
ICANN84 | AGM – ICANN84 GAC Communique Drafting (1 of 6)
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Tuesday, 28 October, at 16:30 UTC. 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 forum in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room, and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case you will be speaking a language other than English. I will now hand the floor over to NICOLÁS Caballero, GAC chair. Thank you, and over to you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you have a good cup of coffee with you because we're going to start the Communiqué drafting here today, where we left off yesterday, which is—help me out here, Fabien—Issues of Importance. Is that correct? Under Issues of Importance, we have the Next Round of New gTLDs, and we have some text. And as you can see on the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

screen, there's a lot of wordsmithing to do. We'll begin right there. But before I do so, there's also text regarding the ASP program, if I'm not mistaken, Fabien. Is that right? Can you scroll down a little bit? There we go. Sorry, sorry, sorry. It's right there. ASP, Applicant Support Program. And for that, I'll give the floor to my distinguished vice chair from the Netherlands, who's going to walk us through this section of the Communiqué. Over to you, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nico. I think I'll just start with a top-down reading of what is currently there. There have been various informal consultations. I see that those have not concluded in the full compromise since we now have two versions. I'll run it down the full text, and then I hope we can discuss the pros and cons. Regarding the Applicant Support Program Implementation and New gTLD Round Outreach, "The GAC recognizes that the Applicants Support Program, ASP, is meant as a key instrument intended to facilitate applications from underserved regions and economies to participate in the Next Round of new gTLDs." That was text that was approved yesterday and then considered green.

"While acknowledging a significant increase in applications in the pipeline since ICANN83, the GAC notes the limited number of applications and geographic imbalance in the ASP. Despite extensive outreach efforts by ICANN and stakeholders in a spread of regions, the number of completed applications remains lower than expected. The current low uptake and limited geographic

breadth poses a risk to the credibility of the program.” My suggestion is I’ll stop here and see if there’s any further comments on the first two paragraphs before delving into the next ones.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Let’s see if we have any edit or comment from the floor. I don’t see any hand up. There’s a hand up from Lebanon. Please go ahead, Zeina.

ZEINA BOU HARB

Nico, I think the first sentence needs to be rephrased because intended to facilitate applicants to participate, there’s something wrong here. Facilitate applicants from underserved regions and economies to participate in the Next Round. It’s either to encourage or to—

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Okay. It’s the verb you have a problem with in this case, right? Facilitate and you want to replace it with? Encourage?

ZEINA BOU HARB

Encourage or something like that, but we cannot say, “Facilitate applicants to participate.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Lebanon.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I'm not a native speaker, facilitate is fine. It offers somebody something to participate, but I'm in the hands of a native English speaker. Ian or anybody from the UK.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I would say something more like enable. But again, we have Ian here. Enable sounds a little bit better to me. I'm not a native speaker, of course. You'll be the next Shakespearean editor here, Ian, by nature. Over to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. I don't think I should have that mantle. I mean, facilitate or enable both seem fine to me. I didn't have any issues with the sentence as it originally stood, but also appreciate there are other readings of it when you're perhaps reading it for the first time. I don't have strong feelings about it. Facilitate or enable, either would be fine from my perspective. That's an Australian view, not a Shakespearean one.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you. Let's try enable in the meantime, and then we can further discuss this. Unless my distinguished colleague from the European Commission tells us otherwise. Over to you, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Nico. I don't think anything about this. I wanted to talk about another point in the section. I'm really leaving this to more competent speakers. My comment concerns the text bracketed. There are two texts. I understand we are a bit talking about either/or, if my understanding is correct. Because we are talking about ways to connect people to their governments in order to get support in case they wish to be supported. I think what is in green is more coherent with what we have discussed with ICANN during the session. Possibly, I would encourage to use more direct language in the sense that the GAC requests ICANN to follow up on its commitment rather than "We are very happy that you commit, but we want to make sure you follow-up on the commitment to facilitate communication," because they said they would. We want to check that this is done. This is a proposal. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you already for those comments. But as I said, is everybody good then now on the first and second paragraph? Because I think that helps staff to keep track. I see no hands on the first and second paragraph. Then indeed it comes down to the next two sections. Maybe if you allow me to read out both. I think it's indeed a binary or either one of them. We have a first option that reads, "This necessitates taking measures inter alia, including disclosure of generic statistical data to concerned GAC representatives after redacting personal information of applicants. This is in alignment with the GAC recommendation in the ICANN83 Prague Communiqué." I believe this is the sentence as it was inserted

