Board-GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) Call

12 January 2026 - 1430 UTC

Summary Notes

In the spirit of issue spotting and candid information exchange, these high-level staff summary notes are intended to reflect the general nature of the discussion during the BGIG meeting. Certain specific aspects of the meeting discussions are provided to enable understanding of the flow and context of the discussions.

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome Remarks - ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha
- Opening Remarks - Nicolas Caballero and Greg DiBiase
- Discussion of the ICANN84 GAC Issues of Importance
    1. Next Round of New gTLDs:
        a. Applicant Support Program Implementation and New gTLD Next Round Outreach
        b. Additional Fee for Evaluation of Geographic Names During the Next Round of New gTLDs
        c. Latin Script Diacritics
        d. Intergovernmental Organization (IGO) Protections
    2. Community Statements of Interest (SOI)
    3. ICANN Review of Reviews
    4. DNS Abuse
    5. Domain Registration Data:
        a. Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data
        b. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)
        c. Accuracy
    6. Governance of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs)
- AOB
- Closing Remarks

Reference

- [ICANN84 Dublin Communiqué](#) (3 November 2025)
- [ICANN Board Comments on Issues of Importance in the ICANN84 Dublin Communiqué (3 November 2025)](#) (6 January 2026)

I. Opening Remarks

Tripti Sinha (ICANN Board Chair) welcomed GAC participants joining this discussion of the Issues of Importance to the GAC from the ICANN84 Communiqué. Tripti Sinha noted the importance of the Board/GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) in assisting the Board's understanding of issues important to the GAC ahead of ICANN85 in Mumbai. Tripti Sinha also welcomed Greg DiBiase, newly elected ICANN Board member, who facilitated this meeting.

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) welcomed all participants and highlighted the importance of the open and collaborative nature of the BGIG discussions.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) introduced himself to GAC members and expressed his enthusiasm in joining this role and to further collaboration with the GAC on its Issues of Importance.

II. Discussion of the ICANN84 GAC Dublin Communiqué Issues of Importance

1. **Next Round of New gTLDs**
    a. **Applicant Support Program Implementation and New gTLD Next Round Outreach**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked the GAC on behalf of the Board for its continued interest in and advocacy for the Applicant Support Program (ASP), noting that the Board shares the GAC's strong commitment to the success of the ASP and its objective to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS. Greg DiBiase noted that as of ICANN84, there were 135 active applications in the ASP pipeline. Of those applicants that provided location information, applications originated from all five ICANN regions, representing 33 countries or territories.

Greg DiBiase further noted that, based on information from ICANN org staff and presentations at ICANN84, ICANN org has been proactively engaging with applicants in the ASP pipeline to support progress in their applications. This engagement includes weekly outreach to applicants, as well as ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities, including a survey intended to better understand challenges faced by applicants. Greg DiBiase noted that by the 19 December application submission deadline, a total of 75 ASP completed applications were received, including 10 applications from Africa, 38 from the Asia-Pacific region, one from Latin America and the Caribbean, six from Europe, and 20 from North America.

With respect to outreach efforts, Greg DiBiase noted that ICANN org hosted or participated in 456 New gTLD Program–related events across all ICANN regions in 71 countries or territories, with distribution concentrated in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Asia-Pacific regions. Greg DiBiase noted that these outreach efforts align with the GNSO Guidance Process for Applicant Support, which provides that no fewer than 10, or 0.5 percent of successfully delegated gTLD applications should originate from applicants supported through the ASP. Greg DiBiase acknowledged the GAC's concerns that this target remains lower than expected and, on behalf of the Board, invited the GAC to share insights regarding challenges faced by potential ASP applicants in their respective countries or territories.

Regarding the GAC's follow-up on the sharing of GAC Representatives' contact details with applicants, Greg DiBiase recalled that ICANN org sent a message to the GAC during ICANN84 offering to collect such information. As of 12 November 2025, four GAC members had submitted their contact information, which has been added to the List of Pro Bono Service Providers and Mentors on the ASP Resources webpage.

