. Okay. So we will read, "In such circumstances, a refund category above the planned 65% perhaps be appropriate." Is that what

we're saying? Sorry, because you're changing as I read. So I'll read again. "In such circumstances, a refund category above the planned 65% would perhaps be appropriate." I'll open the floor for comments or questions.

Okay. There's a slight change proposed by the UK. "In such circumstances, a refund category above the planned 65% might perhaps be appropriate." And I'll pause here. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia. Can we strike perhaps? I'm not sure it adds anything to this sentence.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. Any other? Okay. Any strong opposition at this point? I don't see any hand. Okay. Let's go ahead. Please clean up the text, Fabien, and let's move forward.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The next part of this section on Next Round of New gTLDs, Global Outreach and Promotion of ICANN in your Language.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you. And for that, I will ask again very kindly to our distinguished vice chair from Colombia to help me with a reading. Thiago. Would you please?

-
- THIAGO DAL-TOE Of course, Nico. Which one? The global outreach? “Global Outreach and Promotion of ICANN in your Language. The GAC encourages ICANN Org to further develop and promote its on-demand translation process for the New gTLD Program materials to enhance outreach and engagement in the next round called in ‘ICANN in your Language,’ extending coverage beyond the seven ICANN languages.”
- NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you, Colombia. Comments, edits, any reaction? Okay, seeing none. Sorry, Switzerland? Go ahead. Go ahead.
- JORGE CANCIO I don’t mean to be picky, but is it a process on-demand translation process or on-demand translation system or mechanism or whatever? Just asking.
- NICOLÁS CABALLERO Very good catch, Switzerland. It should be system, in my humble opinion, but again, the floor is still open.
- ESTHER JAROMITSKI MARGARETHE Esther Jaromitski, UK GAC, for the record. It’s process on the ICANN website. So that’s how they refer to the AI system.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you, UK. So you think we should stick to process? Okay. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING It's Netherlands, Marco speaking. Maybe to avoid this discussion, if we say it's on-demand translation of the New gTLD Program materials, then we avoid what it is. I think you can perfectly on-demand translate a material.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Would that be okay with the UK? Thank you. So can we live with this text? Does anybody have any strong objections? I don't see any hand. Sorry, I see Bangladesh. Gulden, would you like to say anything?

GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU We have Bangladesh in the queue. I was going to say that, Nico. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO All right, Bangladesh. Please go ahead.

SHAFIUL AZAM PARVEZ Thank you chair. This is Shafiul Azam Parvez from Bangladesh. Just maybe seven ICANN languages. But on the ICANN website, in that particular program page, they are mentioning six ICANN languages. So I don't know which one is correct. Because I was looking into the program page on the ICANN in your language, and then mentioning

that ICANN Org provides these materials in the six ICANN languages, and then they are talking about the other languages. So it's seven or six, I'm not sure.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Bangladesh. I understand. It is my understanding that is the six official ICANN languages, plus Portuguese. But I stand to be corrected. Benedetta?

No, no. I know, I know. Six ICANN languages officially, but I know Portuguese is not an official ICANN language. But it was my understanding. I stand to be corrected, but they were going to include Portuguese here as well. Not sure, though. Was that the case? Go ahead.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

My understanding here is that the system or the ICANN in your language will extend beyond the six languages. So yes, it can include Portuguese and other languages as needed. But the question here from Bangladesh, I think, was whether it was seven or six, and it is six ICANN languages.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. Any other comment? Okay. Then let's move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I believe this concludes the reading of issues of importance. If we scroll back to domain name registration data, we just made an edit, just for your awareness, of that quote that was proposed with a reference to a Board statement. So we did include a footnote to the letter from the Board to the GNSO where that statement was made, and we just adjusted the actual exact quote in that statement. So that's for information. That doesn't change, I suppose, the substance.

