
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC Communiqué drafting session on Wednesday 11th of March at 13:15 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 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'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you'll be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I'll now hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. We'll have three, actually four, but it depends on how it goes today. We might have three or four Communiqué drafting sessions, three for today

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.

and eventually if need be one tomorrow, apart from the wrap-up session, of course, right?

So what I'm saying is that if we're efficient, we might be able, and I'm crossing my fingers, that we might be able to actually finish the Communiqué drafting today and we'll do our best and it is my understanding that we already have substantive text basically all the, correct me if I'm wrong, Fabien, but all the different sections already have text provided, so it would be just a matter of reviewing each section doing the word smithing, agreeing and then moving on, and that should be fine.

Again, I'm crossing my fingers that there will be no controversies and so on and so forth. So, again, as I said before, we're all set to finish today, provided we have agreement. So, without further ado, let me hand the floor to Fabien, who's going to be walking us through the different sections and what needs to be done at this point. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. So, let's scroll down slowly, so we'll show you the progress that I have.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

One thing I forgot, sorry, but one thing I forgot to mention is that we're going to be greenlighting, we're going to be greening the text that's been already agreed in order to make sure that we can move forward more efficiently. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I'll mention how we've done that and you'll see as we go down. So, let's scroll down, introduction, we've read the text, here you see we've updated the participation numbers, that's tentative because obviously we'll report on the actual final numbers at the end of the meeting, so we'll update that. Otherwise, in the introduction, nothing new.

Second section, Inter-Constituency Activities and Community Engagement. Here we've read the subsections that are highlighted in green, as you see, so we have a few more to go through that we didn't cover in our previous discussions in the first review community drafting session. That takes us to internal matters where we've discussed membership, GAC elections, GAC leadership.

We have received text from the Working Groups that we'll be able to review. I understand that public safety working group is also working on its report, so that should be coming soon. The following section is the HLG, which I don't think we've read, that's why it's not highlighted in green.

GAC readiness for the Next Round of New gTLDs, that's a section we read yesterday but that was not finalized, so we'll come back to that one. In issues of importance, we are still expecting the text related to domain name registration data, which I understand is in the works still.

We started to discuss DNS reviews yesterday but were not able to conclude, so there's been a number of edits to that section in the meantime, so that will be a piece of work for today. The following section, Next Round of New gTLDs, we did cover applicant support program yesterday and we still have two subsections to finalize, community applications and TLD application management system.

On the UDRP review, the session took place this morning, so we expect there should be text hopefully later today on this section. Governance of the regional internet registries, I understand this is a product of work between several GAC members, so we'll get to that today as well. Root server system is new text that we've received as well. And finally Review of Reviews, again text that was not yet read.

Finally, GAC consensus advice through the ICANN Board, there is a proposal we understand from India for potential advice text regarding DNS Abuse mitigation and we would propose to start here this drafting session.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Fabien. Okay, so let's start here, which is the section in which we might or might not have, oh thank you so very much, I got my ristretto, this is beautiful, where we might have or not a consensus, so it's going to be up to us again if it will be consensus advice to the Board at this point or if we will include this

topic under issues of importance or not include anything at all or go as it is, again is for us to decide as I always say, I'm in your hands.

So, I'm going to start reading as it is, then I'll pause in order to get some feedback from the floor or from the colleagues online and I see a hand from the USA, please go ahead.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you chair, I'm just wondering if we could have an explanation of the advice by the proponent of the text and rationale, thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, USA. I was going to do exactly that after reading the text, if you don't mind. So, all right, so I'll read it as it is, then we'll ask, we will kindly ask the delegation of India to give some background information or some rationale for this and then I'll open the floor for discussions, given the fact that this is the only, apparently, and again I'm crossing my fingers, but apparently this is the only potentially controversial piece of text so far.

So, section 5, GAC consensus advice to ICANN Board and I will slow down a little bit for the benefit of our dear interpreters, show me thumbs up or down or do something in case I'm running. The following items of advice from the GAC to the Board have been reached on the basis of consensus as defined in the ICANN bylaws.

