
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Meeting: GAC and ASO
Sunday, October 26, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC meeting with ASO session on Sunday, 26th of October at 16:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and the Portuguese. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking when speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. With that, I'll now hand the floor over to GAC chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone, to our joint session, to our joint meeting with the ASO regarding the second consultation on updating ICP-2. So I'll translate that ICP-2, standing for Internet Coordination Policy 2, which is right after ICP-

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.

1, of course. And for that, we have a fantastic team here. We have Mr. Hervé Clément. We also have Nick, and Esteban Lescano, LACNIC. And by the way, my distinguished vice chair, Marco Hogewoning from the Netherlands, will be walking us through this session. Marco, over to you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, thank you, Nico, and welcome, and of course, welcome to our friends from the ASO who are gracefully accepting our invite. With that, I think I'll leave it over to the people from the ASO to introduce where they're coming from and to talk us through what they actually have been doing. I guess a lot of people have been following this from the GAC, but for those who aren't, I'm sure that you will get into what the ASO's intents are with updating this document further on the presentation. So, Hervé, may I give you the floor?

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Marco, and thank you, Nico, as well. As you say, we are from the NRO-NC. The NRO NC fulfils the function of the ASO AC. We are diverse. We are three people in the Council from each region of the world. And personally, I am Hervé Clément. I am from the RIPE NCC service region and exactly from France and from Orange also. I will give the floor to my vice chair as I am the chair of the ASO AC this time, and my two vice chairs.

NICK NUGENT

Hi. Nick Nugent, my day job, I'm a professor at the University of Tennessee, and I'm the vice chair of the ASO AC from the ARIN region.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Esteban Lescano from LACNIC Board, and I am from Argentina.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you. You can meet also on site Nicole Chan. She is from the APNIC region and Taiwan, and Akinori, who is from the APNIC as well, I see, and Sophie Japenik from Japan, by definition. We can go to the presentation of the ICP-2 update, Internet Coordination Policy, as you said.

The first slide, I will comment it very briefly. ICP-2 originally is a list of the criteria for a regional internet registry to be established. That was the case for the LACNIC and then the AFRINIC. The ICP-2 was adopted by the ICANN in 2001, 25 years ago, and as it was old now and that the relationship between the region and the ICANN has changed, we were asked by the CEOs of the regions, the NREC, to strengthen and to update this document, so it's something we started to do. If you go to the next slide.

We started this work two years ago now. We have started with a set of 24 principles which has to be included in the document. This list of principles has been under consultation. After we were able, regarding the output of this first consultation, to draft one document, which is the regional Internet Registry Governance

document, there was a first consultation and a draft of this document, and we are on the second consultation of this document, and in total, three consultations regarding that. You have the possibility and the opportunity to send a comment to this second version of the document. And you have until the 7th of November to do it. If you go to the next slide.

Okay, so with a figure, with a diagram, it's better to see where we are. We are on the square or rectangle, dark blue, on the bottom, on the second from the right, the second public comment and draft, which will be followed, we hope we'll see, regarding the comment we will have by a final review and approval of the adoption, but it's something to be consolidated, of course. If you go to the next slide.

We have a version 2 of the document we were talking about. To have easier reading of this document, we indicate here the key changes, and Nick, just after, will go deeper into the changes. You will see that there are changes regarding the title, regarding the preamble, regarding the implementation procedures, the recognition and derecognition phases, the audit and proposal, and something which is the emergency continuity as well. Next slide.

Okay, to help you, you will be able to have access to this document, but also to something which is called the right of changes. It's the last document when you will see blue part and red part. The red part, of course, is the part which has been deleted from the last

document, and the blue one is adding, regarding, one more time, the last one. Next slide.

Another document which is very important is the explanation on why we decided to incorporate some change regarding the outputs from the last consultation. You have here the example of the recognition. You have the backgrounds and the change behind that, so it will be very easy if you ask yourself any question about why we added something or not, to have the explanation of that. You can go to the next slide.

Okay, just a last thing, because there was a composition of the ASO AC, we are currently 12 members, because of the situation of the AFRINIC. We have nobody for the AFRINIC just now, but the Executive Board has been elected recently, and there is a call for the nomination of member for the AFRINIC, so very soon we will be happy to have new members from the AFRINIC in the ASO AC. Thank you. Nick.

NICK NUGENT

Thanks, Hervé. Okay, so Hervé provided a high-level roadmap of some of the key changes that we made between Version 1, which you all saw and provided comments on, and Version 2. We're now going to go into some of those more important changes, explaining what they are and our reasons for those changes, starting with the title, preamble, and roles. Next slide, please.

