
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GAC Communique Drafting (5 of 6)
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Ladies and gentlemen, so that you know what we're doing, we're waiting for some text on registration data at the moment, and that's why it's taking a little bit longer than expected, but we're working on it. Rest assured.

GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU

Welcome to the GAC Communiqué Drafting session on Wednesday, 11th of March, at 4:30 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.

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 Portuguese.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. And please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

I'll now hand the floor over to GAC chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. And we have made progress so far. We already have text for the section of the Communiqué, which was under Issues of Importance. Is that correct, Fabien? On urgent requests. Is that the one? Or is it registration data?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Yes, it's on domain registration data. I'm waiting for the text on urgent requests and RDRS and SSAD. That should be coming immediately. And then we do that. In the meantime, if you'd like to use that time, we can go back to Subsection 5 of internal matters. We were at the HLG. If you want to read that, maybe, while we wait for the text—

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I was going to suggest exactly that. Thank you so much, Fabien. Let's read—this is 4.5 or 3.5?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

3.5.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

“3.5. High Level Government Meeting, HLGM. The GAC welcomes the invitation from the Sultanate of Oman to take part in the next High-Level Government Meeting (HLGM) in Muscat on 18 October 2026. This meeting will be held during the ICANN87 Annual General Meeting scheduled for 17-23 October 2026, offering potential opportunities for high-level participation throughout the ICANN meeting. The GAC discussed topics of interest to be considered in the agenda of the HLGM, which will be developed in collaboration between GAC and the host with the support of ICANN’s Government Engagement Team. A GAC webinar is expected to be scheduled intercessionally to continue these discussions and ensure that a draft agenda can be shared with invitations to be sent before ICANN86.”

I’ll stop here. This shouldn’t be controversial at all, given the fact that—as a matter of fact, we read it already. I’m just reading it for the second time just to make sure that everything and everyone is okay with it. Please give me some thumbs up or nodding or something. Are we okay with the—CTU, please go ahead.

CARIBBEAN
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
UNION

Thanks. It’s very minor. Is it governmental meeting?

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Yes. I always have that. Very good catch. We normally say Governmental Advisory Committee, but again, I have no hard feelings in that regard. What's the tradition? What's the style, Fabien?
FABIEN BETREMIEUX	Government.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	We just leave that, government. Unless you tell me you have strong feelings. No? Okay, perfect. I see Egypt. Manal, please go ahead.
MANAL ISMAIL	Thank you, Nico. Can we maybe say a high-level agenda rather than draft?
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Is that the first paragraph? Second paragraph? Where exactly?
MANAL ISMAIL	Last sentence.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Okay. You would like to say, "Ensure that a high-level agenda can be shared." Is that what you mean?

-
- MANAL ISMAIL Yes. I understand we will not be in a position to share a detailed agenda, but I feel draft is like draft. Maybe a high-level agenda would be the—
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX Thank you, Manal. Can I suggest maybe preliminary? High-level is kind of confusing because there's already several mentions of high-level in reference to the meeting and to the participation.
- MANAL ISMAIL I agree, Fabien. Thank you.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Let's agree on preliminary agenda. Perfect. Thank you so much. No comments then, right? I saw thumbs up. I see nodding in the room. Okay, let's move on. Fabien, back to you.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX While I'm capturing the text that I'm receiving for registration data, we can probably read the GAC Readiness for the Next Round of New gTLDs. I think there were edits provided since yesterday. Or maybe not. Anyway, I think we need to conclude this paragraph as well. Okay. Let me read it.
- “The GAC continues its readiness activities in preparation for the Next Round of New gTLDs opening in April, 2026. The GAC held two targeted capacity development sessions to prepare GAC members and observers for their review and evaluation of new gTLD

applications. This included the review of a workbook developed by ICANN Org to provide foundational understanding of community input timelines and actions relevant to GAC members and observers. The GAC continued discussions including an indication of the processing time for the GAC chair and support staff to forward early warnings to ICANN and drafting of its process for the submission of GAC early warnings, a deliverable that will be finalized prior to the launch of the next round.”

