
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GAC Meeting with the ICANN Board and Communique Review Discussion
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN86 GAC meeting with the ICANN Board session on Tuesday, 9th of June, at 16:30 local time. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Committee Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Committee 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. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. With that, I'll now leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulden, distinguished members of the ICANN Board, colleagues and friends. It is my distinct pleasure, as usual, to warmly welcome the ICANN Board of Directors to our joint session here at ICANN86 in the beautiful city of Seville. So, as you

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.

know, these bilateral meetings are an essential pillar of our work. They basically provide a collaborative space where we can align our strategic goals, preserve our community connections and directly highlight key public policy priorities from governments around the world. We look forward to a highly constructive and positive dialogue with the Board today.

During this session, and before I get to the agenda, during this session we will be covering four key priority areas. If you can move to the next slide, please. The four priority areas being the applicant support program, the ASP. We will be discussing steps to reduce financial burdens and foster meaningful global participation in the next round of new gTLDs. That's the idea that we share among the 184 GAC members and 41 observers.

We'll also touch upon registration data and accuracy. We will be reviewing progress on law enforcement authentication mechanisms and also next steps for standardizing data access and ensuring data accuracy, which is a topic, an issue very close to our hearts. We'll also talk about RIR, Regional Internet Registries governance. Basically confirming timelines for the GAC to provide meaningful, let's say, public policy input on regional registry governance documents.

And finally, the fourth topic being systemic DNS risks, addressing the current public policy concerns regarding the risks of large-scale, non-standardized blocking by private providers and its impact on internet universality. And, of course, we'll have the

chance to allocate, let's say, 10, maybe 15 minutes for, again, a meaningful Q&A session.

So thank you once again to the Board for your time, your dedication, and your continued engagement with the GAC. At this point let's begin our session. I don't know if you would like to say anything before we actually start Tripti, and welcome again.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Nico. And on behalf of the ICANN Board, I'd like to echo your sentiments. We look forward to these bilateral discussions. They've always been collaborative and very effective in moving issues forward. So with that, I turn it back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. So, as you can see, I'm not going to read the context, because you have it there, just for the sake of clarity. I'll go directly to the questions, if you don't mind, unless CK, Greg, or Tripti, you tell me otherwise, but I really think that we should go straight to the point. The first question being, question number one, given that the Africa Regional Plan (FY26-30) explicitly aims to 'grow African participation,' and that the ASP fee waiver still leaves a balance of approximately \$34,000, a sum that can be prohibitive for a small business or university. The question is, what specific measurable and time-bound actions has the Board taken or will take to establish a third-party funding or micro-financing

mechanism for ASP applicants from least developed countries (LDCs) separate from the existing fee waiver?

So I'll stop here, then I'll give you the floor, and we'll go to the next question if you agree. Over to you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Nico. The Board appreciates the GAC's reference to the African Regional Plan and the objective to grow African participation. We'd also like to note that ICANN has implemented the applicant support program consistent with the SubPro report recommendations and the GNSO guidance process recommendations that ask for a minimum level of support and that it should be spread equally across all qualified applicants.

Based on consultations with the ASP implementation review team, the IRT, and feedback via our process, the public comment process, on the ASP handbook, the level of financial support was set between 75% and 85% depending on how many approved applicants we have in the end. So, if we have less than 40 applicants, then the support is at 85% and if it's greater at 75%.

We are conscious that the remaining gTLD evaluation fees will represent a differentiated burden depending on the economic status of the geographies of the applicants and there will be this gap in what is not supported. Now I'd like to point out that part of the ASP application asks that applicants submit a plan for how they will pay the unsupported portion of the gTLD evaluation fee, which

may include a funding proposal for approaching funders or investors.

Further to that, the Board would welcome support from governments or other financial institutions to assist these applicants. We also recognize that several GAC representatives have shared their contact information for ASP applicants via the Bono Service Provider and Mentors list. As shared in the Board response to your ICANN81 communiqué in which the GAC asked for ICANN to engage with development financing agencies, like the World Bank and the regional development banks, donor and grant funding organizations, and similar entities to promote awareness of the benefits of the new gTLD program and facilitate matchmaking between financing or funding entities and potential applicants with a view to providing assistance for the supported ASP applicants.

So ICANN org is not in a position to broker a direct link between funders and applicants, but ICANN org via its global stakeholder team, engagement team, will encourage funding agencies or organizations to make themselves known to interact with potential applicants while identifying venues and platforms that facilitate such connections.

Since then, during the course of 2025 and early 2026, ICANN has approached specific funding organizations like the World Bank, the UK Foreign Commonwealth, and Development Office and the Inter-American Development Bank to explain how gTLD supports the

aims of digital transformation and in developing markets and therefore worthy of consideration for inclusion amongst these supported projects.

ICANN also presented on this topic at the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organizations Digital Summit in February of 2025 to an audience that included digital ministers as well as NGO funders and UN agencies and furthermore at the Mobile World Congress we spoke with the World Bank Digital Development Global Director. So these meetings and presentations certainly generated a greater understanding of gTLDs and ICANN's mission, but it did not convince these organizations to take any further action.