One. DNS Abuse mitigation, A, the GAC advises the Board as preliminary issue report of DNS Abuse has highlighted that many

malicious domains operate only for a few hours or days. The current 15-day window allowed for verification of registrant contact details under RAA is a major structural vulnerability.

As this simple amendment in the contract can have most impactful and material impact on DNS Abuse, therefore GAC urges ICANN Board to take up the contractual amendment matter with contracted parties for early resolution of the matter. Anyways, I'll stop there. I see a couple of things to, let's say, fine-tune, but let me stop here in order to give India the floor so that you can provide some rationale. Sushil, please, go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Sushil from India; I think the text itself also has a rationale and we have discussed at length even during the DNS Abuse sessions. My first, I think we can have the language part separately, but I would be first interested in knowing if any country has any reservation on the issue as such or they have a reservation on making it a GAC advice. On the issue part, I think we will deliberate more as we go forward in the sessions, right?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the previous comment my U.S colleague already made, I think we're better off in sensitive issues such as GAC advice that the text of the rationale is developed

before we actually go to drafting or considering the actual advice. I need to understand why it is as such. I would like to make a reservation until that rationale is there, whether or not we need advice. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. I have the European Commission next. Gemma, please go ahead.

It seems that we're having some sort of issue with the sound. European Commission, can you hear me? Gemma, the floor is yours.

Anyways, okay, so I'll give you the floor later on, Gemma. I have the USA next. Susan, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair, and further to my colleague's comment from the Netherlands, I really do think that given that GAC advice is our most powerful tool as a committee, generally speaking, we should deploy it when we think there will be a chance of success and that it will further work within the organization. That means taking into account the various activities by the different constituencies that are outside of the GAC room.

I'll just remind our colleagues that we have just at ICANN85 begun a policy development process on associated domain checks. The GAC and the community writ large over the past year has really

worked together to move this PDP forward and bring it into existence.

We also have another PDP lined up after that, which is the application interfaces. We just think that that PDP should be the priority, and we should support that quickly so we can achieve tangible results on a short time frame. Really, that's the priority for the United States. As such, we would be hesitant during this meeting to advise the Board on the subject matter area for additional work. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. I have the European Commission, then Switzerland, and then I'll give you back the floor, India, so that you can provide some extra rationale or give your feedback in this regard. Gemma, can you hear me now?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Yes. Nico and my colleagues, apologies. I don't know for some reasons the microphone was not working. Apologies for that. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission, for the records.

I wanted to address the question from our colleagues from India. We do not have an issue with the substance of what is proposed. We have prepared text on the same issues of accuracy of registration data in the context of DNS Abuse and the shortening, or eliminate the delay in the validation of registration data contact information in the text of issues of importance.

But we do support also what the colleagues from the United States just mentioned, that this is not mature for GAC advice because we would like to pursue a conversation with relevant parties, the contracted parties, the ICANN Board, to see how to best approach this issue before we potentially move to GAC advice or see other avenues.

So, it's a matter of timing. We agree with the substance, and as I said, this, in my opinion, is reflected in the issues of importance text. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gemma. Thank you, European Commission. I'll give the floor to Switzerland at this point.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So in a similar vein, but maybe elaborating a little bit more on what Gemma and Susan and others have said, I think there is merit in the topic that is being addressed here by our Indian colleagues.

What I wonder is whether this is ripe for GAC advice or whether we should put this on the issues of importance, elaborating a bit more on the rationale on what parts of the preliminary issue report we are referring to, what specifically we are considering, and then elaborating like a recommendation or a suggestion to the GNSO Council.

I think that should be our first port of call in maintaining the way we do things in ICANN, really talking first to the support organization. And if there is no positive reaction from there or we don't see progress, it's always possible to raise this to the Board and see what the Board can do. But I would first try to elaborate this more, try to address the Contracted Parties or the GNSO Council or both, and not included at this moment of time under GAC advice. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Switzerland, I see no more hands online or in the room. So, at this point, I will kindly hand over the floor back to the Indian delegation. Sushil?

