

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (2 of 5)  
Wednesday, June 10, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the second ICANN86 GAC communiqué drafting session on Wednesday, 10 June at 16:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. With that, I will leave the floor to GAC Chair Nico Caballero, please.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. We do already have some text, some input that's already been discussed and agreed upon. So, without further ado, Benedetta, and I understand you're still doing the cleaning. Are you done with the cleaning? So over to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. So under issues of importance, we've received some text on domain name registration data. As we 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, we have four different subheadings, and we have text on D, so accuracy of domain name registration data. And we're still waiting for text on the subsections A, B, and C.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thanks so much, Benedetta. So we'll start right there, and then we pick up on sections A, B, and C as soon as you get the text. So, okay. So I'll read the first part, D, accuracy of domain name registration data. And it reads, "The GAC appreciated the opportunity to discuss with the GNSO the matter of the 15-day timeline for gTLD registrar validation of registrant contact information. The GAC understands that the current 15-day timeline for registrars to validate registrant contact information as required under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, RAA, originates from rules established in 2001. The GAC will pursue a process with the aim to revise these requirements so that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain or the completion of a domain name transfer. The GAC is eager to review the current rules, particularly ahead of the delegation of new gTLD strings, taking into account all relevant aspects of this issue, including potential operational and financial challenges to registrars. Existing research and reports, such as the report of the GNSO small team on accuracy and the informal report, should also be taken into account. Recognizing the substantial work already undertaken by the community on this issue, the GAC believes that discussions should focus on identifying practical implementation pathways. Given the potential need for contractual amendments,

---

the GAC considers important the early involvement of the ICANN board in these discussions with the contracted parties and the GAC. Given the potential need for contractual amendments, the GAC considers important the early involvement of the ICANN board in these discussions with the contracted parties and the GAC." There's a full stop there, right, Benedetta? There's no more text? Can you scroll down a little bit? Scroll up, sorry. Okay. Yeah. Okay, so there you have it, and I have the European Commission. Please go ahead.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Thank you very much, Nico. Two things. First of all, the last paragraph has been copied twice, probably a mistake on our side upon transmission, the given part. This is the same text repeated twice.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah. That was the impression I had.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

And then the other thing is that also for transparency, but in case colleagues have views. So this issue has been discussed and reflections included in the communiqué either under accuracy and registration data or DNS abuse. In the Mumbai communiqué, we had it under DNS abuse. Our proposal was to include it under registration data because this was the session when this was discussed. I know that some other colleagues might have different

---

views. So just to say that from our side, it's not essential. It was just a matter of reflecting where it was discussed. But we are happy either way.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. Good catch. There was a repetition, a clear repetition there. And as regarding where to include this, the floor is open. If anybody has a different idea, more than welcome to say so now, or we keep it there, or we move it somewhere else. We're in your hands. So again, my proposal would be, unless somebody has strong feelings as regarding keeping this where it is, let's just keep it there, and we move on. Okay, seeing no hands in the room or online.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

We have India.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Ah, we have India. Go ahead, please. And UK. All right. India, you're first.

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, I think what a colleague from the EU mentioned, I think these two issues are quite overlapping. So maybe it's also important here to have some reference to the DNS abuse aspect here. It's immaterial whether it appears in accuracy or in DNS abuse because maybe we can have some text to link it to the DNS abuse. And also

---

in the line where we are saying, recognizing this, sorry, in the existing research and reports, such as reports of the GNSO accuracy team on accuracy, and maybe comma DNS abuse mitigation final issue report, and various SSAC recommendations and informal report, I think, so that it's important to highlight as to in which all places these have been raised by the various community.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. UK, please.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you, Chair. UK, Craig Stanley-Adamson. I think the presentation yesterday was really useful. And I think the evidence base that was given by some of those registries, I'm wondering, do we want to bring that out a little bit more, just increasing the evidence base? I know we say there in the final paragraph, "Recognize existing research reports, such as GNSO small team, accuracy, et cetera, et cetera, should be taken into account." Do we want to invite, maybe just make this a little bit proactive, make this something, a small call to action, but invite more evidence base than the two that we had? And the two are very good, but there's a lot more out there.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, UK. And would you be providing some text or ideas in that regard?

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON I can make a quick suggestion. I'll take this down. I'll come back to you within not too long.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Perfect. Thank you so much. So I recommend we park this here, unless, oh, I'm sorry. I have India and then European Commission.