So we'll start very small. We made a very simple change to the name, whereas before it was the Governance Document for the Recognition, Maintenance, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries, we've changed Maintenance to Operation. We think it better describes the role of the document. No big deal at all, we're just noting this because it is a different title document, so we didn't want there to be any confusion as to why the title is different. Next slide, please.

So we also added more content to the preamble, explaining what the document is, what its goals are, and how we intend to advance those goals in the document, which we thought would provide better context, since this document likewise could survive for another 25 years in its current form. Next slide.

Implementation procedures. The challenge with a document like this is that it can't speak to everything that might need to happen in the course of operating regional internet registries, recognizing them, potentially derecognizing them. There are always going to be details that will be relevant, even something as simple as sharing records. How is that going to be done? With what frequency? What systems are going to be used? Or there are things in the document, such as the responsibility of RIRs to have good corporate governance practices. What does that mean?

Well, the document is meant to be high-level. We can't get into all of those details because it would bog the document down, and because, in some sense, the RIRs need to be flexible in defining

what those lower-level implementation procedures are. So our typical response has been those details will be set forth in a separate document called the implementation procedures that the RIRs will get together and flesh out.

A response that we got during the first consultation was, well, the document should note the existence of this separate document. So that's what we've done now. We've made a reference in this document to a separate set of implementation procedures. They will be created, maintained, flexibly updated by the RIRs just to flesh out details, lower-level stuff. The piece that we want to provide is that nothing in the implementation procedures can contradict what's in the RIR governance document, but that's why they can be flexibly maintained and updated. So we add a reference to that. Next slide, please.

Recognition and derecognition. Next slide, please. So one of the most common concerns that we had is that, and let me just step back for just a moment. The process for both recognition and derecognition is that the RIRs first voice their opinion on the matter. You could say vote, but instead we articulate it in the document as recommend against or for an approval. So, for example, recommend for or against a proposal to recognize a new RIR. The version 1 said that all of the RIRs need to approve unanimously, need to unanimously recommend the new candidate RIR. If that happens, then the decision goes to ICANN, and if ICANN approves, then the recognition can happen.

The concern that we heard is unanimity can be hard to achieve. What if there's a single RIR that holds out for inadequate or illegitimate reasons or has a conflict of interest? What then? Well, there are competing interests here. One of the things that we need to make sure is that when a new RIR comes into the NRO, it forces or it creates a new business relationship with all of the existing RIRs. And it could be against the laws of the country of an RIR to be into business relationship with another entity. So, we don't want to create a situation where an existing RIR can be forced into a business relationship with another entity against its will. But also, unanimity can be hard to achieve. How to solve this problem?

We created a process now that allows for if there is a single RIR that is holding out, then there can be a review process by ICANN. In fact, there can be a review process or reconsideration process by ICANN even if it's more than one that objects. But if after ICANN reviews the matter and sends it back to the RIRs to reconsider, if there's still a holdout, an RIR that continues to object for inadequate reasons, then there's a possibility of overriding that RIR. In other words, there's a mechanism to approve a new RIR on something less than unanimous consent. So, that's a big change between version 1 and version 2 in response to a lot of the feedback we received during the first consultation. Next slide, please.

Derecognition. As noted here, we provide some additional protections for an affected RIR. We've tried to emphasize throughout this entire process that by explicitly providing for the possibility of derecognition, it is not our goal to, or it's not the goal

of any RIR to make this decision lightly. There's no eagerness to derecognize any RIR. This is simply a last measure resort after other measures have been taken to try to rehabilitate the struggling RIR. And so, we want to provide protections for affected RIRs.

So, we beefed up, pardon the colloquialism, we added more protections. The proposal to derecognize an RIR must specify the precise reasons why the RIR is proposed to be derecognized. The affected RIR is given an opportunity to publicly respond. ICANN must provide, and the other RIRs must provide their reasons. And so, again, these are all just to protect the RIR system and the affected RIR. Next slide, please.

Likewise, who can initiate a proposal to derecognize an RIR? The last time in version 1, we specified that it could be the other RIRs or it could be 25% of the members of the affected RIR. Well, we heard some good feedback that different RIRs have different numbers of members and different criteria for who even can be a member. So, given that difference, we've created a different threshold. It can be 2,000 members of an affected RIR or 25% of its members, whichever is lower. We've also now provided a mechanism for ICANN to propose to derecognize an existing RIR. But as always, that will require approval of the existing RIRs in order to proceed. Next slide, please.