Finally, Greg DiBiase recognized the GAC's suggestion for an ex post analysis of the ASP included in the ICANN84 Communiqué and confirmed that the Board intends to review all aspects of the program to assess what worked well and what could be improved. As part of this process, applicants will receive a survey to gather their input for the analysis.

Marco Hogewoning (Netherlands) acknowledged the Board's request for GAC input following interactions between GAC members and ASP applicants from their regions and emphasized the importance of understanding who the applicants are in order to engage with them effectively. Marco Hogewoning asked whether the survey would also be sent to applicants who did not complete their applications, in order to identify obstacles that may have prevented finalization and to ensure lessons are learned for future programs.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) reaffirmed the Board's intent to collaborate with the GAC to facilitate the sharing of GAC representative contact details with ASP applicants from relevant regions.

Theresa Swinehart (ICANN org) reiterated the privacy constraints associated with confidential information submitted by applicants, noting that such information cannot be shared. With respect to the post-assessment survey, Theresa Swinehart indicated that ICANN org would follow up with the GAC on whether applicants who did not finalize their applications would also have an opportunity to provide input.

b. Additional Fee for Evaluation of Geographic Names During the Next Round of New gTLDs

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that although there was no separate fee in 2012, this did not mean there were no costs associated with the Geographic Names Review - these costs were paid for by all applicants through the gTLD evaluation fee. As such, in line with the cost recovery nature of the program, there are a number of conditional evaluations that an applicant may elect or are required to undergo to obtain a specific status or exemption, for which a separate fee would be required. The Board notes that the Geographic Names Review has been part of that set of conditional evaluations from the start. The initial review of all applications to determine whether they involve a geographic name takes place during the string evaluation stage and is included in the gTLD evaluation fee. If the applicant does not intend to apply for the string as a Geographic Name (e.g. the string matches a city name but is being used for another purpose) this review is the only step required and no conditional fee applies. The conditional fee applies only when an application is confirmed to be for a Geographic Name and the applicant intends to use the string as representing a city, region, or other geographic term as detailed in Section 7.5 of the New gTLD Program: 2026 Round Applicant Guidebook (AGB).

Greg DiBiase clarified that the Geographic Names Panel will review application responses, supporting documentation (including Letters of Support or Non-Objection), relevant public comments, and GAC Early Warnings. The evaluation panel may request applicants to provide the necessary documentation for approving a geographic name gTLD. Per the AGB, the Geographic Names Panel will determine which governments or public authorities are relevant based on the inputs of the applicant, governments, and its own research and analysis. The Board notes that confirmation from a GAC representative may facilitate this process, but it cannot replace it**.** Following the review of responses received to the Request for Information (RFI) to understand potential providers' capabilities, costs, and challenges associated with conducting Geographic and Reserved Names reviews under ICANN guidelines, and in order to provide certainty to applicants, a "will not exceed" fee has been set at USD 12,000 and may be lower if a lower fee is agreed with the vendor that is chosen to perform the Geographic Names Review.

Finally, the Board noted that as part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, ICANN org will review with the vendor whether there are ways in which costs can be reduced and/or whether differentiated pricing is an option in case an applicant is able to provide information that facilitates the authentication process.

Nico Caballero (GAC Chair) reaffirmed that this is an important topic for GAC members.

Gemma Carolillo (European Commission) thanked the Board for the clarification, noting that it is especially useful to have a revised fee included in the AGB and that it defuses the concerns regarding potentially disproportionate fees associated with the evaluation of applications related to Geographic Names. Gemma Carolillo further stressed that even though the AGB is published, anytime an application includes official documentation from an administrative entity they should not be burdened with in-depth assessment from any committee, since the applications would be accompanied by official letters of administrative entities representing that geographical region.

c. **Latin Script Diacritics**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) expressed the ICANN Board's appreciation of the GAC's suggestion to work with the GNSO on the topic of Latin script diacritics. The Board notes that the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on this topic which is expected to close by August 2026, with the specific notion that the completion of this PDP is not a dependency for the launch of the application process for new gTLDs.

