
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Meeting: GAC and the ALAC
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC meeting with the ALAC on Tuesday, 10th of March at 9 a.m. local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN's 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 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, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC. I have the distinct privilege of introducing the whole ALAC team. We have Kathleen to my left, Kathleen, Amrita, Satish, and of course, Jonathan to my

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.

right, and we have David Bedard from the Canadian government and Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU.

We have, I would say, a very packed agenda, and I really hope we'll have enough time to discuss in depth each and every single one of the topics we have. Basically, we'll be talking about linguistic inclusion, Latin Script Diacritics, and we'll get into the details, of course, and then we'll discuss DNS Abuse and the GAC expectations and end-user harm, basically.

We'll touch upon the Applicant Support Program and then open the floor, of course, for, I would say, short and sweet questions. The idea is to avoid long introductions and long background and try to get, you know, straight to the point in order to make sure that we'll have enough time to cover all the topics, and then finally, the WSIS+20 and global digital governance processes, and hopefully we'll have 15 minutes or more for that.

So, without further ado, let me welcome again the ALAC, and at this point, I'll give the floor to Satish and David Bedard, who's going to walk us through the whole topic of Latin Script Diacritics. Welcome, everyone. Satish, the floor is yours.

SATISH BABU

Thanks very much, Nico. David and I discussed this, and I will go first, and then David will go. So, the Latin Diacritics PDP originates from requests from Canada, the French speakers of Canada, of the At-Large community, who asked for parity between .quebec, that

was already delegated, and .Québec with an accent on the e, which is the way they used it in the communities, in the French-speaking communities.

Now, this was unfortunately not possible to be treated as variants, because the e and the e with the accent, they are not classified as variants. If they're variants, we can kind of happily kind of include them under the EPDP on IDNs, because that's where variants go. But unfortunately, the Latin generation panel decided that these cannot be variants.

In fact, there are very few variants in the Latin Script, compared to the number of languages that exist using that script. Now, since this request came from the kind of bottom-up, through the bottom-up process, ALAC took it up with GNSO, not just as one single issue of the Canadian-French, but the general issue of what happens if a particular script falls between the cracks, and cannot be handled through the EPDP, then what do those communities do?

So, this led to an issue report, which came out in September 2024, which recommended a narrow-scope PDP to address all the cases across different scripts. So, the Latin Script Diacritics was initiated by GNSO Council in November 2024, kicked off by ICANN82, and the name was shortened from Latin scripts Diacritics PDP to Latin Diacritics PDP, because there's some unfortunate acronyms that would otherwise happen. And the PDP kind of put out its recommendations.

It was open till February, and there were 54 recommendations or implementation guidance items. And in this ICANN85 meeting, we had two sessions on Saturday, which took up the initial analysis of the public comments received. Now, throughout this whole thing, what was an anxiety which came up through different forums was that, can we have the output of this in time for this round? Or when is it actually going to take effect?

So, when we examined the comments received, this came from 16 commenters, and 29 of these were substantive, which means a lot of work for the team. And what I should stress here is that there is a dependence of the Latin Diacritics PDP on the ePDP. It's a very close dependence. So, while discussing in the team, we just said, okay, following on from the ePDP and IDNs, this is what we'll do. But by the time we ended in the diacritic PDP, we found that the ePDP and IDNs was already a part of the guidebook, whereas the Latin Diacritics were nowhere in the picture because the consensus policy is not yet done.

So, all these references that leaned onto the ePDP and IDNs would not work, because ePDP is a totally different category now, although they were in the same category when it was discussed. So now the team estimates that the completion time, taking into account all this additional work, would be October 2026, which means subsequent to that, there would be the GNSO processes and the Board. So, the earliest the consensus policy would be ready for implementation would be perhaps mid-2027. So this is not an

official date, but this is what we feel from discussions, informal discussions on Saturday when we took this up.

Now, ALAC, together with other stakeholders, would have liked to see the recommendations incorporated in the AGB for this round. But unfortunately, this appears difficult, and therefore we share the concerns of all groups, including, of course, GAC, as to when is the earliest that the recommendations of this ePDP can be available for use by applicants. Thank you. I will stop here. Back to Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Satish. I don't know, David, if you would like to go ahead now, or we open the floor for questions, or you would prefer to take the questions a little bit later on. It's up to you. I'm okay either way.

