
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (4 of 6)
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the GAC Communiqué Drafting session on Wednesday, 11 March, at 3:00 p.m. local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments will be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room. Please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Now I will give the floor to GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. So we stopped in Section 6, if I'm not mistaken. So may we continue with Review of Reviews unless you think that we should go back to Section 6. Sorry. Number six in Section 4, of course.

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.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX So we had read Review of Reviews, so I think that's read and approved.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Oh, yeah. I'm sorry. Yes. This is 4.7, so to say. So, just to make sure that everybody is okay with the text as it is, which was the case before the coffee break, then we'll move on. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX So if we scroll back up to the start of the Issues of Importance, we'll note that domain name registration data is still the subject for which text is being worked on, I understand. So we can probably go back to DNS abuse mitigation. I think there were some consultation to happen on the text. I wonder if it's ready for reconsideration.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Fabien. Is that the case India? Can we start reading from 4.2, DNS Abuse Mitigation? Would that be okay? All right? U.S.? Yes, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS Apologies. I'm trying to find my way to the Zoom. If we're going to start reading from the top, if that's the intention, may I ask if we—I had suggested an opening sentence and it's in the margins.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yes, I can see that.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Can we pull that sentence into the text? There we go. And what the sentence is, it's really just outlining the three areas of the session. We had a ccTLD presentation, we discussed the PDP, and then we had a presentation on the voluntary initiative. So I am proposing that, and it would begin, then you would strike the currently highlighted text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, USA. All right, so I'll read it now.

"DNS Abuse Mitigation. The ICANN85 DNS Abuse session covered national ccTLD policies, the multistakeholder gTLD policy development process currently underway at ICANN, and a voluntary multistakeholder initiative to mitigate DNS abuse outside of ICANN. The GAC welcomed a presentation by the host country, ccTLD (.in) on its policies to prevent DNS abuse, as well as the Trusted Notifier Network (TNN), a not-for-profit organization focused on facilitating and operationalizing trusted notifier programs. The GAC reiterates its commitment to cooperate with the ICANN community through..." Yes?

SUSAN CHALMERS

I'm sorry to interrupt you. I also suggested for you that this be the concluding sentence.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

In the paragraph above, you mean, right?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Nope. In the whole section, it's just a very generic reiterates its commitment to cooperate with ICANN community. I proposed that that sentence wrap up the section as a concluding sentence. So, I propose highlighting the GAC reiterates its commitment to cooperate with the ICANN community through policy development and capacity building to make progress on addressing DNS abuse. It's just a very high-level generic sentence that can go at the bottom of the section on DNS Abuse Mitigation. It was previously the first sentence yesterday. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you for that, USA. Can you scroll up in order to see how the first paragraph would look like?

So I don't think we need to read the whole thing again. Let me read the first paragraph, and then if you think we actually need to read the rest of the text, we'll go ahead. But I really think that the only modification was in the first paragraph, and I stand to be corrected. So let me read that first paragraph again.

"The ICANN85 DNS Abuse session covered national ccTLD policies, the multistakeholder gTLD policy development process currently underway at ICANN, and a voluntary multistakeholder initiative to mitigate DNS abuse outside of ICANN. The GAC welcomed a presentation by the host country ccTLD (.in) on its policies to

prevent DNS abuse, as well as the Trusted Notifier Network (TNN), a not-for-profit organization focused on facilitating and operationalizing trusted notifier programs. GAC members participated in the inaugural meetings of the GNSO policy development process on associated domain checks and find... Finds? Find? Is there an S there? “And find that the PDP is off to a good start.”

And then the rest of the text is the same as my distinguished colleague from Australia read, so I don’t really think we need to go ahead with a full text, unless you tell me otherwise, of course. So let me stop there in order to see if there are comments.

SUSAN CHALMERS

There should be an S after find. Yep. Thanks. My apologies.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

GAC members, right? Plural. That’s why.

SUSAN CHALMERS

I’ll defer to people who speak better English than I do. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Can you scroll down a little bit, just in case, in order to see the... Let me read that following paragraph, just in case, because I see some edits there.

“Concerning future work on DNS Abuse beyond PDP 2 (Safeguards for Application Programming Interface (API) access to new customers) and a coordination mechanism for combating Domain Generation Algorithm Botnet attacks, the GAC recalls the importance of also addressing the other critical gaps identified in the issue report transparency of reporting under use of predictive algorithms for early detection, subdomain abuse, and reducing the time for registrant contact verification remain particularly important issues for the GAC. The GAC welcomes the indication from the GNSO Council that it is developing a methodology to prioritize these policy gaps and would appreciate further details from the GNSO Council as soon as possible.”

