

---

ICANN84 | AGM – ICANN84 GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 6)  
Wednesday, October 29, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC Communique Drafting Session on Wednesday 29th of October at 13:45 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 form in the Zoom chatbot. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN language 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'll be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I'll now hand the floor over to GAC chair Nicholas Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulden, and thank you everyone for your flexibility, your patience, and your energy, as a matter of fact, in order to try to continue with the communique drafting. As you can see, everybody's got the block scheduled for these sessions. This communique drafting session will go on till 14:30, then we'll have a

---

***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.***

---

short 30-minute coffee break, and then two more communicate drafting sessions going all the way up until 5:30.

And then we'll have two more chances tomorrow morning from nine to 10:00 AM, and then from 3 to 4:00 PM hopefully, and I'm crossing my fingers, we will not need to use that last session at 3:00 PM tomorrow because again, hopefully, we'll be finished hopefully today or if worse becomes the worst, tomorrow morning during the 9:00 AM session. So, without further ado, let's pick up where we left off during the last session.

We were dealing in section four, issues of importance to the GAC, and we were talking about Latin diacritics, and it is my understanding that we already have, I mean, yesterday we already had some text, but there were some little edits, little editorial changes to the text. And for that, I will give the floor now to my colleague from the Netherlands, Marco, please go ahead. The floor is yours.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nico. Good afternoon, colleagues. So, yes we left off with Latin script diacritics yesterday. We have been supplied with some replacement text. Thank you for everybody involved in the drafting for that. I'll start from the beginning again, even though I believe most of the first paragraph remains as it was agreed yesterday.

"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. Despite the PDP progress, 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 of the view that the recommendations of this PDP should be part of the conditions governing the next round of gTLDs.

The GAC understands that there may be viable solutions 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 application and evaluation processes of the Next Round of New gTLDs."

I'll stop there. And you may have noticed that while I was reading, the Staff already made a few grammar checks. Please ensure that we will go over all the text for all the final dots and commas and possessive points later on as well. Any reflections, comments on this text? So far, I see no hands. I think Mr. Chairman, we can mark the screen and thank the proposers for doing all that hard work last night and providing an alternative.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. Indeed, rest assured that everything is gonna be checked not only by the five vice chairs, but

also by the chair and also by ICANN Staff, that's for sure, as regarding the commas, periods, and any other kind of regular check except for the content, the real meaning by itself. So, thank you so much for that, and thank you to the delegations that negotiated the text. Greatly, greatly appreciated. So, with that, let's move on then to the next.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, we're actually going to the top. There is a new introductory paragraph.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. And there's a new introductory paragraph right at the beginning of section four under issues of importance to the GAC. And I'll read it very quickly now. It's regarding the Next Round of New gTLDs. "The GAC welcomes the approval of the Applicant Guidebook and commends ICANN Staff and the many volunteers from the ICANN community, including the GAC, on their contributions to this important milestone in the Next Round of New gTLDs."

And I'll stop there in order to see if there's any reaction in the room or online. I see no hand. So, thank you very much. Can you green that text please so that we can move forward? Perfect. Thank you so much, Fabien.

So, let's move on to the next section, which is SOIs Community Statements of Interest. So, I'll give it a quick read and then, I'll stop

---

for reactions. "The GAC welcomes the recent adoption by the Board of the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest, looks forward to a swift and efficient implementation of its provisions, and would welcome regular updates on its application and effects."

And I'll pause here in order to see reactions in the room. Everything seems to be fine. No hands, no hands online. And one last chance. Perfect. Thank you so much for that. So, we'll green that text and move on. And for the next topic, which is ICANN Review of Reviews, I'll give the floor to Australia, right to my left. Sounds weird, but he's right to my left. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELTON

Thanks, Nico. 3, ICANN Review of Reviews. The GAC recalls the essential character of the ICANN reviews as mandated by the Bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN's accountability, transparency, and governance. Accordingly, the GAC stresses the importance of the Review of Reviews to address the concerning breakdown in the current system. The GAC expects to engage actively in this effort to ensure future reviews are efficient, effective, and aligned with ICANN's commitments to transparency and accountability.

