
ICANN83 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 6)
Thursday, June 12, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the 5th ICANN83 GAC Communique Drafting Session on Thursday, 12th, 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. Remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. And 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. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nico Caballero, GAC Chair. Nico, please.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. And thank you to all the GAC representatives who allocated time, energy, and patience to try to reach an agreement regarding the text on advice we were dealing with during the last session. If everything goes well, let me tell you, and I'm crossing my fingers when I tell you this, if everything goes well, we might be able to finish before the allocated time. Let's see how it goes, but we don't have that much to discuss except for-- and then some minor edits, some minor editorial changes and so on, but no big deal. So, this is the gist of it, right?

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.

So, this session will be running till 3:00, and then we'll potentially have a coffee break, and I say potentially because we might very well end our commitments as pertaining to ICANN83 and go play golf, unless you want to stay for the closing reception, of course. So, with that, let me give the floor to Fabien who's going to walk us through the last part of the wordsmithing commitments we have so far.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And so, this happens in Section 5, GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board. So, we're going to wait to get the communique on the screen. It seems to be on our end here, that's coming. Okay, thank you. And so, we've received edits to the initial text and the text that was last discussed. So, that should reflect the agreement of the different parties that have been involved in drafting this text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Fabien. And again, for the sake of clarity, I'll be reading the whole thing, including the rationale, just to make sure that everybody's on the same page and that whatever agreement was reached is clear for everyone. So, this is Section 5, GAC Consensus Advice to ICANN Board.

The following items of advice from the GAC to the Board have been reached on the basis of consensus as defined in the ICANN Bylaws. Number 1. Policy Development Related to DNS Abuse. The GAC advises the Board to urge the GNSO Council to initiate work prior

to ICANN84 on targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues, prioritizing the following: to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrant accounts or other suitable methods, domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse.

Can you scroll down a little bit? And the rationale is before new strings are added to the DNS as a result of the next round, further work on DNS Abuse is needed to stem the increasing cost to the public of phishing, malware, botnets, and other forms of DNS Abuse. Further, the GAC encourages PDPs that are targeted and clearly scoped to achieve results according to shorter timelines.

The GAC appreciates the wealth of proposals for further policy work recently expressed by different parts of the community and maintains they all deserve attention. The GAC supports multistakeholder action to achieve consensus policy outcomes and encourages for the time being prioritization of specific issues such as malicious use of bulk registrations. Given this timeline, the GAC encourages progress on commencing narrowly scoped PDPs between ICANN83 and ICANN84.

And I'll pause here in order to see if we have agreement. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. And please bear with me. I will retire this, what I'm saying, if not everybody agrees. But I think that initiate work is quite unspecific. So, I can live with it, but I would suggest the following as a friendly amendment. So, it would read, to urge the GNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparations prior to ICANN84 towards targeted narrowly, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. The rest remains the same. But as I said, if this is agreeable, okay. Otherwise, I take it back. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Switzerland. Let me read that part then in order to see if it makes sense to me, and then we'll decide all together if it stays or if we should go back to the first drafting. So, it would read, to urge the GNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84 towards targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues, prioritizing the following, and so on and so forth. Are we okay with that?

In other words, anybody against? In order to make it easier? Anybody has a problem with the wording? I don't see any hand online. I see no hand in the room. So, therefore I would assume this will pass. So, Ian, could you please read the full-- I'm sorry, there's a hand from? Oh, sorry. US, go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Just to be clear, we support the friendly amendment from Switzerland, but a proposal for the consideration of others just to make the advice more concise would be to bracket the text. So, through registrant accounts or other suitable methods, and then a closed bracket. I believe that this does not materially change the advice and it shortens it. So, we would just make that proposal. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. And I have Nigeria next. Is it Nigeria?

AMINA RAMALLAN

Yes, it is. I would just like to go down to the rationale. I would like to add an edit. The second sentence "further, the GAC encourages PDPs that are--" I would like to suggest in place of further, perhaps we could use in addition or furthermore.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Thank you, Nigeria. Can you scroll up a little bit? So, let's go step by step. So as per the USA's proposal, are we okay with the way it would read? Ian, can you help me with the reading?