yesterday by India. And the alternative, and I think that was the result of some consultations between topic leads and other interested members is, “The GAC requests ICANN to follow-up on its commitment to facilitate communication between applicants and their respective government through sharing GAC representative contact details. This will help interested governments better assist applicants in their country move through the ASP.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Netherlands. And again, for the sake of efficiency, we’re going to be using the green color in order not to go back. So, whatever we leave in green means that we have already agreed. Unless you have any very strong feeling, let’s try to avoid going back and discuss again text that is already in green. Again, that’s for the sake of efficiency and to use our time wisely. Of course, we’ll review the whole thing before circulating it to all GAC members. That’s for sure. Having said that, back to you, Netherlands. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. Then back to, as I said, what appears to be two competing paragraphs. I recall the first one came from India. I wonder, can anybody identify who sourced the second paragraph? The commission already made a few changes here, but it appeared somewhere. I don’t know where it’s coming from.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

There's a queue already. I have the USA and then Canada and then India. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States. Just with respect to your procedural comment, Chair, we do reserve respectfully our views on the text as we must confer with capital. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Thank you for pointing that out because that is for granted for every single GAC representative in the room today. But thank you so much for pointing that out, USA. We know that is the case. We'll continue discussing tomorrow, which is my point about having any kind of strong feelings, or maybe not strong feelings, but just different words about any part of the text, we can always go back, of course.

I have Canada and then India. Canada, please go ahead.

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you, Chair. This intervention is mostly for colleagues. Canada submitted the second portion there, so in consultation with some other topic leads, folks have any questions or would like to discuss, please feel free to reach out. Thanks.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Canada. Well noted. India?

SUSHIL PAL

I think we are okay with the revised formulation. We can withdraw our comments, I think. We're okay with that part. The text in the red can be deleted for the sake of simplicity.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, India. I think that moves us further ahead. We now have one paragraph. Are there any comments about this particular paragraph then with the edits from the European Commission included? Otherwise, if you allow me, Mr. Chairman, I'll move to the next one.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Hold on. Just once second, I see a hand from Canada. I'm sorry. That was an old hand. Back to you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay. As Nico said, we green it, it doesn't mean it's final, but of course, pending further reviews, but let's try and then keep working forward. Then the next two paragraphs, I'll read it to the end. Let's do that.

"It may further impact the overall objective of the Next Round of new gTLDs to further diversify and broaden the global base of the

domain name system [DNS]. The GAC recognizes the efforts by ICANN Org to support ASP applicants in the process and the extension of the deadlines to finalize those applications that are in the pipeline. Given the low number of completed applications, the GAC considers it important that an adequate ex post analysis is performed to identify problems to provide input to improve any future programs of a similar nature beyond the 2025 ASP. The GAC appreciates dialogue with ICANN Org to ensure outreach on the Next Round can help in improving global diversity of the DNS sector and encourage applications from underserved regions.” I’ll stop here and again, I’ll open the floor then for any comments or concerns regarding the text as I just read it.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I have the UK.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK, for the record. Just the first sentence, we’ve got two further in that sentence again. I think, actually, what we’re talking about here is the benefit that it will be to the overall objective. Potentially, we take out further impact and replace it with benefit, so then it would read, “It may benefit the overall objective of the Next Round,” etc., etc.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, UK. Good catch. Okay. We’re almost there as regarding this paragraph, of course. Any other comment or

question or editorial suggestion? Okay. I have a hand from Bangladesh.