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you, Chair. Sushil from India. What I could understand from the comments of our colleague is that they are aligned about the sensitivity of the issue. However, they have a reservation only with regard to the placement in the GAC advice under DNS Abuse.

And now I'll go forward with regard to why it's important, at least for the information of a lot of other GAC colleagues who are new or who may not be so clued on to the conversations here. We completely appreciate the efforts of the GAC as well as the Board in taking forward the PDP process. And we also appreciate the sensitivity of the U.S. and other colleagues that our efforts should be to kind of expedite the existing PDP process and not to overload

it with any further work which might kind of act as a friction or can slow down the process.

We completely understand that sentiment and we are completely aligned with that as well. However, it's also important to note that even if the PDP on all those issues reach finality maybe from a year on or two years onwards, right, even if they reach finality, they will have no consequence.

There will be of hardly any consequence because if you don't have accuracy of data, right, then what do I do with my associated domain name details? Or, I mean, supposing we also complete the subdomain thing, I think, what do I do with those things if I don't even have the data, accuracy data of the registrant?

So, it's actually, those PDP processes, even if they reach finality, they will not have its full impact without having the accuracy of registrant's data in place. So, that is why the issue is important and in hindsight, I think that given the importance of this issue, if this gets subsumed within the overall mother of overall DNS Abuse process, then I think it's likely to get delayed further and further because we have one ongoing PDP and the second one has not started yet. That will be starting later.

So maybe if it is not to go for advice, I mean, it's okay, but then, can we kind of take up or take up with the Board to be handled separately as a part of the accuracy work so that it's not bundled up in the larger DNS Abuse process and can get can further be

pushed back in the PDP business, right? Because there's always -- sorry.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I'm sorry to interrupt you, Sushil, but let me kindly ask you at this point, would you be okay including this under issues of importance? Because it is my understanding that there's some text being developed at this point in a similar way. I don't know exactly the wording, but would you be okay with that?

SUSHIL PAL

I mean, I'll be fine with it. I think we have to reach a consensus and we don't want to be the road blocker for that matter. So, that's beside the point. But if it is not going as advice, I think first it should, maybe GAC should work together to make sure that it's not bundled up in the larger DNS Abuse PDP process. And it's dealt separately in an accuracy track, which Gemma was pointing it out in her comments.

If we can, idea is to get this expeditiously done as soon as possible, right? If it can be handled in accuracy work, that's number one. And secondly, I think we are all, I completely am with EC on her comment that that we need to take up with the contracted party house, fully aligned with that. And to respond to our colleagues from Switzerland, we did take this up with the ICANN Board meeting as well.

And what Board told us, they will be looking forward for a more organic approach where the suggestions come from the grounds up. And when it's come from the grounds up in their sense, I understand since it's a contractual amendment, they're awaiting this proposal to come from the contracted parties themselves.

If it is to come from the contracted parties themselves, then it is incumbent on the GAC to engage more actively with the contracted parties to take it up further. And I'm okay with that. I mean, idea is to kind of put the issue on the table and the sensitivity of it and how, I mean, whatever PDP process we might give priority to, even if we achieve that, it's not much we are going to gain. So, that was to underline that.

Secondly, I think we also keep hearing, I think some of the GAC colleagues have made this comment, the Dutch colleague has made this comment about that GAC advice is a very sensitive issue and it's very important. I mean, it's a most important weapon with us. I would submit that even if the most important weapon, it takes three, four years for any results to come, even if you use that advice.

So, I mean, we use the GAC advice 24 hours timeline. I mean, that was two years back. We're still achieving finality and we're still achieving any final result on that. So, just to put things in the context. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that rationale, India. So, the floor is still open, but just before I open the floor again, would you be okay with sending a letter, for example, to the GNSO pointing out many of the things you mentioned?