We'll talk now about audits. Next slide. Previously, we specified that RIRs must undergo periodic audits. Good. What frequency,

though? Simple. We provided an audit frequency of every three years. The purpose of this is to ensure that problems are caught early on. Our hope is that there's never a need to trigger the derecognition process because of all the requirements around transparency and audits, problems can be caught early on and addressed. Next slide, please.

In addition to regular audits, there is a provision for ad hoc audits that, similar to a proposal for derecognition, if the other RIRs, in this case by majority decision, or 2,000 members or 25% of the members of an existing RIR or ICANN want to, they can trigger an ad hoc audit. Again, it's the scenario where there seem to be problems with an existing RIR, rather than just launching straight into derecognition. Let's get at the heart of the matter and see what the problems are. Let's do an ad hoc audit. Next slide, please.

Okay. Emergency continuity. This is something that was a very, we thought, apt comment that we received is, what if an RIR is struggling, not because of any fault of its own, maybe there's a hurricane or an earthquake or civil unrest in the political system of the country, and there's a desire to make sure that services can continue, but we don't want to derecognize the RIR or even start down that road. How can we have some sort of temporary takeover of services? So there's a whole new article in the document, which we call an emergency continuity. Next slide, please.

And as mentioned, this is to provide a temporary transition of services during an emergency. And in that case, the services, the

RIR services, would be temporarily transferred to what we call an emergency operator. It would require the unanimous agreement of the other RIRs and ICANN, and it would be time limited, publicly justified, and followed by a community consultation. Next slide, please.

Just a few notes about the procedures involved here is, it can happen rather quickly. There's no need to conduct a community consultation first or go through a set of established consultations or engagement, necessarily, with other stakeholders. But right after it begins, there would be, during the pendency of the emergency continuity, a community engagement process. The emergency continuity could only last 90 days, although it can be renewed, and it can be renewed multiple times. But that's just to, again, prevent it from being a substitute for derecognition, since it can be done more nimbly. And after it completes, there would be a post-event review, published report, and things of that sort. Next slide, please.

And then just a few miscellaneous changes we'll note that didn't fit into any particular category. Next slide, please. Rectification. What does that mean? Rectification means that there's a change to this document itself. Well, if there's a change to this document that imposes new requirements on RIRs, there's the possibility that an existing RIR is immediately put into noncompliance by a change. If this says the curtains must be blue, not yellow, and a RIR has

yellow curtains, then it's instantly out of compliance. Of course, that's a silly example, but it illustrates the point.

So rectification is essentially a grace period to ensure that any RIRs affected by the change have a period of time to update their policies, their bylaws, their procedures, what have you. And what this change in the document is that we've added, the rectification was there before, but it said that any amendment to the document must specify a particular grace period. And it also says that when this document itself is enacted, there will be an automatic three-year grace period for all RIRs. Now, that doesn't mean all RIRs are exempt from the document for three years. They're only given a grace period to make changes for requirements that weren't already contained in or implicit in ICP-2, the document that this is replacing. I think we lost the slides here. Ah, here we go. Okay. Next slide, please.

Just, again, a few miscellaneous sections. We added a requirement that each RIR must provide a dispute resolution process to enable its members to enforce their rights against the RIR. Next slide. Next slide.

We think that it's already implicit in the document, but we wanted to make it explicit. There's no desire for there to be any gamesmanship in the document, to quickly derecognize an RIR, to play with timelines, to hide the ball. But we've added an explicit good faith obligation under the document. All actions are going to

be undertaken promptly, within reasonable timeframes, and all members to act in good faith. Next slide.

Lastly, well, okay, I'll say that that is a summary of the changes. And just one final slide before I hand it over to my colleague. Some people have said, well, what is ICANN's role in this? ICANN's role is scattered in different sections in the document, but this slide provides just a very high-level summary of the specific role that ICANN plays in these various decision processes. I won't read it, just because I want to make sure we have time for questions, but that's just a quick at-a-glance slide concerning ICANN's role. Next slide, please. And I'll hand it over to my colleague Esteban.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes. Thank you, Nick. Well, finally, it's just a reminder that the public consultation is open. We have time until the 7th of November. You can find the document in this link, and the consultation, the feedback can be provided through the ICANN platform, it's in the web. Next, please.

The document is there, in the QR also. Next, please. And we provide some supporting documents. My colleagues already mentioned them. One is the red-line version of the changes, in which we compare the B1 and the B2, and you also have the summary of changes and the rationale, that is the explanation why the changes were made, and also you have an assessment made by the RIRS, considering the B2 document. Well, we hope that you can provide your comments to the B2. For us, it's very useful, and in

some way, we encourage you to present the comments to the document. I think that's the next one. Thank you very much.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, first. I don't know if you want to add a word after that. So we are happy to listen and to answer your questions, if you have.

