
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (4 of 5)
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 11:45 to 13:15 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the fourth ICANN86 Communiqué drafting session on Thursday, 11 June, at 11:45 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and it's governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please remember to state your name and what language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and please make sure to mute all other devices when you are not speaking. With that, I will leave the floor to GAC Chair, Nico Caballero. Over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. This is the fourth communiqué drafting session. Correct me if I'm wrong, Julia, is it the fourth or the fifth? Fourth? Okay. So, if everything goes well, we might be able to finish our communiqué drafting during this session. I'm not trying to put pressure on you by no means. Please don't get me wrong, but, you know, for the sake of efficiency, maybe we can try to be flexible and collaborative and, you know, find some common ground and be able to actually

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.

produce a very good communiqué like we always do, of course, right?

Only point to mention here is that we are actually becoming more efficient and out of seven sessions that, you know, we used to have in the past, we went down to six and then to five. And perhaps, and I just say perhaps, we might be able to do it during the fourth session, which is this one.

So, without further ado, Benedetta, let me give you the floor in order to walk us through the parts of the communiqué for which we already have additional text. And of course, we will fine-tuning the last part of the -- Maybe we can start there, right? If you agree, let's start where we left off, which was under issues of importance, and then we cover the rest of the text, right? There was -- Yes, that part.

Okay, so again, for the sake of clarity, I'm going to read very quickly with my apologies to our hero, absolutely hero interpreters, but given the fact that we have already read this part, maybe, you know, I'll read a little bit faster. So, yes, B, registration data request service and system for standardized access disclosure.

So, the text would read, the GAC takes note of the experience gained from the RDRS pilot, the findings of the RDRS Standing Committee, and recalls the GAC's comments on the ICANN org Policy Alignment Analysis, and the comments issued in GAC Communiqués since ICANN82. The GAC reiterates that ICANN should maintain a permanent centralized mechanism to facilitate requests to gTLD registrars for disclosure of domain registration

data with A, mandatory participation by gTLD registrars, better integration for registrar's systems and requester's systems. C, participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars, and D, support for urgent request processing and the law enforcement authentication mechanisms being developed by the PSWG. Excuse me.

Either a substantially improved RDRS or a successor system should meet these requirements. The GAC continues supporting efforts to explore voluntary participation by ccTLDs in the RDRS. The GAC looks forward to engaging in constructive dialogue with members of the GNSO's SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team to achieve the goal of completing the team's work by early 2027, with a view to enable the timely implementation of a permanent and effective registration data request mechanism.

I'm sorry for reading a little bit faster than usual, but we have read this about four times. So, the question at this point for the full GAC is, are we okay with the text? There's one part we still need to decide, which was -- Oh, and you cleaned it up. Yeah, but the only part that needed some fine-tuning. I have the USA.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you. I was speaking with our colleague from Jamaica during the break about how to handle the list. I'm putting a sentence in the chat that I would suggest can replace the words starting from the GAC reiterates that ICANN should and then through the end of the list, so PSWG period. The text that I put in the chat has the same

meaning, but changes it from a list back to just a sentence, and just has small word tweaks that I think address the concerns raised. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. So, the text you just submitted would replace the whole thing from that full period, the GAC reiterates, blah, blah, blah, and then up until the end of bullet point D. Is that correct? Okay, thank you. So, Benedetta, there you go. All right, so let me read that part and only that part.

The GAC reiterates that ICANN should maintain a permanent centralized mechanism to facilitate requests to gTLD registrars for disclosure of domain registration data. The mechanism should require mandatory participation by gTLD registrars, provide better integration for registrars' systems and requesters' systems, allow for participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars, and support urgent request processing and the law enforcement authentication mechanisms being developed by the PSWG.

Sounds very good to me, but again, I'm in your hands. Is there agreement in the room? Please give me a thumbs up, and I see thumbs up, and nodding, and more nodding. Okay, perfect. Thank you, USA. Thank you so much for that. Benedetta, back to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. So, that concludes the section, what were we looking at, on the domain name registration data. And we have some new text under item number five on issues of importance submitted by the Ukraine. So, if you can scroll down, Gulden, please and this is new text that hasn't been reviewed yet.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Benedetta, and for this, I will kindly ask our colleague from Uganda to go ahead with the reading. Gloria, over to you. You'll take it. Okay, okay. Netherlands, you'll take it. Go ahead, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Well, I'm also happy to do the reading, but in order, as you said, this is text submitted by the Ukraine. It's actually a text submitted by the Netherlands, but in close cooperation and consultation with our Ukrainian colleague who has agreed not to seek advice, but then suggested that we include this text under issues of importance. As I said, I'm also happy to do the reading, but if Gloria wants to do the honors, by all means.