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, I'm okay with anything, whatever the wise people in the house decide. I guess I highlighted the issue. Let's see where the consensus come. I think idea is to, as I said, advice, no advice is not material. What is material is how fast can we take it. And we believe that if we club it with the DNS Abuse PDP process is going to be maybe almost a decade because it's pretty back in the queue, right? And therefore, to be dealt inaccuracy team and maybe got to engage more with the contracted parties to try and explore possible solution for a more organic approach, right?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, India. I have the U.S and Japan. U.S, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Chair, I'm willing to yield to Japan. They haven't taken the mic yet. Thanks.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you. This is Tomo from Japan. Can you hear me now? Okay, thank you. I'm just echoing the point which my colleagues made,

but Japan also thinks that it's quite important to think about the future process for shortening the process of 15 days verification, but it's still immature and we need to find the best way to reconcile this problem.

And I think that the GAC advice is not the kind of strong signaling, but we need some level of agreement or mutual understanding with other constituencies, including GNSO or some other communities. And at current tickets for the issue of importance, we had some tickets about we needed to consider the future process for our path.

So, my suggestion is that strike this advice tickets for DNS Abuse mitigation and include this point into the issue of importance. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Japan. Well noted. I have the USA next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, United States. Just very briefly, recognizing that this is an important issue to several GAC representatives. We have suggested edits to these issues of importance text above. We've also included a line to substantiate the rationale.

And I just want to make one point is that we do not necessarily agree with the fact that this could be more impactful than the current ongoing work. I want to emphasize that we do expect the

ADC PDP to yield some very positive and meaningful results for DNS Abuse. But we have we have offered some additional thoughts out of recognition of the fact that this is so important to our colleagues. And we look forward to continuing this conversation and determining how to address this with the rest of the community going forward.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. So the way I see it, and I stand to be corrected by my distinguished colleague from India, is that we will not have done GAC consensus advice to the ICANN Board and that we will deal with this issue under, again, issues of importance. Is that correct? Is because it is a matter of the temperature in the room, including India's opinion?

SUSHIL PAL

Give us some time to discuss with the colleagues. I think we can say this. Let's give us some time to discuss the text with the U.S. colleagues, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Okay, thank you so much, India. U.S.?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Yes, Chair, we have proposed amendments, they are already in the text, so we could review them in concert. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. So, let's get straight to that point, Fabien, if you don't mind.

IAN SHELDON

DNS Abuse mitigation. During the ICANN85 DNS Abuse session, 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 policy development and capacity building to make progress on addressing DNS Abuse. GAC members participated in the inaugural meeting of the GNSO policy development process on associated domain checks and find that the PDP is off to a good start.

The GAC favors shortening the overall timeline of the work and encourages the GNSO Council and ICANN Org to regularly assess whether project milestones are being achieved. The GAC expects that the PDP's narrow scope will yield rapid results so that the PDP can be treated as a blueprint for effective policy development at ICANN going forward.

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 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 when possible.

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 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. This could be achieved, for example, through contract amendments and the GAC will continue to consider the best path for efficient implementation.

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 in the context of trusted notifier schemes.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. So, there it is. Can you scroll down a little bit? I just have myself a little problem with the, let me see, with the last paragraph. Right there. This could be achieved. That's like speculating, right? This could be achieved, for example, through contract amendments and the GAC, blah, blah, blah. Maybe we can erase that, because it could be achieved in many different ways.

So, I don't know. I don't have any kind of strong feelings in this regard, but I would erase that last sentence, because, I mean, using could as a potential, anyways.

Other than that, let me open the -- I see two hands already. I have the USA and then India. Please go ahead, Susan.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. I will try to be brief here. So, the, the subject of advice that we were just discussing is contained within the paragraph that is now at the top of the screen. And I just wanted to point this out. And it could, I think, deal with a slight amendment in the first sentence about the verification of contact information. But just generally speaking, that is where that issue is captured within this section.

I had suggested two different, two slight amendments, and they're reflected in the marginalia there up towards the top, so we can address that when appropriate. I'll just also note that the point of this section is to illustrate what was discussed during the DNS Abuse session in general as well. And so, all of this information is contained in the section, in addition to the GAC's priorities for the subject matter area. We have not offered any proposals to the text on reporting, but we may reserve that opportunity. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. But just to go back to you, Susan. Are you sure, I mean, are you comfortable using the conditional sentence there at the end? Like, these could be achieved, and so on?