Greg DiBiase noted that per the GNSO's Policy Development Process, the ICANN Board can only act on recommendations once these have been adopted by the GNSO Council. In other words, the integration of PDP recommendations into the application and evaluation processes cannot happen until and unless the GNSO Council-approved Latin Script Diacritic PDP recommendations are subsequently adopted by the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board is open to hearing from the GAC what viable solutions it has identified to resolve this issue without delaying the launch of the 2026 Round. The Board acknowledges the input received from the GNSO Council on this particular Issue of Importance, which reinforced the Council's expectations in chartering the Latin Diacritics PDP in 2024, that its recommendations would not be available for the immediate Next Round (i.e. the 2026 Round), and should not serve as a dependency for the 2026 Round.

Greg DiBiase noted that if the GAC has identified viable solutions on this topic, the Board encourages the GAC to share these with the GNSO Council, and the Board will stand ready to discuss these with the GNSO Council, as appropriate.

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) asked whether it would be possible to further speed up the process to engage in further discussions, and whether any GAC recommendations submitted at this stage would impact the timeframe.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) responded that this would be a question for the GNSO Council, but in his individual capacity he noted that the PDP is already set on a quick timeline.

Theresa Swinehart (ICANN org) confirmed that the GNSO is currently working quickly but stressed that completion of the Latin Script Diacritics PDP, submission of policy recommendations to the Board and incorporation into the AGB does not align with the opening of the Next Round in April 2026.

Rida Tahir (Canada) thanked the Board for the detailed response to the GAC Communique and shared that Canada appreciates the work being conducted by the PDP. Canada indicated it will continue to explore any potential solutions to address this issue in an appropriate manner while understanding that the next round should not be delayed, but encouraged the Board and GNSO to explore viable solutions or possible interim solutions which could be implemented without impacting the timeline.

Russ Weinstein (ICANN org) added that the new gTLD program is intended to be a series of rounds in the near term rather than an individual application window. As such, Russ Weinstein noted that there will be other items which will require further PDPs to improve the program and the way new gTLDs are applied for. Any additional improvements will be incorporated in any subsequent round or subsequent process, including the issue of Latin Diacritics.

Lars Hoffmann (ICANN org) added that addressing Latin script diacritics involves significant technical and policy complexities, noting in particular that variants with and without diacritics must resolve consistently and not result in separate registries. He emphasized that applications in the 2026 round for such strings will be addressed through existing mechanisms, including string similarity and other safeguards, to avoid delegation to third parties. Lars Hoffmann further reiterated that while diacritic variants are expected to be addressed in future rounds, the issue requires comprehensive policy consideration by the GNSO to ensure a durable solution in subsequent application rounds.

d. Intergovernmental Organization (IGO) Protections

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) flagged that the GNSO Council passed a resolution in November 2025 clarifying that the intent of the applicable recommendations is only to ensure that no organization other than the protected organization can apply for the exact match of the specific protected identifier associated with that organization. The GNSO Council further noted that the relevant identifiers shall not be included in the string similarity evaluation in new gTLDs, but the

application process must prominently display and clearly communicate the Reserved Names list so applicants understand it before choosing a string. ICANN Org notes that this will be included in the AGB and that this proposed action could present difficulties because string similarity is not an algorithmic process. Therefore ICANN org cannot evaluate string similarity without an expert panel. ICANN proposes to provide the list of applied-for strings to the GAC when available after the application round closes, as well as links to the reserved names, to enable the GAC to assess possible concerns about any applied-for strings.