So with that, if we scroll up in the internal matters, we have new text regarding GAC Strategic Planning, as well as the report of the Public Safety Working Group. So those are the two new pieces of text we have.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Perfect. I'll read right now. So this is Section 3.6, if I'm not mistaken, right, GAC Strategic Planning. "The GAC leadership provided a progress report on the delivery of the expected outcomes consistent with the GAC's Strategic Plan 2024-2028 and the GAC Annual Plan 2024-2025. The GAC leadership will work with the GAC topic leads and working group chairs to develop the next GAC Annual Plan 2025-2026 for consideration by GAC members before ICANN83." Maybe we should add Prague there? I'm just saying. But I'm okay with ICANN83, in any case. So I'll stop there. Comments?

Okay. I'm glad to see that everybody is okay with that text. So back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So then in Section 3, GAC Working Groups, we have this text proposed by the Public Safety Working Group.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

So for this, I will ask Egypt to help me with the reading. Christine, would you please?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sure. “The GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG). The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. In the week prior to ICANN82, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest. The PSWG participated in briefing the GAC during the session on developments concerning WHOIS and registration data issues, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG ongoing work. Key takeaways involving PSWG workstreams included potential improvements to the Registration Data Request System (RDRS) and continued progress on work related to ‘Urgent Requests’ for disclosure of registration data. The PSWG appreciated the various presentations and discussions on the findings concerning the inferential analysis of maliciously registered domains, INFERMAL final report, which provided valuable input for progressing the work on addressing DNS abuse.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. So there it is, of course, open for comments or edits. Okay. I see no hands in the room or online,

which means that we can take this paragraph as accepted by everyone. One last chance. Anybody? Anybody against? Again, for the record, I don't see any hand in the room or online. So back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So with this, I believe, and I'm verifying as I'm saying this, we've read all the substantive parts of the communiqué. So we have no advice that was proposed. So we'll remove the section Consensus Advice and Follow-Up on Previous Advice. So we can probably scroll back to the top. And if you want to give a read to the introduction and the inter-constituency activities, that would complete the reading of the communiqué.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Fabien. Before that, I'll give the floor to Egypt.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much. Just to say that we will be providing in the Working Group section a text on the IG Group, if that's okay. It's coming, actually.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

You mean now? I mean, during this session? In the next 30 minutes, in other words.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

I think so, yes. But I stand to be corrected by Manal.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. No problem, no problem. Thank you for that, Egypt. Before we have a final reading, let's say, ITU styling, which we just take a look at each page and the highlights, because we don't actually need to read the whole thing again. It would take us a full hour or so, and it doesn't make any sense, in my humble opinion. So I'll just read this part, and then I'll give the floor to our distinguished Shakespearean colleague from the UK to give it a final read, and we'll see how it goes up until that point.

“Governmental Advisory Committee, Seattle, United States of America. 17 March 2025. GAC Communiqué, Seattle, United States of America. The Seattle Communiqué was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the ICANN82 community forum with some GAC participants in Seattle, United States, and others remotely. The GAC’s discussions during this public meeting are reflected in the GAC meeting minutes and the transcripts of all sessions available at”—and there’s a link there. “The communiqué was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC members and observers to consider it before publication, bearing in mind the special circumstances of A hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication.” Fabien, have we read the introduction? I don’t remember.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

We haven't.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

We haven't? Okay. So I'll read the introduction. Can you scroll down a little bit, please? So one introduction. "The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Seattle, United States of America, in a hybrid setting, including remote participation from 8 to 13 March 2025. X number of GAC members and X number of observers attended the meeting. The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN82 community forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings." Can you scroll down please?

"Two inter-constituency activities and community engagement meeting with the ICANN Board. The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed priorities and plans for the new ICANN CEO, Internet Coordination Policy (ICP-2), Next Round of New gTLDs - Applicant Support Program, Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data, Accuracy of Registration Data."

"Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed INFERMAL Study and GAC ALAC priorities in the WSIS+20 context."

"Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed Quantum computing and impacts on existing encryption technologies and the INFERMAL Study."

“Meeting with Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO). The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed accuracy of registration data, collection of billing contact by registrars in the context of the Registration Data Policy, Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data, INFERMAL Study, and GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse, New gTLD Next Round Implementation Review Team, Latin Script Diacritics PDP, improved communications between GAC and GNSO Council.” Can you scroll down a little bit, please? Thank you.