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Nico. And just before I actually was keen to take the floor. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia. And perhaps it's a question for my Swiss colleague. Is the assumption here that they would undertake all necessary preparation prior to 84 with

commencement at or short after? That's the thinking here. Is that right?

JORGE CANCIO

I was distracted, sorry.

IAN SHELDON

So, you read it here, to undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84, the assumption is that they would start at or shortly after ICANN84, or is immediately?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No, but it says prior to ICANN84. Am I right, Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Yeah, in my non-native understanding of the English tongue, this means for me that everything is ready by ICANN84, so that they just have to trigger and then the PDP starts without using the forbidden word, initiating or things like that.

IAN SHELDON

Okay, thank you. The GAC advises the Board to urge the GNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84 towards targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues prioritizing the following: to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate through registrant

accounts or other suitable methods, domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sorry to interrupt Ian, but that was the part in brackets. That's the part that the US suggested to erase through registrant accounts and dah, dah, dah. So, investigate and then domains associated with that-- Can you clean the text? Or before the cleaning, sorry, before we do that, we need to agree on the-- But yeah, okay, strike out. Thank you. So, Ian, could you please repeat only that part? You don't need to read the whole thing.

IAN SHELDON

Prioritizing the following: to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Australia. Are we okay with the text as it is? I have Germany, go ahead.

RUDY NOLDE

Thank you. GAC Germany for the record. I just wanted to express my support for the text as we have it. I think it's the outcome of a

lot of exchange in the GAC. And I think it's a very important topic. So full support. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Full support as it is or full support as it was before the brackets?

RUDY NOLDE As it is now.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. Just to make sure we're on the same page. You never know, right? Language, especially legal or legally binding language is a little bit complicated. There are different interpretations as what two and two is and there are jokes about that and everything. So, let me read the rationale then taking into account what Nigeria proposed. But before that, I have a comment or question from Japan. Please go ahead.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO Hi. This is Tomo from Japan. This is a really small point, but before the brackets through restaurant accounts, I think that the comma is unnecessary, maybe.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Japan. Good catch. CTU?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimire, CTU. We are a little bit challenged with the flow of words in the first sentence of the advice. To undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84 towards targeted and narrowly scoped, blah, blah, blah. Is it towards enabling or is it towards the development of?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I think it's referred to the processes, but that's my very humble non-native speaker interpretation and I stand to be corrected. Unfortunately, we don't have our Shakespearean friend Nigel with us today to help us with that, but it is my interpretation is referred to the processes, but I stand to be corrected.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

It seemed like a word is missing towards, I don't know, towards enabling maybe. Towards enabling targeted and narrowly scoped processes. At least that's one suggestion. More words would be towards the development of, but I think something is missing there.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect, sounds good to me. As we used to say in the army, that's not a hill I'll die on. Sorry for the comparison, it's okay with me. If it's okay to everyone, we can read the whole thing one last time and see if we have agreement. Would that be good? Netherlands, can

you help me with the reading? Hold on, hold on. He's going to finish the-- Okay. Netherlands, please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay. So, the clean text as it currently reads. The GAC advises the Board to urge the GNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84 towards enabling targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues, prioritizing the following: to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse.

Then following, the rationale. Before new strings are added to the DNS as a result of the next round, further work on DNS Abuse is needed to stem the increasing cost to the public of phishing, malware, botnets, and other forms of DNS Abuse. Furthermore, the GAC encourages PDPs that are targeted and clearly scoped to achieve results according to shorter timelines.

The GAC appreciates the wealth of proposals for further policy work recently expressed by different parts of the community and maintains that they all deserve attention. The GAC supports multistakeholder action to achieve consensus policy outcomes and encourages, for the time being, prioritization of specific issues such as malicious use of bulk registrations.

Given this timeline, the GAC encourages progress on commencing narrowly scoped PDPs between ICANN83 and ICANN84.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Voila, there it is. Comments, questions, edits? And there's a question from Australia.