Greg DiBiase noted that the GNSO Council recommends that the IRT and ICANN org consider including a provision in the AGB stating that ICANN will notify the GAC and protected organizations of any relevant applied-for string. The GNSO Council requests that its liaisons to the SubPro IRT provide this information to the implementation staff and IRT.

Finally, the Board noted the GNSO Council's encouragement for ICANN org to notify the GAC and relevant organizations should there be any applications for potentially confusingly similar strings. Greg DiBiase noted that the Board expects that it will inform the GAC following string confirmation day - i.e., the point after the close of the application window when applied-for gTLD strings are finalized and publicly confirmed and no further changes to the strings are permitted - of the list of applied-for strings along with the relevant list of all reserved names so that the GAC and relevant organizations can take any action based upon the list as needed.

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) responded that the GAC will consider internally whether it should contact relevant protected organizations directly.

2. **Community Statements of Interest (SOI)**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted the Board's alignment with the GAC in this item and the Board's appreciation of the GAC's support of the work to foster a culture of trust, transparency, and mutual respect, and facilitate ethical participation in ICANN's policymaking activities. Greg DiBiase noted that implementation of the Code has begun, through publication on the ICANN website and ICANN org has begun working with community leaders to evaluate each SO/AC's policies and procedures to ensure that these are updated as necessary to reflect the provisions of the Code.

Jorge Cancio (Switzerland) welcomed the Board's reactivity on this item and noted that the GAC would encourage being kept informed on how the implementation evolves and about the work the Board and org will undertake to verify the implementation of the code, and how levels of transparency are improved.

Russ Weinstein (ICANN org) confirmed that ICANN org is actively working with community leaders to ensure they are using these processes within their respective Constituencies and Stakeholder Groups. Russ Weinstein also agreed that additional work will need to be done regarding potential issues of non-compliance. ICANN org will work with the community collegially and professionally to address this item as necessary.

3.   **ICANN Review of Reviews**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) expressed the Board's appreciation of the GAC's support of ICANN's Review of Reviews and agrees that reviews have been foundational to upholding ICANN's accountability and transparency, and welcomes the GAC's active participation in the process. The Board asked James Galvin and León Sánchez to serve on the Reviews Cross Community Group (CCG) effort as part of the Board's active involvement in this community dialogue. The Board shares the GAC's continuing expectation for this work to produce a reliable and effective model that increases efficiencies and aligns with community needs and the maturity of ICANN. Greg DiBiase thanked the GAC on behalf of the Board for its participation in the Reviews CCG and noted that further engagement with the community on this important topic will occur at ICANN85.

Manal Ismail (Egypt), thanked the Board for its valuable participation in the CCG and reaffirmed that the GAC takes this exercise very seriously. The GAC has two representatives actively participating in the CCG, UPU and Egypt, and participates in co-chairing the group. The GAC looks forward to fruitful discussions and further progress at ICANN85 in Mumbai with the aim of a timely delivery of the CCG's Final Report by August 2026.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked Manal Ismail for her intervention and for her contributions to the work of the CCG as a co-chair.

4.   **DNS Abuse**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the ICANN Board welcomes the GAC's input and support to seek practical and meaningful solutions to address DNS Abuse. The Board understands the community's emphasis on narrowly focused Policy Developments Processes on DNS Abuse, ideally leading to rapid and effective outcomes. This emphasis means that certain topics will need to be prioritized. However, rapid and effective PDPs will hopefully create the necessary space to seek further measures to mitigate DNS Abuse in the future.

The Board understands that a number of factors are considered when determining which type of PDP membership model is most appropriate. As communities beyond the GNSO are always invited to participate in PDPs, the Board would encourage the GAC to engage with the GNSO to best ensure that the membership model it chooses aligns with, to the extent possible, the GAC's participation needs.