However, we did receive a sympathetic hearing and brought awareness, but our interlocutors did not ultimately opt, at least publicly, to proactively declare a willingness to support organizations for applying for gTLDs or dedicate people or resources to such an endeavor. However, we did bring attention to that and we believe future approaches by national governments to these organizations may be more successful in generating interest and connections with those requiring additional support. So Nico, I turn it back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes, please. So thank you so much for that, Tripti, for the benefit of the newer -- we have 27 new GAC representatives since Mumbai, since ICANN85 Mumbai. So for their benefit, this is Tripti Sinha,

Chair of the Board of Directors, just in case. Thank you so much for that answer. So this is a good time; I'll pause here in order to see if there's any feedback from any GAC member state at this point in order to respond or to provide or ask any question. We can do it right after each question and answer interaction or we can take questions and everything right at the end, just in order to make it more interactive and, let's say, more natural. I'll just give you the opportunity to do so now.

I don't see any hands online or in the room, so I'll go straight to the next question, which reads, with respect to the ASP funding increase for a fee reduction from 75% to 85%, can the Board kindly provide some transparency and details regarding the ICANN Blog communication of 26 May 2026 regarding "range of feedback received" and exactly how this impacted the Board's decision to "not to take further action on the proposal at this time." Additionally, given the very high likelihood of well over 50 qualified ASP applications, will the Board reconsider the proposal and take potential action at a subsequent date? Tritti?

TRIPTI SINHA

Nico, thank you for the question. The ICANN Board received input from the At-Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and Michael Palage on the proposed additional funding for the new gTLD, the gTLD program, the next round. So some of this input raised questions about the process used to make decisions about using 2012 auction proceeds funding. Some raised

questions about using 2012 auction proceeds, and some were supportive of providing additional support, but there was also disagreement with providing additional support.

So in light of the concerns expressed and in line with the Board adopted ASP handbook and GNSO guidance process recommendations, ICANN anticipates that greater than 45 applicants will qualify for support, thus the gTLD evaluation fee discount would be set at 75% reduction. The Board believes that a balance has been found between those seeking guarantees to support more than 40 qualified applicants and those who believe that this should not exceed the 75% reduction.

The Board does appreciate the community's contributions to the ongoing dialogue on how best to support the ASP and the new gTLD program, while the Board recognizes that not all community members support the outcome of not allocating additional funds from the 2012 auction proceeds to increase the level of funding and support. It encourages continued community consideration of whether the current level and structure of support are effectively advancing the program's objectives. These considerations may be something the community would like to take into account as we look ahead to future iterations of the applicant support program. So thank you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Tripti. So let's pause here again in order to see if there are comments or questions before we move on to the topic

number two, which is gTLD registration data, but still on topic number one on the ASP.

Okay, I see no hands in the room. Ah, there's a hand from, is it UPU? Yeah, go ahead please. UPU.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you very much, Nico, and thank you, Tripti, for the explanation. I think I'm just trying to clarify on the last question that was asked. Will the Board reconsider the proposal and take action at a subsequent date? Is the answer going to be, is the answer to that no, categorically no?

TRIPTI SINHA

So for this current round that just opened and for the current set of applicants, we will stay the course. However, for the future of the program, we will likely look into possibly increasing funding, but we want community input on that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Tracy for the question and Tripti for the answer, of course. So moving on to the second topic, seeing no more hands online or in the room. Next slide, please, Gulden.

Moving on to topic number two on registration data, and this is divided into three, three parts. Next slide. There we go. Yeah, thank you. I'm not going to read the statement and the context. It

was circulated before among all the GAC representatives, so I'll go straight to the questions.

The first question being, the GAC would welcome the views of the ICANN Board regarding its willingness to participate in the trilateral call on this topic post ICANN86 and before ICANN87. As a matter of fact, let me remark, let me state officially here that, as a matter of fact, we requested a meeting prior to ICANN86 in order to be able to address the issue but unfortunately for whatever reasons, we couldn't organize that call, which would have been greatly, greatly welcomed by the GAC. So going back to the question, Tripti, over to you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Greg will be taking this for us. Greg.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Nico. So the Board appreciates the collaborative manner in which GAC raised this issue. We note that this is an issue that was identified in the DNS abuse scoping report. We also appreciate the quick action that allowed an informational session on this topic and hope to learn more through continued discussion. At this point, we're not sure that direct Board involvement is warranted, as we're still discussing the issue, and we think it's warranted for the community to have further discussions for which ICANN staff can support and the ICANN Board can continue to learn about the issue.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Greg. Comments or questions regarding this part of topic number two? Because we have three parts, right? So as regarding the registration data, any question or comment?

