ICANN | GAC
Governmental Advisory Committee

87 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

MINUTES OF MEETING
ICANN87 Annual General Meeting, 17-22 October 2026

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP **2**
1.1. Opening Plenary Session 2
2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES **3**
2.1. New gTLDs Next Round 3
2.2. Registration Data Issues and Informational Session on Accuracy of Registration Data 7
2.3. DNS Abuse 10
3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS **13**
3.1. GAC Roles, Responsibilities and Participation Opportunities 13
3.2. GAC Operating Principles 15
3.1. GAC Capacity Development 16
4. GAC WORKING GROUPS **26**
4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) 26
4.2. GAC Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names Working Group (GAC UA-IDN WG) 27
5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT **29**
5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board 29
5.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council 33
5.3. Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) 36
5.4. Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH) 38
5.5. Meeting with the Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) 40
6. GAC Wrap Up **46**
Attachment 1 - ICANN87 Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST **48**
Attachment 2 - ICANN87 Action Points Compilation **49**

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

67 GAC Members and 8 Observers attended the meeting.

GAC membership currently stands at 185 Member States and Territories (27 vacant), and 41 Observer Organizations (15 vacant). A list of ICANN87 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in Attachment 1 - ICANN87 Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST.

The ICANN87 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website.

Presentations used by speakers during the meeting and supporting briefings prepared for the GAC can be accessed from the GAC website.

Full transcripts for each meeting session are to be made available from the ICANN87 Public Meeting website, via the relevant agenda items on the GAC's website agenda page listed above.

1.1. Opening Plenary Session

GAC website agenda page: https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-1-opening-plenary

The GAC Opening Plenary Session began with welcoming remarks from GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, who welcomed GAC representatives, observers and guests to ICANN87 in Bali, Indonesia. The Chair reflected on Indonesia's cultural heritage and traditions of collective governance, highlighting similarities with the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance. He emphasized the GAC's role in supporting a secure, stable and globally connected Internet.

The Chair outlined the GAC's main priorities for ICANN87, including the New gTLD Program Next Round, DNS Abuse mitigation, Registration Data issues, Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names, and GAC operational matters. These operational matters include progress under the GAC Annual Plan, proposed amendments to the GAC Operating Principles, potential GAC participation in the ICANN Nominating Committee, and implementation of the Continuous Improvement Program. The Chair also highlighted planned meetings with the ICANN Board and other ICANN community groups, as well as the development of the ICANN87 GAC Communiqué.

The Chair noted that ICANN87 would be his final meeting as GAC Chair, after serving four years in the role. He expressed appreciation to GAC representatives, Support Staff, interpreters, technical teams and the wider ICANN community for their contributions and cooperation. He welcomed Ian Sheldon (Australia) as the incoming GAC Chair and expressed confidence in the GAC's continued work under his leadership.

Muhammad Neil El Himam, representing Indonesia's Ministry of Creative Economy, welcomed participants on behalf of the host country. He highlighted the importance of an open, secure and interoperable Internet in supporting Indonesia's creative economy, enabling creators and businesses to reach global markets, and promoting innovation and cultural diversity. He also highlighted

Indonesia's efforts to promote linguistic diversity and digital inclusion, including initiatives supporting local scripts in the domain name system. He noted Indonesia's participation in the 2026 New gTLD Program Next Round, including an application for .Bali. He also invited GAC participants to a dinner hosted on 20 October 2026.

GAC Support Staff provided an overview of meeting logistics and technical arrangements. Participants were reminded to use the Zoom raise-hand function when requesting the floor, whether attending in person or remotely, and to consult the GAC meeting agenda and calendar invitations for relevant session information. Additional guidance was provided regarding seating arrangements, including reserved seating for GAC delegations and certain joint meetings.

The GAC then conducted its traditional Tour de Table, during which in-person and remote participants introduced themselves and their delegations or organizations. Many participants thanked the Government of Indonesia for hosting ICANN87 and looked forward to productive discussions during the week. Several participants attending their first GAC meeting were welcomed.

The Chair reviewed changes in GAC membership and leadership since ICANN86. He welcomed 93 new GAC delegates and noted that GAC membership had reached 185 Members and 41 Observers, including the Republic of Togo as a new Member. Members were reminded to contact GAC Support Staff through join-gac@icann.org for delegation updates and related administrative matters.

The Chair also recalled the election of Ian Sheldon (Australia) as the next GAC Chair, whose two-year term will begin at the conclusion of ICANN87. He further welcomed Thiago Dal-Toe (Colombia) as the incoming GAC Vice-Chair, elected to serve the remainder of Ian Sheldon's Vice-Chair term.

Due to time constraints, the planned review of recent GAC activities and the GAC Communiqué development process was not completed during the session.

2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

2.1. New gTLDs Next Round

GAC website agenda pages:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-4-gac-discussion-on-new-gtlds-next-round-1-2
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-6-gac-discussion-on-new-gtlds-next-round-2-2
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-11-gac-discussion-on-next-round

The GAC discussed the implementation of the 2026 New gTLD Program Next Round following Reveal Day on 7 October 2026. ICANN org provided updates on preliminary application statistics, upcoming milestones, the Community Input Period, safeguard assessments and the Applicant Support Program (ASP). The discussions also focused on GAC operational readiness, including the review of applications, potential public policy concerns and coordination among GAC Members.

ICANN org reported that 1,615 applications were proceeding in the application process, including 891 applications in 263 contention sets. Applicants from all five ICANN geographic regions were represented, and 21 applications were for Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs), representing approximately 1.3 percent of total applications. ICANN org emphasized that these figures remain subject to change following the String Replacement Period, String Confirmation Day and subsequent evaluation processes, and that it was premature to draw definitive conclusions regarding the achievement of the program's objectives, including diversity.

Members were reminded that the String Replacement Period would conclude on 21 October 2026 and that String Confirmation Day, scheduled for 17 November 2026, would mark the publication of confirmed applied-for strings and updated contention sets, as well as the beginning of String Evaluation and Community Input processes. ICANN org reviewed the available community input mechanisms, including Application Comments, GAC Member Early Warnings, GAC Consensus Advice, singular/plural notifications and objections. The Application Publication and Statistics (APS) system was also demonstrated, including its search, filtering and data-download functionalities to facilitate the review of applications.

During the discussions, GAC Members raised concerns regarding applied-for strings with potential public policy implications. India identified strings associated with public services and governmental functions, including .passport, .railway, .defense and .national, and highlighted potential risks relating to consumer protection and DNS Abuse. Members also raised questions regarding applications associated with emerging technologies, including .robot and .llm, and the role of Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs) in addressing potential risks.

ICANN org provided an overview of the safeguard assessment framework, recalling that it originated from GAC Advice in the 2012 Round, including the Beijing Communiqué. The Board subsequently translated this Advice into ten safeguard Public Interest Commitments (PICs), mapped to four risk-based string groups. The Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process recommended that the same substantive framework be carried forward to future rounds.

ICANN org explained that the safeguard framework remains substantively unchanged for the 2026 Round, while procedural improvements have been introduced to strengthen the consistency, transparency and documentation of assessments. These include independent evaluators, structured assessment criteria, documented rationales and quality assurance measures. Applicants are able to provide information through safeguard assessment questions, although their responses do not determine the final classification of a string. Evaluators are required to consider relevant community input, including GAC Early Warnings and GAC Consensus Advice, before reaching their final determinations. The assessment results will be published as part of the String Evaluation results.

Members requested further clarification regarding the assessment of strings associated with regulated or sensitive sectors, including health, finance, education and governmental functions. The United Kingdom emphasized the importance of ensuring that safeguard assessments are conducted comprehensively and responsibly, irrespective of whether community comments have been submitted. ICANN org confirmed that all strings would undergo assessment, including those for which no comments or other community input had been received.

China sought clarification on how the assessment would account for strings with multiple meanings across different languages and cultural contexts. ICANN org explained that the assessment would consider how a reasonable person across linguistic, cultural and regional contexts might understand a string. The evaluation panel's methodology includes consulting external experts where necessary, and further guidance on the assessment criteria and procedures was expected to be published. GAC Leadership offered to make relevant GAC Member expertise available to assist with linguistic and cultural questions, in addition to the formal community input mechanisms.

Members also discussed the interpretation of RVCs and the limitations on commitments relating to content regulation. Switzerland encouraged Members to familiarize themselves with the applicable framework and suggested that an explanatory document could help clarify the distinction between permissible eligibility requirements and prohibited content regulation. India sought clarification regarding the interpretation of contractual provisions requiring compliance with applicable laws and regulations, particularly where the parties involved in a registration and the affected jurisdictions differ. ICANN org undertook to consult its legal colleagues and provide a further explanation.

Geographic-name and community applications were another focus of discussion. Members emphasized the importance of knowing whether the relevant government authority supported or had expressed non-objection to an application, particularly where a proposed string could affect geographic names within a GAC Member's jurisdiction. ICANN org clarified that supporting documentation for geographic-name applications is required but is not routinely published as part of the public application information under the Applicant Guidebook. Applicants may choose to make the supporting letters public, and GAC Members may request relevant information through the Early Warning process. ICANN org also explained that the geographic-name evaluation panel would review supporting letters for authenticity, accuracy and confirmation that the appropriate authority had provided the support, with the results of this evaluation to be published as part of the application evaluation process.

The GAC also reviewed the preliminary outcomes of the ASP. ICANN org reported that the program had received 78 applications, of which 56 qualified for support. Of those qualifying applicants, 51 subsequently submitted new gTLD applications, representing a participation rate of approximately 91 percent. ICANN org outlined ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities intended to better understand applicants' experiences, regional differences in participation and the reasons some eligible applicants did not proceed. Initial survey results indicated positive assessments of the ASP website, while further research was needed to understand barriers to engagement.

GAC Members welcomed the progress achieved compared with the 2012 Round but expressed concern regarding the limited participation from certain underserved regions, particularly Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean. Members emphasized the need to better understand financial, technical and procedural barriers, including the potential impact of the final 75 percent application fee reduction compared with the previously contemplated maximum reduction of 85 percent. Discussions also highlighted the importance of sustained regional outreach, pro bono and technical assistance, access to potential funding partners, and support for ASP applicants as they progress through contention, objections, evaluation and contracting. Members suggested that lessons learned from the current round should inform future iterations of the program, including the possibility of a more structured review. No decision was taken to initiate a formal review. ICANN org confirmed that further monitoring and evaluation results would be shared with the GAC as they became available and encouraged Members to support participation in the relevant surveys.

The GAC further discussed operational readiness and the practical use of GAC Member Early Warnings. Members suggested establishing a means of communicating with applicants to seek clarification or additional information before issuing an Early Warning. They also proposed mechanisms for indicating when concerns raised through an Early Warning had subsequently been addressed or resolved, providing greater clarity for applicants and the wider community. ICANN org noted that the existing system did not provide a mechanism to change the recorded status of a submitted Early Warning, although alternative approaches, including the use of GAC website or wiki records, could be explored.

GAC Leadership emphasized that the application information available following Reveal Day remained preliminary and that applications and strings could change before and during the evaluation process. Members were reminded that the Community Input Period would run from String Confirmation Day until 16 March 2027, and that GAC Consensus Advice could be issued at any time. In light of the concerns raised, Leadership proposed organizing intersessional discussions after String Confirmation Day to enable Members to review applied-for strings, identify common concerns and consider coordinated or collective Early Warnings. At least two opportunities for such exchanges would be explored during the Community Input Period. Members were also invited to share proposed contributions to the ICANN87 Communiqué with the New gTLD Topic Leads for coordination.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC Leadership and Support Staff** to explore organizing intersessional discussions between November 2026 and March 2027 to support GAC Members in reviewing applied-for strings, identifying common public policy concerns and considering coordinated Early Warnings.
- **ICANN org** to provide clarification on the interpretation and application of contractual provisions relating to applicable laws and regulations under the relevant safeguard PICs, following consultation with its legal colleagues.
- **ICANN org** to share the findings of the ASP monitoring and evaluation activities with the GAC as further survey results and assessments become available. **GAC Members** to encourage relevant ASP applicants to participate in ongoing surveys to support the identification of barriers and lessons learned.