MARCO HOGEWONING

So yes, thank you, Hervé, thank you, Estefan, thank you, Nick. Thank you, really informative slide deck. Also happy to see how, especially see how things have changed, and I have already a queue building up. At current, I have Indonesia, the Netherlands, and India in the queue, so Indonesia, Ashwin.

ASHWIN SASTROSUBROTO

Yes. Thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia for the record. Yes, you are processing some sort of process to enable ICANN, for example, to derecognize a particular RIR. My question is, I have several questions about that. If, say, one of the RIR, say, Indonesia is at APNIC, Asia Pacific, if a member of APNIC doesn't like APNIC, just an example, of course, because I like APNIC very much. I mean, 2,000 or so doesn't like APNIC, and we will tell ICANN, we don't want APNIC. So when you derecognize APNIC, do you mean APNIC is gone, or you change the management of APNIC, or what? That's number one.

Question number two is that, if APNIC, for example, doing something not in accordance to Australian law, and the Australian

court say that APNIC is wrong, for whatever reason, will it be automatically derecognized by ICANN? Now, question number three, this is ICP-1, ICP-2, sorry, this is ICP-2. Now in ICP-1, you talk about for the ccTLD administration, can we also derecognize the ccTLD administration with the same way of thinking like derecognize RIR? Because for example, some of the multistakeholder of the ccTLD operators doesn't like the ccTLD operators, they want a change from a particular ccTLD operator to another ccTLD operator. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Indonesia. I can take the second question myself. ICP-1 and ICP-2, although they're sequentially numbered, are totally different documents that both were written up in the emergence of ICANN. So whatever happens to ICP-2 does not influence the status of ICP-1. So I think that that question is really a matter of looking at the ccNSO and their relation with ICANN. But I'm happy to stand corrected if I pass on the floor to Hervé.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Yeah, I will first start. So regarding your point, Marco, and when I give the floor to Nick and Esteban, if you want to complete. That's right, there are historically ICP-1, ICP-2, ICP-3, but there are three completely independent documents. ICP-2 has to be seen per se, and to have a derecognition absolutely doesn't impact anything

about ccTLD. So the two other parts of your question, so going into details, Nick, I think you want to answer.

NICK NUGENT

Yeah, thanks for the questions. Just very quickly, because I know that there are other questions. Just to be clear, ICANN does not have any unilateral power to derecognize an RIR under this document. So it would be that ICANN makes the final decision. But first, the existing RIRs have to approve any decision to recognize or derecognize an existing RIR. So ICANN cannot just say, okay, we're getting rid of APNIC, to use your example.

Second, if APNIC or any RIR were to be derecognized, there would be a process to transition that RIR's services to another entity to ensure continuity of service, because that's very important for the stability of the internet. And lastly, your question, what if an existing government declared an RIR to be illegal? It's a great hypothetical. We're not sure exactly how that would play out, but that could be something that could trigger a derecognition. Or it could be just it triggers a reconfiguration, a shuffling of the deck as to which country hosts it and is responsible for hosting that RIR. But it is not the case that if an RIR is derecognized, it instantly goes away. There's definitely a transition process that would have to happen. Thank you.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

I also want to add that the process reinforced the right of defense of the RIR that is involved in the recognition process.

MARCO HOGEWONING

So thank you. I hope this answers your question. Next up in the Netherlands, and as a kind request, because we have another session pending before the end of today, so please be as concise as possible in both your questions and your answers. Thank you. And Maaïke from the Netherlands

MAAIKE VEENSTRA

Thank you. Maaïke Veenstra from the Dutch government. Thank you, first of all, thank you for the presentation. Secondly, you briefly touched upon the parallel audits. I'm still seeking some further clarification on this. Does that mean that you will audit all the five RIRs at the same time? And how would this work? Because they're quite different, I believe, organizationally. So looking forward to hear some further clarification on this. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you for your question. So I will start briefly on one more time. So I will leave my colleague to complete. No, the idea is not to have audit really at the same time, because it has to be something which has to be done carefully, of course, and I would say that a region is a region with its own policies, even if the policies are not part of this document per se, but absolutely not at the same time.

