

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 5)  
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:15 CEST

JULIA CHARVOLEN

Welcome to the third ICANN86 GAC Communiqué session on Thursday, 11 June at 10:00 a.m. local time. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Stance of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation and please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. With that, I will leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nico Caballero. Over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. So, this session is going to be running till 11:15, just to give you more color as regarding what the plans are for today. Then we'll have a coffee break, a short 30-minute coffee break, and then another session from 11:45 to 13:15. Hopefully, a lot of ground will be covered by that time. If need be, we'll continue with the communiqué drafting from 14:45 to 16:00, and hopefully by that time, everything will be done.

---

***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.***

So, today we're starting kind of like where we left off yesterday, which is, correct me if I'm wrong Benedetta, but issues of importance, right? And under issues of importance, we have the Review of Reviews on the one hand, but we also have new text on DNS abuse mitigation, so we'll start right there for the sake of time in order to see if we cover enough ground today and achieve significant progress let's say. So, for that matter I will kindly ask my colleague from the Switzerland, you know, to help me with a reading. Jorge, over to you.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. So, let me find the right place in the communiqué. I think I have it. Okay. So, DNS abuse mitigation. During the ICANN86 DNS abuse session, the GAC welcomed presentations by the host country government, Spanish National Police, on cybercrime, Interisle Consulting Group on malicious registrations in the domain name market, the NetBeacon Institute on DNS abuse reporting and mitigation at scale, and Article 19 on the risks to registrant Freedom of Expression of domain name blocking.

The GAC representatives in the Associated Domain Check, ADC, Policy Development Process, PDP, participated in four GNSO working sessions during ICANN86. They emphasized that evidence of past DNS abuse by the same registrant and confirmed cases of ongoing malicious DNS abuse campaigns should satisfy the evidentiary threshold required to trigger an Associated Domain

---

Check under the ADC policy. Should I stop for a moment just in case there are reactions?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

There's a hand from India. Please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL

I think we'll be sending some text shortly, that's one. And in the second paragraph when we say that the confirmed cases of ongoing malicious DNA abuse campaign, I think that is what the trigger is all about. I think that is the question which is being raised in the working group, right? That what triggers the ADC check? I mean, and to say that it's confirmed, I mean, that's what it is all about so actually, I'm not clear. Maybe somebody can clarify that.

JORGE CANCIO

Martina?

MARTINA BARBERO

Yeah, it's a bit technical, but I'll be able to explain. So, the moment the trigger is evidence of abuse on a moment X, so for instance what happens very often is that malicious actors register a domain, they activate them for a few hours or months of days, then they deactivate them. And if the registers check in the moment X when it's deactivated, the policy of the ADC will not be triggered.

What the GAC has been asking is that if there is evidence of an ongoing campaign, and even if the registrar checks at the moment

X and the domain is not activated, that should trigger ADC. So, that's a bit, and also this point is also about domain generating algorithms. If, for instance, the example of the UK toll campaign, there was a large campaign to abuse some government subsidies and what we want to make sure is that if the police is cooperating with the Registrar A and already has addressed the malicious campaign in Registrar A, but there is no domain that is activated yet in the portfolio of Registrar B, but the domains matches the same pattern and are part of the same abuse campaign, this should also be in scope of the policy.

So, we are asking to go beyond the just is abusive on moment X to encompass a bit of the past. If it was abusive two days ago, but is not abusive anymore, we still want to be in scope. And if it's not abusive at the moment X, but it's part of an abusive campaign that is confirmed in other registrars, we still want it to be part of the policy.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for the explanation. India, are you okay with that?

SUSHIL PAL

I think I have no questions. We'll discuss with you separately on this.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. Switzerland, back to you.

JORGE CANCIO

Okay, thank you very much for the exchange. I continue with the reading. So, several ideas that have emerged during PDP discussions, but which exceed the scope of the PDP merit discussion later. These include remedies for domain name registrants in the event of mitigation mistakes, more data from registrars to enable evidence-based policy development, compliance enforcement and best practices, transparency reporting, and collaboration across registrars, particularly when cybercriminals design DNS abuse campaigns with registrations across multiple registrars.

