
ICANN83 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 6)
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the second ICANN 83 GAC communique drafting session on Wednesday, 11 June at 13:30 PM 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. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. And please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Nico, please.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. And thank you to the topic leads and to the caretakers for taking the time, the extra time, the extra coffee and the extra patience to do the wordsmithing and the drafting of the remaining parts of the GAC communique. It is my understanding that we already have most parts of the text needed. And for that, on the one hand, we're gonna start with reading the different parts of the communique. And for that, I will have the help of the vice-chairs. And given the fact that we don't have one of our distinguished vice-chairs, you know, Thiago Dal-Toe from Colombia, Zeina, a former GAC vice-chair, is gonna help us with the

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.

reading as well, apart from Christine Arida from Egypt, you know, Australia, Netherlands, and Switzerland. So with that, let's have a general review of the different parts. We'll start from the beginning. So this is how the text will read.

Prague, Czech Republic, 16 June, 2025. GAC communique, Prague, Czech Republic. The Prague communique was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the ICANN 83 Policy Forum with some GAC participants in Prague, Czech Republic, 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 you have the link right there. The communique 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, and obviously this is in the future, I mean, in the past tense, because we're assuming this has already been sent. Okay, so that's kind of like the preamble. Let's scroll down to the introduction. So this is section one, the introduction. I'll read the first part, and then I'll have, again, as I said before, the help of my distinguished vice chairs for the rest of the reading. One, introduction. The Governmental Advisory Committee of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, met in Prague, Czech Republic in a hybrid setting, including remote participation from 9 to 12 June 2025. Ex-GAC members and ex-observers attended the meeting. The GAC meeting was conducted

as part of the ICANN 83 Policy Forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings. The Governmental Advisory Committee mourns the loss of Nigel Hickson, an outstanding champion of a free, open, and secure internet, and an ardent contributor to the multi-stakeholder governance of the internet. Nigel was highly esteemed in the ICANN community and the wider internet governance ecosystem, beloved among his GAC colleagues and his counterparts in many governments and international fora, to whom he was an influential expert, a thoughtful leader, a deeply caring mentor, and a dear friend. Nigel Hickson will be remembered as a remarkable and genuine man, a role model whose intelligence, dedication, humility, kindness, and humor have left an indelible mark on the GAC and ICANN in the service of the global public interest. So I'll stop here in order to see if there are comments, questions, or suggestions regarding this text about our dear friend, Nigel Hickson. Seeing none, you know, okay, we'll move on to the next part, with my apologies for yesterday's, you know, sudden burst of sadness on my, on my behalf. So with that, let's go to the next session, and for this part, I will require help from my distinguished vice chair from Australia. Ian, over to you.

IAN SHELDON

Inter-constituency activities and community engagement. Meeting with the ICANN board. The GAC met with the ICANN board and discussed ICANN policy development, accuracy of registration data, privacy and proxy services accreditation, community

statements of interest, deferral of the accountability and transparency review, and the implementation of the new ICANN advisory committee, the ATRT4. Next, meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC. The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed Applicant Support Program, ASP, and equity in the next round of new gTLDs, and the implementation of the new gTLDs. Next heading, meeting with the Generic Name Supporting Organization, GNSO. The GAC met with members of the GNSO council and discussed accuracy of registration data, DNS abuse mitigation, registration data request service, RDRS, urgent requests for disclosure of registration data and law enforcement requesters authentication. Next heading, meeting with the Address Supporting Organization, ASO. The GAC met with members of the ASO and discussed recap of ICP2 public comments received, feedback and participation from regional engagements, next steps and expected timeline to finalize the new governance document. Next heading, meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, SSAC. The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed access to registration data, free and open source software, DNS blocking. And let's scroll down a little. And final heading, cross-community discussions. GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN 83, including regarding the WSIS plus 20 review and ongoing discussion of the ICANN public meetings strategy, how we meet discussion group.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, Australia. Just one thing I would like to mention, are we gonna stick to ICP2 or, I don't know, are we gonna add any kind of extra info in parentheses or brackets or whatever as, Marco, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