DAVID BEDARD

No, sure. If it's okay with you and with everybody, I'll just go through now, and we can take questions on the topic itself.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Go ahead.

DAVID BEDARD

That would be great. Thank you. Satish, thank you so much for that really great and comprehensive overview, much better than I think I could have done. So, thank you so much. So, I think for the GAC,

this has been a longstanding priority for the GAC, particularly given the importance of universal acceptance at ICANN and the broader goal of supporting linguistic diversity in the DNS.

It's certainly something that is a priority for the GAC and well within our mandate. So, there was greater clarity on how this work adds greater clarity on how ICANN can consistently and effectively handle situations involving Diacritics and help advance our shared objectives around linguistic inclusion.

And I think it's really important for people to realize that these are not just decorative elements of characters. They carry meaning. They indicate pronunciation. They reflect both cultural and geographic identity. So, they really are an important element of both written and verbal speech. I'll move on to the next slide, please.

So, I know that Satish already sorts of touched on this, but as was said, despite efforts within the PDP, and I'll note that the PDP was very well scoped and it moved along quite quickly, there was a mismatch on the timing. And unfortunately, due to that mismatch, we sort of missed the publication window of the AGB.

So, in spite of how successful the PDP was in executing the work done to finalize the recommendations or come up with the initial set of recommendations, the recommendations likely will not be included in the upcoming round. So, it's unfortunate reality for many stakeholders, I think we realize that, including governments, who see a clear public interest value in ensuring that diacritic

inclusive strings can be properly understood and managed in a consistent and predictable manner.

So, while the GAC would have preferred to see these recommendations incorporated sooner, we also recognize the important work in moving the Next Round forward without delay. I think that we're very sympathetic to that. So, we know that the community has been working for many years towards the next round. It's a big part of the work at ICANN and further postponement on that would really create its own set of challenges for applicants, for end users and governments.

So, we do really think it is essential that the next round proceed as planned. But I do want to emphasize that the PDP has been quite successful and all effort and hope is not lost. I think that it was a great exercise and they're continuing to look at the Public Comment submissions and seeing how they can finalize the next step with the GNSO Board and incorporate any sort of future handling of linguistic inclusivity in subsequent rounds.

So, I do think that, and I think my ALAC colleagues would agree with me, that I do think that we have strong alignment between the ALAC and the GAC on this and we should really continue tracking this together. There's always strength in numbers and it's something we clearly care about. And I just want to thank my colleagues for joining us today to discuss this. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Canada. Before I open the floor, let me thank Canada for the heavy, the hard work on this. We know how close to your heart this whole thing about Latin Diacritics, the whole thing is. So, thank you so very much.

Let me open the floor for comments or questions at this point before we move on to the next topic, which is DNS Abuse Mitigation. But before I do that, let's see if we have any comments or questions online or in the room. I don't see any hand online so far. Let's see if we have hands in the room. Italy, please go ahead.

GIACOMO MAZZONE

No, I'm not in Italy with my Italian hat. I'm a WBU observer, sorry, for the records. What I want to say is that there is a possibility that this very meaningful recommendation that are important for the diversity of the environment can be accepted after, even after, could eventually make, because I don't think that nobody will really object to that at the end because we are not harming anybody. We are simply increasing the diversity, can be a clause that can be entering force later and people can voluntarily accept is something that has been done in the past. I'm not sure.

DAVID BEDARD

Sure. Thanks so much. And I think it was a question that we all had on the top of our heads. We'll have to see. I think right now the AGB is quite complicated and it sets out very specific rules in terms of how ICANN evaluate strings and very clear processes.

So, I know that it's certainly something that we are looking into. We don't have a clear answer on how that any sort of recommendations from this PDP could possibly be sort of fitted into the evaluation criteria retroactively, but it's certainly something that we're tracking. I don't know, Satish, if you have anything to add just in terms of particular recommendations.

SATISH BABU

Just like to add that to begin with, this is an exceptional process. The LD PDP was an exceptional process. So, we already are in an exception mode right now. On top of that, whether we can have yet another exception, I'm not sure, as David said. However, it's very clear that both ALAC and GAC have very close alignment on this issue, that if there is any way to make it work faster, sooner to the applicants, the better. So, we don't know how that's going to work out, but perhaps it's worth putting our heads together to work towards that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Giacomo, for the question. We have time for one more question or comment before we move on. Seeing no hand online or in the room, let me give the floor at this point and transitioning a little bit.