IAN SHELDON

I'm GAC Australia. I just have a question. Do we need to address bulk registration? Like just the two words to address? They seemed redundant to me, but I wasn't involved in the huddle over on the side of the room. So, I'm just asking those who ate the Tim Tams to provide clarity.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for the question, Australia. I would leave. I would stick to the wording to address bulk registration as an action item, I would say, but I don't know. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. While I appreciate that, of course, Nigel from CTU is much closer to the English language than I am, I still have a difficulty with enabling because it's quite fuzzy what that means. So maybe as Gemma mentioned in the chat, if we need a word there, I would say starting, if that's agreeable. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. So, starting instead of enabling, right? Is it okay to everyone? In other words, anybody has anything against including the word starting there? And I see Brazil, Brazil, go ahead, please.

VINICIUS WAGNER OLIVEIRA SANTOS

Thank you, Nico. Just a question, not with the starting. Yes, I think it's quite a good change. I have a question about the structure because I think the structure prioritizing the following and then two items came because of the amount of the texts we had before. So, I'm in doubt if we still need this structure or if we can just go directly, like prioritizing, blah, blah, blah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Brazil. So, I'm starting to get confused here. So, I would read. To urge the GNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparation prior to ICANN84 towards starting targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues, prioritizing to address bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse. That's the way it would read if we take your suggestion into account. Now, is it clear for everybody? And I have Jamaica.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Wahkeen Murray for the record, Jamaica. So, I agree with my colleague from Australia that we should strike to address so that it would read prioritizing bulk registration of malicious domain names and blah, blah, blah, blah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you very much, Jamaica. I have Netherlands next. Sorry, sorry, sorry. Go ahead, go ahead.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Or alternatively, we could just say on DNS Abuse issues. It's fine. I was going to say addressing bulk.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I very kindly ask you not to start wordsmithing again, given the fact that it took a long time to reach this. So, anything we touch here, any single comma word or might mean a totally different interpretation. And that's the thing with lawyers, right? I'm not a lawyer, just for the record but good morning could mean many different things depending on the day, depending on the year, depending on the planet you are looking at that. That's the way it works for lawyers. So just to make sure with all due respect to lawyers, of course. Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, it's Marco for the Netherlands. I'm not a lawyer either. I'm an engineer and my engineering brain starts to itch that perfect is the enemy of good enough. So, I support the text as it is and then move to close on the issue, because my sense is that we'll be here tomorrow morning.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. So, I suggest we do some cleaning with the text, read it once again and see if we have broad agreement, as we did 10 minutes ago. That was the situation 10 minutes ago. So, if we continue reading it over and over again, we might end up with some new version of a song or something. So, Ian, could you please go ahead again?

IAN SHELDON

The GAC advises the Board to urge the DNSO Council to undertake all necessary preparations prior to ICANN84 towards starting targeted and narrowly scoped Policy Development Processes (PDPs) on DNS Abuse issues, prioritizing bulk registration of malicious domain names and the responsibility of registrars to investigate domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS Abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. And we don't need to read the rationale again. So again, can we leave with the text as it is? However, no matter how many details we could change and no matter how many other

possible changes there might be. So, I would kindly suggest, unless you tell me there's, as I said before, some heel you would die on, which I don't think is the case. Because broadly speaking we're trying to convey a very specific message here.

So, is that the case? In other words, is any distinguished GAC member against the text as it is right now? I don't see any hand online. And one last time, let me check the room. And we have agreement. Voila. So, thank you so very much for that. With that, Fabien, can you walk us through the, I don't know, the last necessary housekeeping details?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

But before we do that, I understand that as part of the agreement on the advice, there was an edit to be made proposed for the issues of importance on DNS Abuse. So, we're going to scroll up to issues of importance, DNS Abuse. It's number two, DNS Abuse. There we go. I'll speak to some of the clerical suggestions we've made, but right now, I'd like to point to the last sentence of the second paragraph. I understand that, again, as part of the agreement that was reached on the advice text, there is this modification proposed. So, we just need to confirm that this edit of this last sentence in the second paragraph is agreeable.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, and I also see some text in green there, maybe it's just me.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And so, this is part of our clerical review of the text, and I was going to get to that after. But this is a substantive edit compared to ours that are just clerical.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so let me read just that part then. I'm not going to read the whole paragraph, but the sentence before and then that last paragraph. So, it would say, the rapid weaponization of domain names used for phishing campaigns makes swift action essential. The GAC continuously explores a wide range of options, including proactive practices, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, requirements for registrants offering subdomain services, as well as links between addressing DNS Abuse and work on domain name registration data.