SUSHIL PAL Maybe because if we can add, I think, since our colleague from the UK is asking, mentioning more evidence, we can in the last paragraph, existing research and reports, such as reports on GNSO small team on accuracy, and then we have two more. We have DNS abuse mitigation final issue report, as well as SSAC recommendations. So we can mention those two.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay, can you slow down a little bit, please, Sushil?

SUSHIL PAL Yeah, sure. Sorry.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Let's give Benedetta some time to write down.



---

to additional evidence, but I don't think the main call for action from the GAC is to do research from scratch. But the point was, let's build on the existing research and see whether we can implement some solutions. Having said that, if there is a strong request to add more evidence, we are not against, but I think this aspect of having more information is captured at the beginning. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. I have the UK next, and then the CTU. Craig? Ah, sorry, that was an old hand. Okay, CTU, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIR

Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimir from CTU. The third paragraph, "The GAC will pursue a process with the aim to revise these requirements." I think, does that sound as if the GAC has the power to, or intends to, revise the requirements? As a process, maybe with the aim of having these requirements revised or something of the sort. As it's stated there, it sounds like this is something for the GAC to do, which I don't think is in power.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, CTU. That's an important detail to take into account, right? Using the passive voice there would imply that we're requiring someone else to do the job and not ourselves. Very good detail. Thank you, CTU. Well noted. I have Japan next.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you very much, Chair. About this paragraph, the third paragraph, as far as I understand, the verification will be necessary on not only these two types, as the newly registered or completion of a domain name transfer. And I think that when the inaccurate registration data is found, they also need to do the verification. So, I don't have any specific text to propose, but I think that it also should be included. So maybe, for example, the registered data is found inaccurate or something. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Japan. So let me read that part in order to see if it makes sense for everybody. "The GAC will pursue a process with the aim to revise these requirements so that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain or the completion of a domain name transfer when the registration data is found inaccurate." And I'll stop there in order to see if it makes sense for everybody, or if we should keep the... Japan?

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

I'm sorry. Thank you very much. For example, "So that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain, comma, the completion of a domain name transfer, comma, or when the registration data is found inaccurate." Something like that. Thank you.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Japan. I have the European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Thank you. One small point. First of all, agreement with the proposal from the CTU regarding the change in the text in the sense that it's true that I don't think that the GAC can all alone drive and conduct the process. On the other point raised by Tomo, there is an overall agreement that the verification of the data should occur even more often. But I want to say that we should keep it for the moment in bracket and assess whether this pertains to the issue we are discussing. Because we are pointing to specific rules in the registrar agreement, and these are the 15 days timeline for the validation and verification, which occurs when there is a transfer and when there is a registration. So if the inaccuracy of the data is not part of the same set of rules, we risk creating confusions. So I just want to double-check that, if that's possible, if we can still keep it in bracket. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. Okay, so we'll do just that. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Marco Hogewoning speaking for the Netherlands, for the record. I wonder, and I'd like to query the authors, where it mentions SSAC115 and SSAC129 recommendations. The regular nomenclature used by SSAC is to

---

refer to reports. It's not called a recommendation. I wonder, this might be confusing in relation to other points in ICANN where we do make recommendations. So my suggestion is to refer to those as reports, but happy to stand corrected by the authors.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

India?

SUSHIL PAL

I think, I mean, no, I think it's okay. No, I think, I mean, mention whatever Marco is saying. I think, I mean, idea is that it's already been brought out in various SSAC recommendations. Technically, I think I will go with Marco's, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, India. So well noted. Thank you, Netherlands. All right. So at this point, back to you, Benedetta. Please walk us through, because we need to do some...

SUSHIL PAL

It mentions report, so I think we can mention the report as per the matter. I think we just saw it mentions report, so we can mention that report. And we also have SSAC58 report as well, so we might mention all three. SSAC58, SSAC115, and SSAC129.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO Perfect. Thank you so much, India. Netherlands, are you okay with that? Perfect. All right, so here we go. We only have these brackets, this final part. Yeah, the third paragraph after "completion of a domain name transfer," and we have text in brackets there, "or when the registration data is found inaccurate."

BENEDETTA ROSSI That's the text that European Commission asked us to keep for now in brackets.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay, thank you, Benedetta. So we're going to keep that, following the European Commission's recommendation, if okay with everyone, of course. Seeing no hand. All right. So back to you, Benedetta. Sorry, we have the US. US?