Steve Chan (ICANN org) noted that the GNSO Council is meeting on 15 January 2026 and it is anticipated that the charter for the first PDP on DNS Abuse will be adopted then. The call for volunteers and leadership for this PDP should be initiated shortly thereafter. Steve Chan noted that pending adoption of the charter for this first PDP, its membership model is expected to be the "representative" kind, where the GAC will be invited to nominate two Members, one Participant and an Alternate to be integrated into the PDP deliberations.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) expressed the Board's appreciation for the GAC's perspectives on additional issues beyond those that could be targeted by the Issue Report. The Board agrees that there will remain subsequent areas for discussion by the community, both within and extending beyond the realm of policy development. This could include consideration of the suggestions noted by the GAC, such as enhanced data reporting requirements and standardization, as well as other potential initiatives within ICANN's remit.

Greg DiBiase conveyed that ICANN Org continues to identify opportunities for the enhancement of enforcement and reporting tools regarding existing requirements. This includes both educational and enforcement tools for contracted parties, as well as resources for anyone who wishes to report potential noncompliance to ICANN. One recent example is the *Submitting DNS Abuse Complaints to ICANN: A Step-by-Step Guide*, published in all UN languages and Portuguese, which explains where and how to report DNS Abuse and outlines how to submit a well-founded complaint to ICANN. ICANN Compliance is preparing to release its reports on the enforcement of DNS Abuse mitigation requirements in an open, raw-data format in the coming weeks, in response to the GAC's and other community's requests.

Finally, with respect to enhancing the capacity of GAC members on DNS Abuse-related issues, Greg DiBiase flagged that ICANN Org will remain ready to offer support upon request by the GAC for relevant expertise.

Susan Chalmers (United States) expressed the United States Government's (USG) agreement that the ICANN Board and GAC took part in a productive exchange on this topic, which remains a priority to the USG. The USG conveyed that governments have public policy concerns regarding the growing financial and other harm caused by phishing, malware and botnet activity

on the Internet. As new Board members joined the discussion with the GAC, Susan Chalmers recalled the GAC's view on the importance of having sound and effective policy in place for the Contracted Parties to take further steps to mitigate DNS Abuse before new strings are added to the Internet as a result of the New gTLD Program Next Round. Susan Chalmers noted that the United States, the European Commission and Japan are leading the GAC's work on this topic and are organizing GAC participation in the upcoming PDPs, including by forming a GAC Small Group on DNS Abuse.

Martina Barbero (European Commission) supported the USG's input and encouraged GAC members interested in this topic to help prepare the GAC's participation in the PDPs. Additionally, Martina Barbero noted that given the GAC's increased participation in GNSO policy development, the GAC should be included in the chartering phase of PDPs in the future.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) responded that this is a GNSO process not a Board one, but encouraged the GAC to leverage its GNSO Liaison to provide feedback on this matter.

T Santhosh (India) underscored the importance of the timeline for policy development pertaining to DNS Abuse especially in light of the upcoming New gTLD Program: Next Round, as noted in the GAC's ICANN83 and ICANN84 Communiqués. T Santhosh asked the Board to clarify the GNSO Council's timing to initiate the PDPs on the two prioritized issues and whether it is anticipated that the work will be completed ahead of the new gTLD application window.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) responded that at this stage it is not possible to determine exactly how much time this first PDP will take to conclude, but noted that the Board shares the GAC's urgency on making sure the PDPs are efficient. The Board is encouraging ICANN org to devote all available resources to work towards the implementation of policies on DNS Abuse mitigation.

Russ Weinstein (ICANN org) reaffirmed that it is premature to create a firm development plan for the policy. Once the program plan is developed for this first PDP, it will be published as part of its materials. He also confirmed that the GNSO Council has been active and diligent about delivering within forecasted timelines over the last several years.

5. **Domain Registration Data**

    a. **Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data**

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) expressed the Board's alignment with the GAC's view on the importance of community work on Domain Registration Data in the two tracks proposed by the GAC (definition of an appropriate timeline for response to Urgent Requests, and definition of an authentication mechanisms for law enforcement requestors). The Board agrees with the GAC's position that there should be swift determination and response to Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, of serious bodily injury, to critical infrastructure, or of child exploitation.