We're going to be talking now about DNS Abuse, government expectations and end user harm. And for that, I will give the floor to my colleague, Jonathan. I don't know who's going to go first,

though, Jonathan. Is it you or Martina? Martina is joining us online. Or will it be you? Okay, okay. We have Martina Barbero from the European Commission online. Over to you, Martina.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much, Nico. Jonathan, if you want to go first, I'm happy to go second as well, because you have more substantial material and I can comment on that if that's okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Sure. I think calling it substantial is giving it too much credit. It's a little bit of a brainstorm about DNS Abuse issues that may come up and questions that may come up as the first PDP on associated domain checks evolves. And we as the At-Large community have not yet had the all-important, let's get together and figure out what our positions on all these questions are.

And so, this was just some thoughts of things that we might open up for conversation with the GAC and as we start to try and form what might be some joint thoughts on it. So, as far as expectations out of the PDP, I think we want to make sure there's clear triggers for associated domain checking. I mean, part of the problem that has existed in the contracts to date is that they have a lot of language like may and might and must have a policy for or things like that.

And ideally this PDP would more closely resemble the recent contract amendments and make more certain and predictable

what the triggers are for this domain checking. Right now, there's not even a particularly clear trigger for initial action to be taking place, but at least there's a requirement for action to take place.

Clear timeframes. This is going to be a perennial issue related to DNS Abuse and I know the GAC is working really hard on things like urgent requests for data, et cetera. So, clear timeframes for this to happen I think would be a good expectation to have out of this PDP as well.

And then as far as where we might want to see DNS Abuse go beyond this PDP, this is sort of out of scope for this, is looking at preventative measures based on customer info. In other words, can we predict on the way in that predictive analytics, et cetera, around domains. So, those are some thoughts on DNS Abuse.

And then the next slide. Increasingly, the PDPs are including human rights assessment, et cetera, as part of the work. You know, what are some of the caveats that this group may need to consider as it goes forward in the PDP? One of the things that was excluded are compromised domains, which makes sense. But I wonder if we'll be talking about compromised accounts. In other words, if somebody, a count with GoDaddy is compromised, they may register a malicious domain, but the other domains might still be fine.

So, there can't be an easy assumption necessarily that all the domains they've registered are malicious, even though it would be our inclination to make that assumption. So, that might call for

initially a kind of soft suspension that makes it easier for an appeal and the restoration of that domain if it turns out that it was prematurely taken down based on the associated domain review.

And then the other, something that may work as part of that, and again, this is just me brainstorming about this, is that something like page rank methodology. In other words, if you recall the page rank system that Google came up with initially when they first entered the market was about looking at the pointers to a page in order to prioritize search results. So, in a sense, the more links there were to that page, the higher Google ranked that page.

Well, in theory, if we look at a lot of phishing attacks, they're deep links, and there won't be a lot of links to them just existing on the web. And so, a page that has a very low Page Rank could be an indicator of being a maliciously registered domain because every access to it was direct. So, it's just something to be thinking about in terms of how to evaluate in a fair way the other pages that are, the other domains that are registered by that same registrant.

So, those were just some thoughts. But I would invite Kathleen to, as our actual representative on this PDP, to slap my wrist wherever necessary on this brainstorming.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

No. Thanks, Jonathan. Not at all. So, obviously we're in very early stages of the PDP and just having kind of initial conversations. The

big conversation that was had yesterday was around appropriate triggers for ADCs and the conversation going around that.

But one thing that I think ALAC has an important role to play, and there's been obviously different areas of collaboration around this, is making sure that regardless of what amendments and changes come out of this PDP, that there's robust redress mechanisms that prioritize the rights of the registrant. And that's something that we've been kind of throwing around. And so, as we continue to talk and move forward, keeping that in mind is the only thing I would throw out in addition to what Jonathan had already said. But I'm happy to hear other thoughts.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Kathleen. Thank you, Jonathan. Martina, over to you.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much. And apologies for our lack of slides. We came slide unprepared. But we will comment briefly on what the GAC is doing on the PDP and our expectation. And I will give some brief comments and then my colleagues, Susan and Tomo, who are the topic co-leads, will complement.