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair. I think it might read a wee bit better if it says, "or when the registration data is found to be inaccurate."

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, US. Okay, moving on, and thank you again. Thank you, everyone, for your contributions. We're going to move on to topic number four, which is the Applicant Support Program. And for this, I will kindly ask my distinguished colleague from Lebanon to help us with the reading. Zeina, over to you.

ZEINA BOUHARB

Applicant Support Program. The GAC continues to closely monitor implementation of the Applicant Support Program, ASP, for the next round of new gTLDs, which it views as a critical mechanism for maximizing diverse participation in the DNS ecosystem. The GAC acknowledges the extensive work undertaken by the board to date, and notes its stated position at ICANN86 that it has exhausted the operational and financial levers currently within its direct purview, including its decision not to increase the ASP application fee reduction beyond 75% for this application round. The GAC notes, however, that continued efforts remain essential to address financial and accessibility barriers facing applicants from underserved and underrepresented regions. In particular, the GAC encourages the board to outline concrete steps to maximize use of the applicant support directory and to facilitate, through ICANN's global stakeholder engagement teams and in collaboration with willing GAC members, connections between qualified applicants and potential sources of development finance. Additionally, recalling ICANN77 GAC advice, the GAC reiterates its recommendation that the board takes steps to substantially reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support for applicants from underserved and underrepresented regions. In light of indications that the number of qualified ASP applicants may exceed initial projections, the GAC further encourages the board to remain open to future reevaluation of support measures and fee adjustments should

---

demand from underserved and underrepresented regions prove greater than anticipated.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. Let's scroll. Perfect. Thank you. So this is a little bit long, so I'll give you some extra time to analyze it. So in case you have any kind of suggestions, edits, or comments, this is a good time to do so. So let's pause here so that you can read it.

Okay, I see no hands in the room. I see no hands online as regarding topic number four, which is the Applicant Support Program. Just to make sure, are we okay with the text as it is in order to move on? Just want to make sure I capture the temperature in the room, and I see nodding and agreement. Sorry, Egypt, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico, and just to suggest that given the earlier comment in the room, maybe instead of referring to next round, we constantly refer to the 2026 round all across the communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, Egypt. Very good catch indeed. Yes. We'll go ahead with that.

---

MARCO HOGEWONING

Maybe this is one we can take intersessionally as just an overall edit. I see Secretariat nodding, so we'll just plow through the text and fix these things.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Thank you, Egypt. Any other comment or edit? Trinidad and Tobago.

KAREL DOUGLAS

Nico, Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago. I just wanted to underline or underscore the word on the second paragraph, second line, operational and financial levers. To me, it's not too clear. Are we asking or are we saying that the board use these levers to achieve something, but it doesn't say what the levers are doing. In other words, it exhausted the operation of these levers within its direct purview. For what purpose? So are we saying it operated these levers to reduce the fee, or it operated levers to do something? So it's just to say, what were the levers doing or what was the operation of the levers to do? So is it for forbearance or to give relief? In other words, just to kind of complete the thought that they did operate these levers to exercise forbearance or exercise relief, and they could offer no further relief or reduction. Well, it actually does speak to it in the latter sentence, where including it could not increase the ASP application fee reduction. So just to give context as to what these levers are meant to be doing.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Trinidad. You actually got my lizard brain a little bit confused. But I have Netherlands, and then I'll give you some feedback.

MARCO HOGEWONING Yeah, I think what you meant to say is levers suggest it's a verb. There's something to pull. So maybe a way to avoid this is refer to operational and financial capabilities or operational and financial opportunities, to sound a bit more positive. Something like that, but simply swap levers out for something else.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Netherlands. That was more or less what I thought about, so thank you for pointing this out. Yes, I was going to say financial resources. But anyways, Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Nico. It's more of maybe a precision in the fourth paragraph. Are we there yet?

NICOLAS CABALLERO In what, sorry?

JORGE CANCIO The fourth paragraph.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO No, we're doing the second paragraph.