Greg DiBiase noted that the Board looks forward to understanding the community's input on whether additional policy work on authentication mechanisms, i.e. policy surrounding the use of an authentication mechanism, is needed or if the community believes that authentication mechanisms should simply be considered as part of implementation.

Gemma Carolillo (European Commission), noted on behalf of the GAC Small Team on Registration Data that the GAC welcomes the Board acknowledgement of its pending action on the GAC Advice from the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué as reflected in the ICANN84 Communiqué, and that it is pending due to the finalization of the work of the Registration Data Policy IRT. Gemma Carolillo further noted that regarding the Consensus Policy language on the timeline to respond to Urgent Requests, the Implementation Review Team reached a compromise before the Public Comment proceeding and that as such, the GAC's expectation is that this language should be finalized promptly.

Concerning the associated mechanism to authenticate law enforcement requestors, which was requested by the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council to enable appropriate response times, the GAC expressed its expectation that the ICANN Board and GNSO Council will provide a credible path for the inclusion of the work stemming from GAC PSWG-led Practitioners Group.

Finally, Gemma Carolillo noted that substantial law enforcement resources are being allocated to this effort (at the US FBI, Europol and Interpol) and underscored that without credible commitments to integrate the outcome of this effort, it would be difficult for GAC members to secure such expertise in the future.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted the Board's alignment with the positions that the Urgent Requests topic should be concluded and determine what needs to be addressed for the

authentication mechanism to be implemented. The ICANN Board appreciates the resources allocated to this effort and understands the perspective shared by the GAC.

b. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) expressed the Board's alignment with the GAC's support of the continuation of the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), while reiterating that the RDRS is currently a pilot and not the implementation of policy recommendations. The Board will be focusing on the pending GNSO policy recommendations for a centralized system, looking at the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis published for Public Comment. This analysis was requested by the Board to determine which envisioned enhancements to RDRS would require new policy development and which enhancements could be completed based on existing recommendations or policies.

The RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis outlines options for aligning policies being considered (including those related to requests for underlying registration data for domains registered under privacy and proxy services, an enforceable timeline for urgent requests, and other relevant procedures) with the Board and community's requested enhancements for the RDRS or a successor system. The feedback received on the analysis will help inform discussions between the Board and the GNSO Council in assessing how to proceed with the pending GNSO policy recommendations for a System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD).

Greg DiBiase noted that the Board welcomes the GAC's input on the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis and looks forward to reviewing all public comments on the analysis.

Gemma Carolillo (European Commission) expressed the Board and GAC's alignment of objectives pertaining to the RDRS. On behalf of the GAC Topic Leads on RDRS, and considering the Board's commitment to have ICANN deliver RDRS improvements, she requested a timeline for the release of the next versions of the RDRS with improved features. She indicated that this would demonstrate responsiveness to all the community input and a sign of strong commitment towards improving the RDRS.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the Board takes note of this request and as the work evolves on an approach to SSAD recommendations, the Board will report on the progress made.

T Santhosh (India) reiterated the GAC's view, as noted in the ICANN84 communiqué, that the RDRS should be a permanent mechanism, and asked Board members what the Board's view is on this item.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) responded that the RDRS was a pilot to gather information on the feasibility of the SSAD recommendations for a centralized system. Future adoption of policy recommendations regarding a centralized system could lead to a permanent system. Greg DiBiase noted that the RDRS might be similar to what is ultimately adopted but the parameters of the permanent system are yet to be determined.

c. Accuracy

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) deferred the discussion of this topic to the GAC/Board bilateral at ICANN85 due to timing constraints.

6. Governance of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs)

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) deferred the discussion of this topic to the GAC/Board bilateral at ICANN85 due to timing constraints.