2.2. Registration Data Issues and Informational Session on Accuracy of Registration Data

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-7-gac-discussion-on-whois-and-registration-data-issues

The GAC discussed four topics relating to gTLD registration data: law enforcement authentication, the Supplemental System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD) recommendations, the accreditation of privacy and proxy services, and registration data accuracy. The discussion focused on progress toward facilitating legitimate access to non-public registration data, improving the operational effectiveness of existing and future access mechanisms, and strengthening the accuracy of registration data to address DNS abuse.

Regarding law enforcement authentication, the co-chair of the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) recalled the GAC's longstanding interest in developing mechanisms to authenticate law enforcement requests for access to non-public registration data. Following the ICANN Board resolution at ICANN84 encouraging collaboration between ICANN org and the PSWG, ICANN org established a Law Enforcement Input Group in July 2026.
Janelle McAlister (ICANN org) explained that the group is examining the technical feasibility of connecting existing law enforcement authentication systems, including the US FBI Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal and Interpol's proposed Global Digital Police Identifier system, with ICANN's Registration Data Request Service (RDRS). The work includes a proof-of-concept test, potential workflow design, technical requirements, and a summary of findings to inform implementation of the SSAD. It was clarified that the group's work is technical in nature and that the policy framework governing the information to be transmitted remains within the remit of the SSAD policy process.
In response to questions from a GAC Member regarding the scope and practical purpose of the proof of concept, it was explained that the work was intended to prepare for future integration with a permanent SSAD system. However, the timing of implementation would depend on completion of the relevant policy recommendations.

Regarding SSAD, a GAC representative on the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team (SRT) recalled that the ICANN Board had rejected the original SSAD recommendations in March 2026, enabling the community to revisit them in light of the RDRS pilot and the RDRS Standing Committee's findings. He outlined the GAC's priorities, including a permanent system for processing requests for disclosure of non-public gTLD registration data, mandatory participation by all gTLD registrars, effective handling of requests involving privacy and proxy services, and the ability to process urgent requests.
Marc Anderson (Verisign, SRT Chair) reported that the team had reduced the original 18 supplemental recommendations to 12, taking into account lessons from the RDRS pilot and input from the ICANN Board and the broader community. He stressed that the recommendations being discussed are intended to balance the needs of data controllers, requesters, and data subjects, while remaining implementable. The SRT Chair indicated that the recommendations were expected to be published for public comment on 10 November 2026, with the public comment period scheduled to close on 12 December and submission of the final recommendations to the GNSO Council targeted for March 2027. The GAC representative on the SRT noted that progress had been made in reflecting

several GAC priorities in the draft recommendations, including mandatory use of the system following adoption and implementation of the policy, optional participation by ccTLD operators, and provisions addressing requests involving privacy and proxy services. The GAC intends to seek confirmation from the ICANN Board that the previously agreed policy improvements concerning urgent requests would be operationalized as soon as practicable.

Regarding privacy and proxy services, the GAC's representatives in the Implementation Review Team (IRT) provided an update on the implementation work to establish a framework for the accreditation and oversight of privacy and proxy service providers. The IRT is reviewing draft Consensus Policy language proposed by ICANN org and intended to ensure that such providers are identifiable and subject to applicable requirements, including the principle that registrars should not knowingly accept registrations from providers that have not been accredited through the process established by ICANN. The GAC representatives noted that the implementation approach had evolved from the initial concept of requiring all providers to enter into separate agreements with ICANN, with the IRT considering alternative ways to achieve the policy objectives. The draft provisions address, among other matters, requests for disclosure of underlying customer data, response timelines, the handling of individual requests on their merits, abuse-reporting contacts, non-compliance, and protections for customers using privacy and proxy services. Presenters stressed the importance of ensuring that responses to legitimate law enforcement requests address the underlying customer data where appropriate, rather than providing only information about the proxy provider. The IRT is expected to continue its work through the end of 2026, with public comment on the draft Consensus Policy language targeted for January 2027. The GAC is expected to continue engaging in the implementation process and to consider submitting public comments.

Regarding registration data accuracy, GAC topic leads recalled the GAC's longstanding interest in improving the accuracy of registration data and previous work of the GNSO's Accuracy Scoping Team and subsequent Small Team. It was noted that the GAC had increasingly focused on the 15-day verification timeline provision under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) by which registrars must validate and verify registrant contact information within this timeframe. The GAC has raised concerns that maliciously registered domains can be used for abuse within this period and that the rationale for maintaining a 15-day window should be reconsidered in light of current practices and available evidence. The GAC Topic leads reported that discussions had taken place with the GNSO and registrars, including consideration of whether verification should be completed before a domain name is delegated into the DNS, while acknowledging potential operational challenges. The GAC will continue to gather evidence and provide feedback to the GNSO.

Several speakers were invited to discuss the impact of this timeline and of registration verification practices in ccTLDs.

Maciej Korczyński (University of Grenoble, lead author of the ICANN INFERMAL study), presented findings on operational validation of registrant information. The study found that validation of registrant information during account creation or before domain purchase was associated with a 70% reduction in malicious registrations in the dataset examined. The researcher cautioned that the findings should be interpreted carefully, noting that the research focused on maliciously registered

phishing domains and that policy changes may have different effects on attackers, registrars, and legitimate users. He emphasized the importance of considering implementation costs, the potential for attackers to adapt, and the need for further evidence from registrars with direct operational data.

Barbara Pearse (ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee) presented results from a survey of 65 ccTLDs, representing approximately 21% of delegated ccTLDs. The survey illustrated considerable diversity in verification practices. Approximately 44% of responding ccTLDs required registrars to verify registrant data before registration, while manual verification remained more common than automated checks among ccTLD operators. Pearse noted that automation could be constrained by the availability and cost of authoritative databases across jurisdictions.

The Denmark GAC Representative described the Danish ccTLD registry's experience introducing stronger identity verification. Since 2018, Danish registrants have been required to use the national electronic identification system, while foreign registrants are subject to a risk-based assessment and, where necessary, additional identity checks. Petersen reported a substantial reduction in observed abuse following implementation, describing the results as evidence that verification before delegation can be effective and operationally feasible.

During the ensuing discussion, a co-chair of the PSWG asked the INFERMAL study author which measures might be more difficult for malicious actors to circumvent. In response, the researcher highlighted unrestricted access to registration APIs as an important enabler of large-scale abusive registrations, while noting that the effectiveness of individual measures depends on how attackers adapt. A GAC Member asked whether compromised domains should be distinguished from domains registered maliciously and how they might require different responses. Another GAC Member expressed support for reducing the verification period and possibly requiring verification to be completed before delegation, citing research indicating that malicious domains may be used shortly after registration, and argued that the available evidence supported further action, while acknowledging the need to consider implementation challenges and the impact on legitimate registrants. The author of the INFERMAL study cautioned that malicious domains exhibit varied lifecycles: some are used immediately, while others may be held for months before being activated.

The GAC agreed to continue its engagement across these workstreams, including through the PSWG and relevant implementation and policy-development processes. The session highlighted the importance of a permanent and effective system for legitimate access to non-public registration data, reliable authentication of law enforcement requests, appropriate handling of privacy and proxy services, and evidence-based improvements to registration data accuracy efforts. No final policy decisions were taken during the session; several issues remained subject to ongoing policy development, implementation work, and further consideration by the GAC.

2.3. DNS Abuse

The GAC's plenary discussion on DNS Abuse Mitigation during ICANN87 focused on the two ongoing or planned GNSO Policy Development Processes (PDPs): PDP1 on associated domain checks and PDP2 on safeguards for access to APIs used for bulk domain registration.

Overall, the meeting highlighted broad support for advancing ongoing policy work, while emphasizing the need to make abuse mitigation more proactive and consistent, without treating domain association as proof of wrongdoing or imposing disproportionate restrictions on legitimate Internet users, that is that effective enforcement must be balanced with evidence-based decisions, proportionality, human rights, and safeguards for legitimate registrants.

Regarding advancement of PDP1, it was highlighted that no final agreement has been reached on its detailed implementation safeguards. Key unresolved issues include the minimum investigation standard, the evidence needed to justify mitigation, registrant recourse, human-rights impacts, cross-registrar cooperation, and meaningful effectiveness measures. The GAC plans to continue coordinating its positions through the DNS Abuse Small Group.

Several presentations were made during this session in relation to DNS Abuse and ongoing policy discussion:

Ashwin Rangan (GAC, Indonesia) and **Ery Hendraswara (.id ccTLD registry) presented Indonesia's coordinated approach to tackling DNS abuse and related online harms**. They described substantial enforcement activity, particularly against online gambling, phishing, and malware, involving government authorities and the national registry. The .id ccTLD registry representative highlighted practical obstacles to identifying and verifying abusive sites, including false positives, delays in verification, and websites protected by web application firewalls (WAFs). The presenters called for greater cooperation between authorities, registries, and infrastructure providers to facilitate reliable abuse investigations.

Japan Publishers' Manga Anti-Piracy Conference (JPMAC) presented evidence of domain hopping by manga piracy operators, who repeatedly change domain names to evade enforcement while retaining their audiences. JPMAC reported observing more than 450 piracy-related domain changes between November 2024 and September 2026, arguing that frequent changes can undermine enforcement when domain registration is easy and verification weak. It advocated stronger registration-data verification and shorter verification timelines. Its proposed two-step approach would strengthen routine verification and apply stricter checks where suspicious circumstances or evidence of illegal activity warrant them. The presenter also cautioned against imposing excessive burdens on ordinary registrants or undermining freedom of expression and access to the Internet.

Leticia Castillo (ICANN Contractual Compliance) reported on enforcement of the DNS Abuse Mitigation requirements introduced in April 2024. By August 2026, ICANN had initiated more than 650 investigations: approximately 66% resulted in action to stop the abuse, 8% in action to disrupt it, and 21% found no evidence of DNS abuse. ICANN had issued eight breach notices and initiated termination of one registrar's accreditation. The ICANN Compliance representative stressed that the

objective is not merely to resolve individual complaints, but to correct underlying compliance failures through remediation plans and sustained improvements in registrars' and registries' processes.

Sam Cheadle (ICANN Org, Office of the Chief Technology Officer, Security, Stability and Resiliency team) presented research into identifying associated domains using publicly accessible registration and DNS data. The study found that more than half of the maliciously registered domains examined from reputation blocklists could be associated with at least one other domain. The methodology also helped identify potentially abusive activity earlier in some cases. Cheadle proposed considering whether results could be shared through ICANN's Domain Metrica platform to support associated-domain checks. He emphasized an important distinction: evidence that domains are associated is not, by itself, direct or actionable evidence that every domain is being used for abuse.

Regarding ongoing GNSO policy deliberation in PDP1 and PDP2, the GAC's representatives in these discussions briefed the GAC on the current status of policy development, and specifically the ongoing work on processing the public comment received on the PDP1 Initial Report PDP1. Revised recommendations, which will form the PDP1 Final report are expected before the end of the year. In the meantime, PDP2 on safeguards for access to APIs used in bulk registration, remains in the chartering and scoping phase. The GAC's input in these scoping discussions emphasized that the policy should be technology-neutral, addressing bulk-registration methods beyond APIs alone, and should consider safeguards and the allocation of responsibility among registrars and other parties.

Community representatives were invited to share their stakeholder group's perspectives on the major hurdles they see on the way to agreeing on an effective set of policy recommendations for PDP1, and on what is most important to be addressed in PDP2.

Rafik Dammak (NCSG Chair) called for clarity on what constitutes a "reasonable investigation," a proportionate minimum baseline for registrars, and a clear separation between identifying associated domains, investigating actual abuse, and deciding whether mitigation is justified. He stressed that association alone should not establish abuse and that mitigation decisions should be evidence-based and consider each domain individually.

Eunice Perez Coello (ALAC) emphasized the need for consistent investigation standards, sufficient actionable evidence, proportionality, and a human-rights impact assessment considering privacy, freedom of expression and association, non-discrimination, and due process. She also stressed that failure to mitigate abuse can itself cause serious harm.