JORGE CANCIO Oh, okay. I come back.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Sorry. We're on the second paragraph. Yeah. Resources, levers, capabilities, opportunities, currently within its direct purview. So, I have the CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIR Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimir again. To answer Carole's query, I can suggest that we say, "Operational and financial levers for applicant support." That's it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. Thank you, CTU. Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO Thank you. So on this second paragraph, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Maybe it would be good to double-check whether this is really the case. So I have the feeling that we are drafting this very broadly. So this, it has exhausted almost all levers. And if I remember correctly, what the board announced in its blog post is that they have exhausted the possibility of this reduction, or this expansion from 75 to 85. So they were quite specific that they were talking about this and only this. So I

---

wouldn't read more into the board's announcement than that, because going back to what I'm going to say afterwards in paragraph four of this section, we are actually trying to explore whether there is a possibility to try to reduce the registry operator fees, which also are a big cost for any registry. So to cut the long story short, why don't we be more specific in the second paragraph, just refer to the exhaustion that they have announced, which referred to the application fee reduction, and stray away from having a broader language because it would cut into our own argument under paragraph four. Was this understandable?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

A little bit, but in that case, we would basically erase paragraph four. Is that what you're suggesting?

JORGE CANCIO

No.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

No? Okay.

JORGE CANCIO

I can try. So I would try to draft paragraph two in a more specific way. "The GAC acknowledges the extensive work undertaken by the board to date and notes its stated position at ICANN86 that it has exhausted the operational and financial means within its direct purview," and I'm just thinking aloud, "regarding the ASP

---

application fee reduction beyond 75%." Full stop. So we just refer to that because that's the announcement that they've made. And that allows us to explore under paragraph four the reduction of the registry operator fee.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes, much clearer now. Thank you so much, Switzerland. So there we go. There you have it. Spain, please.

IÑAKI GIL OSÉS

Iñaki, here is Spain. It's a grammar issue, so thank you. The last three words, they're still the same with the Switzerland change. Is that for this application round? If you have not talked about the round within the same paragraph, wouldn't it be more clear, the current round, the mentioned round, the 2026 round instead? Just even though, of course, English is not my mother tongue. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Spain. Yes, but I think we mentioned the round before, if you scroll up a little bit. But again, I'm not the expert. Sorry, scroll down a little bit. I think we mentioned it in section three, if I'm not mistaken. Benedetta, can you scroll up a little bit? No, no, no.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

No, up.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      The other, yeah. Section three?

BENEDETTA ROSSI                         Section three.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      A little bit. Yes. Okay. I think we mention it there. I wouldn't have any kind of problem repeating the... But I think it was already mentioned there. In any case, thank you, Spain, for the suggestion. It wouldn't hurt to include it there. So back to you, Benedetta.

BENEDETTA ROSSI                         Thank you, Nico. And yes, we will be going back and streamlining all of the mentions of the round, since they're being used in different contexts, and we'll make sure that they're all aligned in terms of the actual name of the round. And otherwise, for the moment, Nico, we don't have any additional text, so I'm not sure what you want to be looking at.

NICOLAS CABALLERO                      No, no, no, we're still on this. No worries. We're still on the second paragraph because we need to agree that Switzerland's suggestion is okay with everyone. Spain, is that an old hand? Oh, okay. I have Comoros next.

---

COMOROS

Thank you, Chair. I think that as we add current application or application round in each paragraph, that means that if in other paragraph we don't add it, we give opportunity to not act on this current round. I don't know if it's clear. For example, in the next paragraph, we said, "In particular, the GAC encourages the board to outline concrete steps to maximize use of applicant support directory and to facilitate through ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement." If we don't add during current round, it means that we give them opportunity to do it for this round or not. So can we, on the reduction, precise that the recommendation is for this round, or add the current round on each paragraph to ensure that the recommendation for each paragraph will be taken account for this round? I don't know if...

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Comoros. Do you have a concrete example to give? Because I got a little bit confused.

COMOROS

Yeah. For example, here, on the current paragraph we are editing, we precise 70% for this application round. But in the next paragraph, we put a recommendation, but without precisising for this current round. It looks like we give opportunity to do it for this or not.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Thank you, Comoros. I'm not the grammar expert here, but my understanding, my very poor understanding of the English language, is that we're still referring to the same topic. But I stand to be corrected, of course. If there's better language to include here, more than happy to do so. I have Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING I believe the issue is for the reference on this application round. May I suggest to stick to the 2026 round as we earlier discussed?

NICOLAS CABALLERO To remove any doubt. Yes, I agree. Would that fix it, in your opinion, Comoros? Would you be happy with that?

COMOROS Yeah. Thank you. It's okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Perfect. Thank you very much. Any other comment or question? I have Argentina next.