I think, first of all, in terms of, let's put it this way, the way the GAC is approaching this PDP, I think you might have heard it yesterday, we have created a subgroup, which is a small group that will work specifically on DNS Abuse. And the way we intend to use this group is kind of an antechamber for us to be able to prepare position on

the PDP matters, also acknowledging that this is the first PDP, but likely there will be another one, either in parallel or shortly thereafter.

And I want to be faithful to the fact that we haven't really ourselves defined 100% the positions on the PDP charter within this group. But initial feedback on our side, the initial discussion from the GAC focused on being quite pragmatic. And I think, Jonathan, we join you in saying that there's some language in the contract amendments that could be useful as a kind of a starting point, in a sense, because it has already been approved and it's already precise enough, rather than spending maybe a lot of the time of the PDP inventing new definitions.

And I also think that the pragmatism also reflects in the fact that we have expectation in terms of this is a very narrowly scoped PDP. We hope we can achieve results reasonably fast. Yesterday, someone in the PDP room said this could be a blueprint for a faster PDP model, in a sense.

So this is our expectation as well, to collaborate fast. And we appreciate that some communities have already even produced language to make sure that we advance on this topic. Which brings me to my third point, which is, because this is such a narrowly scoped PDP, there are a number of things that are left out, especially from the issue report of this summer. And the GAC is still keeping an eye on every gap that has been identified in the issue report.

Jonathan, you mentioned proactive measures, for instance. This is something that we have reiterated several times, but there are also other points such as transparency of reporting. And while these topics cannot be addressed in the PDP, we would appreciate and we welcome the collaboration with ALAC in making sure that they are addressed elsewhere.

I think we have been quite aligned in the past in terms of the need to progress on DNS Abuse. And I think we can definitely collaborate very well within the PDP and outside. Maybe a final reaction before I leave the floor to Susan and Tomo on the human rights impact assessment. I think I would welcome your experience on implementing this framework in the Diacritics PDP and see how we can do it in an effective manner, because I think this is a very important topic.

But we also want to make sure that it is used at the right moment and that we have a methodology that is solid. At the European Commission, we do have impact assessment for whatever we do.

And I know it can be, if taken with the seriousness that it needs, it can require a lot of time. So, we want to make sure that it's done at the right moment and we want to, you know, meet the expectation of the community on this point. And then Susan, Tomo, I don't know if you want to take the floor from the room and add on anything.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Sure. Thank you, Martina. Susan Chalmers from the United States. And not too much to add to Martina's intervention. But just to note that it would be interesting to hear more from ALAC at some point, if possible, on any insights that ALAC has on the impact of DNS Abuse on end-users. I mean, I think we can all assume and understand that generally speaking, it can be incredibly destructive to people's lives, being the subject of a phishing attack.

I do have one stat I was able to pull up very quickly this morning, which is that per the FBI's 2024 Internet Crime Report, financial losses reported from phishing, malware, and ransomware, which is the type of malware, botnet activity, and these are all included within ICANN's DNS Abuse definition, of course, totaled 93 million in the United States.

I mean, it is incredibly impactful and that we have the opportunity to work together to provide a policy developed at ICANN that can help mitigate that harm, I think is really important and it's quite the opportunity. So, that's why the United States is so engaged in the DNS Abuse work. And outside of that, I would just say that I thought yesterday's sessions were incredibly productive and positive and the GAC is engaged through Martina and Gabe specifically and we have colleagues from the PSWG who are alternates.

But we also have a small group that is, forgive me for the feedback, we have a small group that is coming together and that is meeting and it's really exciting to see how many GAC representatives are dedicating time to this and that number is growing. So, we are

coming together today to kind of develop our top lines in response to the charter questions and are looking forward to engaging and kind of helping keep the momentum so we are able to achieve swift results in this PDP process. Tomo, happy to turn it to you.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you, Martina and Susan. I don't have much to add from the input from Martina and Susan, but I'd love to say that the GAC members are highly alerted mainly for the timeline for the PDP because I think that the current timeline for the initial report might be too long and needs to be shortened. So yeah, it is important to, you know, the current staff and including many topics for the military war compliance, but still we needed to simplify the process. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Japan, USA and European Commission. So yes, as of yesterday, we have 17 GAC members participating. I understand that two or three more joined this morning or something and speaking of numbers, 93 million just in the USA. I was going to ask Japan and the European Commission for their numbers, but maybe we can do that some other time, but you can imagine.

