
ICANN83 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (1 of 6)
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

JULIA CHARVEOLEN

Welcome to the first ICANN83 GAC Communique Drafting Session on Wednesday, 11 June at 11.45 UTC. 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. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak, in case you would like to speak 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. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Thank you, and over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. We're about to start. As you can see, this is not one of the most popular sessions either for the rest of the community, and rightly so, because this is a business that naturally pertains to the GAC. So this session is going to be running for 75 minutes, that is till 3 p.m., provided we have all the text we need for all the different sections of the communique.

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.

And then potentially we'll have a comment. And I say, potentially, because it depends on how we do during these 75 minutes, then we'll have a coffee break for another 30 minutes, and then a final session, a final for the day, I mean, 90 minute session. And then again tomorrow, as you can see, I don't know you, you all have access to the to the blog schedule, right?

We'll have three more communiqué drafting sessions tomorrow. If need be, of course. So with that, let me give the floor to Fabien. He's going to walk us through the different sections of the communicate, as we traditionally do. And we'll identify the right places where input from the GAC is needed. Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support team. Let's scroll down the text and see what we currently have. So, in the introduction, as we had mentioned, we have proposed text regarding the passing of Nigel Hickson. So we will get to read that eventually. The second section, this is the report of the engagement of the GAC with other community groups.

We filled that in. If we scroll down and we go to Section three, Internal matters. We have inserted text regarding the next cycle of GAC elections. We're waiting for the PSWG report, which I understand is being drafted at the moment. You see here, in the Operational Matters section, text regarding the voting that

occurred, regarding the terms of the GAC chair and vice chairs, and the GAC strategic planning.

We've reflected the discussion of the GAC on this matter. And then we also have capacity development description here. In the next section, Issues of importance, we are aware that there is an intention from the registration data topic leads to provide text on RDRS, urgent requests, and accuracy of registration data. Let's just maybe stop here and see if we can get a confirmation and a sense of how far we are from receiving texts.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Fabien. And let me specifically ask the topic leads and caretakers as regarding registration data. And the topic leads are the European Commission, the U.S., and Canada. At this point, do we have any? No. We don't have any texts yet. Any agreed? Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER

Hi, Owen Fletcher, United States. We've got draft texts that we're working on sharing. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you. Thank you, U.S. Thank you, European Commission. And the same question would go to the topic leads and caretakers of the second topic under issues of importance, that topic being DNS abuse. And the topic leads are, again, the

European Commission, Japan, and the U.S. Do we have any input in that regard yet? Or I assume you would be working on it.

Is that the case, European Commission? Okay, thank you. Can you scroll down a little bit? And again, I would assume that is the same case as regarding the text for topic number three under Issues of importance, which is next round of new gTLDs.

And the topic leads and caretakers are Canada, China, the UPU, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Netherlands, and the CTU. Japan, can you give us... sorry, sorry, sorry, Japan is not part of the-- I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Netherlands, can you give us any input in this regard?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sure, Mr. Chairman. It's Marco Hogewoning speaking for the Netherlands as one of the co-contributors to this text. As you can see, there is already some draft text. We're happy to consult the community and review these parts. There are still some things missing. Fabien, if you scroll through, you see 3A, B, C, GAG Readiness, that's still being worked on. We expect some text in the next session, but as far as 3A and 3B, I'm happy to take a look at that, either in this session or later on.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. So can you scroll down? Can you scroll down? Exactly. And then Section 5 is GATT consensus advice to ICANN Board, and there's already some text being prepared as regarding policy development with rationale as well,

and potentially a second topic. I don't know what that topic is yet, but we'll see. Fabien, please go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I was going to suggest that it's probably a good time to get a feel for whether there is consideration of additional advice in addition to policy development.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, that on the one hand, but on the other hand, I have two requests for the floor, I have Switzerland and then Netherlands. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. For the record, just to note that I think I heard you mentioned that topic leads for new gTLDs were Canada, China, UPU, etc. CH stands for Confederatio Helvetica, which is Switzerland. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Oh, thank you so much for that. A good point. Thank you very much for that. So, thank you, Switzerland. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Netherlands. I was actually going back to the question Fabien just asked and advised you on the issues of importance, seeing the lively discussion earlier on the

ASO, I'm proposing to put something in which regard to the RIR Governance text on the issues of importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Netherlands. Basically, the ask is to add some mention to the RIR under issues of importance. Is that correct? Okay. Thank you. Well noted. And I see another hand from Switzerland. That's an old hand. Okay. Thank you for that. So can you scroll down a little bit? And I already talked about this GAC potential consensus advice. What I'm saying is that the text is still being drafted. So we don't have any concrete proposal yet.