“Meeting with a Contracted Parties House (CPH) of the GNSO. The GAC met with representatives of the CPH and discussed WSIS+20, Next Round of New gTLDs, Urgent Requests Authentication, INFERMAL Study.”

“Meeting with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) of the GNSO. The GAC met with representatives of the NCSG and discussed Human Rights Impact Assessment on DNS Abuse, gTLD Applicant Support.”

“Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). The GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed Policy Gap Analysis Update, ccTLD Models.”

“Cross-Community Discussions. GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN82, including a dialogue on ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and a Community Feedback session on theme How We Meet.”

We have already read the internal matters, so we're not going to read the whole thing again. So at this point, I will hand over the floor to Mr. Hickson from the UK in order to give it a final general review, unless we have comments. And I see Japan's hand. Japan, please go ahead.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you. This is Tomonori from Japan. This is a quite small point, but about page four, the part of ALAC, I think at this point we have the INFERMAL Study the first time. And I think that the explanation of INFERMAL review, it appeared on page seven, ahead of page seven, I think. So maybe you can explain that, what is INFERMAL, what it stands for is written at this point, maybe.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Very good catch, Japan. Thank you for that. So we'll take care of that. Rest assured, we'll take care of that. Nigel, over to you.

NIGEL HICKSON

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Here we have paragraph one on GAC Membership, where we welcome Monaco, of course, and the African Parliamentary Network as an observer. The next sentence, factual 184 and 40 observers in membership.

The next paragraph, thanking the outgoing GAC vice chairs and welcoming the new GAC vice chairs. We then go into the working groups and the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) is a text

that we read out only a while ago, just sets out what PSWG have been doing and how they've been participating.

And then we have the GAC Internet Governance, GAC IG Group, and some text is being prepared by our esteemed colleagues from Portugal and Egypt, and some other contributions, and hopefully that will go in so we can go back to that, and we'll have a read through of that, subject to the chairman's wishes.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Can you stop there, Nigel? Sorry to interrupt you, but apparently we already have that text, so maybe we can include it now. I read it and then I'll pass it back to you. Would that be okay? Okay.

“GAC Internet Governance Group (GAC IG Group). The GAC met on March 11 and took stock of the Internet Governance (IG) Group's activities and its first webinar held on February 17 titled 'Shaping the Digital Future: WSIS+20 Review and the Future of Internet Governance.' The webinar focused on discussing the plans and expectations of key UN organizations and departments regarding the WSIS+20 review process. The GAC acknowledged that based on a survey circulated among its members, the IG Group provides added value by informing, engaging, and contributing to GAC national positions on WSIS+20. The GAC also took note of the ongoing work of ICANN Org on the WSIS+20 process and Internet governance. Additionally, it was considered that a webinar dedicated to the Sao Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines (NM+10) may well be of interest ahead of ICANN83.”

I'll pause here in order to see if we have any reactions, comments, edits. Netherlands, go ahead, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, much appreciated. For the colleagues who wrote this text, I've one minor need to pick on contributing to GAC national positions. I think it's either a GAC position or a national position. I'm not familiar with a GAC national position. My suggestion would be to leave it contributing to national positions and strike the word GAC. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Netherlands. Very good catch. Any other comment?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Just an editorial comment. We rarely refer to specific dates of the GAC's activity. So the webinar on the 17th of February, that seems relevant. We generally do not provide the date at which the GAC met during an ICANN meeting on a specific topic. So the text could just say the GAC met and took stock of the—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Would I be okay with Egypt? Just minor editorial changes. It doesn't change at all the meaning of the sentence or the paragraph. Would you be okay with that? Thank you, Egypt. Any other? Germany, please.

RUDY NOLDE Just adding to that, maybe we could just like “have met” as well, just the GAC took stock.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you, Germany. Any other? Mozambique, please go ahead.