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS Thank you, Chair. Marina Flego Eiras, Argentina, for the record. I put a suggestion on the chat, which was introducing a formula on the beginning of the communiqué beside the name of the 2026 round, with a parenthesis and describing the name with a formal formula

---

so that throughout the text, the name of the round is always the same, and there are no divergences.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Argentina. Thank you so much, Argentina. Well noted. Point taken. We'll do just that. Of course, unless anybody has a different opinion. Do we all agree on that? In other words, anybody against? Okay. So thank you so much. We'll keep it. Thank you, Argentina. Moving on. Benedetta, please walk us through. Do we have any other text? Let's clean it up first in order to see if we have agreement here and then try to move on in case we have additional text. Is that the case? No? Okay. So, let's clean up and see if we all agree on this. So at this point, Lebanon, I'm going to have to bother you again to kindly ask you to give it another round of reading. Please, over to you.

ZEINA BOUHARB

Okay. "The GAC continues to closely monitor implementation of the Applicant Support Program, ASP, for the next round of new gTLDs, which it views as a critical mechanism for maximizing diverse participation in the DNS ecosystem. The GAC acknowledges the extensive work undertaken by the board to date and notes its stated position at ICANN86 that it has exhausted the operational and financial means within its direct purview regarding the ASP application fee reduction beyond 75% for the 2026 round of the new gTLDs. The GAC notes, however, that continued efforts remain essential to address financial and accessibility barriers facing

---

applicants from underserved and underrepresented regions. In particular, the GAC encourages the board to outline concrete steps to maximize use of the applicant support directory and to facilitate, through ICANN's global stakeholder engagement teams and in collaboration with willing GAC members, connections between qualified applicants and potential sources of development finance. Additionally, recalling ICANN77 GAC advice, the GAC reiterates its recommendation that the board take steps to substantially reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support for applicants from underserved and underrepresented regions. In light of indications that the number of qualified ASP applications may exceed initial projections, the GAC further encourages the board to remain open to future re-evaluation of support measures and fee adjustments should demand from underserved and underrepresented regions prove greater than anticipated." Stop.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just to make the point I was going to make before, on the now, I think it's the third paragraph, where we talk about additionally. I wonder whether we should be specific because we talk about ongoing ICANN registry fees. And I'm not sure whether that is specific enough. As far as I understood, one of the fees that are ongoing is

---

the registry operator fee. So maybe we want to be specific on that, but I stand to be corrected, and maybe our expert GAC support staff can enlighten us whether that is the right terminology. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Well, I'm with Jorge on being open for ICANN staff to refer to the correct term. I struggle a bit with ongoing. I think recurring fees. An ongoing fee seems a bit of a misdemeanor. I think we're talking about annually recurring fees here.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico, and thank you, Marco. I just want to flag that the language here is directly referencing the ICANN77 GAC advice text, which stated the GAC advice to the board, and then there's various Roman numerals, and one of them says, "To take steps to substantially reduce or eliminate the application fees and ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support for applicants from underrepresented or underserved regions." So the ongoing ICANN registry fees is a direct quote from the ICANN77 communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Benedetta. Okay, I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So maybe to maintain consistency with that advice, we could say, "Ongoing ICANN registry fees, notably the registry operator fee," to expand, so we make sure that we at least refer to that fee.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States. My concern is that this could, even though it is quoting advice, be misread to mean that registry operators should not pay ICANN fees. If that is indeed the original text, I don't think we should be compounding the error there. I understand Jorge's proposal, but I'm just wondering if we can wordsmith this a little bit to come back to it, if that's all right with you. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. You read my mind because it's a little bit confusing, maybe. I wouldn't say misleading, of course, but yeah, it could give grounds to have a different interpretation, again, in my understanding. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, just maybe for the group to elaborate a bit, I think, and I must admit, I also still have to look it up. But I think what this is referring

---

to is that next to the reduction of the application fee, the AGB has currently a formula that will allow some discount for the annual registry fees for those applications that are under the ASP. So there is, just to address some of the US concerns, the AGB, to my recollection, has a safeguard in it. This is not constituting all things, but I agree, we might want to clarify the text as to its intent. So to that, I'm happy to take your suggestion to park this and take it offline for some further drafting.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so I have a suggestion. Let's stop here. Let's park this topic here for two reasons. One, we need to do some wordsmithing on this text, and number two, we're still waiting for additional text. Can you show exactly where, please, Benedetta? We're still waiting for text on A, B, and C in section... Well, as a matter of fact, also under DNS abuse mitigation and in topic number three, domain name registration data, A, B, and C. So my suggestion is to stop here, park it here, wait for the text, and discuss it tomorrow. And at this point, address the only issue, the only topic we didn't have time to cover this morning, which is the CIP process. Can you pull out the slides, please, Gulten? If you agree, of course. And I see nodding, so that we get done with that, and tomorrow we start fresh with the missing text.