As I was reading it, I put in a comment, I will check what it was actually called in the public comment and make sure the text aligns with that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you very much, Netherlands. That totally makes sense. Any other comment or question? And by the way, we're gonna be highlighting in green, you know, the text already agreed, for the sake of time on the one hand and efficiency on the other. We were thinking to do that on the substantive parts of the text, but if you want us to do that. We're going to go to section 3 because I don't see any hand up and I stand to be corrected, but nobody had any kind of issue with that except for the ICP2 Internet Coordination Policy which basically, you know, is the RIR governance, the way IP addresses are allocated, you know, around the world. Okay. So, and for this part, for internal matters, which is section 3 of the GAC communique, Netherlands, would you please go ahead?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sure, Mr. Chairman. So part 3 covering the internal matters of the GAC, heading number 1, GAC membership, and there are currently,

as was presented, 184 GAC members and territories and 39 observer organizations. Heading 2, the GAC elections, the 2025 election process for GAC vice-chairs will be initiated shortly after the ICANN 83 meeting. The initial nomination period will close on 10 September 2025. If needed, a balloting process will be conducted from the 3rd of October until the 27th of October in 2025, which is during the ICANN 84 public meeting, after which time the election results will be announced. And then moving on to number 3, which is a number of reports from the GAC working groups, the GAC public safety working group, 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 ICANN 83, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest. The PSWG contributed to the GAC discussions on DNS abuse mitigation and on WHOIS and registration data issues, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work. Key takeaways involving the PSWG workstream included potential topics for narrowly scoped policy development processes, PDPs, to address DNS abuse, law enforcement authentication, the next steps regarding the registration data request services, RDRS, and continued progress on work related to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. The PSWG appreciated the various presentations on anti-abuse practices from local country code top-level domain, ccTLDs, and of inter-isle and NetBeacon concerning phishing campaigns and bulk-registered domains, which provided valuable input for progressing the work on addressing DNS abuse,

and particularly those ideas highlighting opportunity for a more proactive stance on mitigating DNS abuse harms before they occur. Let me pause here briefly, and if you can scroll up, Fabien or Julia, whoever has it. Moving on to the GAC operational matters as heading number four, pursuant to GAC operating principle 53, GAC members finalized revisions to the GAC operating principles regarding the timing of annual committee leadership elections and the terms of the GAC chair and GAC vice chairs. GAC members in attendance agreed to revise GAC operating principle 31 to adjust the committee's annual election cycle to conclude during the second meeting of the calendar year. This revision will enable leadership transitions to take place at the end of the ICANN annual general meeting, when the ICANN board and other ICANN communities also begin their leadership terms. GAC members in attendance also agreed to revise GAC operating principle 21 to adjust the term of the GAC chair to three consecutive terms of two years, and the terms of the GAC vice chairs to two consecutive terms of two years. GAC support staff explained the transitional impacts of the revisions over the next couple of years, as the current chair and vice chair terms end. Staff reported that the nomination period for the 2025 GAC vice chair election will commence at the end of the ICANN 83 GAC public meeting.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much Netherlands. Can you scroll down a little bit? So, any comment or questions so far? I have not a problem, no hard feelings, but the last paragraph, you know, I don't see the need to

specify who explained the transitional impacts of the revisions and so on and so forth, but I'm okay with the way it is. But I would just say, I don't know, something like, you know, transitional impacts were explained using the passive voice or something like that, you know, but again, I don't have any kind of hard feelings in that regard. So, if it's okay as it is with everybody, we'll just, oh sorry, there's a hand up from Jamaica. Please go ahead.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Thank you, Chair. Joaquin Murray from Jamaica, for the record. At topic three, GAC working groups, where it says PSWG, is it the PSWG's appreciation that we are expressing, or the GAC's appreciation? Because my recollection is those presentations were made within a context of a GAC meeting. Just a question.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Well, I would say it's the GAC in general, unless anybody in the room, which was not the case, right, expressed any kind of concern with that or disagreement, which I didn't identify. But again, I stand to be corrected. If that is the case, we can change it. Any, USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. The GAC topic co-leads on DNS abuse are finalizing our proposed text for issues of importance, as well as some advice text. We do address the presentation in our text, so it

may be useful to just flag this and come back to it once that other text is there, so we can reduce it if it's redundant. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, USA, and thank you, Jamaica, for noting that.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, to address Jamaica's comments, I personally always read this part of the communique as actually it's the public safety working group reporting, so then my take would be that it's indeed the PSWG appreciated, and as our US colleague just said, this will come back further on in issues of importance where it will reflect the GAC's full opinion. My suggestion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. That also makes sense. Anybody against? I mean, but again, why don't we just park it here, and as, you know, the USA recommended, we can come back after, you know, they provide the, you know, the full text and the other components, if okay with everyone. Any hard feelings? Anybody against? And I don't see any hand. All right. So, let's move on, then, to, I think it was, ah, five, yeah, for the strategic planning, and for that, I will kindly require the help of our distinguished former vice chair, Zeina, would you help us with the reading, please?