Okay, seeing none, let's, let's move on to the next. Still on topic two, but regarding registration data. And I'll go straight to the question, again, given the fact that you already have the context. The question reads, can the Board provide an update on operationalization of the law enforcement authentication mechanism, more specifically regarding the possible "testing group or other transparent multi-stakeholder effort" referenced by the Board to support preparation for use of these mechanisms by contracted parties and requesters? Tripti, should I give the floor to you or to Greg again? Greg?

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Nico. So on this topic, if you'll remember that we have settled on the 24-hour response time for urgent requests that are authenticated, which begs the question, what does it mean to be authenticated? And means we need to work on an authentication mechanism. So that work has been ongoing with a group from the Public Safety Working Group. That group has been analyzing mechanisms from the FBI and Interpol.

And we know, we are now at a point that we want to transition that group to a more open, transparent input group, in which we take

the work that has been developed with the PSWG, bring that to a transparent input group, and get reaction from the potential people that will be receiving authentication requests, as well as others interested in the community. So this is work that will go alongside the SSAD recommendations, as they are updated before they are sent back to the Board. But we are in the next stage, so to speak, of finalizing this authentication mechanism based on the great work that has been done in collaboration with the Public Safety Working Group thus far.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Greg. Comments or questions before we move to the third part of topic number two? I see a hand from India. India, please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. This is Sushil from India. We just would request for more clarity as to when we can look forward for this mechanism to be in place, because earlier we thought that the RDRS, the two-year pilot, will give us some clarity on the OAuth platform, but that has passed now.

Now we got a new RDRS standing committee review, which also highlighted that it's important, but somehow we never even tested that during RDRS, which we should have in the hindsight, I guess. Now we have a new testing group, which is expected to run through this technical platform, through which the requester and the

seeker would be able to raise requests, and visibility on the timeline when this becomes operational will be useful, because 24 hours, although agreed, has got no meaning. You know, it's only in the book.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks. I think to help answer that question, Nico, let's go to the next question, too, and I can give a little more context on the work here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Sure. Next slide, please, Gulten. Three of three. Thank you. So, again, on registration data, I'll go straight to the question, and the question reads, the GAC will be actively participating in the ongoing SSAD SRT through its nominated members and looks forward to working with appointed Board liaisons to help advance this important work. It's more a comment than a question, but is that what you were referring to, Greg?

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, I think I want to pull a couple threads together to explain this more holistically. So, if you all remember, the GNSO originally brought a set of recommendations for standardized access and disclosure to the Board. The original proposal was very expensive, and the utility was not known. So, before accepting this original recommendation of the SSAD, the Board decided to do a pilot to test the utility of a system and see what lessons could be learned.

That was called the RDRS. The RDRS had its pilot period. The group noted lessons learned from that pilot period and noted that they believed that the SSAD recommendations could be updated to be better fit for purpose and in a way that the utility could match the cost.

So, those SSAD recommendations have been returned to the GNSO for updating. So, the original SSAD recommendations are now being revised based on the lessons learned from the RDRS. That work is set, there's a goal of a report in February 2027. As part of those SSAD recommendations, or the revised SSAD recommendations, they will be finalizing the language around the 24-hour period for urgent requests, as well as working with the team developing and testing the mechanism for law enforcement requests with an aim of making it operational once these new SSAD, these updated SSAD recommendations are adopted and implemented.

So, it's kind of a part of the full package of we've learned lessons from the RDRS, we're updating the formal policy recommendations that would be binding on all parties, whereas the RDRS was a voluntary pilot.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Greg. India, does that address your question or this is an old hand?

SUSHIL PAL

No, no, I think it's a new hand.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Over to you, over to you.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. We are aware about what has happened over the past four years, right? And we are now again kind of tying up the authentication issue with the supplemental recommendations for SSAD, right? Which we knew four years back or three years back that it's pretty cost heavy. So, the only request is, is the Board thinking given the priority or the importance of auth mechanism to make 24 hours urgent request operational, is Board thinking of making auth in a limited, I mean to take it up on urgently or on priority rather than tying it up with a larger architectural SSAD supplemental recommendation? Because that will, maybe, I think most of us will have moved out by that time.

GREG DIBIASE

So, you're asking if the authentication mechanism on 24 hours can move in advance?

SUSHIL PAL

Yeah, at least for the earliest.

GREG DIBIASE

Right. So, one of those SSAD recommendations is updating that recommendation to clarify that there is an authentication mechanism. So, I think it will be tied to that work. However, we have stressed the urgency to the community that this work is critical and needs to come back to the Board as soon as possible, but there is a dependency.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg. Thank you, India, for the question. The floor is still open. Any other comment? I see no hands online and I see no hands in the room, so let's move on. Next slide, please, Gulten.

So, again, not reading the context, I'll go straight to the question. The GAC would greatly appreciate a suggestion that adequate opportunity and sufficient time will be made available for the GAC to meaningfully consider and provide timely input or advice following any such notification by the Board concerning potential public policy implications of the proposed RIR governance document. Any reaction to this, CK, Greg, Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

CK will take it.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

More than just a reaction. First of all, thanks to the GAC for the interest in the second and in ICANN as well, the numbers. Thanks for not forgetting us. For the benefit also of the new GAC members,

let me go one or two steps back and explain one or two things before I give an answer.