GLORIA KATUUKU

You can go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

I was afraid you would say that. Thank you. Then there are colleagues looking at it so this is entirely new text. I read it slowly.

Under issues of importance will include a separate header, number five, which reads, preserving universal connectivity and addressing ad-hoc DNS fragmentation. During the GAC discussions, a number of members highlighted a systemic risk to internet stability. It appears a number of private providers are independently implementing arbitrary, ad-hoc DNS blocking mechanisms to comply with local laws due to the lack of a standardized technical framework. This trend causes massive collateral damage and accelerates internet fragmentation.

The GAC, noting the SSAC 127 report, encourages the ICANN community to further the work and continue with the ongoing efforts to disseminate best practices to deal with DNS blocking and avoid fragmentation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you Netherlands. Comments? Thoughts? And for the sake of clarity, this was actually discussed during the plenary, only not as advice. That's the only thing we need to clarify here because otherwise we wouldn't be able to include it in our communiqué, right? Just for the sake of clarity. So, there it is. Any comment or question? And I have Germany and India. Germany, please.

RUDY NOLDE

Thank you, Chair. Rudy Nolde from Germany for the record. First of all, I would like to thank Ukraine for raising this very important issue that is really at the heart of also, it could contribute to

Internet fragmentation. And thanks for Ukraine to be flexible on this matter so we can highlight it here in issues of importance. And I think what is really at the heart here is the SSAC report, which already issues recommendations for these providers to really be narrow when they apply local laws and avoid over blocking.

Looking at the text in the second sentence at the end, it says to comply with local laws due to the lack of standardized technical framework. I don't know if that is the reason. I would be in favor of maybe striking it out because we are noting the SSAC report, it's maybe not like a standardized technical framework, but it does provide recommendations and very concrete best practice. So, that's just, yeah, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Germany? India.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. I had the same concerns as was highlighted by my German colleagues, so I think that part is not clear as to what is the standardized technical framework, which is lacking.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Chair. I must say, it's true the issue was discussed and it's good that we acknowledge it. The way it's phrased, the

relationship between arbitrary actions and compliance with local laws, in my view, it's an assessment we are making. We do not really know what we are talking about in the sense we do not know what are the specific cases and what are the ad-hoc actions and what the local laws require.

So, just to be really extra safe, perhaps we could further cut down the sentence to DNS blocking mechanisms because we do not have elements to assess that this is to comply with local laws and actually perhaps local laws do not require arbitrary actions. It's a bit generic as an assessment. And of course, also, I would like to say, but this is not for the communiqué that it would be good that we further explore this issue at next meetings with, you know, more information, getting the SSAC to brief us more on this topic, I think that would be helpful. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Nico, sorry, Gemma, European Commission, can you clarify? Okay, now see was this the attitude intended? Okay, so it would read independently implementing arbitrary ad-hoc DNS blocking mechanisms. That's okay. Just clear. Thank you. I have two more hands up. I see Jamaica and India back, so maybe then Jamaica.

-
- WAHKEEN MURRAY Wahkeen Murray, Jamaica, for the record. In the second paragraph, the second line, that word dissipate, did we intend to say disseminate? Because dissipate means to waste away.
- MARCO HOGEWONING I think you caught me being a non-native speaker. Thank you for that correction.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Jamaica. I have India next.
- SUSHIL PAL I think we just would support the comment made by the EU colleagues that we need more understanding. I think in the second sentence when you say it appears a number of private providers, I mean, it was presented that a number of maybe, I think. It seems like we're speculating out here, so.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. So, instead of saying it appears, you want to put it was presented, sounds a little bit weird to me, but anyways, I'm not the Shakespearean drafter here. I have Japan next.
- TOMONORI MIYAMOTO Sorry, my concern was about the name of SAC 127. Originally it was SSAC, but it's now fixed, so I'm fine, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so I'll pass it back to you, Netherlands. Can you read the cleaned-up text, so to say, the way it would look, finally?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yeah. We'll look into the actual report now. I think it's SAC 127 report, but we can fix that as an editorial. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, what we now have in front of us, and thank you all for your comments, is during the GAC discussions, a number of members highlighted a systemic risk to Internet stability. It was presented that a number of private providers are independently implementing arbitrary ad-hoc DNS blocking mechanisms.