Bruce Tonkin (ccNSO) shared survey findings from approximately 65 country-code registries: 20% regularly conducted associated-domain checks, 30% did so occasionally, and about 5% required registrars to take action. He cautioned against overly prescriptive technical rules, advocated continued information-sharing and training, and highlighted the need for registrant review and appeal mechanisms.

Rod Rasmussen (SSAC) expressed support for establishing a baseline policy and said progress was generally constructive. He highlighted two remaining challenges: developing robust, adaptable

methods for associating domains, and measuring policy effectiveness. He also stressed that implementation must account for changing techniques used by malicious actors.

A GAC member advocated for stronger cross-registrar information-sharing, a clearer minimum baseline for investigations, checks on parties seeking API access for bulk registration, monitoring policy effectiveness and mandatory abuse reporting by registrars.

3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS

GAC website agenda page: https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-8-gac-operations-session

3.1. GAC Roles, Responsibilities and Participation Opportunities

The GAC discussed opportunities for Members to participate in GAC activities and wider ICANN community processes. GAC Vice-Chair Ian Sheldon encouraged Members to consider roles such as Working Group chairs and participants, Topic Leads, Points of Contact, and representatives in cross-community processes. He noted that broader participation would help strengthen the GAC's engagement and distribute its workload more effectively.

Members were informed of vacancies in the Independent Review Process Implementation Oversight Team, the Independent Review Process Community Representatives Group, and the ICANN Planning Prioritization Group. The GAC also noted that a replacement would be needed for Ian Sheldon's role as GAC Point of Contact to the ccNSO following his transition to GAC Chair.

In response to a question from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union, GAC Support Staff explained that the ICANN Planning Prioritization Group considers available community and organizational resources when identifying priorities for implementing Board-approved recommendations and other work. As no GAC Member had volunteered to participate following an earlier call, GAC Support Staff had been attending as observers and reporting relevant discussions to the GAC, without participating in decisions or representing GAC positions.

India requested further information regarding the Independent Review Process-related opportunities. Switzerland emphasized the value of participation in both GAC and wider ICANN community activities, particularly in developing substantive knowledge, building relationships and contributing to policy and implementation outcomes.

Members also suggested that future calls for volunteers should provide clearer information on the responsibilities and expected time commitment associated with available roles. GAC Leadership welcomed the suggestion and indicated that this information could be consolidated and circulated.

Continuous Improvement Program (CIP)

The GAC discussed its approach to implementing the ICANN Continuous Improvement Program (CIP), a community-developed framework through which Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and the Nominating Committee periodically assess their effectiveness and identify opportunities for improvement.

GAC Leadership explained that the GAC's approach would involve a self-assessment tailored to its responsibilities and working methods. The process should build on existing planning and reporting activities, remain proportionate, and avoid unnecessary administrative burden.

The initial phase, between ICANN87 and ICANN88, would focus on reviewing and refining the proposed assessment approach, including its criteria and indicators, identifying potential

improvements, and prioritizing areas for further work. The intended outcome for ICANN88 would be an agreed assessment framework and a focused set of priorities for the first CIP cycle.

Egypt raised questions regarding whether GAC participation in the CIP would remain voluntary, particularly in light of discussions concerning the Review of Reviews and potential changes to the ICANN Bylaws. Members emphasized the importance of clarifying the GAC's position on participation and reporting expectations. GAC Leadership acknowledged these concerns and indicated that the voluntary nature of the GAC's participation could be reflected in the final materials.

No final assessment criteria, indicators or improvement priorities were adopted during the session.

GAC Annual Plan: Stocktake and Preparation for the Next Cycle

GAC Leadership reviewed progress under the GAC Annual Plan and outlined preparations for the next planning cycle. The GAC Strategic Plan for 2024–2028 establishes broader objectives that are translated into expected outcomes and activities through the Annual Plan, which can be adjusted over time to reflect evolving priorities and available resources.

An overview was provided of the nine priority areas covered by the current Annual Plan, including the role of governments in ICANN, GAC effectiveness, the New gTLD Program, DNS Abuse, domain registration data, Universal Acceptance, new technologies, Internet names awareness, and Internet number resources. Leadership noted that work was progressing across most priorities, although some planned activities had not yet begun.

Indonesia requested clarification on the scope of the priority concerning new technologies, particularly whether it included broader Internet-related developments, applications and content services. Leadership explained that the Annual Plan was limited to activities within the GAC's remit and ICANN's scope of work. Indonesia suggested that the scope of this priority could be considered further during the next planning cycle.

Leadership outlined the process for developing the next Annual Plan, beginning with input from Topic Leads, followed by review and input from the wider GAC membership. GAC Leadership would subsequently consider proposed activities in light of available resources and the Committee's capacity to deliver, before circulating a revised plan for further review. The aim is to secure GAC endorsement at ICANN88.

Members emphasized the importance of setting realistic priorities in light of the GAC's workload and the limited number of Members actively participating in its workstreams. Egypt also highlighted the importance of integrating capacity development across the GAC's substantive priority areas, rather than treating it solely as a separate activity. Leadership welcomed the suggestion. No final decisions on the priorities or activities for the next Annual Plan were taken during the session.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC Support** to recirculate information on available cross-community roles and vacancies, including the Independent Review Process-related groups and the ICANN Planning Prioritization Group, and remain available to answer Members' questions.
- **GAC Leadership and Support** to consolidate and circulate information on available participation opportunities, including responsibilities and expected time commitments, to assist Members in assessing opportunities to volunteer.
- **GAC Leadership and Support** to continue developing the GAC's approach to implementing the CIP, including the assessment framework, criteria and indicators, with the aim of presenting an agreed approach and initial priorities at ICANN88.
- **GAC Leadership and Support** to coordinate development of the next Annual Plan through consultation with Topic Leads and the wider GAC membership, followed by leadership review and further consultation, with the aim of endorsement at ICANN88.

3.2. GAC Operating Principles

The GAC considered the proposed administrative amendments to the GAC Operating Principles. Guo Feng introduced the amendments on behalf of the relevant Working Group, recalling that the GAC had initiated the formal revision process at its previous meeting and that the required 60-day consultation period had been completed. No further comments specifically concerning the administrative amendments had been received during that period. Broader substantive comments would be retained for consideration in the Working Group's subsequent work.

The proposed amendments were described as editorial and administrative changes intended to improve clarity, consistency and alignment with current GAC practices. The version presented for adoption was unchanged from the version circulated for consultation.

Ian Sheldon, acting under authority delegated by the GAC Chair, initiated the vote on the proposed amendments under Principle 53 of the GAC Operating Principles. During the voting process, Portugal requested clarification on the precise changes under consideration. Denmark suggested that future meeting agendas should more clearly identify when a vote was expected and ensure that the relevant documentation was readily available. India supported these concerns, noting difficulties identifying the specific changes being put to a vote and accessing some links in the briefing materials. Argentina recalled that the original and redline versions had been circulated by email on 26 June.

GAC Leadership agreed to revisit the proposal during the session to provide Members with an opportunity to review the changes. The redline version was subsequently presented, and the amendments were summarized. These included textual clarifications, renumbering and reordering of provisions, updated references to GAC documents and Operating Principles, clarifications relating to voting procedures, and changes to terminology concerning secretariat and support staff arrangements.

Following the review, no further questions or concerns were raised, and the GAC Chair confirmed that the proposed administrative amendments had been adopted. The session record does not specify the numerical vote count or the number of Members participating.

3.1. GAC Capacity Development

Capacity Development Session 1:
GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-2-gac-capacity-development-gac-readiness-for-the-next-round-1-2

Amina Ramallan (Nigeria), Co-Chair of the GAC Capacity Development Working Group, opened the session, followed by WG Co-Chair Christine Arida (Egypt), who introduced the newly established GAC Capacity Development Working Group. She explained that the Working Group aims to identify training needs, coordinate priorities, and ensure that capacity development activities are planned and delivered in a consistent and effective manner. Its activities will support the wider GAC membership and complement the work of other GAC working groups. The Working Group has developed a draft work plan, which will be shared with GAC members after ICANN87 for review and consideration.

Overview of the 2026 New gTLD Program
ICANN org provided an overview of the 2026 New gTLD Program, by explaining that the program reflects several years of policy development by the ICANN community, including contributions from the GAC and lessons learned from the 2012 Round. ICANN org outlined the different application types, including general, geographic, internationalized domain names (IDNs), brand, reserved names, and community applications. Different application types may have specific eligibility requirements, additional evaluations, fees, or contractual obligations.

The following points were highlighted:

- Geographic names: Certain geographic names require government support or endorsement. The Applicant Guidebook defines which names qualify as geographic names. These definitions do not necessarily include all names commonly understood as geographic.
- IDNs and variants: The 2026 Round allows applications for IDNs and associated variant strings, supporting the use of different languages and scripts.
- Community applications: Eligible community applicants may request Community Priority Evaluation to resolve contention with other applications.
- Brand applications: Eligible brand applicants may use specific procedures to address contention through a change request.

During the discussion, the Netherlands asked how GAC members could raise concerns about an applicant's declared application category. ICANN org clarified that applicants must demonstrate that

they meet the relevant requirements. Community members may also raise concerns through the available input mechanisms.

Switzerland requested clarification on the definition of geographic names. ICANN org explained that the Applicant Guidebook contains specific categories, including certain country and territory names, capital cities, and other defined geographic names. Not all city names automatically qualify as geographic names under these rules.

Application Process and Upcoming Milestones
ICANN org reviewed the main stages of the application process and the upcoming milestones.

The application submission window closed on 12 August 2026. Following an administrative check, ICANN published information on 1,615 applications on Reveal Day, 7 October 2026.

The following milestones were highlighted:

- String Replacement Period (8–21 October 2026): Eligible applicants may select a replacement string submitted with their original application. This provides an opportunity to avoid contention but does not guarantee that contention will be avoided.
- String Confirmation Day (17 November 2026): ICANN will publish the confirmed applied-for strings, reflecting any eligible replacements selected by applicants.
- Community Input Period: Several mechanisms will become available following String Confirmation Day. These include application comments, GAC Early Warnings, and objections.
- Prioritization Draw (2027): Applications will receive priority numbers to help determine their processing order during later stages of the program.

ICANN org clarified that replacement strings must meet specific eligibility criteria. Once an applicant selects an eligible replacement string, the decision cannot be reversed. If no replacement is selected, the original applied-for string remains in place.

The Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU) asked how the prioritization draw would work and why participation was optional. ICANN org explained that applicants may choose to participate in the priority draw for a fee. Applications that do not participate will also receive priority numbers, but after those that opted in, subject to the applicable rules.

In response to further questions from GAC members, ICANN org clarified that string evaluation takes place across applications before priority numbers affect subsequent processing. Priority numbers do not necessarily determine when applications complete the process. Other factors, including objections, GAC Advice, and additional evaluations, may affect progress.

String Evaluation and Community Input
ICANN org outlined the string evaluation processes that will follow String Confirmation Day.

These include assessments of string similarity, geographic names, public interest safeguards, and singular and plural forms. Depending on the results, applications may be placed in contention or, in certain cases, found ineligible to proceed.

ICANN org also explained that community input mechanisms would allow interested parties to raise concerns about applications. These mechanisms have different purposes and timelines. For example, singular/plural notifications may be submitted during a 30-day period following String Confirmation Day, while other objection procedures have longer timelines.

During the discussion:

- Switzerland requested further information on the criteria and procedures used to assess public interest safeguards.
- The United Kingdom supported this request. It asked how safeguards linked to previous GAC Advice, including the Beijing Communiqué, would be applied. It also sought clarification on the evaluation criteria, the publication of results, and how application comments would be considered.
- The United States requested further information on objection procedures, particularly the applicable fees and how costs would be calculated.

ICANN org confirmed that safeguard assessment results would be published as part of the string evaluation results. Relevant application comments would also be made available to evaluators and considered during the assessment process.

Further information on string evaluations would be provided during a subsequent ICANN87 session. Objection procedures and related questions would be addressed during the second Capacity Development session.