- 
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Australia. So, let's pause here again in order to see if we have any edits, comments, or questions in the room or online. And there's a hand from Switzerland. Please go ahead.
- JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I was just wondering, but of course, I'm not a native speaker, where the breakdown's a bit of a harsh expression. Don't know if we could use something less dramatic. I don't know.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Switzerland. And for that, we're gonna have to turn to our distinguished colleague from Canada or from the UK or from the USA or from Australia, by the way, right next to me.
- IAN SHELDON The Dutch will fix this.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO The Dutch, okay. Let's pass it to the Dutch. Netherlands.
- MARCO HOGEWONING Maybe we can say concerning the challenges in the current system.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you chair, and welcome suggestions. Susan Chalmers, United States, for the record. But we do believe that the problem should be acknowledged adequately. We are looking at potentially a bridging amendment to the bylaws in order to cater for what is essentially a breakdown in the current system.

So, our priority for this particular paragraph is just that we acknowledge that things are not working while also looking to move forward. So, with that said, welcome continued suggestions and contributions from colleagues.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that clarification, USA. The floor is still open. So, as far as I can see, we keep breakdown then. Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Thank you for the explanation to the US. But actually, the community has reacted to this challenge and is starting a way to rechannel and to solve the issue. So, I think we should acknowledge that as well. And I find the proposal by the Netherlands, let's say, more adequate in that sense. So, I would keep challenges, but of course, maybe there's a more specific word, but breakdown is kind of something that you cannot fix, and we're fixing it as we speak.

- 
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Switzerland. So, as I recommend, we bracket that word, we include Marco, Netherlands suggestion, and we take it from there in order to see if it would be palatable for the rest of the GAC members. And I have Grenada.
- VINCENT ROBERTS Yeah, Vincent Roberts, Grenada. Would malfunction or misfunction function in that case?
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Grenada. I have Netherlands next.
- MARCO HOGEWONING Maybe, and before, we now have a massive list of six different terms, and then can flip a dice to figure out which one. With regard to the Swiss suggestion, that breakdown is too harsh and addressing, I think the rationale given by the US, could we maybe address that the current system has been suspended? So, if we say refuse to the current suspension of the system.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Thank you, Netherlands. So, yeah, current suspension off, and then... Okay, let me read it as it is in order to see if it makes sense for everyone. So, "The GAC recalls the essential character of the ICANN reviews as mandated by the Bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN's accountability, transparency, and governance.



Accordingly, the GAC stresses the importance of the Review of Reviews to address the current suspension of the system. The GAC expects to engage actively in its effort to ensure future reviews are efficient, effective, and aligned with ICANN's commitments to transparency and accountability." Are we okay with this text? Let me change the question. Anybody against?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The US.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sorry. US, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Given that some of the reviews are continuing to proceed and the status of the CIP, we will be willing to return to the previous wording, however accept challenges in lieu of breakdown. We would like to see the word concerning restored. So, to address the concerning challenges in the current system. I believe that was the Netherlands initial proposal.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. I have Egypt next.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Nico. And running the risk to have more discussion on this, but I'm wondering whether I'm the only one that would like to

add something after the system as if we all know. I mean, it kind of gives a room for people to put something behind the system that maybe we can say the system of reviews or something that is more specific to what we're talking about.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. So, there we go. We don't need to read the whole thing again, so I'll just read that paragraph. So, it would be something like "Accordingly, the GAC stresses the importance of the Review of Reviews to address the concerning challenges in the current system of reviews." Yeah, too many reviews. It is what it is, I know, but it's a little bit weird, but again, I'm in your hands. Should we leave it as it is? Too many reviews for my taste. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Perhaps, to address the concerning challenges in the current system for accountability at ICANN.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. Egypt, was that an old hand or it's okay as it is now? Okay, perfect. So, I see agreement. Anybody against, anybody has any strong feelings in this regard? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on. Thank you so much. Please green the text, Fabien, and let's move on. There's a comment. Could you please read the comment?