LOURINO CHEMANE Thank you. Following the proposal from the Netherlands to delete GAC, I think that maybe you are changing the meaning of the sentence. Because it was my understanding that informing, engaging, and contributing was related to GAC members and not only to the national position. Maybe you can review the text to go back to the initial.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO And say GAC members, right? Is that your suggestion, Mozambique? Thank you. Would this be acceptable for—I think it was Netherlands that suggested the change. Would that be okay with you?

MARCO HOGEWONING Then I would suggest to strike national. As a GAC member, I represent my government. So either have a national position or have a position as an individual.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. And Mozambique, would you be okay with that? Yes? Perfect. Egypt, please, and then Germany.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Chair. I think what is meant here is positions of national governments because I think that would be one position, and so it's the engagement and informing in that sense. So I don't know which language is best, but I just want to make sure that we have the same understanding.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Egypt, are you intending to say that national positions might differ somehow with GAC members positions, is that your point?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

No, I'm just responding to the fact that we're not talking about individual positions of members. We're talking about national positions. Just to be clear, I mean, if that is the understanding that we are getting from the text, I'm perfectly fine.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Germany?

RUDY NOLDE

We mention informing, engaging, and contributing. I would suggest to maybe just mention informing. So we say the IG Group

provides added value by informing GAC member positions on WSIS+20.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Germany. Portugal, please go ahead, and then I have Brazil.

ANA NEVES

Thank you very much. I think that the work of the IG is really to contribute. It's a contribution for the GAC members to be better informed and as a result in their national positions on WSIS+20. So the IG Group is not only to inform but to do something to contribute. So it's not only to inform. If you don't want to engage, okay, you don't engage. But at least it serves a purpose. And I think it's not only to inform but to contribute to something. Otherwise, you don't need this group. You just send documents about the process, and that's it. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal. You do have a point there. Would you be able to live with that, Germany? Or is it extremely important to erase those two words?

RUDY NOLDE

I think contributing is much more than just what we have done. I think informing is quite important. I think that would be the purpose of the group, as I understood it. Contributing to GAC members position on WSIS+20, that would be something that we

really came to a common position, which was not the purpose of the group. So I would favor by leaving it with informing.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Germany. I have Brazil next.

RENATA MIELLI

Thank you, Chair. Renata Mielli for the record. I'm going to speak in Portuguese. I agree with the importance of that group and the need to be able to attract some of the members from GAC so that we can take this in an internal way to our countries, so that we can then have some kind of position within our countries. So I feel that the phrase should be the following: informing, engaging, and contributing to GAC members. And contribute to the national positions on WSIS+20, something like that. What I'm trying to say—

INTERPRETER

I'm sorry, there's a technical problem, just a moment.

RENATA MIELLI

Or engage in contributing to GAC members to inform and participation the discussion in national levels and the positions on WSIS+20. I don't know, but something like this.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Brazil. I have Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING I think my Swiss colleague is in front of me in the queue. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Nico. Maybe one thing that is being difficult in this sentence is the reference to national and national positions because that's quite a strong question. So if I get it right, we want to underscore that this working group helps us in understanding better what is at stake with WSIS+20. So maybe if we slightly change the sentence and say by informing, engaging, and contributing to GAC members' understanding of WSIS+20, we avoid the inferences, the implications of talking about national positions or positions or national, etc. Hope this can help.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Switzerland. I have Netherlands and then Australia.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thanks to the Swiss colleague. I was going in the same direction, so happy with his edits. But then I'm not sure whether engaging, understanding, then my suggestion would be to leave it to added value by informing and contributing to GAC members' understanding and strike the word "engaging".

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

My Swiss and Dutch colleagues have addressed all of my concerns. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. Portugal?

ANA NEVES

I'm going to speak in Portuguese. When this group was created, it was for the awareness of several members in the GAC about what will happen this year and what is important for ICANN. It's important for ICANN for the WSIS+20 to ensure that we will have a multistakeholder approach in terms of Internet governance. So what they're seeing is that informing, contributing to GAC members' understanding of the position. So I don't see what the issue is. We're seeing that we need more engagement of people, of GAC representatives' understanding of WSIS+20, because this is the outcome, there will be implications on ICANN. So if people are not engaged in this group, then all these things will happen. So it's good for GAC members to eventually want to know... Well, it's them, it's their position, but it's important for them to be able to inform their governments what is being discussed.