The ASO Address Council is currently working on the RIR governance document. Some people might know it as ICP2, that was the name of the document before. The Address Council actually works right now, this week on it. They have like 15 sessions where they go through the current version of the document and all the input they got from both ICANN but also from their own public consultations and try to produce a new draft by August. This is then the new version which they will publish and which then gets distributed in the RIR world during the next RIR meetings. They will be between September. And November and afterwards the ASO aims to deliver the approved document from them towards the Board to us.

That's now basically the answer, as part of the ICANN Board consideration of the RIR governance document, ICANN will publish the document for public comment. This is then the point where input is valued. ICANN will also seek input from GAC on any potential matters of public policy. So in a very short answer, yes we do.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, CK. Good, all right, all right. Thank you so much. Comments or reactions? Any thoughts, questions? If that is not the

case, let me look at the room once again. I see no hands, no hands online.

Okay, next slide please, Gulden. And we're getting towards the end of our session with the Board at this point. Topic number four is about systemic risks of arbitrary non-standardized DNS layer and geo-blocking by private service providers and the resulting internet fragmentation. Not reading the context again, I'll go straight to the questions. These are very simple, straightforward questions. Number one reads, who within ICANN is analyzing the impact of private sector over blocking on global DNS stability?

TRIPTI SINHA

Jim Galvin will be taking these questions for us. Jim.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, Tripti. And Nico, if you wouldn't mind, could we take all four questions together? Could you read them out?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

For sure, for sure.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, yeah, yeah, for sure. So question number two reads, how can ICANN facilitate a standardized protocol to prevent

disproportionate over blocking and provide remediation for legal users? That's the second question. The third question reads, which bodies like SSAC, OCTO, IETF should be consulted to evaluate the systemic risks to the unified route of trust? And the fourth question reads, what steps will the Board take to bring private providers, geodata, registries and governments together to ensure the DNS remains a neutral public good? Over to you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, Nico. Taken together, the first thing that I want to acknowledge is the Board understands these questions to be focused on the use of DNS blocking at resolvers and other DNS infrastructure elements. And these are just four specific questions about that particular tool and activity, if you will. So I think the first thing to say is to acknowledge our joint desire and, and good will with the GAC, and that our position is generally clear. ICANN's position is clear. We're all in favor of an open and unified Internet. So things like blocking, which do present some overreach concerns are a concern for all of us and, and we share your concern with that.

We do want to be careful to point out that when it comes to private sector actors and the rules that they might apply and things that they might do, that we really don't have any remit over that. We don't have any direct control or any direct opportunity to tell them what they should or shouldn't be able to do.

And for the absence of any doubt, of course, just in case we're talking about something broader than just resolvers doing DNS

blocking, I want to remind everyone that root server operators, in particular, do not filter any traffic whatsoever. They take all traffic and they respond to all traffic. And they don't apply any rules about how they respond. It's a straight DNS protocol implementation and activity. And they have committed to that in public. They all acknowledge that right away.

With all of that, I think the best response here at this point is to lean into SSAC's publication, SAC127, where SSAC focused on talking about DNS blocking and revisited that concept and referred to it and defined it as a tool. And it's important to understand what it looks like when that tool is used. Because like all tools, it can be used for good or it can be misused. In fact, SAC127 does define that blocking is increasingly problematic as the scale of the impact increases.

So what that means is DNS blocking is actually a fairly reasonable thing. I think most of us would agree. When it's done in your home, you do it to protect your children or your own home network. It's also reasonable for enterprises to consider doing DNS blocking of various sorts for the purposes of protecting a corporate environment and their own interests.

But almost certainly, there will be collateral damage as you move to the ISP level, globally available resolvers, and in particular, even at the nation level. As you apply blocking rules at those higher-level scales, the impact is much greater. And it's just inevitable, it really is a certainty that there will be collateral damage.

There is the practical question of how you manage the blocking if you decide to do that at that high level. So that becomes a question, it's easy to suggest that you can have a rule, nations would ordinarily want to, or even ISPs impose rules that affect their entire community. But the question is, how do you manage what's on that list? How do you get off the list of having been blocked? What kind of redressed options do you have? Those kinds of issues are typically done sub optimally. And the SAC127 document calls that out and references all of that.

So I think the place where we'd like to land is the other thing that SAC127 does is it clearly lays out a set of questions that anybody who has any authority to impose rules, blocking rules, on whatever they consider their stakeholders, it actually identifies the set of questions that you should ask yourself, and you should consider before you do that. And these questions do include things like making sure you understand the downstream consequences, making sure you're aware of the collateral damage, and of course, taking, including in your work, redress and appeal mechanisms, and the ability to recover from a rule which does things you did not intend when you were executing and using that option.