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. The GAC welcomes the progress achieved to date in the ADC PDP and appreciated hearing stakeholders' views from across ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees namely the ALAC, SSAC, RySG, RrSG, CSG and NCSG. Once sufficient progress has been made in PDP 1, PDP 2, which addresses safeguards for API access for new registrants, should begin.

The GAC reiterates its expectations for policy development and implementation to take place before the delegation of new strings from the 2026 application round. Full stop. And I have a question.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Yeah, go ahead with your question.

JORGE CANCIO

So, it's a question to the drafters because we are talking about in the sentence that comes immediately before about the two PDPs. So, is the expectation referred to the two PDPs, which might be a little bit optimistic?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

USA, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the question. It's really not hard and fast here, but we do want to see at least some policy implemented. That's really always been the case, but it's not hard and fast in terms of PDP 1, PDP 2. Though I welcome views from other colleagues.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you USA. Other views from other colleagues? And I have India.

SUSHIL PAL

I think since we presently only have the two PDPs going on, I think rather practically only one, and the second one is yet to start and GAC also pointed out during the interaction with the GNSO that,

---

you know, when are the expected timelines for a start of the second PDP, I think that should be brought out, I think because otherwise it's kind of too broad and lands us nowhere.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Any other comment in this regard? I do have an editorial comment. The last part, no, the one before the last paragraph where it says, ALAC, SSAC, RySG, RrSG, CSG, NCSG and so on, maybe for the sake of clarity, you know, for someone who's new to the GAC or something, maybe we should clarify what ALAC stands for. At-Large Advisory Committee, Security and Stability Advisory Committee, Registry Stakeholder Group, Registrar Stakeholder Group, Commercial Stakeholder Group and Non-Commercial and so on and so forth, but it's just a detail. I have Switzerland and then USA and then the European Commission.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So, following up on what Sushil also mentioned, maybe the last sentence should read, the GAC reiterates its expectations for policy development and implementation, comma, at least or notably on PDP 1, comma, to take place. So, it's kind of an inter alia without using that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. European Commission.

MARTINA BARBERO

I totally agree with the suggestion from the Swiss colleague. I was also thinking in the spirit of less is more, maybe we can put a comma after advisory committees and we delete all the acronyms and we have a less mouthful sentence, but only if my colleagues agree.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I totally agree and I see nodding in the room. Anybody against for the sake of simplicity? Okay, so we'll go that way. Thank you so much, European Commission. USA, you had a hand? That was an old hand, right? Okay, perfect. Any other editorial, any other edit, any other comment in this regard? Okay, I see no hands in the room. I see no hands online. So, back to you Benedetta. Please walk us through the remaining parts of the document for which we already have text.

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you very much, Nico. So, if we continue on the next item under issues of importance, we have domain name registration data. I believe we're still awaiting text for subsection A, B, and C, but on section D, accuracy of domain name registration data, we have a couple of suggestions from India and Japan addressing the bracketed text, which we had since yesterday, bracketed by the European Commission, which is this one on the screen right now. So, when registration data is found to be inaccurate and just

---

before. So, this one that I'm highlighting on the screen is the text that India asked to be bracketed, and then the one underneath is an alternative proposal submitted by Japan, which we haven't read yet.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Benedetta. And for this, I will kindly ask my colleague from Australia to do the reading. Ian, please.

IAN SHELDON

D, accuracy of domain name registration data. The GAC appreciated the opportunity to discuss with the GNSO the matter of the 15-day timeline for gTLD registrar validation of registrant contact information. The GAC understands that the current 15-day timeline for registrars to validate registrant contact information as required under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, RAA, originates from rules established in 2001.