So can you please keep scrolling down? Then we have follow up on previous advice. And again, we're waiting for the inputs here. And then a reference to the next meeting, and given the fact that we have, roughly speaking, what time is it now? Yeah, it's five to two. My recommendation, and let's see if we have agreement here, but I would recommend at this point to give time to our distinguished GAC representatives drafting the texts to grab some good cappuccino or ristretto, or any kind of coffee you want, and give them a good 45 minutes for the drafting of the text, and then we'll reconvene, let's say, at 2:45.

Any suggestion? Okay, so this is good news for you, well, depending on how you look at it, but basically, I can give you time till 3:30, that is including the coffee break, and thus the reference to the different kinds of coffee you might like. So, in other words, my suggestion is to reconvene at 3.30 p.m. in order to give time for

the wordsmithing and drafting and everything else. Excuse me? No, no, we do have text, and we can read the whole thing right now if necessary. But again, I would like to get the temperature in the room more or less.

Would it be okay if we read the parts for which we already have text, and then we pause to give time to do the drafting? And I see nodding in the room. Okay, so we'll start reading then. This is issues of importance, section four, right? Section four, topic three, which is issues of importance, topic four, and under issues of importance, next round of new gTLDs, and we already have text there. And for the reading, I will have the kind help of my colleague from the Netherlands. Would you like to go ahead, please, Marco?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, yes, as you can see, the co-authors, and again, this is Canada, the Swiss government, UPU, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, and the Netherlands, and the CTU, who worked on this together. We have a tiny bit of text regarding the Implementation Review Team, noting the important work undertaken by the Implementation Review Team and the submission of the complete draft of the applicant guidebook for public comment.

GAC recommends GAC members recognize the efforts of the IRT in the delivery of its milestones in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, and thank the GAC representative for their participation. So it's really just recognizing the IRT's effort here and

the fact that the AGB info is now published for public consultation. We're, as co-authors, happy to hear if you all, as GAC members, agree to this text, or if any further input.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. And by the way, in terms of procedure, we'll go ahead with the green highlighting for the sake of efficiency and timing, will be green highlighting the text already agreed in order to move on and be more efficient. And I have the CTU, please go ahead.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimire from CTU. In the last line of that paragraph, and thank GAC representatives for their participation in this critical book. Is it the whole GAC or is it the GAC's IRT representatives? I'm not quite clear on what the intention is.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I think this was indeed meant to be the GAC IRT representatives, but I'm very much scanning the room for my co-authors. Canada, you want to come in on this?

RIDA TAHIR

Sure. Thank you so much. I'm okay with putting it as the GAC's IRT representative, as I believe that was the intention of the panel at the time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, CTU, thank you, Canada. Are we okay with the text as it is right now? And I see thumbs up. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you chair. Would you be able to clarify the procedural proposal, which is that are we reading, reviewing, and agreeing to text right now?

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yeah, for the parts for which we already have text like this.

SUSAN CHALMERS With respect, if we could request the ability to spend time to review the text more fully before agreeing to it just immediately and on the spot, that could provide us sufficient time to consult with capital if needed. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Absolutely, yes. That's why I started the reading part noting that we could perfectly allocate time till 3:30. Would that be enough, by the way, depending on the time zones and depending on many things? But for this part of the text that was already provided, would you need to go back to your capital and consult, and 3.30 would be okay?

-
- SUSAN CHALMERS Chair, we would just appreciate the opportunity to review the text in full after drafting today and then revert. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, USA. And the answer is yes, unless anybody in the room tells me otherwise. I don't see a problem with that. Sorry, sorry. I have Switzerland and then European Commission.
- JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Nico. And that's just on this portion. We have a sentence that starts with GAC members recognized, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And so, in the end, the sentence would read like GAC members thanked the GAC's IRT representatives. So it's kind of some GAC members thank some other GAC members. It's a bit strange to me. I think nobody disagrees with that, but I stand to be corrected. So I would start the sentence with the GAC, which is the normal language we use when we refer to the GAC as a body.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much. European Commission.
- GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. First of all, that was not intentional, but fully support for what the colleague from Switzerland just said. We should try to refer to the GAC to the extent possible, as we have done previously.

And secondly, in terms of procedural proposals, we have a lot of work to do, that's clear still for the text. But also the colleagues have posted text, can we review it and have round of comments now, which doesn't mean the text is closed and more comments can come?

Because the colleagues, I think they made an effort to timely provide the text. But otherwise, if people want to take a suspension, it's going to be okay. Nico, perhaps we can ask the topic leads what they want to do because they posted the text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No, that was precisely my point, and that's why I suggested to allocate enough time for the topic leads to finish drafting their texts and reconvene at 3:30 in order to give enough time, on the one hand, to the topic leads and caretakers to finish, and on the other hand, to provide other GAC delegations to read the text that's already on the screen, that was already provided, as the U.S. suggested. I don't have a problem, either way, but again, it's up to you. And I have Jamaica next.