NICK NUGENT

Agreed. And just to supplement, that's a perfect example of the kind of thing that would live in the separate implementation procedures document as to the precise order in which the RIRs go. it's not terribly material, so that's something that can be worked out. But the idea is each RIR is audited at least every three years and they're probably going to be staggered just to not overwhelm ICANN or the other RIRs. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

So thank you. As I mentioned in chat, I'm closing the queue here. At the moment I have India, Smart Africa, Egypt, and the CTU. After that, the queue is closed to make room for the next session. So India, please, you have the floor.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. We commend the ASO and the RIR community for the considerable effort which they have shown. We just have one observation and that is regarding the authority which is vested for recognition and derecognition of the RIR in just one body. Empowering only RIR as such for the recognition or the de-recognition that it goes against the basic jurisprudence that you cannot be just judging your own cause, and then keeping in view the spirits of the ICANN, I think it would be desirable if there's such a governance mechanism for recognition and de-recognition can be made more multi-stakeholder, including the GNSO or the ccNSO

or the LAC, so that there's a larger representation from all the affected parties. Thank you.

NICK NUGENT

Thanks for the comments. Just saying it very briefly, because I know we have to close the session. All the RIRs will have to, or all the RIRs minus one, depending on the circumstance, will have to approve any recognition or de-recognition proposal. And each RIR that does so will have to conduct those decisions in accordance with its processes for community engagement. Likewise, ICANN will have to make the final decision, and ICANN too will conduct that process in accordance with its engagement process, which could very well and probably will include consultations and other stakeholder inputs.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. Then next up, Smart Africa, Rodrigue.

RODRIGUE GUIGUEMDE

Yes, thank you very much, Roderick, Gideon, the mic. Yes, in Smart Africa side, we start a process to propose a content to submit to this ICP-2 process the second step. And now, because we are still looking for the insurance on that Africa should be represented and give some thought and feedback, we saw that AFRINIC launched a call of recruitment or I think something like this to have someone to be part of this SO/AC.

But for the timelines remaining, I'm afraid on the fact that the timelines will be finished before this representative will be available to join. But in our side, of course, we will propose something. But I don't know if the timelines is something could be maybe changed. I don't know. I'm just thinking about like this and real to see if it's possible to take a look on that. And I want maybe Hervé we react on that. We already have this discussion and it could be great to hear about it. Thank you.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

Thank you, Rodrigue. It's a very important question, of course, and I have always repeated when there was a start of the AFRINIC events, I would say that having no AFRINIC representative in the SO/AC would be a problem because the important thing is to have a concealed representative. What we did for that is at maximum to give the most information we can within the Africa region and to give the opportunity from the AFRINIC community to ask questions, to contribute. So I want to emphasize that most of the meetings we have are open to observers and observers could have the possibility to react also. But it was our priority to still have a strong relation with Africa.

Regarding the timeline for this consultation, we have no choice to end it the 7th of November, but after there will be analysis of the outputs, there will be additional discussions. And I'm pretty sure that regarding the course of the discussion we will have, there will

be ongoing at the time we will have an AFRINIC representative, be sure. So I am not so afraid about that.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

I want to add that there is a rational list for the African community that is open and is receiving the feedback from the consulting process. And we also had some instance to allow the participation of the African community like webinars and other activities. And the reason behind we cannot extend the public consultation is because the SO/AC will meet in Montevideo at the 11th, 12th of November to analyze all the comments received.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. And again, I see a call, thank you, I was about to say people are asking for the QR code back. Thank you, thank you, staff. Please be really, really brief. I still have Egypt and CTU on the queue. I'll try to wrap this up. So Christine, Egypt.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you. Christina, Egypt for the record. So my question is to Nick. I'm here. So you mentioned there could be a hypothetical situation that would trigger a derecognition or maybe it's just simply a relocation. And my question is explicitly about relocation because this is something that was mentioned in earlier comments that were shared. Is this something that is provisioned in the new document? Is put somewhere in the new version or not? Because

you might not really want to go to a derecognition but simply to a relocation.

NICK NUGENT

It's not provided in the document because we didn't think it was necessary to provide a separate process as to how exactly that would play out. We don't think that there's anything that would preclude a relocation where it would need sort of the same level of approval, especially if everyone is on the same page. So it's not separately provided for in the document, but it's certainly something that could happen if the necessary parties agree and it's necessary to happen.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. I hope that answers your question. Then finally, Sherman, CTU, you have the last word, last question.

SHERNON OSEPA

Yes. For the record, Shernon Osepa from CTU, Caribbean Telecommunication Union. So first of all, thank you very much for the updates. In the Caribbean we do have two RIRs, ARIN and also LACNIC. So my question would be more with respect to the process, because we also did provide some feedback on this document, and we would like to know how are you guys going to deal with all the received, let's say, feedback. Is there a way where, let's say, the community can look back and say, okay, these

particular recommendations were addressed in one way or the other? I would like to get a better understanding on that.