All right. So once you can pull out the slides, Gulten, what we're going to do is we're going to cover the capacity development sessions report that, as a matter of fact, we didn't have enough

---

time to cover. And for that, I will kindly give the floor to my colleague from the Netherlands. So, over to you, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nico. Yeah, while staff is digging up the slides, in my mind, I think it was something like 36 or so. You are all subscribed to the GAC mailing list, I hope. If not, please contact our support staff and we'll fix that as soon as possible. Can you flip to the capacity development, Gulden, Julia, whoever is sharing screen?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Please move ahead. That's the CIP. We're going to be covering the capacity...

MARCO HOGEWONING

Slightly ahead, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes. Okay. Thank you. Yes. There we go. And you see here, it's not only me, Zeina, who's sitting in the room. We carry this forward, by the way, as GAC leadership. Before I flip to the next slide, this is quite an extensive piece of text, even though it's only three pages long. I hope you have read it. If not, I recommend also looking at the mailing list and refer back to that. But let me just quickly

---

highlight what we're trying to do, if I can get the next slide. And this has been ongoing work. It was noted this morning. This is also part of the ways we try to improve the GAC effectiveness and the GAC efficiency.

What we have noticed so far is that, and as it says here, this emerged from our discussions we had with leadership retreats both this year, but even last year in Brussels, we already noticed that we see more and more need for capacity development. We see that within the GAC, and I may note, we also see that outside of the GAC. If we look, for instance, at the work at WSIS in the UN, there's also still a very high importance set on capacity building. So there is the bigger global driver. What we see here in ICANN is evolving policy work. It's getting more complex. We try to move at fast pace, for instance, with the DNS abuse. We've also seen examples this week. What's AI going to do with this space? So the digital ecosystem keeps moving, criminals are getting smarter, and we all are trying to keep up. And that was also, again, pointed out, I think, with our colleague from the Democratic Republic of Congo earlier today, the continuous rotation on GAC representatives. And that sort of ties into the policy work, because people come in, there's ongoing policy discussions. You have to quickly get up to speed what has happened. You have to quickly get up to speed what the current problem space is and get the hang of going there.

Looking at that, what we have noticed is that the current efforts are quite distributed. For capacity development, the Underserved Regions Working Group has an important premise to do that

---

originally, looking at indeed helping capacity build the underrepresented, the underserved regions, help them to get into ICANN. But we've also seen involvement of the topic leads, DNS abuse, but also the Next Round topic leads. There's a lot of work being done by ICANN staff. There's also a lot of work done by our support staff with the GAC enrollment. Once people join the GAC, we're trying to help them to get on board. And those efforts are not always connected, and those efforts sometimes are a bit ad hoc and a bit messy, and as I said, we feel that especially with the onboarding, this is sort of a continuous process. It's repetitive. So looking at the various options, and this is sort of evolving over time within the leadership, we figured what's the best way to look into this, and what we feel like is what we need is some central hub. We need some central place to connect the dots. We need some central place to put all these efforts together and look at sort of a more holistic way, what's needed, to whom, and what's the best way to deliver it and when.

So in short, looking at it, our way forward would be to put a capacity development working group into place. This will be a GAC working group, so it's under the GAC operating principles, and bring everything together. So it should not replace any of the existing work. It should very much strengthen it. So bring in the efforts that the other groups are doing, work with them, work with staff, work with the leadership to put it all together, and as it says, coordinate and support the efforts across the community. So as it says, the current role of the Underserved Regions Working Group,