Let me stop there for a second. So this last paragraph is a little bit repetitive for my taste, of course. Important issues for the GAC. And then we say the GAC welcomes blah, blah, blah. And again, I’m not the native speaker here, but I would recommend “we welcome,” or I don’t know. Something of the sort in order not to repeat “the GAC,” “the GAC” again. Any ideas? For example, could we use “we” instead of repeating “the GAC welcomes”? Would that be okay? Argentina, yes?

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS

What about referring to the committee?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Argentina. Okay. So the committee welcomes the indication something like that, right?

Okay, moving on. Let me read the next paragraph that also has edits. “The GAC expresses its strong interest in engaging further with the Board and the contracted parties on how to address in a swift and effective manner the current 15-day timeline for registrar contact information. As the INFERMAL Study notes, malicious domain name registrations were 70% lower when contact details were verified before a registration. To mitigate DNS abuse, verification of registrant contact information should take place before a newly registered domain name can become accessible through the DNS. A possible path to be further explored in this regard are contract amendments and the GAC will continue to consider the best path for efficient implementation.”

Let me stop there because those were the edits made so far. I see nodding in the room. Any problem identified? There’s a hand from the European Commission. Martina, please.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much. This is Martina, European Commission. And sorry for raising this point, but I think in the various editing that we did to this sentence, we missed something, because as highlighted now by, I think, Fabien, the current 15-day timeline for registrar contact information does not mean much. So it’s the current 15-day timeline for registrars to verify contact information, or for registrars to validate contact information? Exactly. It needs to be

clarified that the 15 days apply to—it's the timeline that the registrar have to do this exercise. Otherwise, the sentence is a bit unclear.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. Good catch again. There's a hand from... Fabien, go ahead.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I just want to highlight that we put a comment over that section of the sentence because we'll take a look exactly in Registrar Accreditation Agreement, how exactly that process works, because I believe the 15 days are for registrant to confirm, to ensure the accuracy of their contact information when requested by the registrar. So we just want to make sure it's a precise reference, as precise as possible. And so we'll suggest when we're able to do the research.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. Is everybody okay with that? I see nodding. Okay. So moving on again. Let me read the last two paragraphs.

“The GAC also encourages ICANN to explore the establishment of a centralized reporting mechanism managed by ICANN for the periodic reporting of DNS abuse complaints received by registrars and registries, including the number of complaints and actions taken. Such reporting would help provide a clearer understanding

of abuse trends, improve transparency and support more effective policy responses.”

“Finally, the GAC recognizes the importance of voluntary collaborative initiatives on DNS abuse mitigation practices beyond ICANN’s remit, given their flexibility in addressing real-world issues, and encourages the community on a voluntary basis to continue exploring paths for such collaboration, including the context of trusted notifier schemes. The GAC reiterates its commitment to cooperate with the ICANN community through policy development and capacity building to make progress on addressing DNS abuse.”

Let me stop there in order to see if there are reactions so far. Okay. I see no hands. We’re making good progress here. Back to you, Fabien.

Let’s go to the advice section, or the potential advice, just to make sure we’re on the same page and that we don’t actually need to give any advice, but we need to decide this all together, of course, and that’s why we’re double-checking just in case.

Again, we just want to make sure that the text we included under Issues of Importance actually covers the text provided that would have been used as consensus advice to the ICANN Board.

Okay. Seeing no hands, then let’s just move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

If we go back to Issues of Importance, so we were in Subsection 2, DNS Abuse Mitigation. We’ve covered Subsection 3, Next Round of

New gTLDs. We are still waiting for text on Section 4, UDRP Review. And we have the Governance of the Regional Internet Registries, Subsection 5, to confirm.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

There's a hand from the USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Fabien, we've offered, I think, maybe two or three sentences on the UDRP Review. It should be in your inbox.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Before we move on to the UDRP, USA, if you don't mind, let's read 5, which is Governance of the Regional Internet Registries, and then we go back to the UDRP. If you don't mind, of course. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Okay. "The GAC welcomed the update from the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) regarding the drafting of the Governance Document for the Recognition, Operation, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) (RIR Governance Document). The GAC noted that the RIR Governance Document remains under development and that the final version is still being drafted. In this regard, the GAC encourages that the issues raised during GAC deliberations be duly taken into account in the preparation of the final document and communicated to the RIR Governance drafting process. These include, among others, the importance for the RIRs

to operate their policies in an efficient and transparent manner, and monitoring and auditing of RIR's performance according to objective and measurable operational criteria. The GAC emphasizes that processes related to the recognition and derecognition of Regional Internet Registries should reflect ICANN's multistakeholder model in implementation, ensuring that Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have an appropriate and constructive role in any processes. The GAC is looking forward to reviewing the final outcome document as part of the process for approval and adoption of an updated ICANN policy on governance of the Regional Internet Registries."