GULTEN TEPE

Yes, of course. We have a comment from the European Commission in the chat, noting, while appreciating the short text, why don't we mention at least some of the challenges?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Nico. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission for the record. Do not want to add any complexity to the process, and indeed appreciate that the text is short, concise. But for someone who is not following very closely the Review of Reviews process, it's not entirely clear what's happening, what's the problem, if not that there is a stall in the process itself. This is not strong concern, but just wanted to raise that it's not entirely clear what we are worried with.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, European Commission. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While I agree with the assessment of the European Commission, that this for outsiders might be really hard to understand, I believe that part of the current challenge of the Review of Reviews is indeed making a problem statement. So, it's kind of hard to list the challenges if this work is going away. I feel it would be preemptive to now start listing them and not get not get in the way of the work of the committee.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Chair. I agree with Netherlands, it's gonna be difficult to list the challenges here and now before even the group finishes its analysis. But I take European Commission's point and maybe putting, for example, to address the concerning challenges in the current system, not least, for example, regarding the backlog of recommendations.

I can try to draft something regarding the backlog of recommendations. This is factual information if this addresses European commission's point. Otherwise, it's going to be very difficult to go through the challenges at this stage. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, Egypt. Before I give the floor to Switzerland, I just wanted to give a word of caution in order not to over-engineer, because as it is, it's simple. I agree that for people outside the ICANN environments, so to say, it would be kind of difficult or cryptic to understand. But again, for the sake of simplicity and clarity, maybe we should keep it. I'm not preventing anybody from giving additional ideas, but let's try to keep it simple. Thank you. I have the US, and then Switzerland.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Just to note that we support Egypt's recommendation. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, USA. Egypt, is that an old hand. Manal, would you like to take the floor again? Oh, okay. Sorry. Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just to note and as a way of memory and I guess all interested readers of our wonderful communiques have all the previous communiques in their heads, and 0.6 of Issues of Importance of the Prague communique elaborated a little bit more what the situation was in Prague, which was really the crisis or the breakdown moment, I think.

And now we are more in the starting the solution moment, and there's more information there, there are references to a letter from the Board Chair to the GAC Chair, et cetera. So, just to reference that, I don't think we have to mention it in the communique itself, but there is a history for interested readers. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Very good point indeed, Switzerland. Thank you for that. So, let me read that sentence within the paragraph for the sake of time and clarity. So, it would read "Accordingly, the GAC stresses the importance of the review of reviews to address the concerning challenges in the current system for accountability at ICANN, not

---

least regarding the backlog of recommendations. There we go. Can we leave with this? Any strong feelings? Switzerland, is that an old hand? No. Okay. So, I have Egypt.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

So, just to bring in the rationale, while it's really important for people from the outside to understand what's going on here, we are talking about transparency and accountability, which to governments, mostly the leaders of the community, is a very important and critical issue, especially as we are talking about ICANN as an example for the multi-stakeholder model in this WSIS+20 year.

So, maybe we can just reference the prep communique here somehow, or that part from the prep communique so that people can go back and check in case they are somehow alerted by that text, if that is possible at all. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Christine. We can certainly do that. We can add a food note or something and we add a link if it's okay with everyone. Anybody against adding a food note with a reference to the Prague communique? And I see nodding in the room. So, okay. So, let's do just that. Thank you so much. So, there we go. We can green the text now.

Thank you very much for your contributions. We're making good progress here. Yeah, green it, and let's move forward. Thank you

so much. What's the next? Over to you, Fabien, please walk us through what we need to do so far in the different sections.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, I was gonna just highlight what we have in Issues of Importance and then decide where to go next. So, in Issues of Importance, we've addressed Next Round of New gTLDs, we've addressed community statements of interest, ICANN Review of Reviews, which we just completed, then we have a placeholder for DNS Abuse.