The GAC, noting the SAC 127 report, encourages the ICANN community to further the work and continue with the ongoing efforts to disseminate best practices to deal with DNS blocking and avoid fragmentation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. I just have a little issue with number and number being repeated like in the first and second sentences, but maybe that's just me, so I can leave with that. So, if it's okay for everyone, we can move on unless you want to address that number, number issue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yeah, we need to erase the it.

MARCO HOGEWONING It doesn't work, sorry.

NICOLAS CABALLERO No, you need to erase the it right after the period. If you erase the it right after the period, it would make sense. Internet stability, period, it was presented. Yes, and the period. Sorry, back to you, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING Okay, let me try again. During the discussions, it was highlighted that a systemic risk to internet stability was presented that a number of private providers are independently implementing, I think we need further work. Maybe a native English speaker can help us out here.

SUSHIL PAL I think it would be easy if you make it some members, then the sentence would read fine. During the discussion, some members highlighted systemic risk to the internet stability, I think. Then it becomes easy to read. Some members highlighted.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yeah, but it still doesn't make sense.

SUSHIL PAL No, delete that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Yeah.

SUSHIL PAL Delete that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Ah, that, okay. After presented, right?

SUSHIL PAL Highlighted. After highlighted. Delete the after highlighted.

MARCO HOGEWONING Maybe I'll go dictation speed. Benedetta, I hope you can keep up. Then I think, as I understood India correctly, it would read, during the GAC discussions, some members highlighted a systemic risk to internet stability. It was presented that a number of private providers are independently implementing arbitrary ad-hoc DNS blocking mechanisms, full stop. And then we continue with the second paragraph.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. So, this is where we are. Is it okay? We don't need to read the second paragraph. We have already read it. So, does it look okay to everyone? All right, and I see nodding in the room. One last time, everything all right? Okay, perfect. I see no hands in the room. India.

SUSHIL PAL

Yes, need to doubly check whether the SAC reports mentions fragmentation or should we stop only with DNS blocking in the second para, last sentence?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I really think that, from a technical point of view, it's blocking, but I wouldn't mind, unless anybody tells me otherwise. Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Maybe to accommodate India, if we go noting the SAC 127 report, and then I would suggest brackets, or what is it? Quotation mark, DNS blocking revisited, close the quotation marks, which is the exact title of this publication.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Would that be okay for India?

SUSHIL PAL

I just want to be technically correct. It's okay with me, but I just want to make sure that the SAC report 127, it mentions fragmentation. If it does not, then we should not.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Okay, so we'll keep it. One final chance for edits in this regard. Okay, seeing no hands online or in the room, then Benedetta, let's move on to the next section. So, okay, we're going to address two hopefully, of course, non-controversial items, and then we'll get to a potentially controversial item, which I hope will not be the case.

So, right from the beginning, as you can see on the screen, we have Section 1, which is the introduction. I'll very quickly read the part that we didn't read yesterday, which is only the last paragraph. And this is the reference to the passing of our colleague, Alan Barrett. So, it would read, the GAC mourns the passing of ICANN board member, Alan Barrett and conveys its deepest condolences to his family. His decades of service to the African internet community and to ICANN's mission will be remembered.