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. I see a hand from the USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Regarding the third paragraph here, it reflects, I think, a misunderstanding of what I see, well, proposed what ICP 2 reflects, which is that the SOs and ACs do not have a role in the recognition or derecognition of an RIR, rather that some... as the ASO that is involved. So we would propose deleting this paragraph because it does not actually reflect what is in the document. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Any hard feelings? India?

T. SANTHOSH The third para, which has been mentioned here, is a similar test which is there in the ICANN84 Communiqué. If you can bring that ICANN84 Communiqué, it would be good. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. Any other comment? I have Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If that's the case, maybe a question to India would be, if this has been mentioned in previous communication, do we need it here? Do we need to repeat it, or can we live with the fact that this already was reflected in an earlier Communiqué?

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Netherlands. As a matter of fact, you read my mind, because I was going to ask exactly the same question to our distinguished colleague from India. Santhosh?

T. SANTHOSH As the ICP 2 discussion is ongoing, and until date, there hasn't been any conclusion on this. It is requested that this para may be retained, or alternatively, we have to mention the reference to the earlier Communiqué specific para. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Santhosh. Any special way in which you would like to reference the earlier Communiqué? What you're seeing there is Dublin. ICANN84 Dublin Communiqué.

I have a hand from Australia and then the USA.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. I think, for me, I'm more interested in what is technically accurate and what is being proposed. I take the point that perhaps it was referenced last time in the Communiqué. But, I think, for my own benefit, I'd like to understand what the roles look like, and if, in fact, it is just the ASO, then perhaps we should be accurate now in our description of this. And I'd welcome an open discussion on this topic, because I admit, I don't have all the facts myself, and if it is in fact ICP 2, the role of the ASO is clear in this regard, then our Communiqué should reflect this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you. Just to support the comments of my colleague from Australia, but also to suggest that the GAC be very wary about its mandate leading into that of the ASOs. This is an area that's recognized within the Memorandum of Understanding. I mean, the ASO's role here is recognized in the MOU between ICANN and the ASO, the role the ASOs to provide advice on these issues, specifically recognition and derecognition. So, for these reasons,

we do not support the inclusion of this paragraph in the text.
Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. I have Egypt, and then the Netherlands, and then India.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you, Chair. I'm trying to recall why or what was the rationale when this was included in the ICANN84 Communiqué, and I think that was having a role for the ICANN community when it comes to things that are drastically related to a derecognition of an RIR. But I'm happy actually with what Ian suggested, that we have a more understanding on that topic. My distinguished colleague from the USA said that this is different than what is in the document. Maybe if you, Susan, have some insight on what it is exactly that how this is happening detailed in the ICP 2 document, maybe that will be useful for us to understand how this is tackled, and we would be able to take a rational decision on that text. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. USA, would you like to respond to that before I give the floor to the Netherlands?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Certainly. I'd be happy to refer my colleague from Egypt to the ASO ICANN MOU. And more specifically, if the concern is government

input or any other stakeholder input into these processes, there are processes run by RIRs for this, and I would also refer us back to the new version of ICP 2 to review what is there. I just do not believe that what is reflected on the screen is accurate, and I just have concerns about the GAC's role and advice the ASO's role. We should be respectful of the ASO's role here. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a feeling that we've now ended up discussing the actual draft and not as much as focusing on the text edits. But I agree to the point that if it's insufficiently clear how this works, we should probably refrain from including it to the substance.

My view, my reading of the current draft, is that any recognition or derecognition of an RIR is subject to a decision by the ICANN Board, and following that line down, the GAC always has the opportunity to advise the ICANN Board on their decisions. So in that matter, it might not matter as much as people argued. In that sense, the text isn't adding anything. We have our bylaw defined ways to advise the Board on their decisions, so maybe we should just stick with what is in the bylaws and then remove this text, my view.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. India?