I'll pause here in order to see if there are reactions. Okay, seeing no hand online or in the room. One last time. All right, so let's address the text in green then. Go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And so, in the original text that was proposed, there was a link under Interisle that pointed to the report the phishing landscape 2024 report. Generally, in the communique, we rarely link, if ever, to outside resources. We generally try to contain references to GAC documentation or ICANN documentation. And we try to limit the number of footnotes and links, because we've tried to continue the

tradition of a communique that is sort of self-sufficient and sort of published for eternity and doesn't really depend on anything else.

So, our proposal in this instance for this link to the report would be to refer to the title of the report, which was presented and discussed during the session, and not provide the link. Because with this notion, with the name of this report, it's easy to find. It's also referenced in the slides of the session. So, it's just a way to avoid having another footnote with a link to an external resource in the communique.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Fabien. Everybody agrees? And I see nodding. Anybody against? This is a minor editorial change. Nothing substantive. But again, if anybody has a problem with that, we can-- If not, so then let's just go ahead, clean the text. I mean, clean the whole thing in order to give it a general review right from the beginning. ITU style, as Nigel Hickson used to say.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, if I may, before we get there, which we want to get as soon as possible, I just want to-- If we go all the way up in the communique, we're just going to go down and show you where we've made slight edits for clarity and so that it's visible before we get to the final review. So, if we go down, I think our first change was in Section 2. We've updated the numbers in terms of attendance to the meeting. I'm not sure if those are-- Are they final? Because usually we edit

them during the review period, so they're final. So, these are the final attendance numbers.

If we scroll down in the second section of the communique, we've just added domain to registration data because while it is clear what registration data refers to in the agenda with the Board, it may not be to an outside reader of the communique. So, this is just a slight-- Or even now, somebody that doesn't attend those meetings or doesn't have the full context. So, if we continue to scroll down, we've done that with the GNSO as well.

For this item of the ASO agenda, Marco had asked us to make a precise reference to this government's document for the recognition, maintenance, and derecognition of RIRs instead of ICP-2. So, that made this item very long. And so, to make it shorter, a bit more digestible, we just suggest removing recap of the public comments, received as well, because it's not necessary. If we just public comment on that document sounds sufficient. So, that's another suggestion we're making to simplify and make it as readable as possible. So, unless there is any objection, we'll just proceed to accept those changes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Can you wait a second? Netherlands, are you okay with that?

MARCO HOGEWONING

No, it's perfectly fine. And thanks for looking it up.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, if we continue internal matters, we can scroll down. I don't recall exactly. We didn't suggest any changes. So, then next here, Issues of Importance. We had talked about Domain Name Registration Data. Actually, I'm not sure we talked about it. Usually in that header for this section, it's been domain name registration data recently in recent communique. So out of consistency and for clarity, we're suggesting that the header of that section is domain name registration data. Subsection RDRS, we spelled it out for those same reasons.

Then if we go in the first paragraph here, it seems that this word was missing in the text when we were reading it. So, let me catch up here. So, the sentence is, the GAC welcomes the Board's comment during ICANN83 that ICANN is developing an analysis of which envisioned enhancement to the RDRS would require new policy development and which ones could be completed based on existing recommendations or policy. Without the "ones", it was a little strange because the which seemed to refer to those enhancement that would require policy. So, it was a little confusing and it seems that just that "ones" was making the sentence a little more readable and clear.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So, wait up, wait up. So, is everybody okay with those minor editorial changes? Any hard feelings? And I don't see any hand up. Okay, we're good. This is not any kind of substantive change, just

minor editorial changes just for the record. So, thank you for that, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