ZEINA BOU HARB

Sure. So, GAC strategic planning. The GAC leadership reported on the GAC's strategic leadership reported on its ongoing work with GAC topic leads to develop the next GAC annual plan 2025-2026, and reviewed expected updates to some of the GAC's strategic objectives and various expected outcomes. A draft of the next GAC annual plan is expected to be shared after ICANN 83 for members' consideration and input, with a view to endorse the plan during ICANN 84.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Lebanon. Comments, questions? Okay, seeing none, Egypt. Christine, could you please help us with the next?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, sure. Number six, capacity development. This is the first of a series of sessions. The 1983 GAC capacity development session focused on the new gTLD program, next round, applicant guidebook and particularly on matters of GAC interest related to the applicant journey, community input, objections and appeals, contention resolution and application evaluation. The very engaging and well attended session was organized by the ICANN Organization. The ICANN Organization will be participating on the next round of new gTLDs. The GAC thanks the ICANN next round team for facilitating the capacity development session. The GAC leadership and underserved regions working group, USRWG, co-

chairs will assess the results from the post session survey and will work with the USRWG to continue the discussion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Thank you so much. There it is. Comments? Edits? Are we okay with the text as it is? Okay. Yeah, Egypt. Go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

So I'm wondering if you would like to reflect in that section on how you would like to see the text in the next round of development or that's not a place for it. Maybe in the second paragraph or?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. That's a good point. Could you provide some text in that regard? Two or three lines? I don't know. Something. But not necessarily now. You know, you can provide it later on and then we come back to this in order to have some sort of agreement on the drafting. Thank you so much, Egypt. Very good catch. Any other comment? Okay. Seeing none. Let's move on. And we can come back after Egypt provides the text. We can come back to this section. So section four is issues of importance. Do we have text on this section from the topic leads yet? And the topic leads are Canada, the European Commission, and the U.S. Yeah. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER

Hi. Owen Fletcher. I'm very close to having it ready.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So then I suggest we move on and then we come back to this section. So we already have text for topic number three under issues of importance. Okay. Thank you so much for that. So I'll read the part that belongs to the IRT, implementation review team. That's topic number three under section four, which is issues of importance. The GAC noted the submission by the implementation review team, IRT, of the complete draft of the applicant guidebook for public comment. The GAC recognized the tremendous efforts of the IRT in the delivery of this milestone in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs and thanked the GAC's IRT representatives for their participation in this critical work. And I'll stop there. There's section B there, but that belongs to, that corresponds to applicant support program. Now, if you can go up a little bit, please. I kind of have an issue with, you know, adding adjectives there. Tremendous efforts. Again, I'm not super sensitive. No hard feelings in that regard. And, you know, I'm all in for recognizing the efforts. But if we start adding, you know, these kind of adjectives, I don't know, we might have some issues in the future, right? But, again, no hard feelings. I can leave with it. Any suggestion? I mean, I'm okay. We can move on, but if anybody has a better idea, more than happy to hear. No? All right. So then tremendous efforts will stay. No problem. So part B, please, if you can scroll down a little

bit. Applicant support program. And for that, I will kindly ask Australia to help me with the reading. Ian, over to you.

IAN SHELDON

The GAC recalled the agreed compromise between the GAC and the board, which resulted from the GAC board bylaws consultation on the ICANN 80 GAC advice, including the board's agreement to conduct a review at the halfway mark of successful applicant support program, and the board's agreement to review the GAC's recommendations on ASP applications. The GAC recalled the board's agreement to direct ICANN or to share results of geographic distribution of ASP applications with the IRT after 20 qualified ASP applicants to determine any need for adjustment to communications, outreach, and engagement to target applications from underserved regions, including developing countries, and the number of approved applications exceeds the budget amount of 40 to 45. 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, given that there are only about five months left in the 12-month ASP application window. The GAC expressed concern that with the current pace of applications, 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 could identify the obstacles preventing applications from moving forward more rapidly and recommend appropriate mitigation

activities and draft applications that may not be completed before the deadline. The GAC is therefore of the view that such a review should now be conducted immediately, rather than after 20 qualified applications, in order to provide sufficient time for 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. Is there any more? No.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much for that, Australia. The floor is open for comments, questions, or any edits. And I see a hand from India. Please go ahead, India.

PRADEEP VERMA

Yeah, this is Pradeep from India. So I have put some text in the comment box. So it can be added after the text [inaudible].