“Furthermore, it was requested that said workbook is complemented with plain and digestible information about the possibility for GAC members and observers of using the objections provided for by the Applicant Guidebook (AGB). The GAC discussed holding a call before ICANN86 during which GAC members will have the opportunity to exchange information on their respective approaches to concluding gTLD application reviews. Lastly, the GAC would welcome intersessional opportunities during the GAC early warning period to support further capacity building and exchanges of views.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Australia? Thoughts? Edits? Comments? Okay. Seeing no hands, that means that we can go back... I mean not back, but straight to the section in which text for the registration data issue was provided. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

We're going back to Issues of Importance, domain name registration data, just to the top of the section. Issues of Importance to the GAC, Domain Name Registration Data, Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data.

IAN SHELTON

"Urgent Requests For Disclosure Of Registration Data. The GAC is pleased that the Board agrees to a 24-hour timeline for contracted parties to respond to authenticated urgent requests and looks forward to the amendment of the Registration Data Policy to integrate this timeline developed by the Implementation Review Team (IRT). The Board's decision is in line with GAC advice from ICANN79 and follow-up on previous advice from ICANN80. The GAC appreciates the cooperation with the GNSO Council and the work by the ICANN community on this crucial issue. The GAC, however, notes that the 24-hour timeline for contracted parties to respond to authenticated urgent requests will remain contingent upon establishment of a law enforcement authentication mechanism. The GAC appreciates the ongoing collaboration of ICANN Org with the Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) to finalize law enforcement authentication mechanisms. The GAC recognizes the community's participation in the dedicated practitioners group. The GAC urges the ICANN Board and GNSO to quickly determine the most effective way to proceed with implementing authentication mechanisms for urgent requests. The GAC reiterates its position that a new Policy Development Process, PDP, is unnecessary since the implementation and use of an authentication mechanism is

part of the overall implementation process associated with the Registration Data Policy. Given the vital public safety interests involved in urgent requests, a new PDP would delay further progress on this issue.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Let’s stop here. Can you scroll up a little bit? There you go. Thank you. I just want to make sure that you have enough time to review again these two paragraphs and that everyone is okay with it. Let’s pause here for a second. Any comment, thoughts, edits, questions, any rationale needed at this point? I think this is very straightforward, but again, that’s just my opinion, of course. I don’t see any hand online or in the room, which means we’re okay. Of course, we can go back at any given time, right? But for the time being, maybe we should move on and read part B, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

We’re moving on to, still as part of Issues of Importance, Domain Name Registration Data, Subsection B, Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and policy recommendations for a System for Standardized Access Disclosure (SSAD).

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. I’ll read that part. “The GAC appreciates the Board’s decision to enable the development of supplemental recommendations informed by the experience of the Registration

Data Request System (RDRS) the findings of the RDRS Standing Committee final report and the RDRS policy alignment analysis. The GAC notes that this approach appears to provide the most appropriate path to advance work on a permanent and improved system without initiating a new policy development process.”

“The GAC reiterates its view that ICANN should move forward a permanent, centralized, and globally accessible mechanism to channel registration data requests and that participation by gTLD registrars should be mandatory to ensure the usefulness, effectiveness, and completeness of such a mechanism for requesters. The GAC also encourages timely consideration of appropriate participation models for affiliated privacy and proxy services, and continues to support efforts to explore voluntary participation by ccTLDs.”

“The GAC encourages the ICANN Board and GNSO Council to proceed expeditiously with the supplemental recommendations process and to develop clear timelines for next steps. The GAC also welcomes the proposed engagement of the broader community in the supplemental recommendation process through the Small Team Plus format involving Advisory Committees and looks forward to participating in this work to ensure that public safety considerations are substantively reflected in the revised recommendations. The GAC further appreciates the assurance provided by the GNSO Council that it aims to complete the

supplemental recommendations process in a matter of months as opposed to stretching the timeline potentially over a year.”

Can you scroll down in order to see if that’s it? Those are the four paragraphs so far. Let me make sure that everybody’s got the opportunity to review in detail before we move on. Let’s pause here for a second. I have a hand from the USA. Please, go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER

Hi, this is Owen Fletcher. Apologies, I think we had one typo. In the title of this section, we have Registration Data Request Service, and in the first paragraph, it’s Registration Data Request System, and I think Service is correct. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. Very good catch. Any other? Thank you so much. Moving on. Fabien, can you scroll down please to Part C which is Privacy and Proxy Services. There we go. All right. Australia, please.