And finally, before I open the floor for questions, maybe as regarding the timing, it is my understanding that the current

proposal is about 18 months or something for the whole thing or, yeah, something like a year and a half.

The first impression I got yesterday after hearing that, you know, was that, again, way too long and if it can be shortened by, I don't know, 40%, hopefully 50%, but any number would be more than welcome, you know, by the GAC. Again, one and a half years for this, seems a little bit, I would say too much. Anyways, I'll stop here. Let me open the floor for comments or questions before we move on to the next topic, which is ASP, you know, Applicant Support Program, but before I do that, let me see if we have comments or questions in the room over there. Yeah, please go ahead.

MACIEK PIASECKI

Maciek Piasecki with EURALO. According to the Netskope report, as much as two-thirds of the cyber-attacks, and that includes DNS Abuse, can be attributed to nation-states, so state-sponsored organizations. How is GAC going to address this thing? I know ICANN is strictly apolitical, but this is going to be the elephant in the room, I think, and how do we make sure that this responsibility is being addressed and the whole responsibility is not being pushed onto the legitimate users as some measures proposed already in the process might be a bit intrusive towards privacy and freedom of speech of the users?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for the question. I don't have an answer for that at this point, but that's certainly something we can discuss, you know, among GAC members, for sure. So, thank you, anyways, for the question. I see a hand from -- oh, go ahead, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, I don't think there's a clear answer to that, except that if you put an objective policy on actors, because it could be government, it could also be organized crime, and it could be individuals and things, and so as long as we have remedial measures in place for what will hopefully be the minimal instances of unjust action, then I don't think that governments or organized crime are going to make heavy use of the remedial actions, right?

And so, I think that as long as those things are in place, we'll be able to address some of the rights concerns that this certainly raises, but I think us trying to make a distinction between the characteristics of the malicious registrant is probably not fruitful.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jonathan. The floor is still open. Any other question or comment? I'm sorry, I see Eunice. Go ahead, please, Eunice. Sorry.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ
COELLO

Thank you. I will you speak in Spanish? Thank you. My name is Eunice. I'd like to ask a question to the GAC on the issue of DNS Abuse. So, the specific question I have is if governments see opportunities to improve cooperation between registers, public

authorities, and other bodies which work on DNS mitigation. That is the first question.

And the other question is what kind of damage are end-users suffering? In terms of what do you think is the most urgent damage that has to be dealt with when we talk about DNS Abuse? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

With your permission, given the fact that the question was asked in Spanish. So, I'm going to go straight to the second question. If I understood correctly, what was the most significant threat when it comes to DNS Abuse?

In my humble opinion, it is child abuse and any sort of threat which is posed for human life. Now, I don't quite remember the first question. Could you repeat it, please?

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ
COELLO

So, do you see any opportunities for cooperation when it comes to governments cooperating with registrars, public authorities, and other actors on the issue of DNS Abuse?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Well, that's exactly what we are doing. That's why we're here in the GAC. There are a number of lines for cooperation, not just between law enforcement agencies, but also between governments more

directly and in close collaboration with registries and registrars. Is there anything more specific that you were looking for?

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ COELLO So, what type of cooperation are you discussing at the moment, specifically on this issue? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO I'm going to try to speak a little bit more slowly. Now, my language is very popular in Spain and Latin America, and apparently, I speak quite quickly. So, specifically, what I can say is that the example that we heard before from our colleague from the United States and from the colleague from the European Union, participating governments can join the Working Group, and there they work on more specific issues. For instance, Mexico.

Now, we haven't seen Mexico in the GAC for a while, and it would be wonderful to have Mexico back again, but they could actually join the small group on DNS Abuse, and in that way, they'd be able to cooperate through specific ideas or perhaps specific agreements. I mean, they can bring forward ideas, and it would be extremely welcome. I hope that answers your question.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ COELLO So, specifically, what type of cooperation has occurred in the meetings of small groups, the meetings that you mentioned specifically?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

As we don't have much time, I will pass on the information to you later on. We don't want to allow the meeting to get stuck on this point. Please go ahead.

DEOLINDO COSTA

Good morning. I'll be speaking in Portuguese. Thank you for the opportunity, for the importance of DNS Abuse and its relationship with cyber-crime. I would like to know the experience of GAC and other countries that are part of the working group in terms of guiding the governments of how to approach this issue as to regulation.