So I hope that we have answered your question, and properly understood it, but happy to take any concerns. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Jim, indeed. And the floor is open in case there's any clarification needed. Any further question or any

comment you would like to make at this point? This is a good time. Because as a matter of fact, if you can go to the next slide, please, Gulten. This is just a big thank you before we wrap up and given the fact that we still have 10 minutes for this session, and the next session is actually our first communiqué drafting session. So at this point, do we have -- India, is that an old hand or a new one? India, go ahead, please.

SUSHIL PAL

In case we have time. If we have time, Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I'm sorry, I made a mistake. We have 24 minutes. Yeah, yeah, I'm sorry, yeah. There's plenty of time. Go ahead, please, India.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. This is Sushil from India. I think since we have time, so we thought, first of all, to commend ICANN Board for the efforts they are making for the DNS abuse mitigation. However, one issue still remains, I think, which is regarding the transparency in the DNS abuse mitigation. We have been in various GAC forum raising this with the Board, with regard to having more transparency, so that there is more accountability in the DNS abuse, right?

As of now, I think the RAA, which is the contractual agreement with the registrars, it does not provide the mandatory reporting of the DNS abuse, and as a result you always get a filtered information,

whichever a particular stakeholder wants to push for. I think you never get a complete picture about the DNS abuse.

So if the Board is thinking of making this, if they actually think that the DNS abuse is such a risk to eroding trust in digital economy, making it mandatory for the registrars to report, and also in the informational session today, we saw that the two of the registrars came forward to share that data, right? I think those two are the good registrars. However, there are many registrars which don't even bother to share the various data regarding to all kinds, I mean, relating to the DNS abuse, whether and in what time it was verified and whether the one which is abused domain was verified or not at all.

So we all had also earlier requested to have some kind of a centralized portal which can give more visibility to the domain abuse happening in the ecosystem as well. I think we would also, I mean, request the comment of the Board to build in such mechanism to improve transparency and also to build in more trust in this economy.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Jim, go ahead, please.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you for the question. For context, I am the Board's liaison to the DNS abuse mitigation PDP, and I am aware of your question and your discussion. I think that the Board's primary objective and goal

is to ensure that DNS abuse is mitigated. That's the real primary concern that it has, and it's looking for the community to continue to develop various tools that it can use in order to reduce the victimization that we have and that is present in the community.

As you know, there are two charter questions related to measurement and also related to the effectiveness of the policy that is developed there, and there's been quite some discussion. I know that the other side of the reporting equation discussion that happens is concern about exposing too much to the bad guys, concern about perhaps providing a playbook of sorts about the things you can do. If you provide too much public information in the reporting side, then you give them opportunities to think about how to get around being noticed and how to get around having mitigation applied to them.

These discussions are not done yet in the community in that round. Even today, they have not finalized an initial report, so it's still an open opportunity. Registries and, well, the registrars, some do report out various kinds of statistics. They do that today, but those are always aggregated remarks. Whether or not ICANN should take those on, that's not a final question. It's not for the Board to say. We're waiting for the community to decide how they want to handle that and how to measure abuse so that we can look at how effective the policy is. I hope that answers your question. You're shaking your head. Do you want to clarify?

SUSHIL PAL

I think it doesn't answer my question. I think because you are answering about the PDP which is going on, which is about the PDP for the ADC, right? I mean, that's ongoing work. We have no questions on that, right? I think it's still developing. I mean, we know a simple rule simple thing, the ruling government whatever gets monitored gets done, right? Presently, we do not have any visibility of the domain abuse with regard to the data points. So whatever issue you make I think the issue comes back whether it's evidence based or not. We are trying.

My question is, is Board attempting to create a system which builds in evidence? If you don't have a system which even builds in evidence, which builds in data points, wherein the DNS abuse are reported, how do we aim to monitor it through whatever policy interventions? In our best wisdom, we are hoping that the ADC and the bulk registration, they are the best two policy decisions. I don't know whether the data supports it, right?

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you for the clarification on the question. The broader context here, as I understand, the question is whether or not the Board is looking for ICANN to build a tool for collecting evidence of abuse and then providing those reports for action to registrars and registries. And I just want to make sure that I've captured your question, so you're nodding, so okay. We have not yet, at this time, had a discussion like that. It is fair to say that OCTO is itself looking at how to measure and find abuse.

The generally available system that's public today are really just the block lists, the Spamhaus, SURBL, other kinds of organizations like that, NetBeacon is another one. They collect allegations of abuse and provide that data and those statistics. Whether or not they build evidence, they don't. I mean, and that's really the problem, is building up a system that provides the evidence that would make the abuse actionable. I know that OCTO is looking at that kind of problem, but no one has suggested that ICANN should build a system to collect that abuse and put it forward. And that particular issue has not come before the Board for consideration. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India, for the question. Thank you, Jim. I have Switzerland and then Portugal.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So let me briefly put my SO8, so Strategic Objective Number 8, from the GAC caretaker head-on, which is about internet governance. And let me acknowledge the announcement by ICANN of funding the IGF with one million. So I think that's good news for the multistakeholder community. And I would be remiss not to use this opportunity to raise this in this forum.