IAN SHELDON

It’s like magic. “The GAC appreciates the work of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT) toward implementation of the PPSAI recommendations. The GAC welcomes the IRT’s timeline to advance this work during 2026. The GAC intends to follow these efforts and provide input on the process. In addition, the GAC

reiterates the RDRS must address complexities that arise from privacy and proxy services to be fit for purpose.”

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Any comments? Any edit needed? This is pretty straightforward as well so I would assume it's not controversial, but again, you still have time to take a look. Australia?

IAN SHELDON

Should it be “provide input on the process” or “to the process”? Well, I mean, one is commenting on timeline and the process itself and one is actually substantively inputting into the process.

OWEN FLETCHER

If the question is for me, I think either way is okay. I suppose into suggests sort of doing it through the IRT where we do have GAC participation. Input on the process could also be like something in the Communiqué. Either way seems valid.

IAN SHELDON

I will take your ambiguity.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. I have India.

T. SANTOSH: Thank you, Chair. If we see the 1B RDRS, it is written as affiliated privacy/proxy. On the second paragraph, second last sentence, here it is written affiliated privacy/proxy services. In order to have consistency, we can go to the 1C and add 1C. We are in 1B. 1C we can add in the last line of privacy and proxy services. Before privacy, we can write affiliated privacy and proxy services for consistency. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, India. Well noted. Any other? Thank you.

Looks like we are in agreement at this point with this part of the text. Is that the case? Please give me a thumbs up or nodding or something. I see a thumbs up and nodding. Thank you so very much. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX The last piece of substantive text is the report of the Public Safety Working Group in internal matters section 4, GAC Working Groups.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much. Before I read this, India, is that an old hand? Okay. I'll read this part. "GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG). The PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote lawful effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG contributed to the GAC

sessions pertaining to DNS abuse and registration data issues. The GAC bilateral meeting with the GNSO Council where it discussed law enforcement authentication tools relevant to the ongoing community discussions on urgent requests for non-public registration data. The PSWG also participated in panel discussions organized by the ALAC and the Contracted Parties House, including regarding the criminal use of domain generation algorithms (DGAs). Finally, and alongside GAC members, the PSWG engaged with community stakeholders in meetings of the newly convened GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on associated domain checks as part of policy development on DNS abuse mitigation.”

I’ll pause here in order to see reactions. I see no hands online or in the room, which basically means that we’re in agreement, we’re on the same page. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

We now have a few of the Inter-Constituency Activities, Section 2 of the Communiqué, that we have not had a chance to read yet. Starting with meeting with the ICANN Board.

“Meeting with the ICANN Board. The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed ICANN contributions to the implementation of the WSIS+20 outcomes, GAC participation and interests in the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group process, future GAC contributions to the ICANN Nominating Committee, Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), and Standardized System for Access

and Disclosure (SSAD), urgent requests and law enforcement authentication, accuracy of registration data, mandatory DNS abuse reporting by registries and registrars, and root server governance.”

I think we use a couple of acronyms here, which we could probably replicate later in the document where we spelled them out, so I think we could probably abbreviate other parts of the document.

We generally do that before—once the Communiqué is approved, we go through and correct or improve those aspects without changing anything to a text. For instance, I think it’s the first time in the Communiqué at this stage where we mentioned RDRS and SSAD, so we might have to leave it in this instance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you so much, Australia. Thank you, Fabien. Anything we’re missing here? Is there anything we didn’t include there that we might have missed at this point? This is a good time to say so. That not being the case, can we move on? Have we read the meeting with the ALAC and all the rest, Fabien? I just don’t remember. We’ve already read that part, right? Okay. Back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

The next one is the Meeting with the IETF.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, I'll read that one. "Meeting with the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). The GAC met with members of the IETF and discussed IETF within the IG ecosystem, interaction with ICANN, emerging and ongoing work."

Maybe we should change that. We should actually write "and ongoing work" if okay with everybody, of course.