DR. SHAMSUZZOHA

Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. Mr. Chair, just a suggestion that it may benefit the overall of the two. I think it's not a separate paragraph. It's a continuation of the previous one. That's for clarification.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Fabien Betremieux from the GAC Support Team. I think what happened here is that for us to be able to display the two options on the previous paragraph, so the third one, we sort of split indeed what was initially a single paragraph. I think the reading, it may further impact the overall objective was tied to the second paragraph, probably. There's probably a decision to be made. We either move that fourth paragraph back after the second one, and it probably makes sense to say it may further impact, or it stays there and indeed the meaning may need to change, but at the same time, it changes the original meaning. There might be something to decide here.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I would go with including that text right after the ASP because it belongs more to the one there. Yeah, cut and pasted.

MARCO HOGEWONING Sorry, I think what Bangladesh meant to have it sort of follow, move through the ASP, it may benefit the overall objective, right? That was the idea?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO Exactly. That's what I said.

MARCO HOGEWONING So move to one paragraph down.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO One paragraph down. Right after ASP. Assist applicants in their country move through the ASP. And then there's a period there. Then, "It may benefit, blah, blah, blah," and the rest. Right next to it. There we go. Yes. Unless anybody has strong feelings in this regard. The floor is still open, of course, mainly, and mainly with our distinguished vice chairs who happen to be native speakers.

IAN SHELDON Thanks. I'd suggest moving that paragraph back to where Fabien had it before at the end of the second paragraph, because the third paragraph speaks about information flow to governments, and the second paragraph talks about the geographic breadth of the program. The sentence we're talking about here discusses broadening the global base of the DNS, which thematically flows from geographic limitations.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. I have the UP Union.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you. I was going to agree with Ian's point. I'm not sure if we should say "It may benefit to further diversify," because if we're using the word "may benefit," I think it's already stated that that's the objective of the program. So "it will benefit" if we're using the word benefit. You see what I'm trying to say? It will benefit the overall objective to further diversify. It sounds like we're not sure that it will. I don't think that's all the work we're doing on this is not just to think it might do it. But the original thinking was that it would be impacting the overall objective when it was originally drafted. I think the original meaning is being shifted slightly now by going to the benefit part, if you see what I'm trying to say. Thanks.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I think I'm agreeing with Tracy here. I think maybe indeed remove the further, but stick with benefit or stick with impact. So, "It may impact the overall objective of the Next Round of TLDs to further diversify." Then I think we're back to the original intent of the sentence.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. I have Denmark next.

FINN PETERSEN

Thank you. Finn Petersen for the record. There's something which bothered me on the sentence, given the low number of completed application, we don't know what the end result will be. So we are already judging it for the low number now that something should be done. Maybe it should be rephrased in another way. It might be it's only something on top of my head. If only a low number of applicants benefit from the ASP, then we should investigate how. When we look at the end result at the end of the year, then we know whether it's necessary to carry out this exercise. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Denmark. Marco?

MARCO HOGEWONING

I think the original that we started off with was a low uptake. Given the low uptake, I'm happy to revert back to that. I'm also open to suggestions. I think you have a valid point that we're ahead of the curve here, given that the program only closes on the 19th of November. I'm open to alternatives, although I prefer not to add too many, because adding lists never helps. But if anybody has the solution here, I think we're open.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Well, I don't have a solution, but let me read—because I'm getting a little bit confused here. Let's read it again in order to see how the whole thing would sound. I'm going to read only that paragraph,

and then we'll continue with the wordsmithing. Clean it up a little bit, yeah. That would help.

Okay. Here we go, "The GAC recognizes the efforts by ICANN Org to support ASP applicants in the process and the extension of the deadline to finalize those applications that are in the pipeline. Given the low number of completed applications, the GAC considers it important that an adequate exposed analysis is performed to identify problems and provide input to improve any future programs of a similar nature beyond the 2025 ASP." That's one of the options. The other one would read, "If only a low number of applicants benefit from the ASP, the GAC considers it important," blah, blah, blah, and the rest of the text. We need to decide there. Any idea? Any comment? Australia, please.