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, India. So let me read. I'm not going to read the whole thing again, right? So I'll start right there. After 40-45, after a full stop there. So it would read, The GAC recalls that the ICANN Org has expressed its willingness to share country-wise statistics of all applications in draft and initiated stage to the GAC representatives of that country. GAC notes that this data be shared with the GAC representatives with the consent of the applicant so that necessary

assistance and support can be provided to the concerned applicant. And I'll stop there in order to see if we have any feedback. I have India again, and then Switzerland. Sorry. That's another hand? Okay. I have Switzerland, and then the Netherlands, and then Canada. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cance, Switzerland, for the record. It's more of a question so that we are as precise as possible. In the first sentence under B, we say that the GAC recalled the agreed compromise, blah, blah, blah. Is there any way, shape, or form to pinpoint to a place where we have memorialized that compromise? Do we have any text where we put that on paper? This slips my memory, but I'm afraid that maybe the Board has a different recollection or whatever, so we should avoid that kind of back and forth. If there's a place where we memorialized such an agreement. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Thank you very much, Jorge. Just to clarify that, yes, you're right, we do have that. We have the actual board GAC consultation that took place, so we could insert maybe a footnote to that. And then there was a letter that was submitted by the board confirming their understanding, and then even more clear, a letter from the GAC saying what you agreed, what you understand from the

compromise. So anyway, there was three different things that can be referenced here to make it clear.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So you suggest, if I understand correctly, you suggest a footnote or a link, or what kind of reference would be okay with you?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Maybe if there's an exchange of letters, which sounds very diplomatic, we could include a footnote referencing that exchange of letters with the links and everything, so we avoid any confusion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. We'll do just that. That was another good catch. That's a good thing about having intelligent GAC reps in the room, of course. That's always helpful, and that is the case today with the 90-plus GAC representatives. So thank you so much for that. I have Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually have three comments to make, if you allow me. The first one is very quick. To the purple text in front of us that India just inserted, I think, to share country-wide statistics. I assume that's typo. Back to the discussion on the first, yeah, I think it's share country-wide instead of country-wise statistics. To the discussion on the first sentence, I appreciate and

I think and assume it's technically entirely correct, but I think from an outsider, which resulted from the GAC board bylaws consultation on the ICANN 80 advice. I think you have to be really into the process to understand what we're saying here. I think, to me, this more reads like, oh, we had a consultation with the board on the bylaws. So my suggestion would be to simplify this and refer to the exchange between the board and the GAC following the ICANN 80 GAC advice or something similar like this. But I think this is a bit too technical for my liking. I'll leave it here. We can probably take this back and fiddle with it in a break. Third comment, and that's sort of where I would like to express my reservations because I have a slightly different recollection is the part where in the purple text it says, the GAC recalls that the ICANN Org has expressed its willingness. My recollection of that session, I think they were less explicit, but so I'd like to revisit some of the transcripts to see what was really said before we recall things that weren't said. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, I have Canada and India next, but I think, well, I'm not sure, but I think they, or some GAC member, expressly asked information about country-wide statistics, but I don't know. I'm not 100% sure, and so. Did they ask or did ICANN say yes to it? No, no, somebody asked, but again, we can check the records and everything. India, is it about this?

PRADEEP VERMA

If I can come before Canada, I just want to clarify, maybe if we can make a change here a bit to share the statistics of the applications with the concerned GAC representative. That is the intent, not that. So maybe, can we make a change in the text? Is it possible? To share? Yeah, to share, we delete the country-wide, to share the statistics, delete the country-wide, yeah, to share the statistics of the applications, the statistics of the applications, in draft and initial stages to the concerned GAC, yeah, it's fine, it's fine, it's okay, that's it. The intent is that at least that government be informed, and that be informed with the express consent of the applicant, so that the government can help or facilitate them to complete the long process for the application, so that is the intent. So we do not, the intent is not to share a country-wise, you know, and informing everyone about which applications from which country, that is not the intent.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Thank you. So unless you want to provide, you know, some alternative text or something, let me read it as it is and see if we are in agreement here. So it would read, the GAC recalls that the ICANN Org has expressed its willingness to share the statistics of applications in draft and initiated stage to the GAC representatives of that country. But you mentioned something about of the concerned country or something, or is, okay, okay, of that country. GAC, it should, in this case, it should say the GAC again, because, you know, we're saying the GAC at the beginning, and then after a full stop, we say GAC notes, should be the GAC

notes, but anyways, just a style, you know, little detail. So the GAC notes that this data be shared with the GAC representatives, with the consent of the applicant, so that necessary assistance and support can be provided to the concerned applicant. Is it okay now? Okay, I have Canada, and is that an old hand, India? Okay, I have Canada next.