---

but they're certainly not the only ones who are doing capacity building, find a pathway to work with all the working groups, with the topic leads, and build a plan. And that's where I envision this point starting. Once we have this group, we have a mandate. We can clearly say, "This is the group that's going to do it." And part of the proposal is set this group to work and come back with us, maybe even in Bali, give it 100 days, and sort of building on the GAC strategic plan, building on the GAC annual plan, do a round, collect everything that's needed, and come back and represent the GAC with sort of here's a more long-term plan. Let's say the next year, the next two years, what we think we want to do. So identify prioritized learning needs and start coordinating on the planning of those sessions. And in particular, and there's a bit more detail in the text also, to, for instance, see to build on the GAC website, a special section where there is a portfolio that says, "Welcome to the GAC. Here's a number of items that you might want to look at." Be it online training materials, be it recordings, to simply help people to, this is the way the GAC works. This is the way community drafting works. These are the ongoing discussions. So sort of help that onboarding, help welcoming new resources. And of course, we can all chime in, we can all work together. I know, and I've been told, that there is ongoing effort from ICANN to also strengthen this, so there would be a nice conjunction. We can work together, we can look at what else is there already in ICANN, what is there in other groups, what can we learn from them.

So that's kind of, in a nutshell, the proposal. There's still quite a bit of room to maneuver, I think. As you see, what we've mailed to the mailing list is a one- or two-pager about sort of the rationale and the intent of what we're doing. We try to set up, and also with help from Zeina and a few others, to formulate some bylaws and then firm some key responsibilities and deliverables. As I said, what we deliberately try to avoid is becoming over-prescriptive or micromanagement. So at the current stage, the proposal in front of you is, are you okay with trying this out? If we set up the capacity development working group, go with a small group, small team, set to work and initiate this and do the rounds and create that initial work plan and come back and say, "Here we are. Let's try this." My personal view, I think it's safe to try. If it fails, it fails. We can always remove a working group just as much as we can start it. As for now, before I hand it back to the chair, the operating principles say it's the chair's decision to start a working group, so we're not asking you to vote or thumbs up or thumbs down. Of course, it will help if you express your support. Ultimately, we're in Nico's hands here. Last bit, and that I would like also some feedback or some show of hands in the room. If we do establish it, we need a few volunteers. We need a volunteer chair, and we envision that chair to be supported by probably one or two co-chairs or vice chairs also to provide a backup and some extra human power to do the thinking. So I guess as one of the proponents, I'm happy to take part of that task on me, but I would be glad if there is some additional support coming from the room. And I see Zeina already looking at me. Please, not. But if there are others, please step forward. As

---

leadership, we've got plenty on our plate, so we can use all the help we get. That's it. It's in front of you. As I said, Nico, we're essentially in your hands with this. So, back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. And indeed, I am in your hands. So number one, do we have any other volunteer to join the Netherlands in this endeavor? Number two, I have absolutely no problem going ahead with the creation of this working group. So let me pause here in order to see if we have reactions. Lebanon, please go ahead.

ZEINA BOUHARB

No, just joining Marco and volunteering for the group.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Greatly appreciated, but you're a vice chair, so you would naturally be included in that. Thank you very much. I have Trinidad and Tobago next.

KAREL DOUGLAS

Thank you, Nico. Karel Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago. And of course, I'd be more than happy to volunteer in whatever capacity. I just wanted to go back, and I do understand from the point of view of the evolution of capacity building, and you have caught the elements. If it's okay, if I could just make a comment. The elements of capacity building/onboarding, and we know that the different theories, one is when you are here already, and the other one is

---

when you are now walking into the room for the very first time. And we do understand that there are 20-something new persons, new members of the committee. And for them, they require a specific type of onboarding/capacity building. And of course, for us, the seasoned members who also want to know about, as you rightly said, Marco, AI in the DNS and so forth. And I do appreciate that this is something that can have a lot of benefit. We all need some level of training, continuous training as the case may be. And I'm glad that you mentioned that of the working groups and even ICANN itself, the organization, they do have some sort of training, if it's not leadership training. We've seen that, and we've had the benefit of that. So just to say, and it's really a comment to underscore the need because we've been doing a lot of the underserved regions, I should say, has been doing a lot of capacity building. And I do see a lot of benefit in this. So I just wanted to say that, and thank you, of course. So, yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Trinidad and Tobago. Please go ahead. State your name for the record, right? State your name and your affiliation.

NEEMA LUGANGIRA

Thank you. My name is Neema Lugangira from African Parliamentary Network on Internet Governance, APNIG. If acceptable, I would also like to volunteer myself because I feel that capacity building is a critical component. And when we're talking

---

about government officials, it's important for us to also make ways in which the government officials can also include parliamentarians in their capacity building, because a lot of the things we're saying here has an impact on policy and legislative frameworks. I submit. Thank you, Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much to the African Parliamentary Secretariat. Secretariat or secretary? Secretariat, right?