In the next paragraph, the sentence that start to that end, it may be warranted to contemplate policy requiring links to RDRS or successor systems from registration data directory services. Registration data directory services refers to the contractual obligation of Contracted Parties to publish RDAP services, to offer RDAP services. And so, for somebody who knows this, it's clear. For somebody who doesn't know, it may be all confusing. And so, I was thinking that maybe if this said from registration data directory services, Contracted Parties are required to provide. So at least it clarifies that we're talking about those contractual obligations of Contracted Parties to offer RDAP services. And it's in those services that a link to RDRS would be added, if that makes sense. So, it's not essential, but a slight element of--

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So basically, if I understand correctly, you're suggesting to add from registration data directory services, right? That was not included.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

That's already there.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

It was already there. And so, what exactly is your suggestion? Okay. So, let me read only that part. I'm not going to read the whole thing, but just the two or three last sentences. Promoting awareness and education regarding the RDRS should also remain an important priority. And then it will come to that end, it may be warranted to contemplate policy requiring links to RDRS or successor systems from Registration Data Directory Services that Contracted Parties are required to provide. And that's the change you're suggesting at this point. Is it okay with the GAC? And I see nodding and thumbs up. Anybody against? Any hard feelings in this regard? CTU?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Yes, Nigel Cassimire. Is there any ambiguity if we just say Registration Data Directory Services or do we need to say, or could we say contracted registration data directory services?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Well, that would sound more confusing to me because in this case, you're specifying that the Contracted Parties are required to provide. But if you say contracted registration data directories. Contracted by whom or for whom? Again, I'm not a lawyer, but I'm saying that somebody might have a different interpretation. But as usual, I'm in your hands.

-
- NIGEL CASSIMIRE What's there now is longer, but to me, it's more specific than if that last part is not there. Understand what I'm saying? That to take it out.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO The shorter, the better. Is that what you mean?
- NIGEL CASSIMIRE No, no, no, no. I'm saying this longer form is clearer to me than the shorter form was. The shorter form made me wonder what Registration Data Directory Services are we talking about.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Which was exactly his point when he suggested the change. So, we can stick to it, right? You could leave with it as it is.
- NIGEL CASSIMIRE I could live with it as it is right now.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Perfect. Thank you so much, CTU. Any other comment or question? And again, I see thumbs up and nodding. Back to you Fabien.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX Thank you. So now we're going to accuracy of registration data, which is the last subsection in this issue of importance. I'm going

to scroll down to C. You may recall the discussion of the end of that second sentence. The GAC remains concerned about the pause in the work of the accuracy scoping team since 2022. And it encourages the GNSO small team on accuracy to learn from the lessons of previous experience.

And so, I wonder if something got lost or missed in the edits, in our cleaning up of the edits because it doesn't make as much sense as it seemed to have made at the time. Because either it was lesson of that previous experience. So maybe you were missing of that. So, I was just thinking maybe if we wrote of this previous scoping experience, at least it's clear that it talks about the whole experience related to this scoping team process. Again, because reading previous experience on its own felt very ambiguous. It really wasn't clear what that was referring to.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, this also, it reads awkward to me. Maybe we can even shorten it now and say the small team on accuracy to learn from the previous scoping experience. I mean, the lessons are implicit. We learn from something, which is a lesson.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Does everybody agree? And I see a thumbs up. Lebanon.

ZEINA BOU HARB

Yes, thank you. Just maybe we need to remove "it" because we don't call the GAC it. The GAC remains concerned and encourages the new--

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. Good catch. Any other? So, let me read that part again for the sake of clarity. I'm going to read the first two or three sentences. So, it would read, the GAC continues to emphasize the importance of accuracy in domain registration data. The GAC remains concerned about the pause in the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team since 2022 and encourages the new GNSO small team on accuracy to learn from the previous scoping experience. And so, on and so forth. Are we okay with that? And I see thumbs up. And I see nodding. Anybody against? No? All right, perfect. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you. So, then in this paragraph at the end, we've spelled out AI, although in this day and age, AI is quite clear, but maybe in 50 years it won't be. So anyway, just an acronym that we spelled out. Then in DNS Abuse, so we discussed a change we had made. There was a link for white paper as well. It sounds like the white paper of NetBeacon on proposals to address DNS Abuse is fairly easy to find