Application Publication and Statistics System
ICANN org demonstrated the Application Publication and Statistics (APS) system, which provides public access to information about applications submitted during the 2026 Round.

The system allows users to review application details, identify applicants and applied-for strings, search and filter applications, and download publicly available information. Additional information and functions will become available as the program progresses.

ICANN org emphasized that the Applicant Guidebook is the authoritative source for determining which application information is publicly available.

During the discussion, participants raised questions about access to supporting documentation, particularly government support letters for geographic name applications.

ICANN org clarified that these supporting letters are not included in the publicly posted application information. However, they remain available to evaluators. GAC members and other interested parties may use the available community input mechanisms to raise concerns about the validity or adequacy of supporting information. These comments will be available to evaluators for consideration.

Additional questions concerned application status indicators and the search functions within APS. ICANN org explained that some replacement strings may appear as deactivated because they are

not eligible for selection. Staff also confirmed that assistance is available through ICANN support channels and demonstrations during ICANN87.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC Capacity Development Working Group** to share the draft Capacity Development Work Plan with GAC members following ICANN87 for review and consideration.
- **ICANN org** to address questions regarding objection procedures and associated fees during the second Capacity Development session.
- **ICANN org** to provide further information on public interest safeguard assessments, including evaluation criteria, consideration of application comments, and publication of results, during the subsequent session on string evaluations.

Capacity Development Session 2:

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-3-gac-capacity-development-gac-readiness-for-next-round-2-2

The GAC held its second capacity development session on readiness for the 2026 Round of the New gTLD Program. The session, facilitated by CDWG Co-Chair Christine Arida (Egypt), focused on the mechanisms available to GAC members and observers to raise concerns about new gTLD applications, as well as the operational arrangements developed to support GAC participation in the application review process. Representatives of the ICANN New gTLD Program team presented the available community input mechanisms. Benedetta Rossi, from the GAC Support Team, introduced the GAC operational readiness materials. GAC Vice-Chair Marco Hogewoning summarized the main takeaways and issues for further discussion.

Application Comments on the Application Comment Forum

ICANN org explained that application comments provide an opportunity for any interested party, including GAC members and observers, to bring concerns about applications to the attention of applicants and evaluators.

The Application Comment Forum (ACF) will become available on String Confirmation Day, currently scheduled for 17 November 2026. Comments may be submitted at any time after the forum opens, but only comments submitted during designated comment periods will be shared with applicants and evaluators for consideration. The initial community input period will run for 104 days, until 16 March 2027. Additional 30-day comment periods may apply following certain application or string changes.

ICANN org demonstrated the Application Comment Forum (ACF), explaining that submitted comments will be publicly searchable by application, applicant, date and subject area. An ICANN account will be required to submit comments, but not to view them. Commenters will be able to identify the relevant application and evaluation area and attach up to two supporting documents.

In response to questions from Colombia concerning the editing, moderation and reporting of comments, including those potentially submitted under assumed names, ICANN org clarified that comments cannot be edited after submission and will generally be published immediately, without prior moderation. A reporting mechanism will be available to flag potentially inappropriate content for review, while comments containing confidential application information will be assessed to determine whether confidential treatment is justified.

Singular and Plural Notifications

ICANN org introduced the singular and plural notification mechanism, which allows any interested party to identify potential singular or plural relationships between applied-for strings, or between an applied-for string and an existing or previously applied-for TLD.

Notifications must be submitted within 30 days following String Confirmation Day, using the designated form available on the New gTLD Program website.

ICANN org explained that validated notifications may result in applications being placed in contention or, in certain circumstances, being unable to proceed. Additional guidance, including frequently asked questions and relevant Applicant Guidebook provisions, is available to support submissions.

GAC Member Early Warnings

The ICANN org team explained that GAC Member Early Warnings allow individual or multiple GAC members and observers to identify applications that may raise public policy concerns.

Early Warnings must include a written explanation of the concern and, where possible, indicate how the applicant might address it. The Applicant Guidebook provides that Early Warnings should be submitted within 104 days following String Confirmation Day. ICANN org emphasized the importance of respecting this period, while noting that the wording of the Guidebook allows some flexibility.

Early Warnings are submitted through a designated form to the GAC Support Team, which checks submissions for completeness and publishes them on a dedicated public webpage. Applicants are notified through the TLD Application Management System (TAMS) and receive contact information for the GAC members or observers concerned.

The United Kingdom asked whether an Early Warning could be formally closed or withdrawn once an applicant had addressed the concerns raised. ICANN org explained that Early Warnings would remain publicly available and that there was no formal process for closing them or removing the corresponding notification from TAMS, even where concerns had been resolved.

India requested clarification on the mechanisms through which GAC members could submit Early Warnings. ICANN org outlined the submission process, including the use of the designated form, the role of the GAC Support Team, publication of the Early Warning, and notification of the applicant. It

was clarified that contact information would not appear in the public version but would be provided to the applicant to facilitate communication.

Switzerland raised concerns about the absence of a mechanism allowing governments to seek clarification directly and confidentially from applicants before deciding whether to issue an Early Warning. Switzerland referred in particular to situations involving geographical names or information that was not publicly available, including governmental non-objection letters.

The GAC Support Team confirmed that no specific procedure currently exists for such preliminary contact and that applicant contact information would not be publicly available. Questions could be included in an Early Warning, allowing an applicant to respond subsequently.

Switzerland suggested that the GAC consider whether a more confidential channel for preliminary exchanges with applicants would be useful, particularly where concerns might be resolved without issuing a public Early Warning.

In response to further questions, ICANN org clarified that applicants are encouraged, but not required, to engage with governments issuing Early Warnings. An Early Warning does not directly affect an application, although unresolved concerns could subsequently become the subject of GAC consensus advice.

Indonesia asked whether governments could continue to communicate concerns through official correspondence, as had occurred during the previous round, and whether late objections could be accepted. ICANN org confirmed that governments could continue to send correspondence to ICANN. However, formal mechanisms, including objections and Early Warnings, must follow their respective procedures. In particular, formal objections are subject to strict deadlines.

Objections and Appeals

ICANN org presented the formal objection mechanisms available during the 2026 Round, explaining that objections are submitted to external dispute resolution service providers rather than directly to ICANN.

Four grounds for objection were outlined:

- String Confusion: Where an applied-for string or variant is confusingly similar to another TLD, including similarity in appearance, pronunciation, or meaning.
- Legal Rights: Where an applied-for string or variant may infringe existing legal rights.
- Limited Public Interest: Where an applied-for string or variant may be contrary to generally accepted legal norms relating to morality and public order under international law.
- Community: Where there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of an established community targeted by the string.

ICANN org explained that eligibility to submit objections depends on the relevant objection ground and the standing requirements set out in the Applicant Guidebook. Limited Public Interest

objections may be filed by any party, while the other grounds have more specific standing requirements.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) will administer String Confusion and Legal Rights objections, while the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) will administer Limited Public Interest and Community objections.

The general objection period will run for 104 days following String Confirmation Day. Separate 30-day periods apply to String Confusion objections following publication of string evaluation reports and to certain objections following string changes.

ICANN org explained that an objection panel may determine that an application can proceed, proceed subject to modifications, or cannot proceed. Unlike the previous round, the 2026 Round also includes an appeals mechanism.

The Netherlands asked how the standing of an objector, particularly a significantly interested party, would be determined. Switzerland similarly requested clarification on the assessment of standing for Community objections, noting that the definitions presented appeared open to interpretation.

ICANN org explained that the Applicant Guidebook contains detailed standing requirements and that an appointed panel would assess both the substance of an objection and the standing of the objector during the initial substantive review, referred to as the quick look review.

Funding for Objections and Appeals

ICANN org explained that national governments may request funding for one objection and one appeal, subject to specified conditions and procedures. Funding covers the fees and costs charged by the dispute resolution service providers but does not extend to legal representation or other additional expenses. Payments are made directly to the service providers, and governments cannot obtain reimbursement for fees already paid.

India asked whether governments were required to request ICANN funding before filing objections. ICANN org clarified that funding is optional and that governments may submit multiple objections at their own expense, provided the applicable requirements are met.

The United States requested further information on how dispute resolution service providers calculate their fees, emphasizing the importance of a transparent and fair process.

ICANN org explained that WIPO generally applies fixed fees, while ICC uses a cost structure that may include hourly charges and advance payments. The actual costs may therefore vary depending on the circumstances of the case. References to the published fee schedules were shared during the session.

Independent Objectors

ICANN org also introduced the Independent Objector mechanism, under which three individuals selected by ICANN will independently review applications and may submit Limited Public Interest or Community objections.

Independent Objectors must take account of application comments and may not object unless at least one opposing comment has been submitted. They have 111 days following String Confirmation Day to file objections, providing an additional week compared with the general objection period.

The Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU) requested clarification on whether the three Independent Objectors would act collectively or individually.

ICANN org confirmed that each Independent Objector may independently decide whether to file an objection and that consensus among them is not generally required. A chair will coordinate their work, including helping to avoid duplicate objections. Additional information on the operation of the mechanism will be published.

GAC Consensus Advice

The ICANN org team reviewed the GAC's ability to provide consensus advice to the ICANN Board concerning new gTLD applications, including applications raising public policy concerns or issues relating to national law.

It was explained that GAC consensus advice must be clearly identified as such, include an articulated rationale, and fall within the GAC's advisory responsibilities under the ICANN Bylaws. Unlike several other community input mechanisms, there is no specific deadline for submitting GAC consensus advice.

Switzerland clarified that GAC consensus advice is not restricted to GAC Communiqués and may also be communicated through other means, including letters. ICANN org acknowledged that the presentation had been too restrictive in identifying the Communiqué as the mechanism for submitting advice.

In response to a request for examples of previous GAC consensus advice concerning applications, ICANN org referred participants to materials and Communiqués from the 2012 Round, with links included in the presentation.

The team reiterated that GAC Member Early Warnings and GAC consensus advice are distinct mechanisms. An Early Warning is not a prerequisite for consensus advice, although it may provide an opportunity to raise concerns with applicants at an earlier stage.

GAC Operational Readiness Framework

Benedetta Rossi, from the GAC Support Team, introduced the operational readiness materials developed with the support of the New gTLD Topic Leads and GAC Leadership.

The materials are intended to provide GAC members and observers with a clear and predictable structure for engaging with the 2026 Round as applications progress through the review process.

The materials comprise an overarching Operational Readiness Framework, supporting guidance for GAC Member Early Warnings, and an operational approach for considering possible GAC advice.

The GAC Support Team emphasized that these materials do not introduce new procedures or modify existing rules. Rather, they are intended to facilitate the practical use of existing mechanisms, particularly in view of the potentially large number of applications requiring consideration.

The framework identifies four broad phases:

1. Initial review: From Reveal Day to String Confirmation Day, allowing members to begin reviewing applications and identifying potential concerns.
2. Detailed application review: Following String Confirmation Day, when the community input period opens and members may consider using the available mechanisms.
3. Voluntary information exchanges: Opportunities for members to share information, discuss potential public policy concerns, and exchange perspectives without constituting formal decision-making processes.
4. Possible courses of action: Consideration of whether further engagement, possible GAC advice, or no additional action may be appropriate.

The GAC Support Team stressed that these phases are not intended to be mandatory or sequential. Members and observers retain discretion over whether and how to engage, and the use of one mechanism does not necessarily depend on another.

Further discussion of the operational readiness materials was scheduled for a subsequent GAC plenary session.

Main Takeaways and Further Discussion
GAC Vice-Chair and Topic Lead, Marco Hogewoning summarized the main points arising from the session, highlighting the importance of String Confirmation Day on 17 November 2026 and the general community input deadline of 16 March 2027.

He emphasized that GAC members and observers may participate in several mechanisms available to the broader ICANN community, in addition to the mechanisms specific to the GAC. He also recalled that ICANN funding for objections and appeals is optional and that an ICANN account is required to submit application comments.

Drawing on the interventions during the session, he identified two matters that could benefit from further GAC consideration:

- Whether a mechanism could be established to indicate that concerns raised through application comments or GAC Member Early Warnings have been addressed satisfactorily.
- Whether there is a need for a confidential channel allowing governments to communicate with applicants and seek clarification before submitting public comments or Early Warnings.