SUSAN CHALMERS

I have no strong feelings on the verb tense at this point.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. I have India and then Switzerland.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you, Chair. Thank you to Susan, the colleague from U.S. I think, thank you for this expeditious text on this. Give us some time to absorb this. I mean, content-wise, this is fine, I think, as I said earlier. With regard to your comment on the contract amendment, I think it's useful. It's anyway saying, for example, so it's not binding any which way.

The reason is because we just want to keep that slide door open, that this can be handled without the PDP process. So, if it is to happen without the PDP process, I think it's very clear as to what we are attempting at. I mean, it provides visibility to an alternative path which might be available. That's all.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you. Thank you for that explanation, India. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. So, I'm really happy that this is getting shape and just wanted to make a friendly proposal as an alternative to this last sentence, this could

be achieved. I would propose that we say something like a possible path to be further explored.

A possible path with me to be further explored in this regard are contractual amendments. I think this conveys the same idea and leaves it open whether we explore this together with the contracted parties alone, with the Board, with the GNSO council and the rest. So, the sentence would end with amendments. The rest would be erased. Exactly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. Would this be okay for India and the U.S.? And I see nodding from the U.S. India, are you okay with this?

SUSHIL PAL

The deletion of the last line and the GAC, I think if that remains, I think we would prefer that, honestly. The first part is okay, I think, if there is no strong feeling from the Swiss colleague. However, I raise the hand for a different matter as well, which is, I mean, just to get the comments of the colleagues as to whether this content should be placed herein or in the accuracy track, just to be sure that we treat it separately and not as a larger DNS Abuse PDP process.

Because two already lined up it's not going to be the third for sure as we speak. So, I'm just highlighting that risk. So, I mean, maybe the colleagues who are also joining, we'll discuss with the U.S. colleagues here, I mean, whenever you get the break. However, those who are virtually, if they could respond and respond with

their thoughts as to whether they should be dealt in an accuracy track and we take it up separately, or they should continue being the DNS Abuse, whichever way.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. I understand your point. I'm in your hands. I mean, either way is fine for me, but it's up to the -- yeah, USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. And to respond to my colleague from India, we certainly do appreciate his concern. We think it would be okay if it remained in this section for two reasons. First, because this was raised during the DNS Abuse session by our colleague from India. And second, because the issue itself is in the DNS Abuse final report.

And so that's where you do see this strain of work. And it is adjacent to, in the paragraph above, the various other policy gaps that are contained within that issue report that need to be prioritized, will be prioritized once the GNSO develops its prioritization mechanism, its tool. So, we think as to where it stands now, it's the appropriate place within the communicate. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. And I agree, by the way. But anyways, India, any hard feelings? You would be okay leaving it there? Okay. Thank you so much.

- SUSHIL PAL I see a follow-up colleague joining virtually in case they have any.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. So, Fabien, back to you. Fabien, can you please provide some guidance here?
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX So, my understanding is that we're not closing this part of the text yet. Does it need, it sounds like it needs further conservation. I think as we proceed, we might clean up most of the edits here so it becomes clearer to read. And then adjustments can be made to the cleaner version of this text. So, we propose that we'll be doing that so that the next time around --
- NICOLAS CABALLERO I'm okay with the cleaning but I didn't hear any other modifications so far. Unless I'm mistaken, anybody suggested any edit? I didn't hear anything from the floor, though.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX There is one particular formulation that I think the U.S. indicated might need revision. It's highlighted here. If you scroll down maybe a little bit. The current 15-day timeline for registrar contact information, I think that probably needs a little bit of tweaking. But so, since the text is not closed yet because some delegations would like to discuss it, what we'll do is we'll just clean it, accept the edits

that are currently proposed, and let the interested parties discuss a cleaner version of that text. In the meantime, we'll move on to subsequent sections of issues of importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, that's fine. That's not what I understood, but I'm all right with that. Let's move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So then, if we're scrolling down, we're getting to the Next Round of New gTLDs where we had read applicants for a program, needed to read community application, and I understand on this topic we have a new version of the text that's proposed for this subsection 3B.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

3B.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, it sounds like Denmark is asking that we review the applicants for program text, since they have comments. So, and I see a hand up.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Denmark, please go ahead.