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you, Chair, and thanks, India, for the text. I think, just to first echo what my colleague from the Netherlands said, I don't quite recall that the expressed willingness from ICANN Org to share the statistics. I don't think it was so cut and dry as that. And then my second concern with the text is the second sentence, the GAC notes that this data be shared with the GAC representatives, with the consent of the applicant, so that necessary assistance and support can be provided to the concerned applicant. I find this a little bit unclear. Is it necessary assistance and support from the GAC representative, from the ASP, from, it's just a little bit unclear to me what that is. So I would just, I think that we could maybe discuss a little bit on the addition of this and maybe tweak it to get some of your concerns addressed, but yeah, just a little bit of reservations right now on the text. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Canada, a very good catch again. But for the sake of time, why don't we do that during the break or for tomorrow or whatever, so that we can move on, if it's okay with

India? Would that be okay? Okay, so that we can do some wordsmithing there and reach an agreement and see a good way forward. Can you scroll down a little bit, please? So I would assume that the rest of the text is agreed by everyone. If not, this is a good moment to say anything you might need to say. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. We do not have any disagreement at the moment with the text, but again, we would appreciate the ability to offer commentary tomorrow. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

That's for sure, thank you, USA. Yes, for sure. As I said before, the till nine, actually, it would be better instead of 9:00 AM in the morning, which would be before we start our session, it would be better to move it to, let's say, let me check the block schedule, but let's say 10:15 AM, or even better, 10:45 AM, which would be after the first coffee break, according to the block schedule. So that would provide more time, not only for this, but for whatever other drafting that you might be sending. So if that is okay, so I will move the deadline from 9:00 AM in the morning to 10:45 AM tomorrow. Would you be okay with that, European Commission? Please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Nico, just a small comment. It's not a big change. I would like to start by saying that I think it's a good thing that we have the ability to change, but the thing is that the sooner we get the text, the sooner we have the ability to check, consult it if needed. So, and fine if people need more time, including ourselves, we haven't posted anything, but in a way, if we have time, if we have more time to review what the colleagues post, it's better.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

May I suggest that we clarify between adding new text and reading through the text and suggesting amendments. It seems that they have two different functions and it would be helpful to understand procedurally how we are approaching that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. I think it's a good point. I think that addressing, you know, issues, you know, should be open up until the very last session, that's for sure. Very good point, yeah. So, receiving, you know, inputs for new, you know, new drafting is what I was referring to. So, I think that's a good point. So, let's move the deadline to 10:00 AM, would that be good? Or we should stick to 9:00 AM, which would be before, right, before the beginning of the session. I'm just trying to be cautious here, because, you know, somebody might have some last-minute, you know, addition that

we might need to address. So, in abundance of caution, I would say, I don't know, 10:00 AM. Can we leave with that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER We should start early and finish early, I guess.

NICOLAS CABALLERO You mean the sessions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER Start early and finish early. So, you know, I mean, it's rather than...

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. So, we stick to 9:00 AM I don't have a problem with that. So, okay, so the deadline will be 9:00 AM in the morning tomorrow, Thursday, June the 12th. So, let's stick to 9:00 AM And then we'll start the session at 10:00 AM. So, okay, so if everybody agrees, that will be it. So, thank you, everyone. So, okay, let's move on. I don't see any other hand up regarding this section of the communique. Can you scroll down, please? And for the GAC readiness part, Netherlands, can you help me with that?

MARCO HOGEWONING . Okay. So, the GAC readiness. Item 3C. GAC members highlight the importance of GAC readiness in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, notably regarding opportunity for GAC interventions after the reveal day of string applications. GAC volunteers are

encouraged to collaborate with GAC topic leads to monitor timelines and milestones related to the next round application process, including actively preparing for GAC early warnings, GAC advice, and other opportunities for input to applicants, the ICANN board, and ICANN Org. Second paragraph, some concerns were expressed within the GAC about potential increased spam and abuse in connection to the expansion of the DNS, and that limitations may be appropriate to protect the public interest. It was suggested that the GAC consider in advance of evaluating applications, how the committee should approach discussions on early warnings and other matters. Full stop.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

And I see a hand from Egypt. Please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, thank you, Nico. So we're suggesting for the second paragraph that we replace the word concerns with some opinions were expressed within the GAC about potential increased spam and abuse in connection with the expression of the DNS? And then we suggest to end the sentence here and remove that limitations may be appropriate to protect the public interest.

NICOLAS CABALLER

Thank you, Egypt. Who provided that piece of text? I think it was Switzerland, so if Switzerland is not okay with that, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nicole, and thank you, Christine. Well, actually, this second paragraph tries to reflect some of the interventions we had during the new gTLD session. And at least the intention was to have a fair reflection of that whilst being constructive. So I think we should need to reflect further on the deletion that is proposed by Egypt. Maybe it's good to get together with all the delegations concerned to see what is an agreeable text for the committee. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. So we'll stick, apparently, with the original text. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