These matters were identified as subjects for possible further discussion and were not presented as agreed changes to existing procedures.

Marco Hogewoning also recalled that GAC consensus advice remains available throughout the application process, subject to the applicable requirements.

He referred participants to upcoming GAC sessions on operational readiness, the Applicant Support Program, and further discussion of the 2026 Round, including an open discussion scheduled for Tuesday morning.

The GAC was invited to further consider the operational questions raised during the session, particularly the possibility of acknowledging when issues raised through GAC Early Warnings or application comments have been resolved, as well as the potential need for confidential preliminary exchanges with applicants. These matters remained open for further discussion, with no decision taken to establish additional mechanisms.

4. GAC WORKING GROUPS

4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG contributed to the GAC sessions pertaining to DNS Abuse and Registration Data issues, and to cross-community plenary meetings on the policy gap related to registrant recourse and on DNS Abuse mitigation. Finally, and alongside GAC Members, the PSWG engaged with community stakeholders in meetings of: the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group on Associated Domain Checks, the Law Enforcement Agency Authentication Mechanisms Input Group, and the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Policy Implementation Review Team.

4.2. GAC Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names Working Group (GAC UA-IDN WG)

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-5-gac-universal-acceptance-and-internationalized-domain-names-working-group-ua-idn-wg

The GAC held a session on Universal Acceptance (UA) and Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs), focusing on government engagement, multilingual digital inclusion, and practical approaches to advancing UA adoption.

Abdalmonem Galila (Egypt), Co-Chair of the GAC UA-IDN Working Group, introduced the session. GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero emphasized that UA is essential to inclusive digital transformation and encouraged governments to integrate UA into national digital strategies, public procurement, and public services. GAC Vice-Chair Zeina Bou Harb facilitated the discussion.

International Perspectives and Recent Developments

Muhammad Neil El Himam (Indonesia) shared experiences with local-script domain names, emphasizing the importance of relevant local-language content, institutional cooperation, and technical readiness to encourage meaningful IDN adoption.

Guilherme Canela (UNESCO) highlighted the UNESCO–ICANN collaboration, including UA Day, the joint UA policy brief, and planned regional engagement. He invited governments to contribute to UNESCO's monitoring of its 2003 Recommendation on multilingualism in cyberspace.

Edmon Chung, Co-Chair of the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group (UAEWG), presented the **47 finalized guidelines**, published in September 2026. He highlighted government and public-sector engagement as priorities and encouraged cooperation across ministries, civil society, and international organizations.

Universal Acceptance Day 2027

Seda Akbulut (ICANN org) outlined preparations for UA Day 2027, emphasizing a shift from awareness raising toward practical implementation through technical education, regional cooperation, and adoption-focused activities.

In response to a question from Abdalmonem Galila, she encouraged governments to participate in national and regional UA Day events, engage relevant stakeholders, and use the UNESCO–ICANN policy brief to identify practical measures.

National Experiences and the UA Champion Initiative

Sarmad Hussain (ICANN org) facilitated presentations highlighting national initiatives:

- **Armenia:** Cooperation with universities and government institutions to integrate UA into technical education.
- **India:** Government policies, the BHASHANET initiative, and national capacity-building activities.
- **Georgia:** Challenges in sustaining IDN adoption and the need for greater public awareness.
- **Bahrain:** Integration of UA into university curricula, workshops, and student hackathons.
- **China:** Government policy, standards, education, and stakeholder coordination.
- **Libya:** Support for UA initiatives and continued GAC engagement.

The presentations demonstrated the value of the GAC UA Champion initiative in promoting national cooperation and exchanging practical experiences.

The session highlighted the importance of government leadership, technical education, institutional partnerships, and local-language content in advancing UA adoption. Participants were encouraged to translate awareness into practical implementation.

GAC Vice-Chair Zeina Bou Harb thanked the speakers and closed the session.

Action Point(s)

- GAC Members and Observers: Encouraged to participate in UA Day 2027 activities and promote national and regional stakeholder engagement.
- GAC UA-IDN Working Group: Continue supporting the UA Champion initiative and facilitating the exchange of national experiences and best practices.
- GAC Members and interested stakeholders: Invited to contribute to UNESCO's monitoring of the 2003 Recommendation on multilingualism in cyberspace.
- ICANN org and interested GAC representatives: Explore further cooperation on UA adoption, technical education, and regional implementation activities.

5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-14-gac-meeting-with-the-icann-board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board to discuss Regional Internet Registry (RIR) governance, readiness for the 2026 New gTLD Program Round, DNS Abuse mitigation, registration data accuracy and the 15-day verification requirement, the System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD) Supplemental Recommendations, and law enforcement authentication and urgent requests for registration data.

GAC Vice-Chair Ian Sheldon chaired the session on behalf of GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, who had departed ICANN87 early. ICANN Board Chair Tripti Sinha led the Board's participation.

1. Regional Internet Registry (RIR) Governance

In response to a question from the ICANN Board, Marco Hogewoning (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the GAC, welcomed progress on the recommended draft RIR Governance Document. He noted that the draft was broadly consistent with the GAC's observations in the ICANN84 and ICANN85 Communiqués.

The GAC emphasized the importance of public interest stewardship of Internet number resources, monitoring and auditing against objective and measurable operational criteria, and consistency with ICANN's multistakeholder approach. The GAC considered that the draft addressed many of these concerns through ongoing operational requirements, audits and compliance reviews, while recognizing governments as part of the numbering community.

The GAC also reiterated the importance of an appropriate role for the ICANN community in RIR recognition and de-recognition processes and welcomed further clarification on how this would be reflected in implementation arrangements.

India emphasized the importance of an open public comment process before the framework is approved and adopted, allowing the wider community to assess the proposed changes and any remaining concerns. Board Chair Tripti Sinha confirmed that the draft would undergo public comment following the Board's review.

2. 2026 New gTLD Program Round – GAC Readiness

The Board asked about the GAC's preparations for the 2026 New gTLD Program Round and activities undertaken by GAC Members at the national level to support governments and potential applicants.

Jorge Cancio (Switzerland), speaking on behalf of the GAC, outlined the preparatory work undertaken by GAC Leadership, New gTLD Topic Leads and the GAC Support Team. This included the

development of an Operational Readiness Framework, guidance and templates for GAC Member Early Warnings, and an approach for considering possible GAC Consensus Advice.

The Early Warning guidance and template had already been reviewed and approved by the GAC, while the broader operational framework and approach to GAC Advice were being finalized.

Following Reveal Day on 7 October 2026, GAC Members had begun reviewing applications and replacement strings, exchanging preliminary observations and identifying potential public policy concerns. The GAC would move into the formal review period following String Confirmation Day on 17 November 2026, including the 104-day Early Warning period.

The GAC also highlighted the capacity development sessions held during ICANN87 to help Members understand the available mechanisms and timelines. At the national level, preparations varied and could include coordination among government agencies, outreach to domestic stakeholders and engagement with potential applicants.

Theresa Swinehart, speaking for ICANN org, invited the GAC to identify any additional support it might need as the program progresses.

3. DNS Abuse Mitigation

The GAC asked what measures the Board was considering, within its remit and in coordination with ICANN org, the GNSO and contracted parties, to address DNS Abuse mitigation gaps that would not require a full Policy Development Process (PDP), alongside DNS Abuse PDP 1 and PDP 2.

Board member James Galvin explained that the GNSO Council's Final Issue Report on DNS Abuse had identified potential gaps and distinguished between those requiring policy development and those that might be addressed through other means.

He noted that improved coordination concerning Domain Generation Algorithms (DGAs) was the only non-policy issue for which broad community support had been identified. This work had been suggested for consideration by ICANN org's Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), in coordination with the community.

The Board emphasized the importance of allowing ongoing work, including the implementation of contractual amendments and DNS Abuse PDP 1 and PDP 2, to progress. It welcomed GAC input on other specific gaps that could be addressed without policy development.

India raised concerns about the effectiveness of the existing 15-day registration data verification requirement, referring to research indicating that many maliciously registered domains remain active for only a short period. India encouraged the Board to use available resources to advance work on shortening the verification timeline.

The Board noted that the 15-day verification requirement was among the issues identified in the GNSO's Final Issue Report and would be considered through the Council's prioritization process.

4. Registration Data Accuracy and the 15-Day Verification Requirement

The GAC asked what steps the Board could envisage to accelerate progress on the 15-day verification requirement, referring to the Board's letter of 25 August 2026 identifying contractual negotiations and policy development as the available mechanisms for modifying the requirement.

James Galvin explained that the Board supported ICANN org's coordinated efforts on DNS Abuse mitigation, including contractual compliance, technical research, engagement with governments and the wider community, and policy development.

He confirmed that the 15-day verification requirement was among the gaps identified in the GNSO's DNS Abuse Final Issue Report and was considered likely to require policy development. The Board supported the GNSO Council's ongoing prioritization work and encouraged the GAC to engage through its Points of Contact to the GNSO.

Regarding contractual negotiations, the Board remained open to discussions but emphasized that these would require agreement among the relevant parties on the importance and scope of the issues to be addressed. The Board was not aware of other mechanisms consistent with the multistakeholder process but remained open to considering suggestions from the GAC.

India reiterated the need to accelerate progress and questioned whether registrars could be required to report more systematically on DNS Abuse and the actions taken in response. India suggested that more comprehensive reporting could strengthen the evidence available for policy discussions.

Board members clarified that registrars and registries are required to respond to relevant ICANN Compliance inquiries but are not currently required to publish statistics on their handling of DNS Abuse reports. Introducing mandatory reporting requirements would require policy development.

The United States encouraged registrars to report voluntarily and transparently on the abuse reports they receive, the actions taken and their outcomes, while emphasizing the importance of progressing DNS Abuse PDP 1 and PDP 2.

The Board noted that some contracted parties already publish such information voluntarily and that broader industry initiatives, including centralized abuse reporting mechanisms, were contributing to greater transparency.

Ian Sheldon suggested that the GAC could consider inviting representatives of these initiatives to a future meeting or intersessional discussion to share their work.

Europol asked whether measures were being considered to address the use of anonymization tools in domain name registration, while recognizing the importance of data protection principles. The Board indicated that no such measures were currently planned.

5. SSAD Supplemental Recommendations

The GAC requested an update on the outstanding issues to be resolved before the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team (SRT) could submit its recommendations for Board consideration.

Board member Wes Hardaker explained that the SRT was continuing its work, including addressing policy alignment issues identified through the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) analysis and considering potential SSAD costs.

The SRT expected to publish its recommendations for public comment in November 2026 and submit its final recommendations to the GNSO Council in March 2027. Following Council approval, the recommendations would be forwarded to the Board for consideration.

Board members Wes Hardaker and Greg DiBiase, serving as Board liaisons to the SRT, welcomed the progress achieved and the GAC's active participation. Wes Hardaker noted that the SRT had accepted GAC-proposed wording on one of the recommendations during ICANN87.

The European Commission welcomed the progress and sought clarification on whether the SRT's work was intended to align its recommendations with the existing Registration Data Policy, rather than modify that policy.

Wes Hardaker explained that discussions were ongoing on including language in the supplemental recommendations to avoid the need for further changes to the existing policy. He cautioned that this remained under consideration.

Canada asked whether the Board expected that no further policy work on authentication would be necessary following approval and implementation of the supplemental recommendations.

Wes Hardaker expressed confidence that the SRT was addressing the outstanding issues identified by the Board. However, he emphasized that the Board could not provide a definitive assurance before reviewing the final recommendations.

6. Law Enforcement Authentication and Urgent Requests

The GAC requested an update on the Law Enforcement Agency Authentication Input Group, including progress on technical approaches to authentication and the implementation of the 24-hour response requirement for urgent requests under the Registration Data Policy.

Wes Hardaker reported that ICANN org had facilitated three meetings of the Input Group. The discussions had focused on the group's scope and timetable, as well as testing authentication mechanisms involving the FBI and INTERPOL within a development version of the RDRS.