Is it okay with everyone? I don't think we need to read the part that was already read yesterday. So, this is what I meant by non-controversial. So, give me some thumbs up or nodding or are we okay with this? Okay. All right, and I see more nodding. Thank you so very much. Moving on, Benedetta.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. And if we scroll down a little bit still under internal matters, item number four, GAC operational matters, there's an additional sentence at the end noting the agreement to establish the Capacity Development Working Group and that hasn't been read yet. So, if you want to take a look at that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Benedetta, and I'll read just that part. I'm not going to read the previous paragraph. So, this last sentence, well, paragraph actually, would read, the GAC agreed to establish a Capacity Development Working Group. This group will function as the central hub and coordinate all GAC capacity development efforts, full stop. Comments, questions, edits? Again, non-controversial. This is kind of like a procedural thing. I see the CTU.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Yes, minor editorial. I think we need to in the second sentence, replace the word and with to, to coordinate.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. Thank you, Nigel. As usual, very good catch. Okay, so other than that, I don't see anything controversial here and I stand to be corrected, but if that is the case, maybe we can move on. Would that be okay? All right, and I see nodding again, so Benedetta, moving on.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico. And if we scroll down, we have some proposed text under Section 5, GAC consensus advice to the board. Nico, if you want to take the discussion there, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so for this, I will kindly give the floor to our distinguished colleague from Australia. With a caveat, though, I'm not sure that there is consensus or that consensus was reached in terms of actually issuing advice to the Board at this point. Not that I recall at least, but I stand to be corrected, of course. But in any case, we will read it and then we'll discuss. So, over to you, please Ian. Sorry, I have a hand from Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. It's more of a procedural question. So, I'm not against reading it, but I would welcome the proposers to explain the rationale and how it relates to discussions in plenary.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. That's a very reasonable ask. Who proposed? I understand this text was proposed by Niger. Is the Niger GAC representative in the room in order to give more color, or explain, or as a matter of fact, try to reach consensus? Because that would be required for us to actually, you know, give the board consensus advice.

Is the Niger representative in the room? Because otherwise we will need to erase this part. Niger? Is he online or in the room? I don't

see Niger in the room or online so in that case, and according to our internal procedures and common practice, we will not include this for the reasons already explained, right?

We need consensus, we need to discuss this, we need to fine-tune, you know, and have a meaningful discussion before and very especially, if it's going to be consensus advice to the board. But again, I'm just the GAC chair. I'm in your hands. If you want to do otherwise, of course, you know, I'll just pause here in order to see how we can proceed. My recommendation is to erase this part and move on with the parts that were actually discussed by the full GAC. I have Switzerland, Australia, and UK.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I had the opportunity of reading through the proposals from Niger and I think there's merit to the substance. At the same time, we haven't really discussed this during this meeting, so I would suggest also at a procedural level that we, maybe through our support staff that has received the proposal, get in touch with the proposing delegation with Niger, and invite them to propose this accordingly. Because I don't think there's anything urgent that they propose this for the Bali meeting, for discussion in plenary, and that they are involved accordingly in the preparations of the corresponding sessions so we can have a full discussion there and then decide whether advice is merited. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Switzerland, and that sounds like a very reasonable approach, in my humble opinion. I have Australia next.

IAN SHELDON Thanks, Nico. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia. Just to support the Swiss comment here, I think there's quite a number of good ideas in the proposals here. So, I'd encourage the proponents to repackage and work out how we might be able to table them for discussion in Bali. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Australia. UK.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON Thank you. Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK, for the record. Just to fully support what's just been said by colleagues from Switzerland and Australia, particularly, I think, on the ASP. This is something that we will have to explore at some point in reviewing, but at the moment we have only just started, commenced, this 2026 round. There will be a time and a place for looking back, but we would urge that to come at a much later time. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, UK, Australia, and Switzerland. So, there we go. So, let's follow my initial recommendation of erasing this from the communiqué and getting in touch with a distinguished

colleague from Niger in order to prepare, you know, let's say a repackaging for discussion in Bali. So, there we go, Benedetta, over to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico, and yes, staff will be updating the document, removing that. I'm just looking, if you don't mind, Nico, if we could go back under issues of importance under DNS abuse mitigation. India had submitted some edits via email that I'm just trying to capture right now. There we go. It's under there, yeah, the GAC and its interactions. So, if you look at that paragraph, we'll be replacing the paragraph above that's now bracketed. I don't know if India wants to say anything about this or if this is captured as you requested via email.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So, India, would you want me to read that paragraph? Okay, so I'll read the text in red. The GAC, in its interaction with ICANN Board, reiterated the need for a centralized DNS abuse reporting portal managed by ICANN for the periodic reporting of DNS abuse complaints received by registrars and registries, including the number of complaints and action taken as initially requested in ICANN85 Mumbai GAC Communiqué.