I think it is clear, also, from our discussions on DNS abuse, that there are concerns. This is not, it's, every time you address security issues, of course, while you are widening the surface of attacks, you are widening the security risks. So I would actually say that it's not about opinions. There are concerns, in general, about expanding the surface of attack. At the same time, I would support the comment from Egypt about the fact that having generic reference to limitations, that would be appropriate. It's not clear what

limitations, how this should be considered. The fact that we later on in the text reference early warnings, and previously we have referenced GAC advice, and so on, should be sufficient, because these are the tools that, in fact, the GAC has to address the applications and the new round. So, I would say that we should not impose such limitations on the applications. So, I would, as I said, just to be clear, support having concerns in the text, but removing the last part of the first paragraph. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. But once again, I would ask, you know, the author of that part of the text, if you would be okay with the European Commission's suggestion?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. I think we are adding more people to a group to get together and discuss this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So, that means that you will be in direct touch with the European Commission in order to discuss and try to reach an agreement on this. So, let's just park it there, then, in order to move on, if you don't mind. And we can review it tomorrow morning with some, yeah, yeah, yeah. I have Denmark next. But so, would that be a good way forward, European Commission, Switzerland? Okay. All right. Denmark? Please go ahead.

FINN PETERSEN

Thank you. To this paragraph, if there's going to be draft, I support that we keep the concerns there. But agree that limitation is perhaps, according to my view, not the right word. But perhaps it should be measures, which is more broadly because there might be measures to mitigate the DNS security threats there. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. And we have Egypt next.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, thank you, Chair. So, don't mind actually getting together and discussing. But also in light of what is being said in the room, we can live with taking out opinion and keeping concerns. But we believe that the issue of discussed enough within the GAC that we can keep this part of a sentence so we are of the opinion of, we stick to removing that part of the sentence like colleagues mentioned. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, you mean the whole sentence or just the word?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

The part in brackets and that limitations may be appropriate. The second part of the...

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, I'm getting really confused here. Can you clean the text so that I can read in order to see if it makes sense? Because it's impossible, it's impossible to read as it is. So the thing is somebody is highlighting the text, somebody is, you know... So again, why don't we just part this, you know, and let the interested parties have a good discussion and come back tomorrow in order to avoid getting stuck with this specific part of the communique. Well, now it can be read, right? So it would read something like this. Some concerns were expressed within the GAC about potential increased spam and abuse in connection to the expansion of the DNS. Where should I go? It may be appropriate or... And that, okay, okay. And that may be appropriate to protect the public interest. Hmm? That may be appropriate to... Well, okay, okay, okay. And that measures, okay, and that measures may be appropriate to protect the public interest. It was suggested that the GAC consider in advance of evaluating applications how the committee should approach discussions on early warnings and other matters. Still, it's a little bit confusing to me, but again, I'm in your hands and I see a hand already from the European Commission. Please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Thank you, Nico. I think we should really try to avoid speculations and it's completely unclear what measures may be appropriate to protect the public interest beyond what we know are already the tools available to the GAC. Again, let me repeat, the early warnings, the advice, the screening of the applications. So, let's not invent new categories. I mean, the GAC does not have superpowers to take

measures to protect the public interest beyond the tools that are available to the GAC. So, it's a bit... Also, by the way, I mean, if there are issues with the public interest, measures are not maybe appropriate, very appropriate, but I would suggest that we do not go into a conversation where we are not sure what's the outcome.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission.

INDIA

We support the European Commission. Comments would be completely [inaudible] what the U.S. said. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Thank you, European Commission. And that's why I really think that, again, the interested parties should get together for some good cappuccino and unless you tell me that you agree with the text as it is right now. If that is the case, let's clean up the text, read it again, and we'll all be happy. Should we go that way?

SUSAN CHALMERS

We would support a discussion offline on this to resolve and move forward if there's further text we can address today during this session. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. I was going to suggest the very same thing. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, perfect. So, we're in agreement. Let's move on. Governance. So, for this, we're still under issues of importance, right? And this is topic number four, governance of the RIRs, that is the Regional Internet Registries. And for this, I will kindly ask my colleague from Egypt to help me with the reading. Please go ahead, Christine.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sure, Nico. Thank you. So, number four, governance of the Regional Internet Registries. The GAC appreciates the ASO for providing an overview of the feedback received on the efforts to review and revise the RIR governance document currently in place as Internet Coordination Policy 2, ICP2. Discussion covered common issues received during the public consultation period. Reflecting on the draft document that was submitted to public comment, the GAC notes that it would appreciate more background on the rationale behind a number of changes that were introduced in this document. For the upcoming version, the GAC asked for a red line version with brief rationale on feedback that was not accommodated. Additionally, a number of members asked for more information on the expected implementation and timelines to operationalize the outcomes. As an issue of

importance, the GAC remains committed to provide the ASO with the necessary feedback in intersessional work and is looking forward to a broader community discussion during the ICANN 84 meeting on the new revision of the draft RIR governance document. A useful reference in terms of multi-stakeholder process are the Sao Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines which could be considered going forward.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. And I have two hands. I have Argentina and Netherlands. Please go ahead, Argentina.