The purpose of this work was to obtain early technical feedback and prepare for implementation once the relevant SSAD recommendations had been approved. A proof-of-concept test was planned for December 2026, with findings and lessons learned expected in March 2027.

Regarding the 24-hour urgent request response requirement, the Board explained that an enforcement gap remained because the relevant policy recommendations had not established a framework for authentication providers.

The GNSO Council had indicated that a policy establishing authentication providers would need to be implemented before the 24-hour response requirement could become enforceable. Accordingly, the requirement would take effect once ICANN org had fully implemented a consensus policy establishing an authentication process for requestors.

The Board clarified that implementation of such a mechanism could not begin fully until the Board had approved the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations, which were expected to reach the Board in 2027.

India suggested that the authentication pilot should test the full process, including the interface between authentication mechanisms, ICANN's systems and registrars, rather than only individual components.

Wes Hardaker explained that the current work was intended to gather early feedback using a test environment, rather than implement a production system. He confirmed that end-to-end testing would be necessary before implementation could be considered complete.

7. Closing Remarks

During the closing discussion, Jorge Cancio (Switzerland) acknowledged the importance of continued cooperation between the GAC and Board and thanked departing Board members, including Nicolas Caballero, León Sánchez and Sarah Deutsch, for their service.

Ian Sheldon also expressed appreciation for Nicolas Caballero's contributions as GAC Chair and Board member. Board Chair Tripti Sinha and Wes Hardaker thanked him for his engagement and contributions to the Board's work.

The session concluded with expressions of appreciation for the continued exchanges between the GAC and Board.

Action Point(s):

- **ICANN Board** to proceed with the planned public comment process on the recommended draft RIR Governance Document following the Board's review.

5.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-9-gac-meeting-with-the-gnso

The GAC met with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council to discuss ongoing policy development work and opportunities for continued collaboration, focusing on DNS Abuse

mitigation, registration data accuracy and the 15-day verification requirement, and the System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD).

DNS Abuse Policy Development

The GNSO provided an update on DNS Abuse Policy Development Process (PDP) 1, noting that the work was progressing ahead of schedule and had moved into the development of the final report. Following publication of the initial report in August 2026, the working group was reviewing 42 public comments, focusing on new information, implementation considerations, unintended consequences and drafting ambiguities. The GNSO also noted that lessons from this focused PDP were being incorporated into broader efforts to improve policy development processes.

On DNS Abuse PDP 2, the GNSO reported that work on the charter was ongoing and would continue following ICANN87. Further DNS Abuse work would be considered as part of the GNSO Council's broader prioritization exercise, including outstanding issues identified in the DNS Abuse issue report. The GNSO acknowledged the constructive participation of GAC representatives and Topic Leads in these efforts.

National Approaches to Public Policy and Registration Data

The GNSO invited GAC Members to share national experiences in developing public policy positions on ICANN matters, including approaches to balancing public safety and law enforcement objectives with privacy, data protection, due process and registrant rights.

Switzerland described its approach to coordinating among relevant government departments, ministries and agencies when reviewing ICANN and GAC agendas, with broader political or multistakeholder consultation where appropriate. India highlighted the role of national data protection legislation and engagement with its ccTLD and relevant technical experts in balancing public safety and privacy. Indonesia raised concerns regarding potential disputes involving geographic names that may be locally or culturally recognized but not widely reflected in official registers, and suggested that the GAC could help facilitate dialogue among affected Members. The discussion also highlighted the value of incorporating data protection principles and registrant rights into the GAC's consideration of registration data disclosure policies.

Registration Data Accuracy and the 15-Day Verification Requirement

The GAC and GNSO discussed whether registration data verification requirements and shorter timeframes could improve the prevention and mitigation of DNS Abuse, the available evidence regarding their effectiveness, and possible implementation challenges or unintended consequences.

Denmark described its experience with the .DK ccTLD, where domain names are validated before being added to the zone, reporting a substantial reduction in measured abuse. The European Commission outlined the .EU registry's combined use of pre-delegation checks, registration data verification, risk-based detection and timely intervention. It noted that combining preventive measures could help identify potentially malicious registrations earlier, reduce downstream

enforcement costs and improve the reliability of registration data available for abuse investigations. India also reported positive results from national verification requirements, while acknowledging the implementation challenges involved in engaging registrars.

Peru emphasized that ccTLD experience cannot necessarily be transferred directly to the gTLD environment. Members highlighted potential impacts on smaller businesses, community organizations and first-time users, particularly in developing countries, as well as compliance costs, data protection considerations, the reliability of verification methods, false positives and the importance of appropriate redress mechanisms.

The GNSO explained that the existing 15-day verification requirement applies to new registrations, transfers and changes to existing registration information, but not renewals. The Registrars Stakeholder Group suggested that, if further work were pursued, new registrations could be the initial focus, given the additional considerations associated with transfers. It was clarified that changes to the existing requirement would require a policy development process or contractual amendments.

The United States supported focusing any further work initially on new registrations. The European Commission emphasized the importance of continued GAC-GNSO collaboration and noted that, given the forthcoming delegation of new gTLDs, there remained an opportunity to consider whether existing requirements should be updated. The GNSO welcomed the examples and contributions shared during the meeting and indicated that these would be taken into account in further consideration of the issue.

SSAD Supplemental Recommendations
The GNSO provided an update on the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team (SRT), noting that its work remained on track. Several recommendations had been consolidated or restructured, while a number of issues remained under consideration. The team was aiming to publish its work for Public Comment around 10 November 2026, following which it would review the comments received and work towards a final package for consideration by the GNSO Council.

Due to time constraints, the remaining questions concerning the SSAD work could not be addressed during the session. The GAC Chair indicated that these questions could be followed up intersessionally.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC and GNSO** to continue intersessional engagement on matters of common interest, including follow-up on the outstanding SSAD questions and relevant registration data and DNS Abuse policy issues.

5.3. Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-16-gac-meeting-with-the-ccnso

The GAC met with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) to discuss business continuity and disaster recovery (BC/DR) for country code top-level domains (ccTLDs). The session included a presentation of the ccNSO Disaster Recovery Study Group's findings and recommendations, followed by an interactive World Café exercise and plenary discussion on operational resilience and future engagement between the two communities.

ccNSO Disaster Recovery Study Group – Findings and Recommendations
Peter Koch, Chair of the ccNSO Disaster Recovery Study Group, presented the group's findings concerning the potential role of IANA in ccTLD disaster recovery. He noted that there is currently no documented framework governing IANA's involvement in such circumstances, with previous cases having been handled on an ad hoc basis.

The Study Group emphasized that responsibility for business continuity and disaster recovery rests primarily with ccTLD managers, including where registry operations are outsourced. Given the diversity of ccTLD governance and operational models, preparedness and pre-established recovery arrangements were considered particularly important. The Study Group recommended that the ccNSO Council not initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP) on IANA's role in ccTLD disaster recovery at this time, while recommending further study of possible temporary measures where a ccTLD manager becomes unable to operate.

In response to a question from the European Commission, Peter Koch clarified that existing ccTLD transfer procedures might not be suitable for emergency situations requiring rapid restoration of services, highlighting the potential relevance of temporary operational arrangements.

World Café – Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery
Participants took part in a World Café exercise comprising four discussion stations representing different combinations of regulatory frameworks and ccTLD operational models. Following two rounds of discussion, rapporteurs presented the main observations from each station.

Discussions at the first station examining a regulatory framework with outsourced operations, using .au as an example, focused on geographic redundancy and the importance of locating backup infrastructure sufficiently far from primary facilities. Participants considered the challenges faced by smaller countries and island states, including potential cross-border arrangements, data embassies and satellite connectivity. The importance of including DNSSEC signing infrastructure in disaster recovery planning was also highlighted.

At the second station examining a regulatory framework with partially in-house operations, Colombia presented its model combining government-led policy and oversight with outsourced technical registry operations. Discussions focused on contractual service level agreements (SLAs), emergency registry operator arrangements, regular testing and monitoring, and procedures for

restoring essential services following a disaster. Participants also considered geographic redundancy, communication procedures, and the strengths and potential vulnerabilities of government-led oversight.

At the third station examining outsourced operations without a specific regulatory framework, using .ng as an example, participants emphasized that accountability for business continuity remains with the ccTLD manager even where operations are outsourced. Discussions highlighted the importance of clear contractual obligations covering service levels, responsibilities and disaster recovery procedures, as well as the risks associated with dependence on external service providers.

At the fourth station examining predominantly in-house operations without a specific regulatory framework, Brazil shared its experience with distributed infrastructure and partnerships supporting operational resilience. Discussions highlighted geographic redundancy, privacy and data protection considerations when selecting backup locations, and the potential role of Internet exchange points and technical organizations in supporting business continuity.

Plenary Discussion and Future Engagement
Following the World Café reports, participants discussed the relationship between telecommunications and Internet infrastructure, disaster recovery arrangements for DNSSEC signing infrastructure, and the origins of the Study Group's work. Peter Koch clarified that the Study Group's work had been informed by real situations encountered by IANA but focused on broader scenarios and potential policy implications rather than investigating individual incidents.

Participants provided feedback through Mentimeter, with 25 respondents rating the session Excellent and eight rating it Good. The interactive format and opportunities for dialogue were positively received, and participants expressed interest in similar exchanges in the future.

Suggested topics for future GAC–ccNSO engagement included DNS Abuse, ccTLD governance models, cybersecurity and resilience, cooperation between governments and ccTLD operators, data embassies, and Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and Universal Acceptance. The ccNSO Chair indicated that summaries of the World Café discussions would be shared with both communities, with suggestions raised during the session helping to inform future bilateral discussions.

Action Point(s):

- **ccNSO** to share summaries of the World Café discussions with the GAC and ccNSO communities.

5.4. Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH)

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-15-gac-meeting-with-the-cph

The GAC met with representatives of the Generic Names Supporting Organization's (GNSO) Contracted Parties House (CPH), comprising the Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) and the Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG), to discuss the next round of new generic top-level domains (gTLDs), opportunities to strengthen engagement between GAC representatives and Contracted Parties, and DNS Abuse mitigation.

Next round of new gTLDs and the New TLD Applicant Group (NTAG)
Jeff Neuman, Vice-Chair of the RySG, introduced the New TLD Applicant Group (NTAG), an interest group within the RySG intended to represent prospective new gTLD registry operators and provide a bridge to the RySG, GNSO Council and ICANN Board. He explained that the group was being re-established in preparation for the 2026 round, following the conclusion of the previous group established for the 2012 round. NTAG plans to hold its first formal virtual meeting on 3 December 2026, with an initial in-person meeting expected at ICANN88 in Lisbon.
Jeff invited new gTLD applicants to join the group, noting that participation would provide an opportunity to engage with the wider registry community. He also reported that the RySG would waive its usual USD 500 observer membership fee for applicants participating in the Applicant Support Program. In response to GAC questions about applicants' ability to be contacted, it was proposed that NTAG consider voluntarily publishing applicant contact information on its website. This could help governments communicate directly with applicants when they have questions or public-policy concerns regarding particular applications, including in the context of GAC Early Warnings. Finally, he noted that it was too early to draw conclusions about how the concerns of new applicants compared with those of applicants in the previous round, as many were still becoming familiar with ICANN and its multistakeholder processes.

Engagement between GAC representatives and registries and registrars
Prudence Malinki, Chair of the RrSG Governance Team, and Keith Drazek of Verisign, representing the RySG, led an interactive discussion on how GAC representatives and Contracted Parties could develop more effective working relationships. The discussion emphasized the value of Contracted Parties' technical and operational expertise, the exchange of information on issues of common interest, and the importance of building contacts that facilitate ongoing collaboration.

Keith stressed that government perspectives should inform policy development from an early stage rather than being considered only toward the conclusion of a GNSO process. He cited ongoing work on DNS Abuse and the System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD) as examples where GAC participation and governmental input were welcomed. Prudence similarly encouraged GAC representatives to approach registries and registrars directly with questions, noting that informal discussions and meetings bringing together relevant stakeholders could help clarify positions and build mutual understanding.