IAN SHELDON

Finn, do you think the inclusion of expected applications gets around the timing issue? Given the low number of expected complete applications? I take your point that we don't know how many we'll end up with, but I think we expect it to be reasonably low.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. Any other comment? Any other idea for this particular paragraph? If not, let me read it again as it is right now. I'm going to read just that paragraph again for the sake of clarity.

“The GAC recognizes the efforts by ICANN Org to support ASP applicants in the process and the extension of the deadline to finalize those applications that are in the pipeline. Given the low number of expected complete applications, the GAC considers it important that an adequate exposed analysis is performed to identify problems and provide input to improve any future programs of similar nature beyond the 2025 ASP.”

Sounds a little bit better to me now, but again, I’m in your hands. I don’t see any strong feelings. Eswatini, please go ahead.

ANDREAS DLAMINI

Just a question, Chair. Does it mean that new applications are no longer accepted for the ASP program?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

No, no, no. In this case, in particular, we’re just recognizing the efforts. We’re not saying anything about any deadline in this particular paragraph, right? Or you mean the full paragraph? I don’t understand your question very well.

ANDREAS DLAMINI

The question is because you’re saying the extension of the deadline to finalize those applications that are in the pipeline, does it mean that new ones are no longer accepted?

MARCO HOGEWONING

No. If you recall the presentations by ICANN, anybody can still enter the ASP until the 19th of November, but anybody who has done so by 19th of November is granted some extra time to finalize the application. As long as you're through the door on the 19th of November, I believe you still have a month to finalize it. This particular paragraph recognizes that particular window that is new to the program, originally it would have simply stopped at the 19th of November. We're recognizing here that anybody who has walked through the door has a bit more time. That's how I understood the changes in the program. I'm happy to defer to ICANN staff, but I don't see anybody.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Marco. This is Benedetta speaking. Just to clarify, yes, you're 100% right, but there's a slight amendment as well, which is that applicants have entered and submitted their organization information in the application system have the extra four weeks. You have to have entered and included your organization.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Benedetta. There we go then. We're in agreement here, unless you tell me that there are any kind of strong feeling. I see nodding in the room. Let's move on to the next paragraph. Marco, over to you. Sorry, there's a hand from the UK.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK, for the record. Just a very minor grammatical, there should be a comma. In that sentence, “Given the low number of expected complete applications,” comma. Thanks.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you for spell checking this. Of course, somewhere in the next few days, we’ll also go over the entire document again to fix all the different commas, but always happy to take this on board. I think we’re left with the last—thank you for greening that indeed. I think we really lost the last paragraph, essentially, lost sentence. “The GAC appreciates a dialogue with ICANN Org to ensure outreach on the Next Round can help in improving global diversity of the DNS sector and encourage applications from underserved region.”

This elaborated earlier on that that might be a bit of a stop gap for ICANN to redirect some of the general outreach to something. Any further responses to that particular piece of text? So far, we have none. Let it sink in, but I think—still no. Maybe, Fabien, we can, for now, make this green and we can move to Section B.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. And thank you, Fabien. After cleaning it up, we’re going to green it. And again, one last chance for anybody to chime in here and suggest anything. Are we okay with this text? I’ll read it again very quickly. “The GAC appreciates a dialogue with ICANN Org to ensure outreach on the Next Round can help in

improving global diversity of the DNS sector and encourage applications from underserved regions.” Full stop.

I see no hands online, I see no hands in the room, so let’s move on. Thank you so much, Netherlands. Thank you, Fabien. For the next chunk of text, I will kindly hand the floor to, again, our distinguished vice chair from Australia. Ian, would you please shepherd us here?