Countries such as mine, Mozambique, it has a bill for cyber security, which would be the best approach for this issue. I would like to know more about the legal frameworks in the other countries, and if the entities that work with DNS, should these registrars and registries should report to the governments as to DNS Abuse.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Right off the bat, I can tell you that that is actually, in my opinion something to be decided internally, you know, for each participating government. But certainly, if you have a specific proposal, you know, for the group, you're more than welcome to join the group and make your proposal, you know, freely. It will be more than welcome again. So, okay.

Thank you again for the question. Any other comments? We need to move on though, because we still have to talk about the ASP, the Applicant Support Program, but I just wanted to make sure that there are no more questions or comments as regarding DNS Abuse mitigation.

Seeing no hand in the room or online at this point, let me give the floor to my distinguished colleague, Jonathan Zuck, and Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU. Over to you, Tracy, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Nico. I think this could be a fairly simple conversation, honestly, given Tripti's blog and given the decent number of applications to the Applicant Support Program, I think the number is at 75 now, and it goes well beyond the sort of expected number when they allocated the initial funding for the ASP program.

And we, at the time, the GAC and ALAC together, recommended that the funds grow to accommodate the number of applicants, because the alternative that they had proposed is that the number would go down, so if they had too many applicants, then each of them would get a \$10 discount and a chicken dinner or something like that, and that doesn't quite get the job done.

So, I think they're now asking us, given that they're talking about taking funds out of the auction proceeds, they want to get community feedback on the idea of raising an additional \$5 million, basically, out of those funds, and do we still feel the way that we

did before? And we certainly do as the ALAC, and so I suspect you do as well, and so maybe it makes sense for us to put some combined quick note together for the Board.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Yes, thank you, Jonathan. Maybe we could just, yes, look at this slide. So, given what was just said by Jonathan, I think the questions are very, very clear. Do the GAC and ALAC still support this approach? Well, let's, I guess, discuss if that's not the case.

The challenge here, I think, is really whether or not the 75%, which is the current discount given the guidance that was delivered by the GGP, given that it's 40 applicants, meaning with the current budget, 40 applicants would get 75% at the lower end of the scale.

Now we have likely more than that, at least 45, potentially 75, and there's additional funding. Can we, therefore, recommend, strongly recommend that, at the very least, we go back to the 85% reduction, and therefore the funds allocated accommodate that, and as Jonathan said, maybe there's an opportunity to provide a joint statement. I don't use the word advice yet, but a joint letter to the Board on this issue. So, I guess that's the questions, and if there's any objections or discussion, I'm happy to facilitate that quickly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Jonathan and Tracy. Let me open the floor here. I mean, right off the bat, I can also tell you that we didn't, and

you know, we didn't actually have time to discuss this among GAC members, so this would be a good time to do it on the spot, so, and that's why I'm opening the floor for feedback from the GAC.

So, comments or questions? Any idea in this regard? The questions are on the screen. Do the GAC and ALAC still support this approach, and does it also impact the possibility of a maximum reduction of the 85%, and so on and so forth? I see a hand from Portugal. Please, go ahead.

ANA NEVES

Thank you very much, and I'm going to speak in Portuguese. In the current context, it seems that there is this possibility of increasing the budget for the Applicant Support Program, and of course, I really don't understand if this increase in budget will affect also -- it's 75% now, will increase to 85%. How much will the budget increase to accommodate these 75 candidates, but supporting these 75 applicants, will this -- it's not clear my question?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No, no, no. It is. I just don't have an answer for that. I don't know if Tracy or Jonathan can help me here, or anybody else for that matter?

TRACY HACKSHAW

So, I think it is not clear yet in the IRT, but I think the opportunity here is ask them what to do. Well, Org to do the work. Well, I don't want to say here if it's not 75, then it could be more than 75. We're

asking for 85, maybe it could be more than 75. So, to do the calculation to see what can happen. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Portugal, for the question. I have the CTU next. Nigel, please, go ahead.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you very much, Chair. Nigel Cassimire from the CTU, and we certainly would be supportive of an increase in the budget to keep the discount at the maximum level, right? So, if the level were 45, we could support an 85% in the budget. If it happens to be 75 now, we would say increase the budget such that the discount level remains at 85%. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. The floor is still open. Any other? Yeah, Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Yes, Judith Hellerstein. So, the question is, you said the money is going to come from the auction proceeds. Do we know how much money, and do we know what the procedure is going to be to give, to have the money brought over? And is it going to be loaned? Is it going to give? Is it going to be permanently given? There's a range of having been on the auction proceeds original committee, that's what I was wanting to know.