MARINA FIEGO EIRAS

Thank you, Chair. I am thinking out loud in relation with the last sentence of this paragraph. I don't think that this has been a substantive discussion. I mean, it's a suggestion which was expressed during the debate, but it is too necessary to include it in the communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Very good question, Argentina, and thank you for your observation, but it's not for me to answer, as a matter of fact. We will decide all together if it should be there or not. I don't have any kind of, you know, hard feeling or anything against or or in favor of, but maybe the country that provided that text can speak in this regard. I don't

have a problem either way. And I'm sorry, Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico, and thank you, Argentina. As this, regarding this last sentence, it's something we mentioned in the discussion, so that's why I'm proposing to reflect it here. It's not the first time we have it mentioned in the communiqué, at least we mentioned it in the Kigali communiqué when we were referring to the high-level governmental meeting, but I'm open to see whether we can find a good compromise on this. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Well, thank you for that. Argentina, is that an all-in? Okay, I have Netherlands, but Brazil, would you like to say anything in that regard before I give the floor to Netherlands? Please, go ahead.

BRAZIL

Thank you, Chair. Just to say that we support the suggestion made by the delegation, present the idea of including São Paulo must take a hold of the guidelines in the GAC communiqué. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Brazil. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Marco for the record speaking on behalf of the Netherlands. Notwithstanding further discussions on whether this is a useful addition, I'd like to get some clarifications from the authors of the last sentence, and that is towards which could be considered. I wonder, can we clarify the text to make it explicit who should do the considering here? Is this the GAC to consider the São Paulo guidelines as we look further into this process, or is this something we would like the ASO to do?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Thank you, Marco. Good catch. I guess it's, well, I guess it's directed to those running the process, so if it's the ASO or the NRO, I would draw their attention to it, but I'm flexible on the formulation. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So something like, could be considered by the constituencies or by the, without mentioning specifically, you know?

MARCO HOGEWONING

And my suggestion would be to indeed say like ASO, for the record they're speaking as one of the co-organizers of the session. It was very explicit. It was only the ASO on stage and it's the ASO who's running this process. So then I would leave it to the ASO, and it's an interesting spelling of ASO that we're now introducing. My suggestion then would be, which could be considered by the ASO going forward, and then maybe if I may, a small request, and I'm

not sure, and I'm looking at Secretariat, but given that the Sao Paolo guidelines are external to ICANN, maybe a footnote with a URL would be in place, as these are not ICANN documents.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. I have China next.

CHINA

Thank you, Chair. Actually, I was going to suggest that we add a footnote with regard to the Sao Paolo multi-stakeholder guidelines. It would be good if it is published online, the text. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, China, and thank you, Netherlands. But how would it read then? Because we will need to erase the whole sentence, because otherwise it would read a useful reference in terms of multi-stakeholder process. Are there something there which could be considered by the ASO going forward? So what should the ASO consider going forward? So it wouldn't make sense, that's my point, unless you tell me otherwise.

JORGE CANCIO

I don't know if it's a problem of the screen, but at least we can read that the reference is to the Sao Paolo multi-stakeholder guidelines. So it reads, a useful reference in terms of multi-stakeholder process

are the Sao Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines, which could be considered by the ASO going forward.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, okay, now I can see it. Thank you for that. Switzerland? Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

You know, to clarify, and I think my Chinese colleague was with me, a simple footnote here to provide a reference on where these guidelines can be found, they are not in the ICANN document repository.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you so much for that, Netherlands, now it makes sense, okay, perfect. All right. Okay, so we seem to have some sort of agreement here. Anybody against? Any other edit? Anything we need to change? Perfect, I don't see any hand online or in the room, which means we're in agreement, so let's move on. Topic number five, which is community statements of interest, SOIs, I'll read that part. The GAC acknowledges the latest public comment opportunity shared by ICANN, seeking comment on an updated version of the ICANN community participant code of conduct concerning statements of interest. The GAC appreciates the continuing progress on this matter by the board and staff and reinforces the importance of conducting the effort by the end of

this calendar year at the latest. Full stop. Comments? Questions? Edits? I have the USA, please go ahead, Owen.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you, Owen Fletcher. We could also add a line expressing support for acknowledging the board's, I think, affirmation during our bilateral meeting that the updated code would not change expected disclosure requirements for GAC members. I could read you a sentence, if you'd like.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Yes, please.