HERVÉ CLÉMENT

I can start. So the process is open regarding all the outputs we have. We provided for the last consultation a list of all the comments provided, and from the regions and from the ICANN as well. And it's, I would say, pretty easy to see if-- we read all the comments. And if we don't include a specific comment, generally the reason is because it's out of scope of the document, and the scope of the document is written and explained in the rationale of the current document. That is my first answer. So if you want to complete that.

ESTEBAN LESCANO

Yes, as part of the process, we take very seriously all the comments received, and we go through each of them, comment by comment, and as full group. We don't split in the full group. Read all the comments and analyze if they are adequate to the document. Maybe there are a lot of issues that are related with implementation procedures that is not for that document, or other issues that maybe are not relevant or to the point we need. But we review every comment received.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. With that, we're really out of time. Don't leave the room. There's more coming. But let me remind you, as people

said, that the current revision is open for public comments until November 7. So have a look at the ICANN website and leave your comments there. Which leaves me to thank you for joining us again, Hervé, Esteban, and Nick. And for me to hand over to, I think, Fabien or Rob. I think, Rob, there are a few small housekeeping announcements to make. So while we change the sessions.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Marco. And so I don't know if Rob is in the room. I believe an email was sent to the mailing list to explain that we are shifting a bit the agenda because of unforeseen circumstances that do not allow for the session that was planned with the co-facilitator of the WSIS process. So we're pushing that to tomorrow.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

That's right. Fabien, just to reinforce what you're saying, you should have received, it's probably in your inboxes, please check that. So we're not having the WSIS+20 discussion today with the co-facilitators for some reasons we don't fully know at this point. So we're going to use this time in order to review some key communiqué drafting details. And for that, I'll hand the floor back to you, Fabien. Please go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. And this is because we will have this WSIS+20 discussion tomorrow at about the same time. So we're going to give a piece of our session tomorrow about the communiqué for

that purpose, and so we're using the time right now to go through some of the content and discussion we were planning to go through tomorrow.

And so what I'd like to do, as we usually do, is to go through the process in a bit more detail than I did during the opening plenary session, and that's to ensure that everybody that is not familiar with the process or that has not experienced the process knows how we proceed with communiqué drafting so that it can be a predictable and smooth experience. So as you may recall, yesterday-- I have a bit of echo. I don't know if it's just here or in the room. I just want to flag that.

So the communiqué development process incorporates three phases. You recall I mentioned that yesterday, the communiqué preparation phase, the communiqué drafting phase during the meeting, and the communiqué review period after the meeting.

The communiqué preparation phase purpose is to make sure GAC topic leads and any GAC members interested can highlight to the committee topics that they'd like to see addressed in the communiqué, either as issues of importance or advice. And you may have seen yesterday an email that I personally sent on behalf of the DNS abuse topic leads with some initial consideration on that specific topic for potential issues of importance. So that's what is expected from this preparation phase, is to bring to the fore some topics that are being envisioned as to be addressed in the communiqué.

Now that we are in the meeting week, we are getting to the drafting phase. I sent the email yesterday, you may recall, with a link to the Google document that we use to support that drafting of the communiqué. Ideally, during the drafting phase, we ask that GAC topic leads during the plenary sessions allow time for discussing on each of the various issues that are the subject of those plenary sessions what they would propose to put in the GAC communiqué. And so generally, we aim for the end of the plenary sessions to have time reserved to discuss considerations for the communiqué.

This leads us to then the actual drafting phase, where we gather for a number of sessions and we dedicate the time to reading the text that's proposed and agreeing on the text and agreeing on the entire communiqué. I'm just checking my notes to make sure that I cover all the essential points. When

So one of the purposes of discussing the potential communiqué text in each of the plenary sessions is to enable interested GAC members that are interested to participate in drafting of language to identify who the topic leads or the pen holders are. That way, we hope that this facilitates discussions before text is proposed on the communiqué and therefore facilitate agreement and reaching consensus of the committee on the text that's proposed. And that's for the efficiency of the actual drafting process once we get to reviewing text on the actual document.

We've experienced in the past situations where there was substantial text proposed by several parties and another piece of

text by other parties that covered the same issues but in different ways, and this is harder to reconcile. So what we're hoping is that the reconciliation, if necessary, between various interest positions on a given issue can be done before we get to reading the text on the document. And that's again for efficiency's sake.