And I also want to take the opportunity that we have some time and that you are here to kindly ask you to elaborate on this

announcement. I think that will be for the benefit of our colleagues and the community. And also to clarify, if you can, on the period and the time frame, this very generous funding is linked to if there's any time frame in that sense. Thank you very much.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you so much for your words of appreciation for that donation. ICANN takes internet governance very seriously, and the outcomes of the WSIS+20 review were extremely positive and favorable for our ecosystem. And our donation is a clear sign of support that we would like to see internet governance further strengthened and receive future funding from other sources as well. This is, at this point, a one-time donation.

So we have not looked into any other future activities yet. But we expect that the funds will be used in an effective manner to bolster all the modalities and conversations that we have in this space. And we wanted to put our foot forward to show our support in this space. So thank you again for your words of appreciation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Tripti. I have Portugal next.

ANA NEVES

Thank you. Ana Neves from Portugal, and I will speak in Portuguese. Here, my question to the board is about topic four on geo-blockage of service providers. Is the possibility of frequentation of the internet the response given orally by the Board

members? Could it be informed about and sent to all the members of the GAC? Portugal is very interested in this matter. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you for the question. It is true that one of the collateral damage things that happens with respect to blocking is that you do fragment the internet, you do risk, especially as the impact of the blocking increases, you risk cutting off members of your own community. And in your own community, your own authority, within your own realm of authority, those that you are trying to protect by blocking, sometimes the blocking is overreaching. And so you create collateral damage that has what could be construed and thought of as blocking.

I would say personally, the Board has certainly not examined the question of whether it could collect those kinds of reports and do that. There are others in the community, there are websites and stations that do track when portions of the internet go dark for various reasons. There are people who pay attention to blocking efforts that happen and report on those and make that visible.

But no, the Board has not yet undertaken to consider the question of whether it should be a central clearinghouse of that information and thus be in a position to provide that to the GAC. So there's only three public services that do that just as a matter of course for their own purposes. Hope that answers your question. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Portugal, does that answer your question? Go ahead.

ANA NEVES

Yes. Maybe what's written here is not exactly what I said. But I think it's a matter of interpretation. But I know we have interpreters here and well, and we use the headphones. No. Again, what is written is not what I said.

JAMES GALVIN

I'm sorry, if I understand your question, you're asking if what was communicated orally could be communicated to you in a written form, my prior answers to the question?

ANA NEVES

Yes. But I would like to thank you for the information that you then provided. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

Okay, thank you. So yes, I'm getting a nod here. Yes, certainly, we can take to respond to the GAC directly in a written form.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you. Maybe I should have translated that as well. Anyways, thank you so much. Thank you Portugal for the question. I have Japan next and Nigel Cassimire. Unfortunately, we don't have Japanese translation though, Tomo. So, go ahead, please.

TOMONORI MIYAMOTO

I'm sorry that we don't have any Japanese translation. Well, about the blocking, let me share my personal observation rather than the official opinion from Japan. But I agree and I think that the SAC127 is quite important document for thoughtful consideration before employing any blocking activities is quite important. But let me stress that the importance of constructive communication with victims is also quite important because any discussion of blocking has a background, like there are some reasons.

Like, for example, in Japan, as you may know, there is a big problem of the copyright infringement of the manga piracy and they seek many alternative solutions. Well, I recognize that the current definition of DNS abuse doesn't include, the definition itself is quite limited and it has a reason. Of course, I understand it, but they also seek the solution for compensating their damage and mitigate their damage. So, what should be quite important is the careful communication with the victims and being on their side to find alternative solutions. Thank you very much.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you very much for that comment. Certainly, I do agree with everything that you said. DNS blocking is an interesting tool, but it's a hard one to apply to achieve a unique goal. It is often subject to having an impact greater than what was intended when it was done. And you're right, we should be focused on victims.

I think the problem with blocking is not creating more victims based on providing a particular service. So, even when DNS blocking looks good, you have to worry about what you're doing beyond what it is you're trying to achieve. And SAC127, as you say, does speak to this issue and does talk about this. This is one of the concerns that really has to be looked at and studied by anyone who wants to apply DNS blocking to be careful about helping the victims and not creating more victims along the way. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Jim. I just want to make sure. Portugal, is that an old hand or a new one? Oh, okay. So, I have the CTU, and we have two more minutes. Please try to be short and sweet.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you. Nigel Cassimire from the CTU. I'll be very quick, Nico, just following Jorge's lead to acknowledge and express gratitude for ICANN's contribution to the Emergency Telecommunications Cluster's Hurricane Melissa response, which will directly benefit our member state of Jamaica. So, I thank ICANN for that. I see the Emergency Telecommunications Cluster as one of your pre-qualified agencies, so I'm sure we can look forward to further support in disaster cases like that in future. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much for your words of appreciation. Thank you. I will make sure our CEO hears that. Unfortunately, he was not able to join us for extenuating circumstances.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so very much. So, we're almost at the top of the hour. Any final comments or very super short questions you might have at this point before we wrap up? I see no more hands in the room. I assume that's an all-hands CTU. Anybody else?