FINN PETERSEN

Thank you. I hope that you can hear me. I have questions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Can you turn your volume up a little bit, please, Finn?

FINN PETERSEN

Okay. Is it better now?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes. Way better.

FINN PETERSEN

Okay. I just put up. I have a question to this section. In the second paragraph, we strongly support the additional funds of \$4.9 million. And in the paragraph afterwards, we support that each applicant should have a reduction of 85%. And we agree with that. But is the \$4.9 million enough to give everybody, if we have 75 applicants, a reduction of 85%? If not, then there might be contradiction between the two paragraphs.

And if that's the case, I will suggest that we delete the amount of money which is needed in the second paragraph. We could allocate up to, instead of up to, we could allocate additional funds to the ASP from the 2012 Round Auction Proceeds. Instead of mentioning this figure from the Board if more is needed. Thank you.

-
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Finn. Thank you, Denmark. I think it makes sense. I would agree with that. But again, I'm just the GAC chair, so it's for you to decide. But I think it's an intelligent way not to compromise on any given number at this point. So, it would read, the GAC expresses its strong support for the Board's proposal to allocate additional funds from the 2012 round, blah, blah, blah. So, would that be okay? UPU?
- TRACY HACKSHAW UPU, yes. I think that's an excellent intervention. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, UPU. So, I assume there's support for this? Anybody against? And I see nodding in the room. So, okay. Thank you so much, Denmark. Back to you, Fabien.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX Then we're going to community application next. And actually, we have a hand up in the room.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO I have a hand from Switzerland. Jorge?
- JORGE CANCIO Hello. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just on this amendment from Finn that Tracy found positive, I wonder whether we want to specify to allocate the necessary additional funds.

Because additional funds could be whatever. What we want to convey is that it is really what is necessary to fulfill the goal we have identified. But I leave it to Tracy and to the experts.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Switzerland. It totally makes sense to me. And thank you for the good catch again UPU.

TRACY HACKSHAW Another excellent intervention.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Indeed. Thank you so much, Switzerland. So, we agree. We all agree. The necessary additional funds. Okay. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX So, then back in the subsequent subsection. Community applications.

IAN SHELTON Thanks, Fabien. I understand this was redrafted completely. And so, this is new text. The GAC notes that ICANN will decide which vendor will conduct community priority evaluation CPE for the Next Round of New gTLDs.

The GAC welcomes the announcement by ICANN staff that the CPE evaluation guidelines will be opened for public comment. The GAC will follow the process closely as the successful implementation of

CPE will be impactful for the involvement of communities in the domain name system.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Comments? Thoughts? Any feedback? Okay, seeing no hand online or in the room, we're good to move on then. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Following subsection, TLD application management system with new text here as well to replace what was inserted yesterday.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So, I'll read it. C, TLD application management system, the GAC thanks ICANN for the timely release and previews of the TLD application management system, TAMS, which represents an important step toward facilitating the submission and management of applications in the upcoming round.

To support GAC members in carrying out their responsibilities during the application review period, the GAC encourages ICANN to provide dedicated intersessional sessions prior to ICANN86, explaining how GAC members will be able to access the publicly available information that will allow for review of the applications.

The GAC asks for these tools to allow for search and download options that would increase the efficiency of the application review

by GAC members. Let me stop here in order to see if there are any reactions.

Perfect. I see no hands. No hands online. Are we okay to move on? And I see nodding in the room. Perfect. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Still in issues of importance, governance of the regional internet registries.

IAN SHELTON

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, 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 RIRs to operate their policies in an efficient and transparent manner and monitoring and auditing of RIRs' performance according to objective and measurable operational criteria. In particular, the GAC emphasizes that processes related to the recognition and derecognition of regional internet registries should reflect ICANN's

multistakeholder approach in implementation, ensuring that the supporting organizations and advisory committees have an appropriate and constructive role in any process.