"Emerging and ongoing work, engaging with the IETF/ISOC, individual from the government..." I don't understand this part. Okay. Individuals from governments. But still doesn't make sense to me, at least. Individuals, what? It should be individual government participation or something like that. India?

T. SANTOSH

During the meeting, it was mentioned that while attending IETF, it will be in the individual capacity. We need to rephrase participation in IETF in individual capacity.

IAN SHELDON

This was one of the subheadings from the slide deck that they have. It was originally supposed to be talking about the roles that governments might have coming to places like the IETF Policymaker Program, governments participating in the IETF. I will say when governments do participate at the IETF, they do represent government views. I think many others participate in individual capacities, but I certainly know when my government sends engineers there, they do represent the views of the

government, but that's beside the point. I will take you up on the point around members of the IETF though, because I think your point stands that the IETF doesn't have membership. Perhaps it might be better phrased "The GAC met with participants of the IETF" if we want to be clear.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Australia. I have the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, colleagues. I agree with the suggestion just made by my Australian colleague. My point was to say representatives. In the end, they did sort of present on behalf of the IETF, but happy to stay with participants in this case.

To the point on government participation, I can see the difficulties and sensitivities around that also from the IETF side. Maybe my readout from that particular section was engagement. Maybe I talked about the policymaker program, so maybe a royal way out there is to talk about government engagement with the IETF.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. All right. Let's move on. Fabien, what else do we have so far with the meeting with the—Review CCG, right? That's very short.

"Meeting with the Review of Reviews Cross-Community Group, Review CCG. The GAC met with members of the Review CCG was

updated on the group's work and discussed the draft design proposal submitted by the group for community discussion at ICANN85."

Pretty straightforward. Okay. We're greening this section of the Communiqué as well. We're in your hands... Australia?

IAN SHELDON

"Cross-Community Discussions. GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN85, including ICANN's role in the future of Internet resilience, the Review of Reviews, and WSIS+20 Lessons Learned and Next Steps."

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Are we okay with this text? Any comments? Again, very straightforward. Okay, I see no hands. Now, we're in your hands, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I note in an edit suggested in the report of the GAC Universal Acceptance and IDN Working Group in the last paragraph, so this is Internal Matters Working Groups, UA IDN Working Group, you see at the bottom of the last paragraph.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. I'll just read that part, that last sentence. It's a long sentence. Anyways, I'll take it from the period.

“In this context, the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group (HRILWG) 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 consistent with ICANN’s core value.”

I already have a problem there are. Too long a sentence. We need two or three commas, I would say, but I’m not the expert here. I’m pretty sure we need at least one comma, or maybe not. Again, I’m not the Shakespearean expert here. I can live with it as it is, no problem whatsoever, but...

Okay. I have the okay from Australia, which is good enough for me, absolutely. Egypt?

ABDALMONEM THARWAT Actually, after—
GALILA

NICOLAS CABALLERO Can you speak closer to the microphone, please?

ABDALMONEM THARWAT To further discussion on UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators,
GALILA considering is a promoting diversity consistent with ICANN core values.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I don't understand. Are you adding anything?

ABDALMONEM
GALILA

THARWAT

I tried to scrape some words maybe not relevant for most of us, and have the core value in order to be highlighted. And to make a sentence somehow short enough.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Do you mind repeating the edit you're suggesting and what part of that sentence you're suggesting to strike out?

ABDALMONEM
GALILA

THARWAT

After Universality Indicators, scrape "to assess" until "aimed at" and add the word "considering promotion of diversity consistent with ICANN's core values."

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Egypt. I'll read just that sentence again for the sake of time. It would read, "In this context, the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group (HIRILWG) looks forward to further discussions on UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators, considering the promotion of diversity consistent with ICANN's core values."

I guess, don't we need a coma after diversity? Just saying. Well, according to my Australian vice chair, a coma wouldn't hurt there so let's just add it. Thank you so much. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I believe this completes the reading of the Communiqué. We have noted in section, in Issues of Importance, DNS Abuse Mitigation, that we still have to research exactly the best formulation to refer to the validation and verification process in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Because we believe it's not a matter of timeline for registrars, but timeline for registrants to confirm their contact information. We need to confirm that sentence and suggest the most accurate reference in line with the recommendation on this matter that the GAC had made in the ICANN84 Communiqué. We can make that edit as part of our editorial review just to make sure that the reference here is actually aligned on the way the contracts are worded and aligned with the previously expressed recommendation of the GAC on this matter.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. There's a hand from Lebanon.