I'm not aware that we have finalized text yet. Domain Registration Data, we do have finalized texts as you can see in three subsection, Urgent Request, Registration Data Request Service, Accuracy, then we have Governance of Regional Internet Registries, as well as text regarding IGO Protections. So, I know that we have 15 minutes left in this session, so, I wonder if we want to dive in any of those substantive issues.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No, no, no, let's go to that... Sorry to interrupt, but given the fact that we only have 15 minutes, let's go over section seven IGO Protections, which seems to be the shorter one, I would say, because the other three seemed a little bit... IRRs. Sorry, sorry, yeah, IRRs. So, if we can scroll up a little bit. There we go, six, Governance of Regional Internet Registries. And for this, I will

---

kindly ask my colleague from Columbia to help us with the reading.  
Thiago, would you please?

THIAGO DAL TOE

Governance of Regional Internet Registries, IRRs. "The GAC welcomed the update from the ASO regarding the second draft of the IRR Governance Document. The GAC appreciates the efforts to provide a clear rationale for the changes and notes that many of the public comments on the first draft have been addressed.

The GAC underscores the importance of continued consultation with all stakeholders to align the governance framework, in a manner consistent with ICANN's core values of transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness.

In regard to subsequent implementation of the new governance framework, the GAC emphasizes that ICANN's multi-stakeholder community, including its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, should have an appropriately recognized consultative role in matters relating to the recognition and recognition of Regional Internet Registries.

The GAC would welcome continued dialogue with ICANN and the Regional Internet Registries on operationalizing the new framework to strengthen trust and confidence in the Internet numbers governance system."



NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Colombia. I'll pause here in order to see reactions from the floor. Okay. We have a hand from the Russian Federation. Please go ahead.

VIACHESLAV EROKHIN

Colleagues, I think that we should remove the whole part which started in regard to subsequent implementation, because I didn't see any document where a role of multi-stakeholder community in connection with recognition or direct recognition will be defined.

I don't know why GAC decided to define this consultative role and describe it as a consultative. Especially, I want to stress that ICP-2 document even not approved. And if you will read this document, there is no any statement about multi stakeholder involvement in implementation processes. I don't see any need to add this part. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Russian Federation. So, we'll put it in brackets for the time being, and then I'll give the floor at this point to the Netherlands and then to Switzerland. Netherlands, please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. To recall, and we have quite a bit of consultation, this paragraph does reflect a question that was raised during the ASO session. To highlight, the ASO session was not about the ICP-2, it was about the future and currently proposed RIR governance

document that is in public comment right now. So, I don't necessarily see what the history of ICP-2 has to do.

And I think as we discussed also with the ASO and asked the ASO about future prospects, and the ASO pointed to several items that will be left to review implementation. To me, the paragraph makes sense, but of course, we're in other people's hands, so maybe the Swiss colleague has a solution for us.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland. I wish I have a solution. And I remember the conversation during the session that I think is the basis for this para that Russia has made considerations on. My question was a little bit different one. It's just two questions. First, we mentioned in the first line the RIR governance document.

I was wondering whether we could be maybe even more specific and put the whole title. I think it used to have governance document for the recognition, maintenance, and derecognition of regional internet registries, but it's just a question whether that is appropriate.

And the second question also for those more into this issue is whether the phrase at the very end, operationalizing the new

framework to strengthen trust and confidence could be read in a different light like we need to strengthen it.

Maybe we want to say that we want to maintain the trust and confidence or something more recognizing that there's already a lot of trust and confidence in how it works. I don't know if I am explaining myself. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. I don't understand who your question is for, though. Is it for the full GAC? Is it for me? Is it for the Russian Federation? Can you...