It was highlighted that gTLD registries and registrars operate internationally and should not be assumed to have the same local relationships as country-code top-level domain (ccTLD) operators. Keith Drazek also underlined the importance of capacity-building activities to help GAC representatives understand the respective roles, responsibilities and technical capabilities of registries and registrars, particularly given the turnover and arrival of new GAC members.

The discussion identified practical difficulties in finding the appropriate contacts, including cases where a registrar's public website did not provide an easily identifiable contact address. Prudence Malinki offered to help GAC representatives identify and reach relevant registrar contacts through the RrSG, while Owen Smigelski, pointed to ICANN's and IANA's databases of accredited registrars[1], which includes contact information, and offered assistance where needed.

To help maintain relationships despite turnover among GAC representatives, Keith Drazek proposed developing jointly prepared, regularly updated reference or training materials explaining the work of registries and registrars and their positions on relevant policy issues. The Contracted Parties also plan to develop an explanatory document for GAC representatives on how to engage with them.

Ian Sheldon (Australia), GAC Vice-Chair, encouraged Contracted Parties to consider including GAC representatives in relevant discussions with other government bodies, such as regulators and law-enforcement authorities, where appropriate. He observed that coordination within governments could not always be assumed and that early involvement of the GAC representative could help ensure more consistent engagement with ICANN. Jorge Cancio (Switzerland), GAC Vice-Chair, supported this point, noting that early communication could help both governments and Contracted Parties address issues before they progressed into formal policy or legal discussions.

DNS Abuse Mitigation

Owen Smigelski introduced two new RrSG explanatory documents addressing registrars' motivations to mitigate DNS Abuse and the financial impacts of such abuse on registrars[2]. He encouraged GAC representatives to review the materials and provide feedback. He emphasized that DNS Abuse could harm registrars' businesses, customers and reputations, and that registrars had incentives to address abuse, in some cases taking action beyond their existing contractual obligations.

Keith Drazek recalled that registries and registrars had voluntarily worked with ICANN to develop the contractual amendments on DNS Abuse mitigation that have since entered into force. He described these amendments as an initial baseline, with further work expected through GNSO policy development processes. He expressed the CPH's support for continued policy work and for collaboration with the GAC on measures to address DNS Abuse.

Some GAC members welcomed the discussion but raised concerns about the consistency and transparency of reporting on DNS Abuse mitigation. The representative asked whether a framework

[1] See https://www.icann.org/en/contracted-parties/accredited-registrars/list-of-accredited-registrars and https://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids

[2] See RrSG Explainer: Why registrars want to mitigate DNS Abuse and RrSG Explainer: Financial Impacts on Registrars of DNS Abuse

could be developed to provide more demonstrable and consistent reporting, including by parties that were not currently reporting. Owen Smigelski responded that reporting obligations were being discussed within the registrar community and that voluntary reporting was one possible avenue for further dialogue. He also noted that ICANN Contractual Compliance had begun using the new contractual provisions, including issuing breach notices, and described this as a positive development.

The session concluded with an acknowledgment that further work remained necessary both to mitigate DNS Abuse and to strengthen continuing collaboration between the GAC and Contracted Parties.

5.5. Meeting with the Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG)

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-10-gac-meeting-with-the-csg

The GAC held a joint session with the CSG to discuss matters of mutual interest, focusing on DNS Abuse Mitigation, Registration Data and the Review of Reviews.

The GAC Chair opened the session and welcomed representatives of the CSG. Mason Cole, speaking on behalf of the CSG, thanked the GAC for the opportunity to engage in a bilateral discussion and expressed his appreciation for the continued cooperation between the two groups.

DNS Abuse Mitigation: Practical Measures and Policy Priorities

The first part of the session focused on practical measures to strengthen DNS Abuse Mitigation, including registration data verification requirements, ongoing GNSO Policy Development Processes (PDPs), and opportunities for further cooperation between the GAC and CSG.

Registration verification requirements

John McElwaine (Intellectual Property Constituency) presented the CSG's views on the existing requirement for registrars to verify a registrant's email address or telephone number within 15 days of domain name registration, as well as the potential implications of requiring verification before a newly registered domain name becomes operational.

He referred to findings from the INFERMAL Study, which he indicated had associated pre-registration verification with a 70% reduction in malicious activity, while certain low-friction registration practices had been associated with higher levels of abuse. He also cited research suggesting that the use of artificial intelligence in early verification processes could contribute to reducing malicious domain registrations.

John explained that the current 15-day verification period originated from the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). Under the existing framework, registrars are required to verify a registrant's email address or telephone number within 15 days of registration. Where verification is

unsuccessful, registrars must undertake manual verification or suspend the domain name. However, the domain name may remain operational during the verification period.

He noted that technological developments since the adoption of the 2013 RAA had made more immediate verification increasingly feasible. Although the existing verification requirements provide a baseline, he considered that the procedures could be circumvented through the use of disposable or inaccurate contact information.

He emphasized that verification should go beyond checking the format or operational functionality of an email address or telephone number and should provide greater assurance of the reliability of registration information. He also acknowledged the operational challenges that more stringent verification requirements could create for registrars, while noting that comparable verification practices were already common across many online services.

The CSG therefore supported exploring a shorter verification period, potentially between 24 and 72 hours, or requiring verification before domain name activation. John McElwaine considered that stronger verification requirements would serve the public interest by helping prevent malicious registrations.

CSG priorities for DNS Abuse Mitigation

Mason Cole, CSG Chair, provided an overview of the CSG's DNS Abuse priorities and areas of alignment with previously expressed GAC positions. These included Associated Domain Checks, bulk domain registrations and automated registration interfaces, public reporting of DNS Abuse statistics, registration data verification and transparency reporting obligations.

Some differences in priorities were also identified. While the investigation of subdomain abuse had not been taken up as a CSG priority, the mitigation of exact-match domain registrations was a CSG priority that had not been similarly reflected in the GAC positions reviewed. Mason also noted that preventive measures, including validated contact information, were increasingly being incorporated into registration practices and contractual frameworks. Referring to ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) analysis, he highlighted the potential value of Associated Domain Checks in identifying malicious activity involving related domain registrations.

Regarding further policy development, the CSG emphasized the importance of greater transparency and reporting on DNS Abuse Mitigation actions, as well as more standardized and substantive responses from registries and registrars to abuse reports. Other priorities included addressing exact-match domain registrations used for phishing, fraud and disinformation, and strengthening risk-based registration data validation. Existing verification practices were considered vulnerable to inaccurate or disposable information, while more extensive customer validation procedures already used by some registrars could inform future requirements.

Mason Cole concluded by inviting GAC representatives to share their priorities for future DNS Abuse policy work, particularly in light of the ongoing first DNS Abuse PDP (PDP1) and preparations for a second PDP (PDP2), and to identify opportunities for further cooperation between the GAC and CSG.

Discussion of DNS Abuse priorities and policy development

During the discussion, GAC members welcomed the overview of shared priorities and sought clarification regarding the GNSO's approach to prioritizing further DNS Abuse policy work. It was observed that several areas of potential alignment had been identified but that the ability to address them would depend on the sequencing and prioritization of work within the GNSO.

In response, Mason Cole confirmed that the CSG supported the ongoing GNSO prioritization exercise and recognized that not all proposed measures could be addressed immediately, given the range of matters under consideration by the community. Nevertheless, he emphasized that the CSG would continue advocating for measures to address DNS Abuse because of its financial, operational and reputational impacts on the interests represented by the group. He also expressed the CSG's willingness to cooperate with other GNSO participants in advancing this work.

Peru highlighted the importance of considering regional differences when developing DNS Abuse Mitigation measures. Peru encouraged the use of data and evidence reflecting experiences across different geographic regions, including Latin America and the Caribbean, to ensure that mitigation approaches responded to the global nature of DNS Abuse while taking account of regional and national circumstances. Peru also emphasized that more extensive registration data validation should remain proportionate and consistent with applicable national data protection frameworks. Particular attention should be given to the potential impact on developing regions, small businesses and individual registrants, where additional verification requirements could create disproportionate burdens.

In this context, Peru sought further clarification on how risk-based validation measures could be designed to achieve stronger safeguards without unnecessarily restricting access to domain name registrations, particularly in emerging markets.

Mason Cole acknowledged these concerns and emphasized that the CSG did not intend to create unnecessary obstacles to domain name registration. He explained that its objective was to support measures that would improve the safety and security of the DNS and reduce opportunities for abuse, while recognizing the need to consider their impact on legitimate registrants.

The United States welcomed the continued engagement with the CSG on DNS Abuse and provided an overview of the GAC's ongoing work in this area for the benefit of newer representatives. The delegation recalled that the European Commission, Japan and the United States served as GAC DNS Abuse Topic Leads and that a dedicated GAC small group, involving representatives from different regions, met regularly to advance discussions.

The United States also expressed satisfaction with the progress of PDP1 and noted that discussions within the GNSO Council were underway concerning the charter for PDP2. Referring to the GAC's ICANN83 Prague Consensus Advice, the delegation reiterated its support for targeted and appropriately scoped policy development processes to facilitate timely progress on DNS Abuse Mitigation.

Brian Beckham (WIPO), raised a question concerning the scope of Associated Domain Checks under PDP1. In particular, he asked whether the CSG had developed a position on conducting such checks across different registrars, rather than limiting them to registrations managed by an individual registrar.

Mason Cole explained that the CSG had not yet established a formal position on this question. He acknowledged the practical and operational difficulties that could arise when requiring registrars to share information across competing businesses. He suggested that conducting checks across multiple registrar accreditations held within the same corporate group might be less challenging but noted that further discussions with the Registrar Stakeholder Group would be necessary before the CSG could develop a position.

India welcomed the CSG's priorities and emphasized the importance of continuing work on registration data accuracy, increasing transparency through reporting obligations and considering consensus policy measures addressing subdomain abuse.

The discussion highlighted substantial areas of common interest between the GAC and CSG, particularly regarding verification practices, transparency, reporting and further DNS Abuse policy development. However, the prioritization, scope and practical implementation of additional measures remained subject to ongoing discussions within the relevant ICANN community processes.

Registration Data: Progress on the SSAD and Areas of Alignment
The second part of the session addressed ongoing work on the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure of non-public gTLD Registration Data (SSAD), with particular attention to authentication, access to underlying privacy and proxy registration data, response times and accountability.

John McElwaine (IPC) provided an overview of the CSG's perspectives on these issues, noting that recent developments within the SSAD review team had resulted in progress on several matters that had previously presented challenges.

Authentication and access for legitimate requestors
John McElwaine (IPC) began by discussing the authentication of requestors seeking access to non-public registration data.

He explained that the SSAD review team's ongoing work on authentication was expected to focus initially on law enforcement agencies. However, he emphasized the importance of developing a framework that could subsequently accommodate additional categories of legitimate requestors.

These could include other government and intergovernmental authorities, consumer protection agencies, cybersecurity professionals, intellectual property practitioners, brand protection services and other trusted requestors.

He noted that establishing reliable authentication mechanisms could allow recognized categories of requestors to benefit from more efficient processing and potentially faster responses. He clarified

that this would not necessarily mean that all requests from authenticated users would qualify as urgent requests under the applicable policy definitions.

John considered that the development of an authentication framework capable of accommodating additional categories of legitimate requestors represented an important area of alignment between the GAC and CSG.

Access to underlying privacy and proxy registration data
The discussion then turned to requests for registration data where a domain name is registered through a privacy or proxy service.

John McElwaine (IPC) outlined progress within the SSAD review team on facilitating access to underlying registration data for domain names registered through privacy or proxy services, an issue of shared interest to the IPC and GAC. Under the existing Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), such requests could result in responses indicating that the relevant information was already publicly available, without providing an effective means of obtaining the underlying registration data.

A proposal introduced by GAC representatives, which had received support within the SSAD review team and been incorporated into the draft recommendations, would allow requestors to seek disclosure of underlying privacy or proxy registration data through the same system, subject to the applicable disclosure terms. John welcomed this development as an operational improvement and expressed hope that the proposed approach would be retained in the final recommendations.