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. Just one thing I would like to mention at this point is the fact that every time we refer to ICANN, in some places we refer to ICANN as ICANN Org and here we're just saying ICANN. Just a little detail, but something to take into account. Maybe it was just me, but I think I saw ICANN Org in some other part of the document, but anyways, it's just a minor detail to pay attention to.

So, let me stop here in order to see if we have reactions. And I have two hands, one from the Netherlands and the other one from Australia. Marco?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah, to answer to your question, the reference to ICANN is deliberate here in that it's ICANN, the multistakeholder community, that ultimately makes a decision on this policy. So, that's why it's not referred to as ICANN Org. A small, minor editorial thing, now I see it and have the floor. Monitoring and auditing

prefer to replace the ampersand with the word, and, just for consistency. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. I had a question, I guess, for the drafters on substance here. The RIR governance review process had an open consultation process and I think the GAC had decided not to supply a collective comment, but encouraged each GAC member to submit a comment through the ICANN process or through each respective RIR process.

Is it appropriate for the GAC to assume that conversations we have here are picked up by RIRs separate to any other formal consultation process? Does that privilege the GAC's open conversation over those formal consultative processes? That's my read of this paragraph here. Is that right, or have I misunderstood this section?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

That's a very good question, Australia, and thank you. I would go back to the delegation that drafted this text for that. This is coming from? From the Netherlands, right? Marco, would you? In India. So, I don't know if India or the Netherlands would like to go ahead with that.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Happy to maybe to clarify the collective membership. India originally proposed some text, which I subsequently shortened, at which point India made some edits. So, it's going back and forth a bit behind the scenes. I believe this particular sentence originated from the contribution to India. So, happily to defer to my Indian colleagues to explain what the intent is behind the sentence. Thank you.

T. SANTHOSH

Thank you, Marco and Santosh for the record. Now, the deliberations which we had in the GAC on the RIR governance, this was also being, this consultation was also done in the previous ICANN meeting. And the similar test was also included. And this matter is very important for the multi-stakeholder community, including the GAC.

That is why this topic has come during the discussion with the ASO, with the GAC. Hence, it is submitted that we may include this test, so that Multi-Stakeholder Model remains. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. I have a hand from the U.S.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, United States. I think that our Vice Chair raises an interesting question here. And I'm not entirely

sure that the third paragraph in particular, at this, we could have further discussions. But at this stage, I just, I do not believe that it reflects the consensus view of the GAC.

So, we just request some further time to be able to take a look at the text and to revisit this. It's a rather complex issue. And we just need some time to wade through it. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. India, would you be okay with that? So, basically, we're asking for, I don't know, maybe one more session or maybe half an hour. So, we'll get back. So, I suggest we park this here. And we move on for the sake of time. We still have, yeah, a good 15 minutes. So, Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, moving on next to Root Server System. And I believe text that was proposed by the Netherlands.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. So, I'll read this part. Six, root server system. The GAC welcome the overview provided by the root server stability advisory committee, RSSAC, about the structure of the DNS Root Server System and the stability and resilience of the service which the diverse group of root server operators, RSOs, has managed to deliver since the inception of the DNS.

The GAC is keen to continue the conversation with RSSAC, the RSOs, and the Root Server System Governance Working Group, RSSGWG, about the ongoing efforts both in technological development and governance to ensure the stability and security of the DNS root system in an ever-changing and expanding ecosystem.

In particular, the GAC would like to learn more about current and future frameworks on And the GAC would like to learn more about risk modeling and mitigation. And how those are used to provide learnings for future enhancements in the risk modeling and mitigation within the various organizations involved in operating the root server system. And I'll stop here in order to see reactions. I have a hand from the UK.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you, Nico. Craig Stanley-Adamson from the UK. I would like to point out in line 3 of the second sentence, it refers to stability and security. However, in the first paragraph, it refers to stability and resilience. I think we should refer to resilience here, to draw consistency, but also to remove any suggestion that the system is not secure. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, UK. Good catch. Thank you so much. So, there we go. Okay, fixed. Thank you so much. Please go ahead. Timor Leste, right?