This is a process. I represent an organization within the GAC, and this has always been our position. So I think it is interesting to say this. I don't think it makes sense extending the discussion. If you

want to do away with engaging, well, that's okay, but the goal of this work is not just sending documents, disturbing people so that eventually there will be no engagement. Now, if you are for this group, then that will depend on the government's positions. It's not that ICANN stakeholders have to be part of this discussion. What they have to do is just to understand the process. If there is no engagement by GAC members in the WSIS+20 process, well, then, okay, this is what we have. Thank you very much. Thank you. So you think the three words should remain in the text? Is that right?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Chair. I think we support the idea by Brazil and Portugal, that we want more than just information, we want actual engagement and contribution. So I'm going to suggest, and I don't know if that would be okay or not for colleagues, that by informing and supporting GAC members in contributing and engaging in WSIS+20.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Germany, would that be acceptable to you?

RUDY NOLDE

Give me a second. It's still being edited.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

In the meantime, can I say something? It's a little bit confusing. Look, it says the GAC acknowledged that based on a survey, blah blah, blah blah, the IG Group provides added value by informing

and supporting GAC members in engaging and contributing, and so on and so forth. A little bit confusing. We need to do some wordsmithing here. But again, Germany, back to you.

RUDY NOLDE

Maybe we need a little more time to discuss this off session. I was happy with Switzerland's proposal, actually. Maybe we need more time.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Germany. I have Netherlands and Australia.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I'm happy to consent with my German colleague, that we might need a bit more time to contemplate this text. I agree with your observation, the [inaudible] also screams that less is more, and we keep adding, notwithstanding. That I think it should be in engaging with and contributing to the WSIS+20 process. But overall, I'm getting quite uncomfortable with all these additions as whether or not it still fits the remit of the ICANN Government Advisory Committee. I appreciate all the work that's being done in the IG Group, but I think we're slightly getting out of scope here. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Nico. I think I'd concur with my Dutch colleague. I think it's important that the GAC be clear on its remit. I will be at the table negotiating for Australia through the WSIS process, but I will not leave wearing my GAC hat in that role. And I think it's important we remain clear about the role and the remit of the GAC. I mean, I very much support Ana's comments and the general gist of this working group. I think it's vital that we support others through this process. I think it's vital that we raise awareness, help others engage through this broader work. But, unfortunately, my GAC hat must come off when I engage in formal WSIS engagement because it blurs the lines, and I'm a little uncomfortable blurring those spaces together. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Portugal?

ANA NEVES

Thank you. I'm going to speak in Portuguese. I think that this discussion is very important so that we can see if it makes any sense for us to continue with this. Maybe it doesn't make sense to continue. Maybe this webinar was an interesting one, and that's it. Because I feel that if we start worrying so much about whether there's a commitment here or not, it's not really a commitment. We don't have a position to take here. What I meant to say here previously is that GAC and the representatives of GAC in their respective countries, what they do is they work within the scope

being here, representing their countries in a multistakeholder model. So there's negotiations with WSIS+20.

But in wearing my GAC hat, that's part of the system. And by forming part of the system, it's good. Those of us that don't like the WSIS+20, we'd have to discuss it at a global level. So the issue is not whether GAC members are going to talk about their positions with regards to WSIS+20. Instead, we're engaged in the model which is going to be in the WSIS+20 discussions. But if there's no need for informing, well, we have ICANN Org that does their job very well. We don't need the Internet governance within the GAC. Therefore, there's no need for this because the group that's within ICANN Org does the work, and that's enough. So we don't have to take so much more time on this topic. I don't think it's worth it, because with regards to informing, that's why we have ICANN Org for that. Thank you very much.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Housekeeping detail, we're absolutely out of time. We could potentially go on for maybe 10 more minutes in order to try to finish this paragraph, which, as a matter of fact, is the only thing that prevents us from finishing today and having the two time slots tomorrow at 1:15 and 3:00 p.m. for our golf commitments, so to say. So, it's up to you to decide. Should we go on for 10 more minutes or, I don't know, maybe 15, in order to try to finish today, or we just park this conversation and come back tomorrow and continue with this at 1:15 right after lunch? What should we do? Option A or Option B?