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. “B. Additional fee for evaluation of geographic names during the Next Round of new gTLDs. With respect to the evaluation of geographic names, Section 6.5, recalling the GAC input into the public comment related to the Draft Applicant Guidebook, AGB, filed on July 23rd, 2025, the GAC expects clarifications as regard the justification for the introduction of additional fees in comparison to the 2012 round where a similar procedure was in place. In addition, the GAC is of the opinion that the AGB text as proposed introduces some ambiguity in the role of the Geographic Names Panel, GNP, and the application of the fees associated with their conditional review. The GAC recalls its concerns with the current text and finds that an additional fee should only apply in exceptional cases, excluding the general case where the authenticity of supporting documents can be confirmed by the relevant GAC representative as described in Section 6.5.3.2 of the AGB.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. As per the comment, the GAC recalls its concern with the current text given that the Board is likely to approve the AGB on Thursday. I find using the current somewhat ambiguous and possibly confusing as whether we are referring to the draft as it was published for public comment in June, or whether we are referring to the text as will likely be approved by the Board on Thursday. The authors might want to clarify that and make it a direct pointer to which version we are talking to. The other then is the caveat of recalling section numbers. Let's hope they don't change by the time the Board has approved the AGB.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Netherlands. Let's bracket the current and just leave out a text. Bracket. There we go. Not including text. Only the current. It should be that text. I'm sorry. Current should be bracketed. We would keep that text.

So, it would read... Let me just read that part. "The GAC recalls its concerns with the text and finds that an additional fee should only apply in exceptional cases." And I'll stop there. I will let it sink in a little bit, and then we can read the whole thing again. European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. I agree with the comment made by our colleague from the Netherlands. Perhaps we can simply leave it with the text or refer to the text on this topic. Because we are talking about the additional fee, and as regards, the possibility that the numbers of the section may change, we could also say that as described in the relevant sections of the AGB, because we are talking about this very specific matter. Even without the number, I think it can be clearly identified. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. That's a very important thing. The numbering might change. The index might change. Thank you for that, European Commission. I have the UK next.

ESTHER
JAROMITSKI

MARGARETHE

Thank you so much, Nico. United Kingdom for the record. I just had a quick procedural question. What is the process usually? The Board approves this in a Board meeting last thing on Thursday. And then we do have those 72 hours where we can still change anything in the GAC Communiqué. Do we need to change any language here? Like specify the sections? Or do we just leave it like that?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

We just leave it like that. And when you say this, you're referring to the AGB, right? To the Applicant Guidebook? Yes, that's the case. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Might be to emphasize that the 72-hour silence period is really just to confirm any lost minutes. I would not recommend because that means reconvening the GAC to approve the Communiqué. I certainly would not go down that route.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Very good point. Thank you, UK, for the question. Important indeed. The floor is still open. Are we okay with the—we're talking about the second paragraph. Any strong feelings in this regard? Again, we take for granted that you will be consulting your capitals. Just to remind you. We'll continue discussing this tomorrow. But in general, the idea is to green the text so that we can move ahead more expeditiously. Australia, back to you.

IAN SHELDON

I also had a quick grammatical clarification for the first paragraph as well. I had a suggestion for a slight amendment in the first paragraph. Just replacing "as regard". Change that to "with regard to".

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

It seems that we're experiencing some network latency again because my typing doesn't show up immediately on the screen so we're going to have to investigate that. So, please bear with us.

IAN SHELDON

Okay. Thanks. I might take the opportunity to give a final read through while it updates. "With respect to the evaluation of geographic names, Section 6.5, recording the GAC input into the public comment related to the Draft Applicant Guidebook, AGB, filed on July 23rd, 2025, the GAC expects clarifications with regard to the justification for the introduction of additional fees in comparison to the 2012 round where a similar procedure was in place. In addition, the GAC is of the opinion that the AGB text as proposed introduces some ambiguity into the role of the Geographic Names Panel, GNP, and the application of the fees associated with the conditional review. The GAC recalls its concerns with the text on this topic and finds that additional fees should only apply in exceptional cases, excluding the general case where the authenticity of supporting documents can be confirmed by the relevant GAC representative as described in the relevant section of the AGB."

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Australia. There we go. Comments? There you have it. Comments or questions? If not, we can also let it sink in for a little while and we move on to Latin diacritics, given the

fact that some text was already circulated. But again, let's give one more minute before we green the text.

Okay. All right. Let's move on to Latin diacritics. I'm going to read the first time, and then we'll stop for some wordsmithing, and then we'll take it from there.