ZEINA BOU HARB

Hello, everyone. I just want to note that in the paragraph related to the HLGM, we are using... Can we see the text please? We are using the word "take part" whereas we usually use "host". I think "take

part” is like participating, it’s like minimizing the role of the host. Can we just use host instead of take part?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I think the way we formulated the sentence here is that “take part” is associated with the invitation from the Sultanate of Oman. The object of taking part is GAC members. So the GAC welcomes invitation from the Sultanate of Oman to take part, for GAC members to take part or for high-level representatives to take part. If you think that that’s not clear enough, we would need to reformulate the sentence.

ZEINA BOU HARB

I would prefer to reformulate it, if possible. Maybe later. Not necessarily now during the meeting.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Lebanon. We’ll take that offline. We’ll get back to you. Thank you, anyways, for the suggestion. Any other thing we didn’t cover so far, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

I was scrolling down to double-check. I don’t think there is anything else of substance to discuss. We’ve noted some suggested improvements or sort of small editorial edits by, I believe, our colleague from Zimbabwe. This is usually what we do once the text is adopted. We go through a process of ensuring that all these little

editorial aspects are taken care of and so that the text is fluid and readable and consistent. We'll consider those suggestions as part of that process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. Can you keep scrolling down in order to see if everything is all right? And that's green which means it's okay. ccTLD Application, green as well. UDRP Governance, okay. Please keep scrolling down. Root Server System, okay. Review of Reviews and Next Meeting, and voila, it seems like we're done.

But bear in mind, we still need to do the review Nigel Hickson style to honor his memory. I would say Shakespearean but given the fact that that was—we used to call it ITU style. Do you remember? And for that, I will kindly give the floor to our Australian Shakespearean native speaker, Ian. Unless of course you tell... There's a hand from... Is that Spain? Spain please, go ahead.

IÑAKI GIL OSÉS

Thank you, Nico. It's just maybe I'm confused. At the end, the date of the next meeting, it doesn't start on the 8th, not the 7th. Because it says 7th. Is 7th correct? Because 7th is Sunday, if I'm not wrong. I was taking as the official date the Monday, 8th. If you could clarify that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Good catch, Spain. Thank you so much. You're right. It's the 8th. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very happy to tell

you that we're done. We will do the Nigel Hickson style review tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. in order to give you time to get in touch with your capitals and see if everything's okay, if you we're aligned, any final touches that we might need to add at that point.

Then very quickly, tomorrow, during—because we still have one—I need to go back to my—we still have... As a matter of fact, we have two potential sessions tomorrow. One was the sixth Communiqué Drafting session, and then we had the wrap up. I assume we won't need the Wrap-Up session so we can do that right after we review the whole thing at 1:15. Let's see how it goes. It should be fine. But the idea, again, is to give you the chance to consult with your capitals overnight and come back tomorrow with a lot of energy and fresh minds to give it a final look. Would that be okay with everyone? I have a hand from the Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sorry. Clarification, you mentioned 1:15. In which time zone? Because as far as I'm aware, we're looking at... Sorry, my agenda is mistaken. Still 1:15 Indian time, right?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Correct. 1:15 p.m. Indian time. Right after lunch, basically. Because in the morning tomorrow, we have the Community session Review of Reviews again. The GNSO discussion on Next Steps for the SSAD, that's from 9:00 to 10:00. Then there's a coffee break then there's the ICANN Public Forum, lunch break, and we are supposed to

reconvene here at 1:15 p.m. for the final read, to review whatever is needed, and for the Nigel style final review, if okay with everyone. We might not need the Wrap-Up session, but that's where we are at this point.

Any final comments? Thoughts? I'm very happy to finish to wrap up this session seven minutes ahead. All good? Thank you very much then. We'll reconvene tomorrow at 1:15 p.m. Thank you so much. This session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]