Response standards, prioritization and accountability
John McElwaine (IPC) discussed the need for clearer response standards and shorter processing times for registration data requests. While the existing Registration Data Policy provides for a response period of up to 30 days, the IPC considered that requests involving serious matters, such as DNS Abuse, trademark infringement and counterfeiting, could warrant faster responses, even where they do not meet the definition of an urgent request.

Drawing on experience with the RDRS, where approved requests received responses in approximately seven to eight days and denied requests in around 16 days, John McElwaine suggested establishing shorter target response times or service-level expectations. While not necessarily creating additional contractual compliance obligations, such targets could provide greater clarity and predictability for requestors.

Discussion of SSAD recommendations and remaining issues
During the discussion, GAC members welcomed the progress achieved within the SSAD review team, particularly on issues that had required extensive deliberations. Canada referred to the upcoming public comment opportunity, expected to begin on 10 November, and thanked John McElwaine (IPC) for his constructive engagement. In turn, John McElwaine acknowledged the contribution of GAC representatives, particularly Canada's role in advancing a proposal concerning access to underlying privacy and proxy registration data.

India emphasized the importance of extending the proposed authentication framework beyond law enforcement agencies to other legitimate requestors, including intergovernmental organizations

and intellectual property rights holders. The delegation also cautioned against duplicating authentication procedures where government systems already provide appropriate verification.

Regarding privacy and proxy registration data, India expressed concern about leaving registrars with broad discretion to accept or consider disclosure requests. The delegation advocated for clear, enforceable obligations requiring registrars to accept and substantively consider properly submitted requests.

In response, John McElwaine clarified that a proposal gaining support within the SSAD review team would establish a mandatory obligation, reflected in the use of "must" in the draft provision. Canada confirmed this understanding, expressed satisfaction with the direction of the discussions and offered to provide further clarification to India outside the session.

Review of Reviews (RoRs): Structural and Accountability Reviews

The final part of the session addressed the sequencing and frequency of future ICANN accountability and structural reviews. Osvaldo Novoa, CSG member of the Cross-Community Group on Review of Reviews, advocated for a comprehensive structural review of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/ACs), including their relationships with ICANN org and the Board, to be conducted before other reviews. He noted that previous efforts to undertake such a review had not been completed and considered the proposed 15-year review cycle too long. In response to a question from GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, he suggested that structural reviews should take place at intervals of no more than ten years, with some favoring a five- or six-year cycle.

Manal Ismail, GAC member and Co-Chair of the Cross-Community Group on Review of Reviews, clarified that the GAC had not yet discussed the proposed structural review arrangements and therefore had no established position. Drawing on discussions within the cross-community group on reviews, she explained that the proposal to conduct the structural review first had not received broad support. The prevailing preference was to begin with the Accountability and Transparency Review, already envisaged under the ICANN Bylaws, while preparing the structural review in parallel and aligning it with ICANN's strategic planning cycle to avoid duplication of efforts. Regarding frequency, the proposed 15-year interval represented a compromise between differing views, taking into account the scope of the review and the time needed to implement its recommendations.

Osvaldo Novoa indicated that further discussions would continue within the CSG and the relevant working group. No GAC position was established on the sequencing or frequency of future reviews.

6. GAC Wrap Up

GAC website agenda page:
https://gac.icann.org/sessions/icann87-session-13-g-gac-communique-or-wrap-up

The GAC held its final session of ICANN87, chaired by GAC Vice-Chair Ian Sheldon on behalf of GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, who had departed the meeting early. The session focused on finalizing the draft ICANN87 GAC Communiqué, reviewing its contents and formally closing the meeting.

6.1. Finalization of the ICANN87 GAC Communiqué

GAC Vice-Chair Marco Hogewoning presented final amendments proposed by the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working Group (HRILWG) to the section of the Communiqué describing its activities.

The amendments covered the Working Group's contributions to the Work Stream 2 Community Coordination Group, its continued efforts to promote sign language interpretation at ICANN meetings, and its support for Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs).

The Working Group also expressed concern about the limited number of IDN applications in the 2026 New gTLD Program Round, noting that the preliminary figure of 21 applications, representing approximately 1.3% of all applications, raised questions about the Round's contribution to linguistic and geographic diversity.

No objections were raised to the proposed amendments, and the text was accepted.

Ian Sheldon then conducted a final section-by-section review of the draft Communiqué, covering the GAC's interconstituency activities, internal matters, Working Group activities, operational developments and Issues of Importance.

The review included sections on the 2026 New gTLD Program Round, Universal Acceptance, DNS Abuse mitigation, registration data accuracy and verification, the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), SSAD and privacy and proxy services accreditation.

The Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU) identified an editorial inconsistency in the heading concerning the 15-day registration data verification timeline. The Chair invited members to communicate any further editorial corrections to GAC Leadership or Support Staff during the final review period.

No further substantive comments or objections were raised, and the GAC concluded its review of the draft Communiqué text.

GAC Support Staff explained that a final editorial review would take place before the text was circulated to GAC Members for the customary review period. An email would confirm the applicable deadline and instructions.

6.2. Closing of ICANN87 and GAC Leadership Transition

Ian Sheldon thanked the Government of Indonesia for hosting ICANN87, as well as the interpreters, transcription services, technical teams and GAC Support Staff for their contributions to the meeting.

He explained that, as Nicolas Caballero had been unable to participate in the closing session, GAC Members and Observers would be invited by email to submit written farewell messages, which would be collected and shared with the outgoing Chair.

Portugal welcomed participants to ICANN88 in Lisbon in March 2027 and encouraged members to reach out with questions or suggestions concerning the upcoming meeting.

Following the formal closure of ICANN87, it was announced that Ian Sheldon had assumed the role of GAC Chair. The Vice-Chairs congratulated him and wished him success in his new responsibilities.

Ian Sheldon thanked members for their confidence and emphasized his openness to suggestions and ideas for the GAC's future work, encouraging members to contact him directly.

The session concluded with an invitation for participants to join a group photograph as a farewell gesture to outgoing GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC Support Staff:** Complete the editorial review of the ICANN87 GAC Communiqué and circulate the revised text to GAC Members for the customary review period, including the applicable deadline and instructions.
- **GAC:** An email will be circulated inviting GAC Members and Observers to submit written farewell messages for outgoing GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, to be collected and shared with him.

Meeting Follow-Up - Notable Post-Meeting Committee Dates to be tracked by support staff:

- Publication of GAC ICANN87 Communiqué - 26 October 2026
- ICANN87 GAC Minutes ~ November 2026
- ICANN87 GAC Agenda Setting Calls (to review preliminary agenda) ~ November 2026 (and potential #2 ~ Early August 2026)

- ICANN88 Community Forum, 13-18 March 2027, Lisbon, Portugal

# # #

Attachment 1 - ICANN87 Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST

	Registrations	Attended (in-person & virtual)
Member Delegations	82	68
Observer Delegations	8	8
Member Delegates	147	102[1]
Observer Delegates	8	8

1. 4 Member delegates attended virtually without registration, 3 of which were the solo delegate of their delegation (Hong Kong (China), Israel, Timor-Leste)

GAC Members (68)		
European Commission	Government of Islamic Republic of Iran	Government of Sao Tome and Principe
Government of Argentina	Government of Israel	Government of Senegal
Government of Armenia	Government of Italy	Government of Serbia
Government of Australia	Government of Japan	Government of Singapore
Government of Bahrain	Government of Kenya	Government of Spain
Government of Bangladesh	Government of Korea, Republic of	Government of Suriname, Republic of
Government of Belgium	Government of Kuwait	Government of Switzerland
Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Government of Lebanon	Government of Tanzania, United Republic of
Government of Brazil	Government of Libya	Government of Thailand
Government of Cameroon	Government of Malaysia	Government of Timor-Leste
Government of Canada	Government of Mali	Government of Togo
Government of China	Government of Mauritania	Government of Trinidad and Tobago
Government of Chinese Taipei	Government of Myanmar, Republic of the Union of	Government of Tunisia
Government of Colombia	Government of Netherlands	Government of Uganda
Government of Cote d'Ivoire	Government of Niger	Government of Ukraine

Government of Croatia	Government of Nigeria	Government of United Arab Emirates
Government of Cyprus	Government of Niue	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government of Denmark	Government of North Macedonia	Government of United States
Government of Egypt	Government of Norway	Government of Vanuatu
Government of Gabon	Government of Paraguay	Government of Zimbabwe
Government of Germany	Government of Papua New Guinea	
Government of Hong Kong (China)	Government of Peru	
Government of India	Government of Portugal	
Government of Indonesia	Government of Russian Federation	

GAC Observers (8)	
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	Smart Africa
Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO)	Universal Postal Union (UPU)
League of Arab States	World Broadcasting Unions (WBU)
Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Attachment 2 - ICANN87 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
1	**New gTLDs Next Round**	**GAC Leadership and Support Staff** to explore organizing intersessional discussions between November 2026 and March 2027 to support GAC Members in reviewing applied-for strings, identifying common public policy concerns and considering coordinated Early Warnings.

2	**New gTLDs Next Round**	**ICANN org** to provide clarification on the interpretation and application of contractual provisions relating to applicable laws and regulations under the relevant safeguard PICs, following consultation with its legal colleagues.
3	**New gTLDs Next Round**	**ICANN org** to share the findings of the ASP monitoring and evaluation activities with the GAC as further survey results and assessments become available. **GAC Members** to encourage relevant ASP applicants to participate in ongoing surveys to support the identification of barriers and lessons learned.
4	**GAC Operational Matters**	**GAC Support** to recirculate information on available cross-community roles and vacancies, including the Independent Review Process-related groups and the ICANN Planning Prioritization Group, and remain available to answer Members' questions.
5	**GAC Operational Matters**	**GAC Leadership and Support** to consolidate and circulate information on available participation opportunities, including responsibilities and expected time commitments, to assist Members in assessing opportunities to volunteer.
6	**GAC Operational Matters**	**GAC Leadership and Support** to continue developing the GAC's approach to implementing the CIP, including the assessment framework, criteria and indicators, with the aim of presenting an agreed approach and initial priorities at ICANN88.
7	**GAC Operational Matters**	**GAC Leadership and Support** to coordinate development of the next Annual Plan through consultation with Topic Leads and the wider GAC membership, followed by leadership review and further consultation, with the aim of endorsement at ICANN88.
8	**GAC Capacity Development**	**GAC Capacity Development Working Group** to share the draft Capacity Development Work Plan with GAC members following ICANN87 for review and consideration.
9	**GAC Capacity Development**	**ICANN org** to address questions regarding objection procedures and associated fees during the second Capacity Development session.
10	**GAC Capacity Development**	**ICANN org** to provide further information on public interest safeguard assessments, including evaluation criteria, consideration of application comments, and publication of results, during the subsequent session on string evaluations.

11	**GAC UA-IDN Working Group**	**GAC Members and Observers** encouraged to participate in UA Day 2027 activities and promote national and regional stakeholder engagement.
12	**GAC UA-IDN Working Group**	**GAC UA-IDN Working Group** to continue supporting the UA Champion initiative and facilitating the exchange of national experiences and best practices.
13	**GAC UA-IDN Working Group**	**GAC Members and interested stakeholders** invited to contribute to UNESCO's monitoring of the 2003 Recommendation on multilingualism in cyberspace.
14	**GAC UA-IDN Working Group**	**ICANN org and interested GAC representatives** to explore further cooperation on UA adoption, technical education, and regional implementation activities.
15	**Meeting with the ICANN Board**	**ICANN Board** to proceed with the planned public comment process on the recommended draft RIR Governance Document following the Board's review.
16	**Meeting with GNSO**	**GAC and GNSO** to continue intersessional engagement on matters of common interest, including follow-up on the outstanding SSAD questions and relevant registration data and DNS Abuse policy issues.
17	**Meeting with ccNSO**	**ccNSO** to share summaries of the World Café discussions with the GAC and ccNSO communities.
18	**GAC Wrap up**	An email to be circulated inviting GAC Members and Observers to submit written farewell messages for outgoing GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero, to be collected and shared with him.