And the new section. The GAC will pursue a process with the aim of having these requirements revised so that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain, the completion of a domain name transfer or when the registration data is found to be inaccurate. The GAC will pursue a process with the aim of having these requirements revised so that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain. Noting that the 15-day timeline also applies to other cases e.g. transfer inaccuracy, the GAC seeks further information to

---

understand and deal with the issue coming from lack of accuracy through appropriate policy implementation. I'll pause there for comments.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Australia. I have the USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, United States. So, this was a very hot topic during this ICANN86 meeting. We heard a lot from the community, including a general desire for greater data relating to the use of malicious domains upon registration, timelines, et cetera. I think both of these paragraphs do contain a number of different elements that are worthy of consideration.

The United States would like to keep it simple and proposes that for this issue, especially since we have just opened the issue and we had this opening discussion with the GNSO on this item at ICANN86, we propose that there's a full stop in the first sentence after the word domain. And that encapsulates the entire text for this issue.

Again, when we had the meeting with the GNSO, we did describe it as the opening of a conversation. This does not lock us in to transfer or inaccuracy, which we can explore further down the road. And so, for simplicity's sake, this is what we would propose. Thank you.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, USA. Any other comments? Now, do we agree with this? I wholeheartedly agree, by the way, because the simpler the better, I would say, but again, we're in your hands. Do you think it would, on the one hand, avoid, you know, getting into details about transfers and registration and inaccuracies and so on and so forth? So, in other words, the simpler the better. Do we agree on this? I have India, sorry, Japan and then India.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you, Chair. This is Tomo from Japan. I think that the second sentence of the input from Japan is, how can I say, still be in the text because I feel that the information accumulation in the broader sense, including the transfer or inaccuracy, should be continued because we have not enough data to talk about this issue.

Well, it is not necessarily limited to transfer or inaccuracy, but the first sentence seems to be looked at that we only do further approach on the activation of newly registered domain. And as we discussed in the session, the policy itself is applied in all cases. So, I'd like to keep the text about accumulation of information in all cases. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you Japan. I have India next.

---

SUSHIL PAL

I mean, first of all, I would support Japan in keeping the text in the third para, which is completion of a domain name transfer or when the registration data is found to be inaccurate, that to be retained. And also, in the second para we had suggested some edit, I think it's not figuring up here, so maybe we can speak that, it's after established in 2001. And also, the need for in the second paragraph when we say originates from the rule of 2001 because it's not giving the reason as to why we are reviewing the 2001 rule, so we just want to add the rationale as to why the 2001 rule is not appropriate to handle present challenges.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So would you repeat the --

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, and the need for the effective prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse as noted by GAC in its communiqué issued during ICANN83 Prague, ICANN84 Dublin, and ICANN85 Mumbai.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Yeah, I have --

SUSAN CHALMERS

Chair, I have a two-finger.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah. Go ahead USA.

SUSAN CHALMERS

The term DNS abuse did not exist in 2001. So, we're at the end, and this 15-day requirement was to validate information for contactability purposes. So, I don't think that what our colleague from India has suggested is correct. So, we would not support adding that sentence because it is factually incorrect.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you.

SUSHIL PAL

I mean, we can turn up to the GAC Communiqué, you know, earlier. And I don't think the sentence is referring that the DNS abuse existed in 2001 or not. I mean, we are only trying to give the rationale as to why do we want to visit the 2001 rule. I mean, if somebody has a better formulation, we are okay, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. I have Japan, Denmark, and the European Commission. Japan, please.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Sorry, this is an old hand, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Oh, sorry. Okay. Denmark.

FINN PETERSEN

Thank you. Finn Petersen, Denmark, for the record. As to the yellow part of the checks, we can go along with the US proposal to keep it simple. And we will note that at least the last one do not make sense because if the registration data is found inaccurate it is already in the route so it does not make sense that the validation should occur prior to the activation of it. In general, we are fun to if we can keep the text as simple as possible and we do not think there's a need to reference all the past history. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Denmark. European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Good morning. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission, and Chair and colleagues thank you for your patience with us. We are not being very disciplined this time around. I would like to offer two considerations.