Also because communiqué drafting has to fit in a number of sessions. I believe this time around we have six or seven of them, and we do not have extra time. So we absolutely need to conclude communiqué drafting at the end of those communiqué drafting sessions. In the past, as you may have experienced, some of you might recall, probably even ten years ago in Dublin, there was to some extent no limit to communiqué drafting times, and so sometimes communiqué drafting would go through the night. And so this has changed for various reasons, and so that's why we're trying to make sure that every opportunity is given for members and topic leads to discuss text before it comes into the communiqué.

I've spoken to the Google Doc, and so that's the purpose of the arrows underneath the central rectangle. So those arrows underneath are to remind you that we invite direct editing of the document, the link of which I sent yesterday. Regarding this link, be careful not to share it on a chat window in the Zoom room, because that becomes public and that could lead to interference with the text. We've had that once, and so we had to reset, recreate the document. It was a bit of a difficult situation, so we try to keep

this link private to the GAC to avoid any interference and difficulties.

So feel free to use that document, but we again invite you, if you're interested in a very specific area, to consult with other members that may be interested and with topic leads as necessary. The live editing of the document stops at some point. Usually once the document solidifies and we start to have a substantial amount of text, and we've reviewed text and we've agreed on text, we tend to reach a point where, for stability of the text, we close the editing. And in those situations, we ask that you go through us, the support team, via email or in the Zoom room or chat, various ways to provide your text to us so that we can edit the document ourselves.

And throughout the process, please feel free to reach out to us as well as a resource to check on references that you'd like to make in your text or precedent or the way we may address this or that topic or the way we may have done that in previous communiques for consistency. We try to make sure that the communique is a sort of predictable experience for its audience to some extent so that the community and anybody that's interested in the communique find the information that they're used to or expecting in the various sections of the communique, which makes me think that we didn't go through the document to explain each of the sections. I had mentioned that yesterday, but we'll do that in a minute. I know that we have 10 more minutes, so I'll take the time to do that.

Please feel free to stop me and ask any questions if you'd like. I'd be happy to answer. So we'll get to the document, but before we get there, I just want to finish by mentioning the review period, the 72-hours communicate review period that comes at the end of this week. Once the communicate is drafted, agreed upon, and adopted in session, we enter the communicate review period. The purpose of this 72-hour period is to provide an opportunity to the entire GAC membership to review the document. This was instated during the COVID-19 period in recognition of various barriers to participation for members, be it time zone, language, and the remote situation specifically.

The purpose of this review period is not to edit the document. It's to identify if any GAC member or observer has a specific issue with the text, a substantive issue with the text. And if it's the case, then the process plans for the GAC to reconvene remotely, because it would be after the meeting, to discuss that objection or issue with the text, substantive objection.

So it's never happened before. It may happen, this is why we have the process, but you'll be reminded in the email that we send at the start of this review period that an objection should not be considered lightly because of this aspect of the process. And it happened previously that we caught some typos or inaccuracies in reference in the text, and we do have the possibility to address those without reconvening the GAC.

But we try to provide a document that's hopefully clear of any mistakes so that you can focus really on a substantive review. So that's for the review period. At the end of the review period, assuming there are no objections, the GAC support team proceeds to work with the ICANN org to publish the communiqué. And this is why the communiqué now bears a date that is subsequent to the actual meeting, because we use the date of that day we publish the communiqué.

So now let's go to the actual communiqué document for the last few minutes we have. Benita, are you ready to show it? Thank you so much. Excellent, thanks so much. So here at the very top of the document, it's just some information in terms of deadlines and objectives we're trying to reach every day of the meeting. We can scroll down, we'll focus on the content. Maybe let's stop here. This is just to explain to you, if you're not used to using Google Doc or this document, that you have the possibility to make edits that come as suggestions.

And so once you create text on the document, a small window will pop up. And this is where we ask that you identify yourself as the author of the modification so that we know who's the author. Otherwise, we have no way to know. So we ask that you provide that identification in the comment box and not forget to hit reply. Otherwise, it will not show up on everybody's version of the document.

So let's go to the communiqué. I wanted to take everyone through the structure of the communiqué, especially for those that may be new to the communiqué. So we start with an introduction, just general reminders of the meeting, the attendance in the meeting. It's a very general section. Then section 2, Inter-Constituency activities and community engagement. That's meant to report on the GAC's engagement with other ICANN community groups. We generally refer only here to the topics that are discussed and not to the substance of the discussions. That's the purpose of the GAC meeting minutes that I also mentioned, if you recall, yesterday, as being another output document of a GAC meeting.