IV. Closing Remarks

Nicolas Caballero (GAC Chair) thanked the Board and GAC members for their active and meaningful participation in the discussion.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked the GAC for its input submitted to the Board and expressed the Board's appreciation for the frank and constructive dialogue during the meeting.

Tripti Sinha (ICANN Board Chair) thanked the GAC Chair and Greg DiBiase for facilitating the meeting and noted that the discussion yielded a number of important takeaways for the Board. She highlighted the Board's understanding of the GAC's interest in the learnings from surveys related to the Applicant Support Program, the importance of avoiding disproportionate fees in cases involving illegitimate documentation, and the value of the GAC's engagement in the ICANN Review of Reviews. She also acknowledged the GAC's contributions on DNS Abuse, including concerns related to bulk registrations and requested timelines. Tripti Sinha concluded by thanking participants for the constructive exchange, noting that the Board had captured the items raised, and adjourned the meeting.

Attendees:

GAC

Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair
Marina Flego Eiras, Argentina
Klaus Parrer, Austria
Igor Germano, Brazil
Rida Tahir, Canada
Alejandro Berrocal, Costa Rica
Zdravko Jukić, Croatia
Mislav Hebel, Croatia
Finn Petersen, Denmark
Manal Ismail, Egypt
Gemma Carolillo, European Commission
Martina Barbero, European Commission
Rudy Nolde , Germany
Samantha Scotland, Guyana
T. Santhosh, India
Pradeep Verma, India
Aditya Vikram Dube, India
Shiva Upadhyay, India
Cathal McGuinness, Ireland
Ashwin Sasongko, Indonesia
Adriano Daddario , Italy
Wahkeen Murray, Jamaica
Kazuki Imao, Japan
Tomonori Miyamoto, Japan
Zeina BOU HARB, Lebanon
John Lewis, Montserrat
Marco Hogewoning, Netherlands
Maaike Veenstra, Netherlands
Idris Idris, Nigeria
Wiktor Skwarek, Poland
Ana Cristina Neves, Portugal
Deolindo Costa de Boa Esperança, São Tomé and Príncipe
Serigne Abdou Lahatt SYLLA, Senegal

Sasa Kovacevic, Serbia
Inaki Giloses, Spain
Jorge Cancio, Switzerland
Lucas Prêtre, Switzerland
Lukas Füeg, Switzerland
Cheng-Nan Chiang, Chinese Taipei
Caron David, Trinidad and Tobago
Jael Goddard, Trinidad and Tobago
Gloria Katuuku, Uganda
Yurii Matsyk, Ukraine
Craig Stanley-Adamson, United Kingdom
Esther Jaromitski, United Kingdom
Susan Chalmers , United States
Owen Fletcher, United States
Pearl Risberg, United States
Nigel Cassimire, Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)
Shanea Lewis, Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)
Tracy Hackshaw , Universal Postal Union
Brian BECKHAM, WIPO

ICANN Board

Tripti Sinha
Amitabh Singhal
Alan Barrett
Chris Buckridge
Constance de Leusse
David Lawrence
Gregory DiBiase
James Galvin
León Felipe Sánchez Ambía
Miriam Sapiro
Patricio Poblete
Raul Echeberria
Sarah Deutsch

Wes Hardaker

<u>ICANN Org</u>
Christian Wheeler
Eleeza Agopian
Erika Randall
Karen Lentz
Kristy Buckley
Lars Hoffmann
Leticia Castillo-Sojo
Mary Wong
Mukesh Chulani
Russ Weinstein
Sally Newell Cohen

Theresa Swinehart
Steve Chan
Vinciane Koenigsfeld
Wendy Profit

<u>ICANN GAC Support Staff</u>
Robert Hoggarth
Fabien Betremieux
Julia Charvolen
Benedetta Rossi
Gulten Tepe Oksuzoglu
Berry Cobb