The first one pertains to the text proposed by Japan. I fully understand that issues concerning the inaccuracy of data are also relevant and they need to receive adequate attention. And that in the agreements, the 15-day timeline concerning action for the registrant to adjust data that are inaccurate is also present, but we are talking about different requirements. So, while we have no problem with the idea of further investigating issues related to inaccuracy and the timeline associated to that, these technically

does not seem to fall in the same bucket as the domain name data that are validated before registration or after 15 days from registration.

So also, nothing prevents us from raising more questions, addressing this issue without necessarily pointing this into the communiqué. So, if we are not sure about what we want to achieve, perhaps we could stick with the yellow text, which by the way comes from the Mumbai communiqué. I take responsibility because we were drafting the text and the reference to domain name transfer was added by us, but in reality, the text from Mumbai communiqué only refers to newly registered domain names.

As regards to the text proposed by India, I understand fully the rationale. I think the aim is not to link it to the requirements established in 2001, but to explain why we are tackling this topic. And the fact is not simply because these requirements are old, they come from 2001, but because as stressed in previous communiqué, the issue of the validation of domain name registration data is linked to prevention of DNS abuse. I just think this should be in a separate sentence.

So, the way it's put now, it's not clear, so perhaps if we want to speak to the link between accuracy and domain name and DNS abuse, we could say that the GAC further reiterates its position from communiqué 82, 83 and so on, whatever is on screen. The link between the accuracy of domain name registration data and the 15-day timelines for prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse or

---

something to that effect, but not to connect it to the registrar accreditation agreement because indeed the two seems a bit at odd. That's a possible solution.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. So, perhaps a way to address the US concerns and India's suggestion and what you just mentioned would be to include some sort of transitional language between the two and maybe use a separate sentence or a separate paragraph or something. I'm not the language expert here, but maybe that would help.

India, I don't know what you think. US, would that be a solution some sort of transitioning, you know, from one topic to the other in order to keep accuracy on the one hand and in order to avoid confusion on the other? Would that be acceptable? And I see nodding from India and I see nodding from the US. Perfect. CTU, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Nigel Cassimire from the CTU. I note that the text goes on to further talk about reviewing the current rules. And I want to suggest that maybe we read that to see if it contains already any of the thoughts that we are discussing right now because we stopped at a certain point. Maybe we should see what else is coming to make sure that we don't duplicate.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you for the suggestion. So, we'll try to read it as it is right now, not including the striked out text. Switzerland, would you please? Sorry, was it you, Australia? I'm sorry. Ian, please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

I'll just go from the second paragraph. The GAC understands that the current 15-day timeline for registrars to validate registrant contact information as required under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, RAA, originates from rules established in 2001 and the need for effective prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse as noted by GAC in its communiqué issued during ICANN83 Prague, ICANN84 Dublin, and ICANN85 Mumbai.

The GAC will pursue a process with the aim of having these requirements revised so that such relegation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain. The GAC is eager to review the current rules, particularly ahead of the delegation of new gTLD strings, taking into account all relevant aspects of this issue, including potential operational and financial challenges to registrars. Existing research and reports, such as the report of the GNSO Small Team on Accuracy and the INFERMAL report, DNS Abuse Mitigation Final Issue Report and SAC 58, SAC 115, and SAC 129 reports should also be taken into account.

Recognizing the substantial work already undertaken by the community on this issue, the GAC believes that discussions should focus on identifying practical implementation pathways. Given the

---

potential need for contractual amendments, the GAC considers important the early involvement of the ICANN Board in these discussions with the contracted parties and the GAC. Is there any more on the section? That's it?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So, this is where we are. Does it cover your concerns or, you know, your comments and questions regarding this topic? Are we okay with the text as it is or any other suggestion? Can you scroll up a little bit so that we can see it from the beginning, including the -- Okay, thank you. So, this is where we are. Let me pause here in order to see if there's agreement. If there's no agreement, I would highly suggest we park it here and we continue on other sections in order to avoid getting stuck so that, you know, we give you the opportunity to come up with better wording. Okay, so let's do just that, if you agree. US, go ahead, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. In the interest of moving us forward here, I have two proposals. The first is that the text provided by our colleague from India could become the second sentence of the first paragraph. So, you know, the GAC reiterates the need for, and so on and so forth.