Then section 3 is internal matters, where we report on the membership and evolution of the membership of the GAC, on GAC leadership elections, on certain working groups that have activities that they'd like to report on in the communiqué. Then we have various operational matters. And since the Kigali meeting, we've generally reported on GAC strategic planning. So here, as you may recall, we are planning to report on the endorsement of the new GAC annual plan 2526. And so we've suggested text here for your consideration for this purpose.

Then in this section, we've also reported in recent meetings on capacity development activities. And this takes us now to the more substantive parts of the communiqué, issues of importance. And so as you can see here, so you recall, issues of importance is where

the GAC states various positions on issues that are of importance to the GAC prior to issues generally.

This is not GAC advice, this is just substantive positions that have been proposed to be a potential. So it's an opportunity to communicate with the ICANN community on the GAC's position, but it's also been seen by some GAC members as a potential precursor or first step before consideration of eventual potential GAC advice. So this is the perspective here in issues of importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Very quickly on that, thank you, Fabien. This is like pre-advice, this is like pre-consensus or maybe not consensus, but this is-- We could consider this as pre-advice or something very important for the GAC and therefore it should be included there. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. And this is also important for the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board reviews the communiqué and this part, issues of importance, is the subject of specific analysis by the Board and discussion with the GAC, eventually in a specific call that's organized after the ICANN meeting for the ICANN Board to respond to the issues of importance and an opportunity for the Board and GAC to exchange on those.

It is also the case of advice. Obviously there is a potential clarification call if the board determines that it needs clarification on GAC advice that's been issued in a communiqué. And this has

been a sort of traditional process for the Board to consider advice, to seek clarification if needed, before the Board responds to the advice and takes a position on the advice. And so in complement to that, the Board also considers formally the issues of importance to the GAC.

So we can go on to the next section of the communiqué, which is-- Oh sorry, maybe let's stop here, let's go back up. You see, as you see in the document, we have a number of issues that have been identified. And so tomorrow, when we reconvene tomorrow afternoon to start the consideration of the communiqué, we'll start there. We'll start at those topics. We hope that text will be provided as soon as possible under each headings that are identified. I'll just for now list the topics we have and request that if you're interested to be involved in the drafting of text on those issues and you're not yet, please let yourself known so that you can be connected with the various topic leads that are currently working on proposing text.

So we have, at the moment, applicant support program implementation and outreach as a topic for issues of importance. Early warning procedure for the next round of new gTLDs. Additional fee for evaluation of geographic names during the next round of new gTLDs. So those are three topics that relate to new gTLDs.

If we scroll down, we have then community-- Yes, yes, absolutely. Sorry, I'm taking the luxury of the time that was given. Sorry. So

then community statements of interest, systemic visa issue undermining global inclusion. ICANN review the reviews, and we're also aware of topic leads working on potential text for DNS abuse and domain registration data.

Finally, GAC consensus advice. That's the section number five. This is where the GAC states its advice, provides a rationale for the advice, and this leads to bylaw-mandated procedure for the board to consider the GAC consensus advice.

And finally, we have a section that's follow-up on previous advice, where the GAC sometimes follows up on a piece of advice. And here the goal is to state considerations that relates to previous advice that the GAC sort of brings back to the fore. But we try in those sections not to change the wording of the advice and add consideration that should be taken into account with the time that has been spent since the issuance of advice.

And that concludes the substantive content of the communiqué, and the last section, next meeting, just states the next occasion during which the GAC will meet. With that, thank you for your attention, and we'll be back discussing the communiqué tomorrow afternoon.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Fabien. Just for the record, I know this might sound and might be boring and repetitive, we don't do this because we have any kind of doubt about your understanding, by

no means; we're just doing this because of the 32 new GAC representatives that might not be very familiar with the internal procedures and internal mechanics. So apologies, again, if it is a little bit repetitive.

So a couple of things before we have some drinks. So in the first place, apologies again, but there was no way for us to guess that one of the WSIS+20 co-facilitators would get sick. So, we did our best in order to cope with the situation.

The second thing is that, as Fabian correctly pointed out, we'll be discussing the first communique drafting session tomorrow at 4:30 p.m. right after the coffee break, which will come right after our meeting with the ICANN Board. As you may see, tomorrow we have the welcome ceremony and the Tarek Kamel Award, and then the geopolitical forum, and then another community session on ICANN review of reviews, RORs, yet another acronym for us to memorize, but anyways.

So that's all as regarding housekeeping details. Now we'll have the GAC social, as you can see right there. I have one final thing for you to help me with before we leave. There's a \$10 million prize to whoever can tell me how come we can have 88% plant-based water? I'm not joking. It's right here.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The other 12% to squeeze from a cow. 10 billion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Plant-based water. Thank you so very much. Enjoy the GAC Social.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]