I mean, it is within the guidelines of this, but I'm also wondering, what about the other funds that ICANN has with the SFICR, or whatever, that's being renamed on those also available funds for this purpose? Because there's often that amount there, too. They're looking at raising that amount, too. So I'm just curious, as this is a very priority project for ICANN, what was the thought given to getting money from that angle, and not just auction proceeds? Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Judith. The short answer would be, I don't know, but would be more than glad to find out, right? At this point, we don't have an answer for that, unless anybody can help me with that. Tracy, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, we don't know why they're proposing taking the funds out of auction proceeds, other than it's the easiest bucket to take money out of, probably. So, it does have an impact on the grant program, long term, to take the funds. The amount of money they're talking about is \$4.9 million, and I think what we're proposing is to support an 85% number, regardless of what that number ends up being.

And so, I haven't sat here and done the math, and I don't know if 4.9 gets to say 85 or 75%, actually, but I think what we're saying is supporting the 85%. But I think you're right to question that. There are essentially three questions on the table.

The first is, are the auction proceeds the right bin from which to extract the money? Is 85% the target, or is it 75% as the GCC had originally recommended if we went over? So, I mean, those are sort of the big questions. And I think we're saying probably yes to both, but we can take it up with the Board on the other sources of funds, potentially.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW

And just quickly, just to remind the community that this, the auction proceeds discussion happened before. So, there was agreement from the community to use the auction proceeds, I don't know, six months ago, whatever it was, six months to a year ago. So this is just a reiteration of the decision that was taken previously that was supported by the community.

So they're just simply asking, do you still agree with that decision that, for whatever reason, it's coming from there, but we did agree? And they're asking again, do you agree? We are now asking, now that we agree, if we do, can we also ensure that the range is at the higher end for the 75? Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Tracy. For the sake of time, I don't think we'll have a clear answer for each one of the three questions at this point.

Maybe this is a good topic to discuss intersessionally with the GAC, and the sooner the better, of course.

Deadline is March 20th. I know, I know. But my point is, I don't really think we'll have consensus, you know, within the GAC at this point today. And given the fact that we only have 15 more minutes, and we still need to cover, you know, the WSIS+20 topic, I suggest that we move on, and we discuss this on a Zoom call with the GAC next week, hopefully. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Could we potentially just ask a hypothetical? I mean, because we might be able to take advantage of everyone's here to get their feeling, because we can operate on the assumption the money's coming from the auction proceeds, and then we're just asking, does this group support enough money being taken to get 85% to all of the applicants? And we could just, I don't know what you do here. Do you get a show of hands or anything like that? Instead of getting one by one, I don't know.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I wish I could give you an answer, but the floor is still open, and I don't see hands in the room or online. So, the most logical thing at this point would be to discuss later on with, unless you have a better idea.

JONATHAN ZUCK

There's this old-fashioned thing where you go like this. That's what I was saying, what's the temperature of the room? You don't do that. It's not formal enough for the GAC. Is that it? I can't see your face. Is he grimacing?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Jonathan, I mean, you're more than welcome to continue chairing the session if you want, but we do things in a certain way in the GAC. If you want to come and change that, again, more than welcome to, you know, yeah. Justine, I see your hand.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you, Nico. This is Justine from the ALAC. So, not to impose anything on your processes, which we respect, but potentially this is something that can be addressed through the GAC communiqué. So, there is an avenue for discussion within the GAC to come up with the communiqué, right?

We just want to have an indication that potentially we could do something with GAC in terms of a joint correspondence. If that's not the case, that's fine as well. I know ALAC is prepared to take on, you know, communication with the Board by the 20th of March.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Thank you, Justine, for the idea. But the GAC communiqué, believe it or not, also has a process, you know, that starts long before each ICANN meeting. And I'm sorry, I didn't invent the system. You know, it's kind of like a bureaucratic way of

doing things in order to make sure that everybody will have a say. You know, again, it's not a perfect way to deal with things. I agree. I wish things could happen faster. I wish there were peace in the world. I wish so many things, you know. But this is just the way we do things.