If not, then all we have to do at this point is to wrap up and thank the Board again for their time, their energy, their patience, and their understanding in answering our questions. Sometimes our questions are very long and with lots of context. And certainly, for people who don't belong to the GAC or who are not aware of the kinds of discussions we're having here, they might think we're a psychiatric case or something given the fact that they actually don't have the background. But again, given the fact that we don't have to explain the background and go over the context you would need to go over 20 or 30 pages for each one of the questions, which is impossible.

And again, our apologies. We're not a psychiatric case for the ones outside the GAC who don't understand what we're talking about. That was kind of like my case when I first joined ICANN. It looked like a madhouse for me. But anyways, here I am as the GAC chair. Can you imagine? So, thank you so much. Any final words, Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

First, I want to assure you we do not think you're a psychiatric case or a madhouse. We very much appreciate this engagement. We appreciate your input. We take your concerns of public policy very seriously and we look forward to the next time we engage. Thank you very much for having us.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you again, Tripti. And thank you, Greg, CK, Jim. And Sajid, you're very quiet today. Thank you so much. The session is adjourned. For the GAC, of course, stay in the room because we'll be starting our communiqué drafting session in five minutes. Thank you very much. The session is adjourned.

IAN SHELDON

Hi, colleagues. I think we might get started for our last session of the day. So, please take your seats, log back on, and we can get going on the communiqué.

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN86 GAC Communiqué Review session on Tuesday, 9th of June at 17:35 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. I'll now leave

the floor over to GAC Vice Chair, Ian Sheldon. Over to you, Ian.
Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Gulden. Hi, all. This is the first of our communiqué drafting sessions. Many of you will note that we went over communiqué basics yesterday. So we'll be looking to go through the document, do a bit of a scan, flag any text, make sure we're aware of who some of the drafters and topic leads are, and hopefully we can get out on time and away for the reception.

I won't read any of the language at this point in time. The document is still open, but we start with, perhaps we can start with issues of importance. So, we've got some text here reflecting yesterday's session on review of reviews, talking about the initial draft report as submitted by Manal, outlines some of our intended forward actions, and a couple of issues that we wish to highlight based on our view. Scroll down, please. And that's all. At the moment, four issues of importance. Is there any other text that might be coming for this section? Yes, European Commission, please.

MARTINA BARBERO

Thank you very much, Ian. As we might not be able to foresee the future, but we know that we have DNS abuse on the agenda tomorrow morning, I suspect that we might need a placeholder for DNS abuse, but I don't have the crystal ball.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Martina. I always think it's good to flag any potential issues even as placeholders, and then we can come back and fill it out as we need. Any other early thoughts at this stage? Please.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Ian, again, not a surprise. We're going to have text together with the colleagues on domain name registration data.

IAN SHELDON

Great. Thank you. Any other issues of importance to flag at this stage? I see none. Perhaps we can scroll down to the next section. Is there any consideration for advice? I think, again, it would be great to flag at this early stage in the week if there's any thinking on this part of the document, and, of course, you're all welcome to jump directly into the document and insert that text as well.

I see no requests for the floor at this stage, and I might also take this opportunity to flag that if you are looking to draft some text, keep it short, plain language, and straight to the point as much as possible. And, of course, we will work through editorial, clean up the language and grammar as we go. And also, I would recommend working with other GAC members as well to draft some of that language. If there is nothing else for this section, perhaps we can move back up to the start of the document and have a look at what else we might have in there.

Great. So we are still getting, I think, final numbers for the introduction and attendance. Scrolling down. And then we start to move into the inter-constituency activities and community engagement, including a meeting with the Board as well as other cross-community discussions that the committee may have attended. So, I think this section will be quite brief. Next section, please.

On to internal matters. So, latest numbers on GAC membership. There's a brief note in here talking about the GAC election and then a final note here about the special vice-chair election as well, which we will get to tomorrow. Is that right?

I'm scrolling down. Working groups. So, the PSWG text is still being worked through, I understand. And that will be dropped in whenever ready. We have some text already in here on the operational matters, reflecting on the session that we had earlier today about the operating principles evolution working group and some of the administrative changes we're looking to make as well as the consultation period that we'll be looking to go through. This is followed by a section on the HLG with text still to come and a final section in here on capacity development, which I understand is also still being worked through.

And I think that brings us back to issues of importance again. Is there anything else that we need to flag? Is everybody aware of the link to the Google doc and how to include text? I should hope so. We covered all of that yesterday.

Okay. We have about 15 minutes, so I think having done the overarching review, perhaps we can start reading some text here and try and get through a little bit of this text in the last couple of minutes of the day and then perhaps it will go away and give this section a bit of consideration overnight.