It would read, "The GAC understands that a dedicated Policy Development Process, PDP, on Latin script diacritics is underway to develop policy for gTLD strings that include diacritical marks and have ASCII-equivalent applications, reflecting how many Latin script languages are written. We are aware that the PDP is quickly moving through the process and we look forward to its conclusion. That said, despite the PDP progress on this topic, the GAC has learned that the PDP will not be completed in time to include its outcomes in the Applicant Guidebook, AGB. The GAC is aware that viable solutions exist to resolve this issue without delaying the launch of the Next Round whilst providing proper notice to prospective applicants. It encourages the Board to work with the GNSO to explore options for integrating PDP recommendations into the AGB and the upcoming New Round of gTLDs. One such option could be the inclusion of a placeholder in the AGB, allowing for the future incorporation of PDP outcomes during the 2026 application window."

I see a hand from Canada. Please, go ahead.

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Fabien and Benedetta, for getting this text into the document. It's just missing one sentence at the end and perhaps I'll dictate it to make it just a bit easier.

FABIEN DETREMIEUX

Sorry, I got the sentence. My window of reading your e-mail was too short. I apologize. I missed that sentence.

DAVID BEDARD

No, no. It's totally fine. Just to let colleagues know that this originated from Canada in conversations with the ALAC and with other conversations with some colleagues. If folks have questions, please don't hesitate to reach out. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Canada. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Chair. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just to note that I've taken the liberty of swapping the "we" with "the GAC" and to have the usual formal language we use.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. Comment pertaining to the operative part of the second paragraph where we say, “It encourages the Board to work with the GNSO to explore options for integrating PDP recommendations into the AGB.” I think we have to recognize the timelines here that with the AGB very likely being approved final on Thursday and our 72-hour silence period starting Sunday, by the time this GAC Communiqué is out, the AGB ink will be dry. May I suggest we shorten this and say it encourages the Board, and I think it also says we should publish “The GAC encourages the Board to work with the GNSO to explore options for integrating PDP recommendations into the upcoming next new rounds of gTLDs.” Maybe there are ways outside of the AGB to accommodate this, but I don’t think it’s feasible for us to ask for AGB changes once this is approved in December or in Thursday night.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Good catch indeed. I was uncomfortable with the “it encourages”. Who encourages? “The GAC encourages the Board to work,” and so on and so forth. Is everybody okay with this? Any? UK?

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK, for the record. Just a question. I’m trying to find it now. The sentence in the middle paragraph starting one such option. That implies we’ve got a list of other options and it seems a bit strange to pick out one here. Do we

want maybe say “A preferred option could be”? Do you want to go a bit further with that?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, UK. All right. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

I’m sorry. Now with the UK comment, my eyes inadvertently drawn that in this last sentence, we fall for the same trap where anticipating on AGB changes while this Communiqué will likely be released after the AGB is being decided. With all respect, I do think this is a good cause, but I suggest for the proponents to find other language to not open the AGB again.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Is that an old hand, UK? I have Timor-Leste.

JOSE LAY

Thank you. Jose Lay for the record. I just like to suggest the one reflecting on the first paragraph, to change it to “reflecting the writing systems of many languages”. The writing systems of many languages. Full stop. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Timor-Leste. Canada, please.

DAVID BEDARD

Thank you. Thanks for your suggested changes. Just with regard to the latest one, the writing system of many languages, just to note that the PDP is on Latin script languages, so that would necessarily need to be included. But I'm fine with the writing system of many Latin script languages. Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Canada. That was going to be precisely my point, but again, I don't have any kind of strong feelings in this regard. Because the title of the whole paragraph, the subsection is Latin script diacritics. Even though I also agree with my distinguished colleague from Timor-Leste that the writing systems of many languages also would fit. But we're specifically referring to Latin script diacritics. And that's why I also agree that the text should remain as it was. But again—I mean, your hands. Is that an old hand, Jose? Okay. Any other comment? If not, I would kindly ask Marco to help me out here to read it again in order to see if we are in agreement. Please go ahead, Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I'll read slowly. Fabien is cleaning up. "Section C, Latin Script Diacritics. The GAC understands that the dedicated Policy Development Process (PDP) on Latin script diacritics is underway to develop policy for gTLD strings that include diacritical marks and have ASCII-equivalent applications, reflecting the writing systems