The second proposal will be in the last sentence. I would just propose to delete one sentence fragment if we could go to the last paragraph, please. In the penultimate sentence in this paragraph

---

that begins with recognizing, I find that the first part of that sentence isn't quite in the spirit of the discussions.

Again, what we're exploring here is whether revision of this rule from 2001 will prevent DNS abuse. And this again, as I mentioned earlier, we had a discussion about the need for data. So, I don't think that on this specific issue the community has undertaken substantial work. So, I would propose that we just begin that sentence with the GAC believes that. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA, for that contribution. Comments? Do we agree? Any hard feelings in this regard? No problem? And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Let me put it the other way around. Okay, India, are you okay with the first part of the suggestion going back up? Please, can you scroll? There we go. Thank you. Are you okay with the way it is framed now?

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, we're okay with the first part. Thank you, US, for that and thanks to the US for that. Only thing, the correction made in the last paragraph, I think we'll need some time to absorb.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you, India. I have the European Commission now.

---

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Nico. Just not to leave the topic completely in the void because we are saying that we reiterate the need to prevent DNS abuse like a bit in the void while we are talking about the 15-day timeline. I propose that we say something about the GAC reiterates the importance of this issue for the effective prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse. Because it's a link between the 15-day timeline register validation and the DNS abuse, not DNS abuse on its own. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Gemma, but where exactly would that be?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

So, in the second sentence, I think we could quickly amend by saying the GAC reiterates the importance of tackling this issue for the effective prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse and then we close it there. Because I'm sure about 84 and 85, I trust in the 83 we also have text on that, but this we can check quickly. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay. Thank you, European Commission. Do we agree? Any problem with that?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Sorry, we should leave as noted in its communiqué. I mean, we make reference to the previous communiqué. Yes, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Any hands? All right. Okay, so it seems like we have agreement on this. So, I'll read it as it is in order to see if it makes sense for everyone, one last time and then we move on with the ASP topic if you agree, of course, right? So, it would read, the GAC appreciated the opportunity to discuss with the GNSO the matter of the 15-day timeline for gTLD registrar validation of registrant contact information. The GAC reiterates the importance of tackling this issue for the effective prevention mitigation of DNS abuse as noted by GAC in its communiqués issued during ICANN83 Prague, ICANN84 Dublin, and ICAN 85 Mumbai.

The GAC understands that the current 15-day timeline for registrars to validate registrant contact information, as required under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, RAA, originates from rules established in 2001. The GAC will pursue a process with the aim of having these requirements revised so that such validation occurs prior to the activation of a newly registered domain. Can you scroll? Oh, there's some text. Okay, and then I'll continue reading the last paragraph in order to see if we cover the US suggestion there.

So, the last paragraph would read, the GAC is eager to review the current rules, particularly ahead of the delegation of new gTLD strings, taking into account all relevant aspects of this issue, including potential operational and financial challenges to registrars. Existing research and reports, such as the report of the

---

GNSO Small Team on Accuracy and the INFERMAL report, DNS abuse mitigation final issue report, and SAC 58, SAC 115, and SAC 129 reports should also be taken into account.

The GAC believes that discussions should focus on identifying practical implementation pathways. Given the potential need for contractual amendments, the GAC considers important the early involvement of the ICANN Board in these discussions with the contracted parties and the GAC. So, there we go. European Commission, please.

MARTINA BARBERO

Just noting, I tried not to take the floor to say it, but if you go up, up, up in the first paragraph, there is an end missing between prevention and mitigation. Apologies.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you Martina, very good catch indeed. So, there it is. Any hard feelings? Is it okay? Any further comments or edits? The floor is still open. I have India, please.