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you for the comments from the colleagues. But in 10 days, we have not gone through the MOU as to what is the role of the... We'll have to go afresh through the MOUs and look at as to what MOU has for ASO has with ICANN. However, I think the intention is that RIRs should not in itself be the deciding body, either for recognition of a new RIR or for a derecognition of a new RIR. There should be other stakeholders involved in the decision-making, and that is all. As I said earlier, as well, in the relevant session, that I cannot be judging, it's my own cause. I mean, why talk about recognition? I think you just say closure. Just like the root server arrangements. I mean, it's heading towards that. So let's accept more for the information of all the GAC colleagues, then we are calling it a closure that they henceforth, irrespective of how the Internet evolves in the future, there will not be any new RIRs ever in future. That's what it is. If I were to decide whether I would allow any other member, obviously I'm interested party. I mean, I would never allow anyone. And that is what we intend to say that, when we say that it should be done through a multistakeholder body, right? RIRs, yes, being an interested party can have a majority role, should have a significant role. That point is well taken. But there should be other organizations of ICANN as well involved in this process. That's all. It was with this intention that this was agreed in the last ICANN Communiqué.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, India. But still, that's precisely one of the reasons why I also would support deleting that paragraph. But again, I'm just a GAC chair. I'm in your hands. What should we do? I would say there's a majority so far that would like to erase that paragraph. Would it be too much of a problem for you to go by without that paragraph?

SUSHIL PAL

We don't see any reason for deleting the paragraph as it is once it's already agreed. That's a wrong precedence, never to go back to the already agreed recommendations.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Egypt?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Maybe we can add something. Maybe we can reference the GAC Communiqué of ICANN84, and add something that says in conformity with ICANN Bylaws or something that would keep whatever we are suggesting or saying on track and coherent with existing norms and rules.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. But in that case, we would be keeping the whole paragraph. I'm not sure everybody agrees with that. Let me just make sure that—

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sorry. Just to say that I was going with the idea that was proposed by, I say, was Netherlands and supported by you that instead of putting the text again, you just referenced the ICANN84 Communiqué, and to address the point mentioned by Australia, keeping a safeguard that we are in conformity with the bylaws, so that we would not go technically against how this is done. Sorry if I didn't make myself clear the first time. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. So let's see. Alternatively, refer to ICANN84 Communiqué and reference that this should be consistent with applicable rules or bylaws. And I have a hand from India, USA, and Netherlands. India?

SUSHIL PAL

Just to make a change in the second line after the implementation of multistakeholder model, we can add that as agreed in the ICANN84 Communiqué. And then we can have a reference to the bylaws and rules, whatever you want to add.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you. I just want to make sure that everybody is very clear here, and my colleague from the Netherlands said this earlier, but the GAC's role here is to offer advice to the Board on this issue. I believe that we're all striving for the same thing. So we will think about how to implement or support the direction that Christine is taking here for her proposal. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you for the interpreters. I'll try to speak a bit louder. Let me know if this works better.

Yeah, I sense and I feel with the U.S. to a point. I can understand if reference is the only way forward, but I don't think the Communiqué becomes easier to read with referring to other Communiqué text and then adding something with applicable rules. I think we should also step back a bit and maybe consider good faith here, as my U.S. colleague, I think, also just explained. Any such decision is subject to ICANN multistakeholder process, and any such decision is subject to the GAC advising in those particular processes. So maybe, as an alternative, we should just say that and keep it to a very simple and short sentence saying the GAC emphasizes that any processes related to the governance of

the RIRs should comply with ICANN's existing multistakeholder approach. I leave it with that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. I hate to say this, but it goes without saying. I mean, looks like a play on words or something, but we all know that any processes related to the governance should comply with the existing multistakeholder approach. So then why mention it at all? That's why I suggested erasing the whole thing. But again, I'm in your hands. I see Australia, and then Egypt.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Nico. Yes, I would agree with your sentiment here, but I think my preference would be to remove it. We've said our piece in the previous Communiqué. And I think coming back to the comments I made at the start of the Communiqué drafting process, I think we should strive to provide new perspectives in a brief and clear manner. If we feel we must comment on this, I'd be supportive of Marco's additional sentence as a replacement for that section there. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. Egypt?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

I was going to say that I like the suggestion by Marco. I do see your point, Chair. I also see the point by Ian. But with all due respect, the

overshadows of the AFRINIC problem do put some shadows over what has happened, and it's actually the reason why this process was initiated. And hence, since it is an ongoing process still, I see the rationale behind our Indian colleagues to stress on the importance of the role of the multistakeholder governance model of ICANN in that perspective as well. Though it is redundant, I do not see any harm in adding that. So to be short, I like the suggestion by Marco and support it. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. Okay. I don't have a problem with that. My point was that, on the one hand, we already mentioned that in the paragraph above. If you take a look the paragraph before this, it reads, "These include, among others, the importance for the RIRs to operate their policies in an efficient and transparent manner and monitoring and auditing of RIR's performance according to objective and measurable operational criteria," and so on and so forth.