of many Latin script languages. The GAC is aware that the PDP is quickly moving through the process and looks forward to its conclusion. That said, despite the PDP progress on this topic, the GAC has learned that the PDP will not be completed in time to include its outcomes in the Applicants Guidebook (AGB). The GAC is aware that viable solutions exist to resolve this issue without delaying the launch of the Next Round whilst providing proper notice to prospective applicants. The GAC encourages the Board to work with the GNSO to explore options for integrating PDP recommendations into the upcoming new round of gTLDs.” And then, bracketed, “A preferred option could be the inclusion of a placeholder in the AGB, allowing for the future incorporation of PDP outcomes during the 2026 application window.” And then the last sentence, “Proactively addressing this issue now would support predictability and inclusivity while keeping the program on schedule.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

I don’t want to be difficult here, but I’m not very comfortable with the conditional sentence after the bracketed words, “A preferred option could be the inclusion of a place...” Why don’t we just use a more—I wouldn’t say stronger language there, but we’re giving advice to the Board. So using the “could be” or “may be” or “might,” I’m not very comfortable with that. Perhaps, we should say, “They use...” or “The GAC recommends the inclusion of a placeholder” or something along those lines. But again, this is just

me. Again, I'm in the hands of the Shakespearean colleagues in the room. And I have Switzerland and Netherlands. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I know it's nine minutes to the end of this session, and it's been a long day. But really reading it again, I'm not entirely sure if the message we want to convey comes across. Because in the end, putting it in natural language, we're saying there is a PDP on diacritics. This PDP will be finished quite soon, but not in time for the AGB. What we want is still that the results, the policy of this PDP is taken into account is a condition for prospective applicants. And we encourage the Board, together with the GNSO, to find solutions to make that happen.

What lacks, I think, is the part where we say clearly, we want the policy conclusions or the policy recommendations of this PDP on diacritics to be part of the conditions applicable to the applicants of the New Round. So, I have not a solution, but I think the current text doesn't get this message across. And I envisage that the Board will ask us at the next BGIG meeting on this matter. Because the only place where we mention this implicitly is where we say viable solutions exist to resolve this issue. But what is the issue? The issue is that we want this policy recommendations to apply, but we know there's a problem, but we are not explicit. I leave it by that. Sorry to be the spoils person.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Before I give the floor to the Netherlands, I also have a problem with the last sentence. And again, I'm not trying to be difficult on the contrary, right? But why don't we just say, "The GAC is of the opinion that proactively addressing this issue supports predictability" and so on and so forth? Instead of using again—and I'm not criticizing. Please don't get me wrong. I'm just trying to include more clarity, try to be more specific. "The GAC is of the view or of the opinion that..." and the rest of the sentence. I'll leave it there. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

I think there is also quite a bit to unpack on that last sentence. I'm proactively addressing this issue now, but how and where reminds, I agree with my Swiss colleague that viable... To the point I raised my hand in the second reading, I wonder do we actually lose any importance if we indeed delete the last sentence? It's repetitive, but then also "The GAC encourages the Board," maybe we need to be stronger here and say, "The GAC requests the Board to work with the GNSO to explore options."

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. UK?

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you. Just along the similar vein, just to strengthen that particular sentence that Marco's raised, I think actually explore options. Again, if we're saying there's viable solutions, then we

should maybe be saying, “Work with the GNSO to ensure the integration of PDP recommendations.” We know the solution’s already there, we don’t need to explore them, just ensure that it actually happens.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UK. We have exactly four minutes before the end of the session. I would suggest, Netherlands, to read the whole paragraph again, and we park it there in order to... On the one hand, to go back to your capitals, in order to consult and see how things are going as regarding the full text so far, and then we take it from there tomorrow. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Okay. Going from the top again, although this paragraph has not changed, “The GAC understands that a dedicated Policy Development Process (PDP) on Latin diacritics is underway to develop policy for gTLD strings that include diacritical marks and have ASCII-equivalent applications reflecting the writing systems of many Latin-script languages. The GAC is aware that the PDP is quickly moving through the process and looks forward to its conclusion. That said, despite the PDP progress”—the PDP’s progress maybe—“on this topic, the GAC has learned that the PDP will not be completed in time to include its outcomes in the Applicant Guidebook (AGB). The GAC is aware that viable solutions exist to resolve this issue without delaying the launch of the Next Round whilst providing proper notice to prospective applicants.