SUSHIL PAL

Maybe in the sentence which US has concerns whether the community had undertaken that work or not. So, maybe the idea was that we're referring it to the substantial work already undertaken, which is in the sentence prior to that. So, maybe we can have, recognizing the substantial research already undertaken and the recommendations made. Already undertaken and the

---

recommendations made and then come up if that's okay with US and other colleagues. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, India. Would that be okay for the USA?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Look, I just don't think it reflects, I just don't think it's accurate, but this is not something that we're willing to really spend further time on. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA, but you wouldn't mind keeping it then? All right. Thank you so much for that, USA. Thank you, India. Any other comment? All right, so seeing none, Benedetta, maybe we can clean up, you know, the whole paragraph and see if it makes sense for everyone as it is now. That's the whole paragraph, right? There's no more text underneath or anything? Okay. So, there we go. That's the full text on accuracy of domain name registration data. Please take a final look in order to move on. If everything's okay, we'll start discussing ASP. All right. Thank you so much. Moving on.

In any case, rest assured that, you know, whatever other, you know, editorial ideas you might have, I mean, there's going to be time for sure. We have two more sessions so rest assured there will be enough time to make any necessary changes if that is the case. So, now moving on, we're going to be covering ASP and for that I will

---

kindly give the floor to my esteemed colleague from the Netherlands. Over to you, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Nico, and good morning, colleagues. As you remember, and thank you for your patience, we had a tiny pending item yesterday with regards to the third paragraph on your screen. As you see, there was some discussion on terminology. Meanwhile overnight, as I said thank you for your patience, I have looked up the applicant, the ASP handbook and looked up the actual text that's in there. Benedetta, I put a replacement text in a comment if you can have a look there.

Then my suggestion is to point it to the actual text of the ASP handbook and then suggest for us to work with, to substantially reduce or eliminate base registry operator fees, comma, pursuant to the ASP handbook 6.6.7, comma. That's why I hope we satisfy your desires to provide a bit more clarity on what we were referring to and then provide a bit of scope for what we're asking.

To reiterate, so the base registry, the handbook says reduced base operator fees should be the supported applicants fail in the gTLD program, so this is exactly what I think. And unfortunately, my UPU colleague is not in the room this morning, but I think that captures what we're trying to achieve and aligns the terminology with what you see. So, then the text now highlighted would be deleted, so we

---

simply have a running sentence, but that would be my proposal to move forward.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Comments, questions, or edits in this regard? I don't see any hand. I don't see any hand online. So, Marco, back to you. I don't know if you have any final thoughts or comments as regarding that paragraph?

MARCO HOGEWONING

If the room is happy, I'm happy so I guess we've got another text there agreed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

And again, one more chance for everybody to take a look in case there is any edit or anything, you know, to be modified, this is a right time to say so. Okay, so thank you so much. Moving on, Benedetta, what additional texts do we have so far?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Nico. I'm just adding text that was submitted on domain name registration data. We've got, if you can scroll up, Colton, please, number 3A, urgent request and requester authentication. So, this was submitted just now and I'm just double-checking if we have any further text on RDRS and SSAD. You submitted? Okay, cool. Well, in the meantime, if you can start with this and in the background, I'll continue to add the rest. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Benedetta, and for that, I will kindly handle the floor to my colleague from Switzerland, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. So, urgent requests and requester authentication. The GAC reiterates its observations made in the ICANN85 Mumbai communiqué and notes with support ICANN's recent publication of the 24-hour response timeline for urgent requests within ICANN's registration data policy.

The GAC appreciates ICANN org's collaboration with the PSWG to develop law enforcement authentication mechanisms for registration data disclosure requests, as well as ICANN's intent to manage related community engagement through an input group. The GAC urges all relevant ICANN community members to act expeditiously to finalize aspects of law enforcement authentication so that the urgent requests policy can take effect.

The GAC further notes the importance of providing anticipated timelines for the completion of the authentication mechanisms as the input group conducts its work. And I think there's two full stops, we can erase one of them. Okay. The GAC stresses that the authentication mechanisms should be incorporated into the RDRS or its successor system once they are operational.

The GAC emphasizes that pragmatic and implementation-oriented approaches for authentication should be explored while the input

---

group and SRT, maybe we would need to spell that out, conduct their work to enable swift operationalization of the 24-hour response requirement. So, I'll pause here. It's a long para with many GAC, the GAC. Okay. As you wish.