Further, it was emphasized that mandatory reporting of DNS abuse by all registrars is necessary for any objective and evidence-based policymaking for DNS abuse mitigation. So, let me pause here in

order to see if we have reactions. I have the USA and Switzerland. USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States. We certainly support the spirit of this text, but it does appear that the GAC is making a request for ICANN to build a new system. That is our concern with the text and I'm not so sure that that is a GAC position. I do recall that there is text on reporting from the Mumbai communiqué, so perhaps we could just recall the GAC's interest in further reporting more effective DNS abuse reporting from the Mumbai communiqué.

I also would note that if we go up a wee bit to the bullet points, so these ideas emerged during PDP discussions, and so some of this is already covered and these have been important discussions. We really like specifically the second bullet. So, we would propose that, instead of making what seems to be a request for a new ICANN org initiative that would require resources and dev work, perhaps we just recall the ICANN85 advice and then have more discussions about this in Bali. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Actually, it was a question to Benedetta. So, if I read the text we

had before which is now bracketed in black font, and I read the text that has been proposed by India, it's the same text, right? I don't see any difference, so I was wondering what's the change, or I don't know.

SUSHIL PAL

I think the black one needs to be deleted, that's what I think Benedetta. I mean, it is an editorial mistake or a drafting mistake. Thank you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

May I, Nico? Thank you very much. Just to confirm, Susan, you were noting, the recalling the ICANN85 Mumbai communiqué. So, would that be instead of noting taken as initially requested? Is that the sentence that should be updated as noted in the ICANN85 communiqué? Is it the word requested that is a problem? I'm sorry, just to make sure.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Yeah. Thank you, Benedetta. I'm sorry I couldn't take some time to propose some wordsmithing. I think it's just that we're moving from asking ICANN to explore, to stating that the GAC reiterates a need. And to me, those are two different approaches, two different positions.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. My cue is not completely accurate, but I have two hands. Perhaps India and then the European Commission. Thank you. Gemma, please, and then India.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you. Thank you very much, Ian. No, just I think in terms of substance, this does not differ much from the Mumbai communiqué. I posted the text in the chat because in the Mumbai communiqué we have encouraged the board to take action in a way to explore the centralized reporting portal managed by ICANN. This is what we have agreed in the GAC in the Mumbai communiqué.

Now, if the formulation about reiterating, I mean I'm not a native speaker, but I do not see a big difference from encouraging them to explore this. I mean, the main element is that we think it could be a good idea if there was a centralized DNS abuse reporting portal managed by ICANN. This was the previous position from the GAC, which of course, can change over time, but the way it's formulated for us, it's not necessarily a problem. If there are better formulations, it's okay as well, but I'm not sure we are departing too much from the Mumbai communiqué.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. India, please.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. I think, as Gemma said, I think largely built on the Mumbai communiqué itself. And the reason it's been important, I'll reiterate again because in the interaction with the board we saw that the board was not even aware, I think, that the response we got from the board, that they're hearing it for the first time and therefore the need to kind of emphasize on this.

And we keep talking about the evidence-based policy, but if we do not take actions -- I mean, I urge all the GAC members here that, you know, we keep talking about data-driven, evidence-based policy, but then when it actually comes to policy formulation, we tend to rely upon the standalone research, which is obviously drawn from a limited set of data or a limited set of resources, right?

So, maybe it's in the interest of the larger community that, you know, we have a system where the full body or the complete data is available so that we are fully informed that the policy action on which we are spending time and the resources, they're actually the best one, I think.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. United States.

SUSAN CHALMERS

I do just want to point out that in the DNS abuse session, we did have a presentation from NetBeacon, which provides a centralized reporting mechanism. So, one does already exist. Are we asking ICANN to duplicate NetBeacon's work?

SUSHIL PAL

I think whatever we know, the NetBeacon portal is not a comprehensive, that's the point we're trying to make. It's any centralized portal, if it is not a comprehensive portal, if it is not the whole, then it doesn't serve the purpose, right? And we have had a consultation with NetBeacon and they have admitted it's only the data they have got access to. To that extent, they have built the portal. It does not capture all DNS abuses relating to all the registrars.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Japan, please.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you, Ian. Tomo from Japan. I support the spirit of this paragraph, but maybe we need to consider about this, the exact words of it. So, I support the US stance of what's missing for taking more time to do it. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

So, where do we go from here? Do we break and rework this paragraph? Yes? Okay, perhaps let's look at other parts of the document to see what else we need to rework. Back to you, Benedetta. Where else do we have to have a look at?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Ian. I'm just looking at the document.