So, to me, it's a little bit redundant, but I can live including that sentence at the end. No problem. If that is the case, if everybody agrees, we can just go that way. And I see nodding from India. Would that be okay for you with the Netherlands's suggestion?

SUSHIL PAL

Netherlands's suggestion, I think, is okay with us. But just to clarify to your aspect, I think those two are the sentence you read before,

and the sentence which is there for a multistakeholder, which is pretty obvious, I think, but most of the text in the GAC are pretty obvious, I think. And we should actually run AI tool check as to what novelty we add to the GAC Communiqué every year. I think that would be good exercise, actually.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Agree. Agree. Okay. Can we do some cleaning? Because this is getting a little bit confusing.

SUSHIL PAL

It's okay. I think we are okay with Marco's text. I think we'll be happy with that because it conveys the meaning.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Gulten?

GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU

Thank you, Nico. Just would like to highlight a comment, it's been shared in the chat by European Commission. "Editorial suggestion for the second section: These include, among others, the importance for the RIRs to operate their policies in the public interest, including the continued stewardship of Internet number resources in an efficient and transparent manner." Thank you, Gemma.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So I have another hand from India, and then the European Commission. India? Oh, old hand. Okay, European Commission. Gemma?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo, European Commission. Just to say this is a long edit, that's why I'm taking the floor. But the reason behind the edits is to specify not to leave the issues of efficiency and transparency in the void, but referring that the policies are operating in the public interests, and then that we are talking about the Internet from the resources to be operated in an efficient and transparent manner. So this is just a short explanation of the rationale for the proposed edits. Assuming that, from our point of view, this does not alter the substance significantly. It's a matter of being more precise. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you very much, European Commission. So it looks like we're in agreement here. So I will kindly ask my colleague from Australia to give a final look at that part of the text in order to see if we are all on the same page.

IAN SHELDON

Great. I'll skip the first paragraph because I will assume it's agreed. I'll move to the second.

"The GAC noted that the RIR Governance Document remains under development and that the final version is still being drafted. In this

regard, the GAC encourages that the issues raised during GAC deliberations be duly taken into account, into the preparation of the final document, and communicated to the RIR Governance drafting process. These include, among others, the importance for the RIRs to operate their policies in the public interest, including the continued stewardship of Internet number resources in an efficient and transparent manner, and monitoring and auditing of RIR's performance according to objective and measurable operational criteria. The GAC emphasizes that any processes related to the governance of RIRs should comply with ICANN's existing multistakeholder approach. The GAC is looking forward to reviewing the final outcome document as part of the process for approval and adoption of an updated ICANN policy on governance of the Regional Internet Registries."

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. So there it is. Any strong feelings about any of the paragraphs, about the edits? Can we live with this text? Okay. And I see nodding in the room. Thank you so much. All right, maybe we can green the text in order to move forward. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So I believe this almost completes the section on Issues of Importance. We only have domain name registration data that remains to be provided. We can probably move back to the section on internal matters in the meantime. Oh, sorry, we do have the

UDRP Review text that we haven't read. Sorry, my apologies. So Section 4 in Issues of Importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sure. So let's do Part 4. UDRP Review. It reads, "The GAC welcomed a presentation from the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the Internet Commerce Association (ICA) under joint report on the UDRP Review. The GAC understands that work by the GNSO on this review is on the horizon, subject to prioritization of various GNSO work streams. The GAC suggests that GNSO consider using the WIPO ICA report as a resource to frame the upcoming UDRP Review and identify issues for further discussion." Full stop.

Thoughts, comments? And I see thumbs up and nodding in the room. Brian, would you like to take the floor?

BRIAN BECKHAM

Thank you, Chair. Thank you, colleagues. This looks, from my perspective, like a very helpful text. I just wonder if the addition of one word might be useful to record here that this is an independent project from the ICANN working group processes, so perhaps we could put simply the word "independent" between there and joint in the second line.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, WIPO. So I'll read just that sentence. "The GAC welcomed a presentation from the World Intellectual Property

Organization (WIPO) and the Internet Commerce Association (ICA) on their independent joint report on the UDRP Review.”