JORGE CANCIO

For the drafters.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, Switzerland. Well noted. I have the European Commission, and then India, and then Netherlands, right? Please go ahead, European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. So, I would like to intervene in support of the text that is currently in bracket. I think if it is not clear that we are not referring to the changes in the governance document for the recognition operation and the recognition of regional internet registries, also known as the governance document, we should

make it clear we are not talking about further amendments to the current document.

We are talking about what is happening afterwards, which is the implementation phase. And we have asked the question to the ASO as regards what is happening in terms of the ICANN community involvement in this process, not just ICANN Org involvement in this process. And they rightly said, this is not for us to determine, this is for ICANN to determine.

So, we are suggesting, we are not the editors of the text, but we are in support of this text, to have clear indication towards ICANN that the community, in particular, advisory committees like the GAC might have an opinion on issues linked to recognition and derecognition.

And just to also remind everyone that in the past, there have been GAC advices on these specific matters. We were discussing recently with some stakeholders who were pointing to GAC advises concerning previous recognition of registries. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, European Commission. I have India next.

T. SANTHOSH

Thank you, Chair. This is Santosh for the record. On regarding the third paragraph of governance of Regional Internet Registries, this paragraph was formulated basically on the ethos of ICANN multi-

stakeholder process, which is followed, and the paragraph has been contemplated in ways by which only one constituent should not take a lead on the governance of RIRs. And during the ASO plenary, both with the GAC and ASO, this was also emphasized. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, India. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, two points, one in response to the Swiss comment on the title. I've looked it up. Indeed, this is the correct full title, but then in between brackets it simply says the short title is RIR Governance Document, but I'm happy to go with the longer one if people prefer that.

To words, the comments made by Russia and just made by India, I think also paraphrasing this, what essentially the GAC is asking here is that when ICANN goes to implement the new RIR Governance Document, that simply, that implementation will build in something that will take it back to any decision taken back to the ICANN constituencies.

To me, that makes sense, and you probably don't want this to simply stick to the hands of ICANN Org to make a decision. This is something that probably needs to go to the community.

So, maybe it's quite a complex sentence, but essentially think that's what we're asking for is that if this gets implemented, that in

that implementation, there is somewhere, a hook to bring this back to the community. That's my reading on it. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. So, can you erase the brackets for the time being again, Fabien, in order to see if we have agreement here. Before I give the floor to the UK, let me ask the Russian Federation, if, given the background as already explained by some of my colleagues, if they would be okay with keeping the text? Russia Federation?

VIACHESLAV EROKHIN

No, we are not agreed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Could you please explain why?

VIACHESLAV EROKHIN

Taking in account the last comment from Marco, I agree that it can be added something about future participation of multi-stakeholder community in the process of recognition and derecognition according with appropriate role.

And we are strictly, again, work consultative, but not in this wording. We can say something about participation of multi-stakeholder community and future work, but not like that. We should work with wording.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      Thank you, Russian Federation. I have Netherlands, and then the UK. Sorry to keep you waiting, Craig. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING                      And sorry, UK, for jumping ahead, but I'm looking at the time, this session is supposed to end in one minute. The paragraph was originally introduced by India. I, as wearing my caretaker head of this topic, ask India to consult with Russia in the next break and see if there's compromised language to be found on this paragraph.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      Thank you so much. That's a very good idea, indeed. So, at this point, sorry, UK, but we need to wrap up at this point. So, we'll have a coffee break. India would you please get in touch with our distinguished colleague from the Russian Federation in order to see if we can reach some sort of common ground before moving on? We greatly appreciate your cooperation.

T. SANTHOSH                                  Yes, chair. I believe he's online, right? Okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      Yes, indeed. Because It is my understanding that Sasha is not in the room, right? Are you in Dublin? Let me ask you.

---

VIACHESLAV EROKHIN

No, I am not in Dublin. I am in Moscow. We can contact only online.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much for that. Okay, let's pause now. Let's have a 30-minute coffee break. Please be back in the room at 3:00 PM. Thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**