The GAC requests the Board to work with the GNSO to ensure the integration of PDP recommendations into the upcoming New Round of gTLDs.” And then within brackets, “A preferred option could be the inclusion of a placeholder in the AGB allowing for the future incorporation of PDP outcomes during the 2026 application window.” “The GAC is of the opinion that proactively addressing this issue now supports its predictability and inclusivity while keeping the program on schedule.”

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. We have two minutes for comments, questions, or edits. Let me open the floor. I have Australia.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. Sorry for not putting my hand up in the Zoom Room. Just noting the comment I provided as well as the comment Jorge made and European Commission’s message in the chat suggests we take this text offline and perhaps just rework this a little if the original drafters are amenable to workshopping it.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Absolutely agreed, unless anybody in the room tells me otherwise. And I see no hands. I see no hands online. Perfect. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Can I just suggest we, before closing, read through the titles of the next section in issues of importance just to set the stage for what we'll be discussing tomorrow afternoon? And there is probably still work on going just for everybody's awareness. We do have Community Statement of Interest. We have text there, ICANN Review of Reviews. Can we get a sense of whether text is likely to be ready for tomorrow early afternoon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE

Yes. We're currently discussing with the U.S., and we will be providing something by tomorrow. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I'm aware that this is the case for DNS Abuse as well. Domain Registration Data, I'm not sure. Is it the same? Okay. And then Governance of Regional Internet Registries?

MARCO HOGEWONING

I'm in the hands of my collaborators. I have cycled another version of compromised text awaiting replies. I hope that tomorrow, we can show what we've come up with.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you. I think it would be a great target if when we start Communiqué drafting tomorrow after lunch, we have all the texts. That way, it will be more effective, I suppose, use of our time tomorrow afternoon.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

There's a hand from, Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you. Just to ask if we can add a placeholder now for IGOs. Because we have just received an e-mail regarding the Council's voting tomorrow and we might want to add something in that respect, of course, in coordination with WIPO as our topic lead.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. Indeed. There we have it. That would be Topic #7. Thank you so much for that.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

That's all we have time for. A couple of housekeeping details. Tomorrow, we start at 9:00 a.m. in the morning with the GAC meeting with the NCSG, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. Then we'll have the meeting at 10:30 with the ccNSO. Lunch. Right after that, we'll continue with the GAC Communiqué drafting. So, we'll stop here. Anything I'm not covering?

FABIEN BEMETRIEUX

Yes. Right after lunch on the resuming of Communiqué drafting, as you may see on your schedules, I don't know if we can easily share

a schedule, but there is the first 30 minutes of that block of time after lunch is dedicated to the GAC Leadership meeting, during which it was suggested that it could be an opportunity for drafters of text to potentially fine tune complete any drafting so that when the session actually starts, which will be at 1:45, then we're ready to proceed with the reading of the text.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Good catch. Thank you for that, Fabien. I was going to refer to that tomorrow, but it's even better if beforehand. In other words, we're giving you more time not only to have lunch and some good coffee right after that, but during that coffee you can get together in order to continue with whatever wordsmithing might be needed at that point.

So, I'll stop here. Thank you very much for your time—sorry. European Commission?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Nico, very, very quickly. Just procedurally, time for submission is tomorrow morning. Do I understand correctly?

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Before lunch would be okay.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Okay. Thank you so much.

NICOLÁS CABALLERO

Thank you. Let's stop here and we'll reconvene tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. Enjoy your dinner and your social activities tonight. Thank you so much. This session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]