So my offer is we discuss this during a Zoom. You won't have the answers today unless, I mean, I would be very happy, you know, to be told otherwise. And again, the floor is still open. I don't see any hand online. I don't see a hand in the room from the GAC, I mean.

Okay, so moving on, Amrita, we're going to be talking about the WSIS+20 and global digital governance processes. We have seven minutes for that. I'm so sorry about this. And we have Jorge Cancio and Christine Arida online. Would you like to go first?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Yes, I'll keep it very precise. And many of the GAC members had been there at the WSIS+20 review session yesterday. Something which came up, which Jorge was also speaking, is we've had a lot of reflections, lessons learned. What do we do next? And as Jorge was mentioning, the governments agreed to a particular text.

How do you make it successful? Even the ICANN community was very successful. So, we want to explore and identify how the GAC-ALAC can work in coordination, especially when the timelines and implementation is pretty blurred. Thank you. Christine and Jorge, if you want to add something, please go ahead.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much, Amrita. I think I'll leave it to Jorge first. Okay, go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Oh, okay, Christine. Thank you. And thank you, Amrita, by the way. Congratulations, Amrita. Very well-deserved. And I think just to recap a little bit what we discussed yesterday. Of course, many of our governments participated in the WSIS+20 Process. We are speaking here mostly in a national capacity, because each country has different positions within the GAC regarding the WSIS+20 Process. But it's true that we reached a consensus, which is something that is very hard to achieve nowadays in internet governance, digital policy matters. So, at least we have a document that we all agreed in New York a couple of months ago.

So, that's very positive. Now, the question is to deliver on that, because as was said yesterday, it was a consensus, but it was fragile and it was also conditional. Conditional on delivering. And delivering means that the UN family, the different parts of the UN and the member states and also stakeholders get together and really do their best to get those goals, those objectives we have in the WSIS+20 document on connectivity, on data, on AI, on financing, on many other issues into reality. So, that's a big issue.

And of course, this is much broader than the ICANN remit, but I know that as we governments, we also deal with other issues, also

stakeholders participate in wider processes in different capacities as yourself, Amrita, in the IMSP. So, we can, I think, continue these exchanges and basically on an informal basis, seeing what we can do best and also what can be the role of ICANN Org, ICANN, the community, all the parts of the ICANN community in this work.

And so, there's a lot that can be done. ICANN can continue its work. I think Kurtis mentioned some of the activities they are doing, like with UNESCO, with other organisations which make absolute sense in the implementation cycle. And of course, ICANN has been also strong supporter of the UNIGF, of other processes.

And we were discussing in the previous segment that ICANN is sitting on \$200 million or more of the auction proceeds funds and the grant Programme so far has supported some Internet governance initiatives, but it could be used in a much more strategic fashion, that's my national position, in order to support the implementation of WSIS. I leave it by that. I'm sorry, I talked too much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

It's all right, Switzerland. Thank you so much. Christine, you have three minutes, literally speaking.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

No, actually, I was going, Nico, to say that I'm also congratulating Amita, by the way, but I just want to add more to what Jorge and

Amita have said. I think it would be better if we listen to our colleagues in the room about those three specific points.

What are lessons that we may have learned from the WSIS+20 process and what could be possible areas for GAC-ALAC to move on, on implementation of those outcomes. So, I'll leave it to you to moderate the room if any other colleagues would like to jump in here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. Any final comments or questions? Amita, Jonathan, Kathleen, Satish, you are our invitees, so you have priority at this point.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you. I think we need to keep the conversation rolling because these are all topics which are flowing all the time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Amita. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I don't have any more on this topic, but I do want to say that we've really appreciated the cooperation that we've had with the GAC and the opportunities we've had to do joint communication because there is strength in numbers, and I know that requires a lot of coordination, and I know we owe a lot of that coordination to Mr. Hogarth in the back of the room there, and so I just wanted to get

everybody to give him a round of applause for the work he's done for this cooperation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Jonathan. So, thank you so much. Thank you, Kathleen, Amita, Satish, Jonathan, and of course, Tracy and David, our GAC reps at the head table.

So, we're wrapping up the session now. Please be back in the room at 10:30 for session number 14, which is the GAC discussion on who is and registration data issues. Thank you very much. Enjoy the coffee.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]