WAHKEEN MAUREEN

Wahkeen Maureen, Jamaica, for the record. I agree with your chair that we may need some time to digest the information that is there. I think the editing might go a little bit more smoothly if we lock some time to just read. And with that said, I had a comment on the Implementation Review Team's work, but I am prepared to step

back from mentioning anything if others in the room are agreed that we lock some time for a review.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Jamaica. Any other, any better idea, I would say? Any better way forward? Anybody? If not... oh sorry, Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Well, having heard the comments and then giving people an opportunity to review, maybe if we can quickly present 3B right now as the text is right in front of us. And then we take you up on your idea and close this session so everybody can have a read, can suggest more text, and we'll come back after the coffee break and see if we have other texts to review. Maybe that's the way forward here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

That sounds very reasonable to me. And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? No? Okay. So let's go that way. Australia, can you please help me with the reading? 3B, Applicant Support Program. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

Applicant Support Program. The GAC recalled the agreed compromise between the GAC and the Board, which resulted from the GAC Board bylaws consultation on the ICANN80 GAC advice, including the Board's agreement to conduct a review at the

halfway mark of successful Applicant Support Program, ASP, applications. Currently, there are approximately five months left in the window period for acceptance of ASP applications.

The GAC recalled the Board's agreement to direct ICANN Org to share results of geographic distribution with the IRT after 20 qualified ASP applicants to determine adjustments to communications, outreach and engagement, to target applications from underserved regions, including developing countries, and to determine if additional funding may be needed if the number of approved applications exceed the budgeted amount of 40 to 50.

The GAC noted the current statistics presented by ICANN Org on the status of ASP applications in process, and in particular, the very small number of completed applications submitted at this latter stage of the application window. GAC members expressed concern that, with the current trajectory, there may be no opportunity to conduct a review or determine any adjustments to the current communications, outreach and engagement plan before the ASP application deadline.

This review should also clearly identify the obstacles preventing applications from moving forward more rapidly and recommend the implementation of appropriate mitigation activities. Additionally, the review will also likely have the benefit of identifying draft applications that may not be completed before the deadline.

The GAC is therefore of the view that such a review should be conducted now, rather than later, in order to determine any project implementation course corrections, including communications, outreach and engagement adjustments necessary to maximize the number of ASP applications completed and submitted for evaluation before the deadline.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. And unless any distinguished GAC member tells us otherwise, let's stop here in order to give a good one hour, 20 minutes for further review, not only of this text, but as we mentioned before, give enough time to topic leads and caretakers to be able to finish their work. Do we have agreement here?

Anybody against? Is that a good way forward? And I see nodding, and I see thumbs up. Okay, nobody against. Perfect. So let's do just that. Let's stop here, and we'll reconvene right after the coffee break at 3:30 sharp. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So I think the GAC leadership had discussed setting a deadline for the proposal of initial text, and I wonder if this would be a good time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. This is a good time to talk about that. So, again, for the sake of clarity, order, and fairness, I would say, I will set the deadline to provide any additional text as tomorrow, 9 a.m. In the morning, in order to be able to cope with the workload because, remember, tomorrow is our last day.

So in order to make sure that the three or four sessions, depending on what kind of progress we make. So what I'm saying is that 9 a.m. tomorrow will be the deadline to provide any additional text in order to have enough time to review it, to do any kind of wordsmithing and so on, and so forth. Would that be okay?

Because I don't want to sound like a dictator or anything, I'm just trying to find some logical way forward, in terms of the time available, on the one hand, and in terms of any kind of logical review that we might need or not. Hopefully not, but you never know, right? Experience tells me that whenever you think that anything is ready, it's actually not that true. And I see a hand from the CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Just to support what you said, because tomorrow is the last day, and really, one would expect some discussion of the points and text reviews and so on. So even nine o'clock tomorrow is quite generous.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, I'm just trying to be realistic here. And on the other hand, the other important thing is to avoid having like a big chunk of text coming up like out of the blue. With all due respect to my distinguished GAC colleagues, but that's something that cannot happen, mainly because it was not discussed before. So, I can't have a GAC representative from Antarctica coming with three pages of, I don't know, advice on the DNSSEC implementation when it was never discussed.

I'm exaggerating, of course, but just to clarify the point. So, once again, anybody against the idea? I mean, having a break now, stop and reconvening at 3:30 p.m. Is that okay? And again, I see nodding. Perfect. So we'll do just that. Thank you so much. Grab some good coffee and let's give the topic leads and the caretakers some extra time. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]