The GAC calls on the GNSO's SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team to work toward outcomes that enable ICANN policy to distinguish between authenticated and unauthenticated requests, as law enforcement authentication could be useful even when a disclosure request is not urgent, as defined in the urgent requests policy.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Switzerland. So, let's pause here in order to give you time to digest more or less what was read by Switzerland. Okay, so thank you again Switzerland. I see no hands in the room and I see no hands on the -- Oh, sorry, sorry, there's one hand from the CTU. Nigel, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Nico. Nigel Cassimire. In the first sentence it says, and the notes with support ICANN's recent publication, blah, blah, blah, could it just say, and supports? I wonder if that's basically what it means to say, and the notes with, is kind of cumbersome to me. I'm trying to interpret what is there.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CTU. So, it would read, the GAC reiterates its observations made in the ICANN85 Mumbai communiqué and supports ICANN's recent publication of the 24-hour response timeline and so on and so forth. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico, and following on Nigel's excellent observation and reminding myself of what we use in UN language normally, we normally welcome something like that and welcomes ICANN's recent publication. Because supporting the publication is a bit strange, but welcoming, I think it's what we want to say, I guess.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. Is that okay for everyone? And I see nodding in the room. All right. Perfect. Okay, moving on then to part B. So, one final chance, are we okay with part A, urgent requests and requester authentication? Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Yeah, so I have a question and please indulge my ignorance, but we mention here that, so we call it, so that the urgent requests policy can take effect. Is this a policy in ICANN terms? It's a PDP something or it's a recommendation, what is it exactly?

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, sorry I should have raised my hand. Jorge, so this is a part of the domain name registration policy, so it is technically

---

policy. It's not a self-sending policy, but it's a section of the domain name registration policy. I really think we can call it policy because it is policy text.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. I had, I think it was the IPO, WIPO, sorry, WIPO. Is WIPO in the room or online? Over to you, Brian. Over to you.

BRIAN BECKHAM

Hi, Nico. Hi, colleagues. It's Brian Beckham. I was going to make one suggestion on A and this relates to the text that follows in B. On the final sentence in A where, and I appreciate that this section is about urgent requests and law enforcement, but I wonder if the text that's highlighted on the screen, law enforcement, is necessary in that final sentence given that the following section B refers to RDRS and SSAD? And the SSAD speaks about authentication generally for all types of user groups, not just law enforcement.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, WIPO. I don't have a problem either way, but it's not for me to decide. So, at this point I'll revert back to the full GAC. Any problem with that? Should we keep law enforcement or we just refer in general as authentication? What do you think?

Okay, so let me ask you the other way around, anybody against erasing law enforcement? Or are there any hard feelings about keeping law enforcement in the text? If it's okay, let's just erase it

---

according to the WIPO's suggestion and we move on if you agree. Would that be okay? Okay, and I see nodding in the room. Thank you so much.

So, let's move on, Benedetta, to Part B, RDRS and SSAD. And for this paragraph, I will kindly ask for the help of my distinguished colleague from Lebanon, Zeina Bou Harb. Can you help us with the reading, please? Lebanon, over to you. Part B, RDRS and SSAD.

ZEINA BOU HARB

The GAC takes note of the experience gained from the RDRS pilot, the findings of the RDRS Standing Committee, the GAC's comments on the ICANN or policy alignment analysis, and the comments issued in the GAC Communiqué 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 mandatory participation by gTLD registrars, better integration for registrar system and requester system, participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars, and support for urgent request processing and the law enforcement authentication mechanisms being developed by the PSWG. Either a substantially improved RDRS or a successor system could meet these requirements.

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, full stop.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Lebanon. Before I give the floor to Switzerland first and Japan next, where is our esteem Vice-Chair from Uganda? Gloria, we will need you here at the head table to help us with the reading, so would you mind approaching whenever you have the time? Thank you so much. So, yeah, Switzerland and then Japan, please.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So, the first comment is on the first sentence. It's a bit strange that the GAC takes note of the GAC's comment, so it's a bit weird, self-referential. So, I would propose that after the comma, so the first part of the sentence is the takes note, and after the comma we say and recalls -- No, after the other comma, the second comma, sorry. So, it makes more sense, I think.