as well. So, we'd suggest just leaving as it is, not putting a footnote. We spelled out API. And then here we suggested referring to the ICANN Editorial Advice, just for clarity that we're talking about the advice in this communique, although it's implied, but at least that makes it even clearer.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, and maybe easier to locate for future reference. Okay. So, are we okay with that? Again, extremely, extremely minor editorial changes. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you. And so, we're going down to Section Four, governance of the Regional Internet Registries, where there's a reference to Sao Paolo guidelines. So, we looked it up and we found a reference to a statement, the multistakeholder statement of NetMundial+10, which contains those guidelines, but that are deeper in the text. And so, we were concerned that in the same fashion, putting a link to it was more confusing than just a reference to them because looking for the Sao Paolo multistakeholder guidelines sort of delivers points to those guidelines in many places.

So, we're wondering if we do want to put a footnote here, we might need help because the one that we-- Maybe if you try to click on the comment, it will show what we found, which seems to be the most official reference. But this leads to the statement, and then you have to scroll down several pages to get to the guidelines. So,

somebody who doesn't know that subject might be more confused by this footnote, then that would help. So, we were not sure how to proceed here, and we thought that just leaving the text as it is, putting no footnote with the link, would still be okay, because in the context of internet governance, Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines are sort of easy to find in a way. Does that make sense?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

My suggestion is just to deal with the footnote. Otherwise, we would be opening up pandora's box here and spend 72 hours discussing the NetMundial+10. There are countries that agree with it, other countries-- So, let's just try to stick to the footnote, or the link, or a specific place within the link. If we can please go back to our text. There we go. Yeah.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So just leave the text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Exactly, exactly. So, the suggestion is to leave the text as it is, with no footnote, or no link, so anybody interested in 10, 15, or 20 years can go and look. And agreeing or not agreeing with the Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines, that would be a totally different discussion we don't have anything to do with. My humble suggestion. Otherwise, we would be opening up pandora's box and we'll end up having dinner and breakfast together here in this very room without reaching agreement. And I already see a queue

forming. I have Netherlands and Argentina. I told you, pandora's box. Anyways, Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Well, I was hoping to avoid the queue, given that I was the original one that suggested the footnote. I'm happy to take the advice from the editorial team and skip it. But apologies.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. I have Argentina next.

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS

Thank you, Chairman. Marina Flego Eiras, Argentina, for the record. I am of the view that the text as it is, it's better than a version which includes a reference to the document, because the guidelines itself is a point of a document and are okay Don't have any reference to other fora that is not the Sao Paulo multistakeholder guidelines, NetMundial+10, and other fora, basically. So, if we just refer to the guidelines as they are, without referring to another document, I feel that it will be okay in order to avoid any kind of disagreement or incompatibility with what any country could feel or have. Just a suggestion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Argentina. I wholeheartedly agree with you. Any other comment or question? I'm sorry, Brazil.

VINICIUS WAGNER OLIVEIRA SANTOS Thank you, Chair. Just to say that we are completely fine with the text as it is.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much. So, we're in agreement. So, let's not invest any more time on this, given the fact that we have broad agreement. So, Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX Thank you. And the very last one, and we apologize for taking you through all these clerical changes. We went back and forth with Manal, in particular, as to whether there should be ATRT4 mentioned here on the title of this section, because technically we're talking about the fourth ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review, ATR. It's not an acronym that's being used. But in the text, on the first line, we do use the ATRT4 reference, which makes sense, because the Board also, in its resolution, refers to ATRT4. And so, our suggestion is to refer to ATRT4 in the title for clarity, so that we don't have to repeat what ATRT4 means in the first line of the text. So, very simply, we had removed ATRT4 from the header, and we propose to just put it back in, as sort of a consistency with the Board's practice to refer to this issue as ATRT4.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. And I have a hand from Argentina. Please go ahead.

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS Sorry, it was an old hand.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. So, I totally agree with this, but anyways, because it makes sense. But if anybody has any strong feeling, we can discuss. Any problem with this? Minor editorial change? I see no hand in the room or online. Perfect. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN So, we're ready for the final read.