IAN SHELDON

Sorry. Just got one hand from the UK, please.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you; Craig Stanley-Adamson, UK. I would like to flag and just revisit issues of importance to the GAC, para three on domain name registration data and then point B, registration data request service. We have in the second paragraph, we refer to ccTLDs. I have just consulted the UK ccTLD operator and have been advised that it might be more accurate to say by all parts of the ccTLD ecosystem. The reason for this because whether it is a gTLD or a ccTLD, it is the party acting as a registrar that has the most data about a customer. ccTLD registries only have what the registrars give them so it's a bit of a broader wider piece. So, if we're happy to extend this for clarity, that'd be great. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, good pick-up. Are we amenable to this change? I see no other hands. Perhaps we can move on. Thank you, UK. Back to you, Benedetta.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Ian. I'm just double-checking, but as far as I can see, I think all parts have been reviewed. I'm checking from the top of the document. So, I believe that we have topic leads who are

reviewing the DNS abuse mitigation in room, so there's some work going on there. Otherwise, I think we're okay. I don't think there's anything else that needs to be reviewed at the moment. Staff will remove the advice piece. I haven't touched that yet. And I don't know how you would like to proceed, Ian, if you'd like to pause while the group is working on this.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. I'm a little reticent to start the final read until we have all the text in the document. So, perhaps we can break, give our DNS abuse topic leads time to work through that final paragraph and then we'll reconvene at quarter to one. Thanks all.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, welcome back, everyone. We'll continue where we left off and for that, I will kindly hand over the floor again to my distinguished colleague from Australia. Ian, over to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks. Thanks, Nico. Perhaps we could get the new text up on screen. Okay. Right, so I might just start here, halfway down the page, this is the new portion. So, the GAC notes that proactive efforts by registrars to prevent malicious registrations in the first instance should, in turn, lessen the burden of DNS abuse mitigation.

Recalling the ICANN85 communiqué and noting the exchange with the ICANN board on a centralized reporting function, the GAC

reiterates the need for a mandatory reporting requirement for DNS abuse by registrars. I'll pause there to see if there are any comments or questions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. So, there it is. Thoughts, edits, any comment? All right, so I see no hand in the room and no hand online. So, over to you, Benedetta. Let's move on. By the way, we're making very good progress. We might be able to finish once again before the allocated time, which is very good news for everyone. Benedetta, back to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. So, that concludes the items that we were looking to edit and I think that what was agreed before the end of the session was to do one final read-through. I believe that that's what Ian had mentioned. So, I'll bring it back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Benedetta. So, there we go. Now we will proceed with the traditional, and we coined a phrase for that, the Nigel Hickson style final review. And for that, again, I'll give the floor to Ian, Australia.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Nico. So, for those who might not be familiar, we'll just be going reasonably light through the document, section by

section. I won't read the text out verbatim, but we'll pause at the end of each section to see if there are final comments, questions, or concerns, noting we will fix grammar and spelling mistakes through a final editorial review. So, if you do spot those errors, please take note and send them to leadership and secretariat and we can clean those up before final publication.

So, we have our standard preambular text, and then we move into the introduction. This should hopefully be reasonably straightforward and, I hope, non-controversial. Any questions for this section?

I see no hands. Perhaps we can move on. Next section, please. Inter-constituency activities and community engagement. So, we have a few points here, noting our meeting with the ICANN Board, as well as the cross-community discussions. Also highlighting the At-Large discussion, which we took part in as well here. Any final thoughts on this section? And I'll pause briefly. I see no requests for the floor, so perhaps we can move on. Next section, please.

Internal matters. A brief note here stating our current membership numbers and there's a few paragraphs here talking about the GAC elections.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Ian, we have a hand from Jamaica.

IAN SHELDON

Yes, please, Wahkeen.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Wahkeen Murray, for the record. Just my apologies, if we could just go one back. I know in the previous session or earlier, we made an amendment, that point about systemic risks and internet fragmentation. I think the US had pointed out that blocking should be used, so just to ensure that the terminologies that we're using throughout the document is consistent.