Who votes for Option A? Oops. And the rest would like to come back tomorrow and discuss it. Raise your hands, please, if you like Option B. Option B, coming back tomorrow. Coming back tomorrow? So this is democracy. We stay for 10 or 15 more minutes, with my apologies to the interpreters. I have Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING

In that case, I'll be brief. I think we should remind ourselves that we are drafting the communiqué here, and we've slipped into a discussion regarding the purpose and remit of the IG Group. So I think we should be back to actually factually reflecting what the group did. And I think that that's the best way forward here.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Portugal, is that an old hand? Brazil, please go ahead.

ANA NEVES

Thank you, Chair. I'm going to speak in Portuguese. What is this role of this governance group within GAC? Well, is it provide information and incentivize the GAC members so that they can stay committed to the provision of the WSIS? I think this is a message we want to give, and maybe we can simplify it in this manner. So we could say informing and contribute to the GAC members and incentivize them so that the GAC members can participate in our WSIS+20 discussions.

So that would be the role. It's not just providing the information, as Portugal mentioned, because information can be sought out anywhere. It's incentivizing the countries so that they know that they have a place to be able to participate in the discussions regarding WSIS+20. So I think maybe this is a way of simplifying the phrase or the linguistic part of the phrase.

NIGEL HICKSON

I've hesitated to speak on this. I mean, I can see the points of many distinguished delegates. I mean, certainly we don't want to say that the discussion we had contributed directly to the national position because the national position is made up of lots and lots of different components. But what we hope the discussion, I suppose, does is to help inform and sort of educate and whatever on what is going on, so that the GAC member can in time talk to his colleagues, and that might be one of the contributions. And I noticed that our good friend, Manal, has put a further text in the chat, which perhaps might solve our issues. Just to be clear, of course, we are talking about a result from the survey here. We're not making things up.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, UK. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. I think Nigel is right, that Manal is right, and it's a good compromise. I think we should go with our former GAC chair. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Mozambique?

LOURINO CHEMANE

Thank you. I'll speak in Portuguese. The comment I like to make is the following. It's just a small change, the change of the word. So with regards to what Portugal and Switzerland said, where it says engaging GAC members' contribution and the population of national decision, I think that's the contribution that it does. It has to do with the commitment on behalf of the members of the countries that are here present. These are the contributions of the national positions within the GAC. That's my interpretation.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Action happening in the chat room. Unfortunately, I'm very bad at multitasking. I can't read what's going on there. But as far as I understand, the highlighted text was proposed by Egypt, is that correct? So let me read it, because we seem to have agreement there, and see if we can move forward from that point on. The GAC acknowledged that, based on a service circulated among its members, the IG Group provides added value through information sharing and facilitating engagement among GAC members for further informed participation and contribution to WSIS+20. Would that be okay with everyone? And I see nodding and more nodding. Germany, would you be okay with that? And more nodding. Anybody against? Let's keep it simple. I don't see any hand up. I don't see any hand online. Sorry, U.S., go ahead, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair, we would request some time to be able to consult internally. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Okay. You mean right now or until tomorrow? Because otherwise we will need to go back tomorrow at 1:15 and the whole—

SUSAN CHALMERS Yes, until tomorrow. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Thank you, U.S. Okay. So then we'll defer the final reading, Nigel, for tomorrow, 1:15. Sorry for going over time. Fabien, any?

So again, for the sake of clarity, we're going to close editing, right? We're going to close access to the Google Docs at this point. As everybody knows, we've been saying this for the last two months, at least, for the sake of clarity, right? We'll keep the text as it is, and we'll come back tomorrow then for the, hopefully, final Communiqué Drafting Session at 1:15 p.m. So in the morning, we'll have the Geopolitical Forum, and right after that, the ICANN Public Forum. We'll reconvene here at 1:15.

Thank you very much. Enjoy your evening. The session is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]