NICOLAS CABALLERO And for that, I will give the floor to my new Shakespearean friend. It's a matter of generations. There's a new generation of Shakespearean readers, in this case from Australia. So, over to you, Ian. We're going to do the review ITU style, let's say, for the sake of time.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Nico. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia, for the record. Look, I'll do my best. So, for clarity, we'll be going section by section, seeking a final check on whether we have consensus agreement on all the text. I won't be diving into the details, and I won't be reading it line by line. But this is really a final check to make sure

everybody's comfortable with what we're proposing. So, we obviously start with the standard language at the front end, talking about the setting of the meeting before moving to the introduction. Could you scroll down, please?

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. Jamaica, is it related? Please don't tell me you want to change a coma or a word or--

WAHKEEN MURRAY No, no, I'm sparing everyone. I'm just noting that in the first paragraph, we already referenced Governmental Advisory Committee, GAC. And then in the fourth paragraph, we have it spelled out again. So, just to change Governmental Advisory Committee to GAC.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Where?

WAHKEEN MURRAY There you go.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX I think in our drafting of this particular section, we thought that it could be referred to or used in a different context. And it felt like spelling out Governmental Advisory Committee felt formal and

appropriate. I see your point, but I think that's the approach and why we spell it out.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Out of respect to the memory of our dear friend, Nigel Hickson, that's the whole point. Any hard feeling in that regard? You think we should actually change it?

WAHKEEN MURRAY

I won't die on that hill, Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Jamaica. So, back to you, Australia. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. And might I also suggest that we pick up editorial or minor amendments separate to this. The leadership and the support staff will go through with a fine-tooth comb for a final check of any of those inconsistencies or grammatical or editorial issues. So, if you do spot them, please note them down and we can go back through and fix it up.

So, the introduction, as we just discussed, also contains a nice few paragraphs memorializing our friend, Nigel Hickson. And then we move into the inter-constituency activities and community engagement. So, we list briefly the topics we discussed with the

ICANN Board, meeting with the ALAC, meeting with the GNSO, with the ASO, with the SSAC, as well as other cross-community discussions. I'll pause there briefly. I see no hands.

Internal matters. A brief statement on the GAC membership, followed by a brief note on the GAC elections, and before we move into GAC working groups. So, we have a brief update here on the Public Safety Working Group before we move into GAC operational matters. I see no hands. There's a brief two paragraphs here on the GAC strategic planning, before a few paragraphs here on capacity development. I'll pause here again to give you a moment to briefly skim this paragraph, hoping we are in agreement. I see no hands.

Before we move into issues of importance to the GAC. So, the first section here is domain registration data. We have quite a number of paragraphs on registration data request service. Urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. If you could please scroll down. Accuracy of registration data. And I'll pause here. I see no hands, noting we've spent quite a good portion of the last day and a bit discussing these issues.

Could we move on please. The next section here covers DNS Abuse. I see no concerns. Before we move on to the next round of new gTLDs. So, here we have some sections on the Implementation Review Team, the Applicant Support Program, a few paragraphs on GAC readiness. I'll pause here again. I see no hands. So, the next section discusses the governance of Regional Internet Registries, followed by the next section on community Statements of Interest.

And final section for this page is deferral of the fourth ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review, ATRT4. Any concerns at this juncture? I see none. Shall we move on? GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board. So, the piece of advice here deals with policy development related to DNS Abuse, including the rationale. Any final concerns or queries? We have consensus. I see no hands. We can move on. And finally, the last section of the communique covers the next meeting. So, given the lack of hands or queries, it looks like we're at consensus.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, Australia, and thank you, everyone. I don't think we need to highlight anything in green anymore because everything has been already discussed and checked. And thank you so much. We accomplished the whole thing in 45 minutes, 55 minutes. We have agreement. Thank you so very much. We deserve a big round of applause.