So issues of importance to the GAC. 1, Review of Reviews. The GAC welcomed the update on the draft initial report on a refreshed system of reviews from the co-chairs of the Review of Reviews Cross Community Group, CCG. The GAC takes note of the current proposal for the cadenced and on demand reviews and the CCG's proposed definition to the effect that "the purpose of the reviews is to assess whether ICANN is fulfilling its mission, commitments and core values as set out in the ICANN articles and bylaws in a transparent and accountable manner.

The GAC intends to continue its participation in the CCG and reiterates its special interest in the topics highlighted in the GAC's Mumbai communiqué from March 2026. In that context, the GAC wishes to highlight its view that important reviews that are closely linked to ICANN's mission, in particular, a security, stability and resiliency SSR review, must be accounted for early in any updated system of reviews and be conducted at predictable intervals.

The CCG's proposal should include specific explanations as to why its proposal to separate the accountability and transparency review and structural review is not duplicative of each other and will not consume unnecessary resources, and the CCG's proposal

should include an estimate of the expected workload of all proposed reviews in a single timeline to enable the community to consider the practical feasibility of the proposal. I'll pause there and I can see Jorge's hand. Please.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Ian. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. So I don't have an alternative yet, but on the second bullet point, I think the point is really to recall that we should follow a form follows function approach in the framing of the reviews. So we have some language from the Mumbai communiqué that could be included in the I don't think we are just or at least I don't just expect an explanation.

I would really expect that the reviews as proposed, especially the structural and the accountability and transparency review are consistent with the form follows function approach. And if it is really consistent, then we may accept that they are separate. Otherwise, I don't stand still convinced that they need to be separate, because there could be a scenario where there could be just one overall form follows function review, which every ten years, for instance, would go in depth on the structural aspects of it. So I will think about language to propose, but I just wanted to raise the point here that we are not expecting just explanations, but something more.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Jorge. We'll put a flag in here and come back to you perhaps tomorrow with some text for this. Any other comments on this section? And I can see Manal's similar request for language on bullet point two. I see no requests for the floor. Is that you, Jorge? Would you like to be left to draft in peace or would you like to read out what you're writing? Okay. Thank you. Perhaps we can move on if there are no other requests. Gemma, please.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. One small editorial comment. I think we are using highlighted highlights like twice in the paragraph which says the GAC intends to continue interest in the topics highlighted and then the GAC wishes to highlight. I think we should perhaps just change that. And I sent on possible reformulation of the first bullet in the chat. So language for consideration. It's just that I mean some tweak in the languages so could be considered or not. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Okay. Perhaps we can have a look at this first bullet point. So this is intended to replace that first bullet point. That's right. So the proposed text would read critical reviews that are a fundamental to ICANN's core mission, particularly the security, stability and resiliency SSR review, must be explicitly catered for in any revised review framework with a binding commitment to regular predictable cycles. How does that text read? Perhaps we can leave that in there and return to this tomorrow morning. But I don't see

any opposition at this stage. Any other requests? Netherlands, please?

MARCO HOGEWONING

No opposition to this text. But to your earlier point in trying to be concise as to the point, we are now referring to o the GAC's Mumbai communiqué and then about one sentence later, two sentence later, we're back to referring to the Mumbai communiqué. For clarity, I would encourage the drafters to figure out a way to remove one of the two references, simply to make it easier for everybody whose native language is not English.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Marco, perhaps you could provide advice to the drafter who is presently working through the document.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Let me think about it. Sorry, nothing right now springs to mind as a solution.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Any other requests for the floor for this section? I see none. Let me take a quick look at the rest of the document and see if we can squeeze something into the last five minutes. Okay. The next brief section, perhaps, is the election one. Section 3, please. If we can get this squared away in five minutes or less, that would be fantastic. Perfect, just there. Section 2A. Right, okay.

1, GAC membership. There are currently 184 GAC member states and territories and 41 observer organizations. 2, GAC elections. A, GAC chair election. The GAC noted the results of the 2026 GAC chair election process. Following the close of the nomination period on 24 April 2026, Ian Sheldon, Australia, was the sole nominee for the position of GAC chair. In accordance with GAC operating principle 32, Ian Sheldon was confirmed by acclamation as GAC chair for a two-year term commencing at the close of the ICANN84 annual general meeting and concluding at the close of the ICANN93 annual general meeting.

I'll pause there for any comments, questions or suggestions. I see none. So we'll take another quick look at the document, but I'm tempted to draw this meeting to a close. Let me have a quick chat with Benedetta. Great. I think we might call it a close there for today. Please be back in -- oh, Tracy, please.

TRACY HACKSHAW

I think since we've concluded that part of the communiqué, maybe we can give a round of applause to the incoming GAC chair.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Let's go grab a drink. Please be back in the room at 10 a.m. tomorrow and we'll go over some GAC operational matters and a few other procedural issues. Thanks. Have a great night and I'll see you all tomorrow morning.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]