OWEN FLETCHER

Hold on. The GAC welcomes the affirmation from the board during its meeting with the GAC at ICANN 83 that the updated draft code of conduct would not expand existing disclosure requirements for GAC representatives. Open to any suggested changes, but that can get us started. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Thank you very much for that, USA. So, it should read, during its meeting with the board at ICANN 83, the GAC welcomes the affirmation from the board during its, ah, okay, no, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Sure. I suppose, sorry. Yeah.

OWEN FLETCHER	You could say welcomes the board's affirmation during its meeting, to remove a few words. Thanks.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Perfect. Okay. So, it would read, the GAC welcomes the board's affirmation during its meeting with the GAC at ICANN 83 that the updated draft code of conduct would not expand existing disclosure requirements for GAC representatives. And I see the European Commission.
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Thank you, Chair. Very briefly, just to say we think this is an important addition, and we would welcome that it's included in the text.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	And I totally agree. Netherlands?
MARCO HOGEWONING	Editorial nit picking here, but was the meeting with the GAC at ICANN 83 or during ICANN 83?
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Good catch again. Yeah. I'm okay either way, but, yeah, we can change it. Okay. So, would it work as it is for everybody? And let me read only that part again, right? So, the GAC welcomes the board's affirmation during its meeting with the GAC during ICANN 83. Well,

but we have during, during, so it sounds a little bit weird. But anyways, that the updated draft code of conduct would not expand existing disclosure requirements for GAC representatives. I see an issue there, you know, repeating during and during, but, again, I can live with it.

MARCO HOGEWONING

So, in its meeting with the GAC during ICANN 83, but I'm fine either way.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. So, that's why I mentioned I could live with at or, but anyways. So, it would read the GAC welcomes the board's affirmation in its meeting with the GAC during ICANN 83 that the updated draft code of conduct would not expand existing disclosure requirements for GAC representatives. And I'll stop there. Okay, perfect. Seeing no objections, let's move on to topic number six, deferral of the fourth ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review, ATRT 4. And for that, I will kindly ask my colleague from Australia to help me with the reading. Ian, over to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. The GAC notes the intended deferral of the ATRT 4 review process, as well as the decisions adopted by the board recently on other accountability mechanisms, as explained in the 27 May letter from the board chair to the GAC chair. In this regard,

the GAC recalls the essential character of the ATRT 4 reviews as mandated by the bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN's multi-stakeholder accountability, transparency, and governance. Accordingly, the GAC calls on the board to expedite consultations on the matter with the multi-stakeholder community with a view to finding a common ground approach for a way forward, respectful of bylaws obligations as soon as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. I see a hand from China, go ahead.

CHINA

It should be ATRT 4 in the first sentence, ATRT 4.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, China. Good catch. So the floor is still open for comments or questions.

RUSSELL WORUBA

This was a very interesting conversation with the Board and I think more for our topic lead, stress the importance of the Board being contradictory in explaining that. So I think that's covered well in that, there was allusion to a review of what accountability means in general. I'm not sure if that can be captured somewhere, but I

see it was more from the vice chair of the board that it was more a personal suggestion. Thank you, chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Papua New Guinea. Do you have any specific suggestion in this regard?

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

No, chair, it was just for the topic to just note. That's all. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you. Well noted. The floor is still open for comments or questions. Before we move on to GAC advice, we have a motion to approve the GAC consensus advice. And I see no hands. Which means that apparently we're in agreement. As per topic 6. Is that an all hand, Papua New Guinea? Okay. Thank you. Okay. So let's move on to section number 5, which is GAC consensus advice to ICANN board. And it is my understanding that as we speak, you know, the delegations are drafting text. That being the case, please, Fabien, let me know if we have any other text that we could read at this point. So okay. So we have some homework to do. Given the fact that we only have ten more minutes, I don't know if we should wrap up the session and kindly ask our distinguished representatives to get together and try to find, you know, some common ground as per the, you know, paragraphs that still need some, you know, wordsmithing. Not sure we'll have enough time to include everything today unless you tell me, you know, that that

can be done in ten minutes. Excuse me. So if you all agree, let's wrap up the session here and come back tomorrow at 9:00 AM in the morning in order to continue with the caveat that any new text, you know, that the deadline for any new contribution will be tomorrow morning at 9:00 AM And we'll continue with the reviews and the reading and the wordsmithing and the corrections and the edits and so on and so forth. Anybody against this way forward? Or better said, any better idea? That not being the case? Okay. Let's wrap up the session right here and we'll reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 AM. Remember, tomorrow we only have three, well, potentially four communicate drafting sessions. So we'll need to exercise our patience, our, you know, our flexibility and come back with lots of energy and some good coffee in hand. So thank you so much for your energy today. We'll reconvene tomorrow at 9:00 AM Thank you so much. The session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]