IAN SHELDON

I think we had -- Yeah, please, Nico. So, we had entitled that this is verbatim to that agenda point for the slide. So, I think it's important to clarify in the issues of importance, and I stand to be corrected, but I think we are locked into this wording given we had submitted this as part of the agenda. All good? Thank you. Any other comments for this section? Great.

Maybe back to the internal matters section. Any questions here? I see none. Perhaps we can move on. So, there's a few paragraphs here about the special vice chair election before moving into our GAC working groups section. Any questions on the special vice chair election before we move on to section 3? I see none. So, can we scroll down please?

So, we've got a section here on the Public Safety Working Group and perhaps we can move on to the operational section next. There's a few paragraphs here talking about the administrative

changes to the operating principles and a note outlining our agreement to establish a new Capacity Development Working Group. Any final requests for amendments? I see none. Let's move on.

There's a paragraph here on the HLG, followed by a section on capacity development. Any concerns with what's on screen at present? I see none. Let's push forward. Great. Thank you. Issues of importance. So, there's a couple of sections here on Review of Reviews. United States, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Just a very minor suggestion. It's a somewhat awkward usage of the word catered for in the first bullet. Could we suggest accounted for or provided for? It must be explicitly accounted for. Just very small, non-substantive suggestion.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Are we okay with this minor edit? Great. Any other comments or thoughts for this section? And thanks for the thumbs up, Manal. Perhaps you can scroll down a little bit further. I'll pause here again. I see no requests for the floor. Perhaps we can move on.

DNS abuse mitigation. So, a couple of paragraphs here recounting our sessions. I'll pause here briefly. I see no requests for the floor, so perhaps we can scroll down again. I'll just pause briefly again. No requests. Let's continue. Domain registration data. So, there's

a couple of paragraphs here on urgent requests and requester authentication. Again, recalling our Mumbai communiqué and discussing briefly the SSAD work. Any requests for the floor? I see none. Let's continue.

Registration data request service and system for standardized access, disclosure. A few paragraphs here on the RDRS pilot. Any comments? I see none. Let's move on to privacy and proxy services. A number of paragraphs here talking about PPSAI and its final report. Any comments? I see none. Let's continue. A couple of paragraphs here on accuracy of domain registration data, talking about the 15-day timeline. Are we okay with these paragraphs? I see no hands. Let's continue. Great.

Applicant Support Program. A few paragraphs here on the ASP and a brief discussion on the fee reduction work, a recall of the previous GAC advice, and a little further encouragement of the board. Any comments? I see none. Let's continue.

Great. I've got a section here now on preserving universal connectivity and addressing ad-hoc DNS blocking. Highlighting those risks and referring back to SAC 127. Any other comments for this section here? I think it's all looking pretty good. Let's continue. Great. And there's a brief mention here on the next meeting that's scheduled to take place on 17th to 22nd October. So, thank you, Chair. Back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. Speaking of which, at this point, let me kindly invite to the head table our distinguished representative from Indonesia, Mr. Ashwin. Would you like to give a few words as regarding our next meeting in Bali, Indonesia? Ashwin, the floor is yours. More than welcome. By the way, before I give you the floor, sorry, Ashwin, just one second. So, we're officially ending the communiqué drafting. So, at this point, I guess we all agree that the communiqué is finished.

One final chance, and be very careful, please, but just in case, I want to make sure that we all agree and that there's nothing. Even though there's a 72-hour period, right, in case there are any issues identified during that period, rest assured that you will have the chance to flag any problem you identify. Be very careful in that case. If it's an editorial, grammar, or vocabulary issue, it will be fixed because the whole thing will be reviewed by GAC staff and by GAC leadership, let's say, the GAC chair and the vice chairs, of course. So, before I give the floor to Indonesia, give me thumbs up, nodding. We're okay with the communiqué as it is, right? So, we deserve a big round of applause then.

And my personal congratulations because we finished the communiqué drafting in four sessions. This is fantastic. From seven to four is always a good number. Indonesia, sorry to keep you waiting, the floor is yours.

ASHWIN SASONGKO Thank you, Nico. Well, all my friends at the GAC, first of all, I would like to thank ICANN for selecting Bali, an island in Indonesia, to be the venue of the next ICANN87 annual general meeting.