ZEINA BOUHARB

Network on Internet Governance, APNIG.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Oh, APNIG. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, APNIG. Okay. My apologies.

ZEINA BOUHARB

No, it's okay.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. More than welcome. So there you go, Netherlands. You already have Lebanon, Trinidad and Tobago, APNIG, and Netherlands. And other colleagues are also more than welcome to join. Okay. Any further questions or comments in this regard? Because we still have 19 minutes to talk about CIP at this point. So if we can move on and get done with the CIP, I will be very happy to give you 10 extra minutes for some extra Spanish coffee.

---

This is very straightforward. The proposal you have on the screen is a lightweight approach to this first three-year cycle of the CIP, the Continuous Improvement Program. I'm not going to read the whole thing, but the idea is to leverage the existing work within the GAC in anticipation of a likely review of the CIP, which in fact is the case, right? There's an ongoing process, and I stand to be corrected here. After the first cycle and in consideration of current workload and so on and so forth, there are some current best practices being identified in the GAC to be the key initial indicators. What is the CIP? Very quickly, again, it's a recommendation from the third Accountability and Transparency Review. And I assume we will have the links, or we can provide the links for those GAC members, which I assume would be the case of the 27 new GAC representatives. My apologies if that is not the case. We're not assuming anything here, but just in case, we will provide the corresponding links. And by the way, this will be applicable to all SOAC structures, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and the Nominating Committee itself. There are five common principles. The SOAC or NomCom is fulfilling its purpose. Again, Supporting Organization Advisory Committee or Nominating Committee is actually fulfilling its purpose. The structures of SOAC or NomCom are effective, efficient, and they are accountable internally to their stakeholders and substructures, where applicable, of course, and externally to the wider ICANN community. And basically that they collaborate to further the mission of ICANN and the effectiveness of the ICANN bottom-up multi-stakeholder model. A detail to mention here is that in our

case, in case of governments, we do have a bottom-up, super multi-stakeholder model, I would say, that is called elections. And that happens to us every four or five years, every two years in some cases, in case of parliamentary elections and so on and so forth. So I'll stop there. Do we have another slide on this, Gulten?

Okay, so there we go. So for each principle, there's a need to select at a minimum three criteria, and for each criteria, the need to identify a minimum of three indicators, which would be used in any case as KPIs, key performance indicators, speaking in commercial or business language. Example indicators, regular issuance of GAC communiqué, just to give you an example, on-time publication of meeting notes and minutes, regular review of progress against annual plan and working groups, which by the way, we have already implemented and we do on a regular basis. So, this is just to illustrate what the point is. No need to go any deeper in that regard. So the discussion question at this point is: does the GAC agree with the proposed approach, the proposed criteria, and the proposed indicators for this first three-year CIP cycle? Of course, if there are better ideas, this is an excellent moment to state them. And again, I'll pause here in order to seek reactions from the floor. Let me put it the other way around. Anybody against this approach, or are we okay to move on? Please give me thumbs up or nodding or something, or if anybody wants to take the floor, this is a good moment to do so. If not, we'll go ahead with this. USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States. Forgive me if I'm missing something, but is the draft proposal, this effectively is the straw man for the first phase?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I believe so, Susan. I stand to be corrected. But that is my understanding as well. So there you have it. That's the question. Do we agree with the proposed approach? Of course, we can fine-tune it and we can continue talking about this tomorrow. But this is a heads-up of the issues still pending as regarding the CIP. And the floor is still open. Any other comment or question? If not, I would suggest we actually park it here and continue tomorrow with both this part, only this part of the CIP discussion and the remaining text we still need to review. Again, for the sake of clarity, Benedetta, I stand to be corrected, but I understand that we still need parts A, B, and C of section four, correct? Is it section three or four? Anyways, we still have a lot of ground to cover in that regard. So unless you tell me otherwise, I'm very happy to give you 10 extra minutes of your precious time. We'll reconvene tomorrow at 10:00 AM. And if everything goes well, we'll have three more communiqué drafting sessions, but of course, we can always finish ahead of time, which is my idea, and I guess our idea at this point. So, thank you very much. The session is adjourned. See you tomorrow at 10:00 AM.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**