Okay. So, again, going back to some housekeeping details, given the fact that we actually made it, and I'm surprised, I'm gladly surprised at the level of efficiency we're achieving because, remember, last time in Seattle, we also finished one session ahead, which is very good progress. It means that we're doing something in a better way. I don't know exactly what it is. Maybe consensus reaching. I don't know, but there's some magic behind we need to identify, and I'm very glad we reached this point.

So, again, some housekeeping details. We don't need to come back, of course, for the next session. I suggest that any final, and this is for Rob and for the Fabulous Five, we might have some announcements. We might have some things to share with the full GAC. I suggest we do it now so that we take advantage of the 30-minute coffee break because otherwise-- And I know we're running out of time. We only have three more minutes for this session, but my suggestion would be to stay here and listen to whatever housekeeping details we need to listen, and then off we go for two or three or seven rounds of your golfing commitments. Would that be okay with everyone, or you prefer to have a coffee break and come back at 3:00? I'm in your hands, as I always say. Somebody.

ROB HOGGARTH

Nico, this is Rob. I can do it in 30 seconds.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

All yours. All yours, Rob. Please go ahead.

ROB HOGGARTH

Thank you very much. What we wanted to flag, and you can just go to the next slide, Julia, is some follow-up work that may merit your attention here over the next month or so as you prepare for ICANN84. So, I'll just go through these bullets, and then you can adjourn, Nico, if you'd like to do that.

For ICANN84 general meeting planning, it starts now. I know that a number of GAC members take vacation in the month of August, and while October seems a long way away, there are many, many demands from other communities to meet with the GAC, requests for other topics of discussion. So, please, if you have any potential topics that you would like to discuss, please alert us at your earliest convenience from a staff perspective. We expect to have the first agenda-setting call of the committee in mid-July, and so having that input from you as soon as you can, while this is all still fresh in your mind, would be most helpful.

Nomination period. You'll see an email from me likely tomorrow announcing the beginning of the nomination period for the 2025 GAC vice chair elections.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

With the new rules, by the way, right?

ROB HOGGARTH

No, no. As we explained in the previous session, the application of the new term length, yes, will apply to whoever's ever elected during that period, but the election rules themselves won't change, just the timing of the terms. And so, you'll have until early September to get those nominations in, but we encourage you, if you intend to nominate someone or nominate yourself, please do so at your earliest convenience.

Third bullet is identifying a number of public comment opportunities coming up fairly quickly after the meeting. While I think there is some assurance and comfort level from many of you that the updated statement of interest guidelines won't require you to do anything extra, you may want to take a peek at that proceeding and let the leadership team know if you think that there is any merit by mid-July to file comments in that proceeding. And then the next two, the proposed next round-based gTLD registry agreement, as well as the final proceeding for proposed language for the draft next round Applicant Guidebook come in later July, and those are likely to be discussed quite heavily within the topic leads group for that effort.

Quick commercial. Next Tuesday, we're going to have the first of two webinars. Next week's going to be capacity development on the 17th. For those of you who are not familiar with the base gTLD registry agreement, very important to give you an opportunity, foundation, and understanding of what goes into that type of documentation.

You mentioned a couple of days ago the progress on the GAC annual plan. A heads up that you will be getting an email from staff or the chair looking for your reflection on and potential input on changes to the annual plan, so please keep an eye out for that. Please, anyone here, take the floor, staff or membership or leadership if you think there are other matters that you want to

bring the folks' attention. Otherwise, that's it for me, Nico, and thank you very much for a very productive four days here in Prague.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Rob. Under AOB, I have a quick question to the GAC representatives. How many of you are going to the IGF in Norway if that is the case? How many are going? Nine. That's more for a cappuccino conversation, but maybe we can get together and plan something. Plan not in a formal way, of course. Plan I mean some lunch or coffee break or dinner or whatever for the ones who are going to be in Oslo in 10 days.

With that, let's give a big round of applause to our hero interpreters. Thank you so very much. A big round of applause to our technical team as well. And yet another one to the F Fabulous Five, Fabien, Benedetta, Julia, and the whole team, and Rob, of course, and Barry. Thank you so very much. So, for the ones who are going to be in Oslo, see you soon. And for the rest of the of the team, so to say, we'll see each other again in Oman in October. Thank you so very much. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]