Is everybody okay with this? There are two hands raised, India and Spain. Please go ahead, India.

SUSHIL PAL

I think the text is fine. We just do not see—I mean, we would rather request for deletion of the subject to the prioritization of the various GNSO work stream. I think we appreciate the empathy for a GNSO, but then, since they’re a central body, I think, I mean, everything will have to go to them any which way. So, I mean, it’s for them to decide the priority. I think why should we qualify this as to how they would prioritize?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. WIPO, would you be okay with that? Thumbs up. Thank you. I have Spain next.

IÑAKI GIL OSÉS

Hello. Iñaki Gil Osés from Spain for the record. I would just like to propose a small modification or addition. At the end of the text, when it says “identify issues,” I would propose adding pending issues. Pending, the word pending, basically. So as for the sake of the continuation of the process and for being a bit more concrete. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Spain. WIPO is nodding, so well noted. Thank you again. Okay. There we go. Looks like we're in agreement here. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

We could use the last 10 minutes of this session maybe to cover some of the text we haven't yet covered in internal matters, Section 3 of the Communiqué, and we could start with the Working Group Reports. Under Subsection 4, we have the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group and the GAC Universal Acceptance and IDN Working Group.

IAN SHELDON

"The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG). The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) continued its efforts to promote the effective participation of governments from underserved and developing regions within the ICANN ecosystem. The working group focuses on identifying barriers that limit participation in ICANN policy development processes and exploring practical measures to strengthen engagement, capacity development, and representation of governments from underserved regions."

"On day one of ICANN85, the USRWG facilitated two capacity development sessions on the Next Round of new gTLDs (NxR) focused on NxR readiness, including application timeline, publicly available information, different gTLD application types, actions

GAC members and observers can take on new gTLD applications, resources available to support the GAC community and applicants, overview of key issues and developments related to the Registry Service Provider Program (RSP) and the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to prepare GAC members for the upcoming facilitated dialogue at ICANN86 on the relationship between these programs.”

Is there more?

“The working group discussed ongoing initiative to support awareness and participation of governments from developing regions in key ICANN policy processes. The working group will continue to collaborate with other GAC working groups and the ICANN community to advance initiatives that enhance inclusivity and meaningful participation of underserved regions in ICANN activities.”

I don’t see any edits from last time I read this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. This is absolutely non-controversial, I would say. But just in case, are we okay with this? And I see nodding in the room. There are absolutely no edits whatsoever here. So, okay, moving on. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The GAC Universal Acceptance and IDN Working Group.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. And I'll read that part. "As part of its continuing revitalization, the UA-IDN WG conducted a session during the ICANN85 that featured updates on Universal Acceptance (UA) efforts from UNESCO, including a review of the recent UNESCO ICANN policy brief drafting efforts. The GAC plenary session on this matter also provided a preview of planning efforts for UA Day 2026 and reviewed progress made since the launch of UA Day initiatives in 2023. In addition, participants explored guidelines published by the UA Expert Working Group that were recently released for public comment and reviewed ongoing work on UA-related matters within the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). The discussion also examined the role of governments in promoting UA, providing an opportunity to learn from government experiences to date. GAC delegates exchanged views on key leadership opportunities available to them within their respective countries, including case studies from India and Bahrain."

"The GAC welcomes UNESCO's renewed engagement in the activities of the committee and highlights the valuable contribution this international organization can make toward advancing the GAC's objectives, including the enhancement of linguistic and cultural diversity on the Internet. In this context, the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group (HRIWG) looks forward to further discussions on UNESCO Internet universality indicators to assess whether this measurement tool

could be used by the GAC to evaluate the impact of its activities aimed at promoting diversity and inclusion.”

Let me stop there in order to see if there’s any edit needed. I see no hand online or in the room. Fabien, back to you.

I really think we should stop here because there’s only three minutes until the coffee break. Maybe we should stop here and come back. Can you show me the next chunk of text we would be covering? Okay. So it’s just five?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

HLGM and GAC Readiness indeed for the Next Round of New gTLDs, still internal matters. And then, eventually, we’re waiting for the PSWG report, as well as the text on domain registration data. And for the rest, I believe we’ve covered the text already.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So I recommend we stop here for another coffee break, and then we come back with fresher minds in order to concentrate on, I would say, the last push before we have a general review, if you agree, of course. Yes? Okay.

Thank you so much. Let’s pause here. Please be back in the room at 4:30. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]