SASTROSUBROTO

Now, as you might be aware, Indonesia it's a country consists of around 17,000 islands. Well, some of them disappeared during this high sea, so sometimes we say 13,000 islands. It has five main big-sized islands and Bali is one of the many medium-sized island. It's full with nice beaches, rich with cultures, and other tourist attractions. But also, Bali is an interesting and good international conference destiny. That includes IGF-8 in Bali, Internet Governance Forum meeting in Bali, and also two years ago in 2024 is the ICANN Asia-Pacific DNS Forum. I think Ian was there.

And from the ICT technical aspect, from the internet technical aspect and telecommunication, to cover all this Indonesian area with internet access is a real technical challenge. From west to east, Indonesia is around 5,200 kilometers, quite long and with around 290 million populations. Many live in remote islands, far from the large or medium size island, then you know it is a real technical telecommunication challenge. You can use satellite, of course, but of course, all you know is the technical differences between satellite and fiber optic cables.

Now, in addition, of course, the financial aspect is also a challenge for us because Indonesia is a 5,000 US dollar per capita income country, which is different from Spain and other EU countries, which is 50,000 or more US dollar per capita income. But yet, with

all these challenges, Indonesia's internet users now, in accordance to the APJII, Internet Service Provider Association, and IDNIC, Indonesian Network Information Center, IDNIC survey, our internet users is around 235 million people, that's around 81% penetration. So, it is quite interesting. Perhaps we can even discuss this technical challenge and how to fulfill WSIS target for internet coverage in this type of countries.

Finally, my friend, once again, I would like to invite all of you to come to Bali for the next ICANN meeting and of course, this is very important, extend your stay for holiday. Bring your families and swim with me at the Bali beach. And don't forget close to Bali there are many small islands, including one of the famous is Komodo Island, where you can find, well, to quote-unquote, the very, very old Komodo, the very, very old animal, that one. Thank you, and hopefully I can see all of you in Bali. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Indonesia. Indeed, Bali is a beautiful island. I had the opportunity to be there. You've got to be careful with the Komodo dragon zone. I'm not sure they're located in Bali, Ashwin.

So, at this point, just two final things. Of course, a huge thanks to our interpreters. Thank you so very much to the technical team right there behind Lars and the GAC staff. Thank you so much for the fantastic image and sound and everything and your efforts. As usual, thank you so much to GAC staff. Of course, the Fabulous

Five, which is Fabulous Six as of today, right, if I'm not mistaken. And thank you all in general.

Speaking of which, I'll give the floor to Mr. Lars Hoffmann at this point, who is Mr. Rob Hogarth's successor, if you recall, so that you can have the opportunity to associate a face with name at this point. He is, well, not the next Rob, but the next Lars. Lars, the floor is yours.

LARS HOFFMANN

Thank you, Nico. Thank you very much. Yes, I have the great honor to take on Rob's mantle. I just joined the team on the 1st of June, so the whole work that has happened here to make this meeting it goes so easily and flawlessly, at least as it appears to me, is thanks obviously to you and to the GAC team that is working here on the ground. I quickly want to thank them as well.

Fabien unfortunately had to depart early due to a family situation. I think Benedetta and Gulden have stepped up here tremendously to help you with the drafting of the communiqué, so that's really a job very well done. Julia also has worked her magic in the background. Mary has helped me very much to find my feet in the first few days as has the rest of the team, and our thoughts obviously with Fabien as well.

Just a couple of words. I've met some of you already during the meeting here. I'm looking forward obviously to working with you in the coming months, years going forward. I've been with ICANN

for a while. I've been working just before this on the new gTLD team under Marika's leadership and I've also supported the GNSO before and worked on organizational and other reviews in ICANN. So, I'm hoping that I can bring some of that knowledge here to support you and your work that is really important as part of the multi-stakeholder model. I will leave you to it.

Four sessions, Nico, we're going to get it down to three in Bali, obviously, your last meeting. Thank you for your leadership during this meeting and obviously all of the GAC co-chairs as well. And to you for what I think was a very productive meeting. Thank you so much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

All right, so one final request for the technical team. Can you put the official ICANN86 Seville image on the screen so that we can get the family picture all together here in front of the head table? So, that's the last request for you.

And yes, Bali will be my last meeting as the GAC chair. I might show up as the gardener or something or getting you some coffee. Who knows, you know, but I might be around. So, again, for the family picture, please approach the head table, okay, there we go, so that we can get a picture with this beautiful background. Thank you so much and, you know, very good job.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]