And then there's a question of really understanding the sentence that starts with either, a substantially blah, blah, blah, and then we use could. Isn't this super weak? Shouldn't we say should or something in that sense? Because could, everything could and maybe we are expressing an expectation that it should. So, I see Owen nodding. I don't know if you were the author of this.

---

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. I have Japan next.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

Thank you, Chair. Tomo from Japan. I remember that the previous communiqué, our communiqués included about voluntary participation of ccTLDs. So, if there's not any problem, I suggest to add in the line five after the with mandatory participation by ccTLD registrars and voluntary participation by ccTLDs.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Japan. Where exactly would that be again?

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

The fifth line, I mean the line five. Yeah, there, after by gTLD registrars and voluntary participation by ccTLDs. Maybe we don't need comma between gTLD registrars and.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Japan. Let me read that part in order to see if it makes sense for everybody. So, we'll read, the GAC reiterates that ICANN should maintain a permanent centralized mechanism to facilitate requests to gTLD registrars for disclosure of domain registration data with mandatory participation by gTLD registrars and voluntary participation by ccTLDs, better integration for registrars' systems and requesters systems, participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars, and support for urgent requests processing and the law enforcement authentication.

---

Oh my God, I think there are many ands, and, and, and, and then and support and processing and the law. We need some wordsmithing here, but again, I'm not the expert, so I would revert back to the experts. But again, but that's just me, maybe it's okay as it is. I just find it a little bit confusing and long, I would say. Maybe there's a way to rephrase this, but let me pause here. I have the European Commission and then the USA.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Nico. Just perhaps a suggestion to make it more readable because indeed it's too long. If we want to keep capturing, which is a good idea, I think all the elements that are important for the GAC, then we could have a semicolon and a list because I see we have centralized mechanism to facilitate requests to gTLD registrars for disclosure with semicolon, A, B, C, D and we have the different characteristics that the system should have in place. Perhaps it's a way out of this very long sentence.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. USA, please.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you. This is Owen Fletcher. I was reviewing past comments and communiqués on ccTLD participation. I believe including the item, that item in this list is going a step further than we have before. I would suggest striking the ccTLD item from this list, but we could reuse a previous communiqué sentence such as one I

---

could read to you right now from ICANN84. The GAC continues to support efforts to explore voluntary participation by ccTLDs in the RDRS. I would suggest that being a separate sentence after the list, not an item in the list.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, USA, and thank you, European Commission, for the year. Does it look okay now for everyone? So, once again, USA, just checking in order to see where it should go, after or before the list?

OWEN FLETCHER

In the paragraph where you have it now, but I would suggest maybe after, make it the second sentence instead of the first.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much and there's agreement from Japan as well so I think we're in good shape now. So, would you like me to read the whole thing one last time? Oh, we have two hands, one from Argentina, one from Jamaica. Who was first? Sorry, I didn't see. Argentina.

MARINA FLEGO EIRAS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Marina Flego Eiras, Argentina for the record. Maybe in that last paragraph we could replace continuous to support efforts to explore, by continuous supporting efforts to explore so that we avoid having to do something to do something.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you, Argentina. Jamaica.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

I'm Wahkeen Murray, Jamaica, for the record. I'm not sure that I understand the list now that we've broken it out into A, B, C, and D. It is my understanding that the centralized mechanism is intended to facilitate a number of things, one of which is requests to gTLD registrars for disclosure of domain name registration, to facilitate mandatory participation, to facilitate better integration. So, I'm wondering if where we have requests to gTLD registrars, that should also be in the list.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jamaica. That's a very good question, but given the fact that we're already over time, I suggest we pause here. You know, we grab some good coffee or tea and then we come back with a fresh mind in order to cover the rest of the text. So, let's have a coffee break now. Please be back in the room at 11:45. Thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**