BANGLADESH

From Bangladesh.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I'm sorry. Yeah, Bangladesh. Sorry.

BANGLADESH

Here the root server stability advisory committee, they are basically working the activities related to the DNS issue. So, in the first paragraph, in the third line, has managed to deliver since the inception of the DNS. Can we write that RSO has delivered since the inception of the DNS?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Bangladesh. Don? Thank you very much. The floor is still open. Other comments? Okay. Seeing none. Fabienne, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Next is Review of Reviews.

IAN SHELDON

The GAC is still discussing the draft design proposal, also in light of the GAC uniqueness and existing operating principles. The GAC welcomes across community group CCG outreach and inclusiveness efforts, allowing active participation by observers and reaching out to members and chairs of past review teams, and

welcomes the approach followed so far maintaining successes of past reviews, building on work of ATRT3 and being forward-looking for sustainability.

The GAC will continue to participate in the CCG with special interest in how important reviews such as Security, Stability, And Resilience, SSR, and the competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice, CCT, that are closely linked to the ICANN's mission established in the by-laws will be accommodated in the refreshed proposal.

How the overall cadence and workload will look like after compiling all reviews on one timeline. And how final proposal will be driven by a functional approach, taking care that each review has a distinct function and a clear, added value, be mindful of resources, and be communicated in clear, plain language, enabling those unfamiliar with ICANN to understand how the review system works.

I think I read that section out verbatim yesterday, and it doesn't look like there are many edits to it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Thoughts, comments, questions? Are we okay with the way it is written? I have the CTU?

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you, Chair. What is the uniqueness we are referring to there? I know it says also. Also, would seem to suggest that there was

something else. Still discussing the design proposal. I'm wondering what is the sense of the uniqueness that we are referring to in this context? Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. Very good question indeed. So, the GAC is still discussing the draft design proposal. Also, in light of the GAC uniqueness and existing operating principles. Yeah. You have a suggestion, Australia? Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

I thought perhaps this sentence talks about the GAC's unique nature and our existing operating principles. So, perhaps the GAC is still discussing the draft design proposal, giving consideration to the GAC's unique nature and existing operating principles.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Given?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Given consideration. But I mean, Australian English is not perfect, so very happy to be corrected.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I have Egypt online. Manal, please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico. Can you hear me?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes, loud and clear.

MANAL ISMAIL

Okay, apologies, I will not switch on my camera for the sake of better audio. And just to respond to CTU, this was meant to refer to the unique status of the GAC in the ICANN by-laws regarding the reviews.

There is a clause in the ICANN by-laws that refers to special status of the GAC. But this was in the past review system. So, this is just to keep the door open for any discussions by the GAC. But I'm happy to work on the language along the lines of Australia. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. No, I think it's way better now. Well, and I stand to be corrected. CTU, are you okay with the way it is drafted now? Please go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW

It's better now for sure. It's clearer.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Sorry, perhaps it should be status rather than nature. Manal refers to something specific within the by-laws and perhaps status might give more light to that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Again, Manal, more than welcome to continue wordsmithing a little bit in case you want to add anything. But so far, we're in agreement here. And I see thumbs up. Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much, Egypt.

So, let me stop here in order to see if there are any other considerations to take into account at this point. Okay. I see no hands online. No hands in the room. And we still have seven minutes before coffee. Should we stop here, have some good Indian coffee or tea, and then we come back with a fresh mind and go ahead with the rest of the drafting? Or Fabien, do you have anything, like, quick to take a look at now?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

It might take us a few minutes to go all the way back to the top of the committee. No, I'm not finding very short time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

All right. No, no. Then let's pause here. We're going to have a coffee break now. And please be back in the room at 3 o'clock. We might be able to finish this ahead of time. I'm enthusiastic and I'm crossing my fingers that Indian tea and Indian coffee will do the

magic. So, please be back in the room at 3 p. m. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]