

---

ICANN83 | PF – GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)  
Thursday, June 12, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:15 CEST

NICOLAS CABALLERO Welcome back. Please take your seats. We're about to start. Julia.

JULIA CHARVOLEN Hello and welcome to the ICANN83 GAC Communique Drafting Session 3 out of 6 on Thursday, 12 June at 7:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

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

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. So before we start, let me just give you a very short review of the activities for today. So this is our last day. As everybody knows, we'll be having this Communique Drafting until 10:15. Coffee break, and then we'll be back at 10:45. The session will be running until 12:15. And then a lunch break, and then we'll have another session at 1:45, and

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

---

hopefully by that time we will have already reached, hopefully again, some sort of agreement on the Communique text. We already received it. It is my understanding, Fabien, that we have already received substantial input on the parts of the Communique that needed input from the GAC representatives. So we should be fine, but again, never count your chickens until they hatch, as the old saying goes.

So let's try to be efficient and straight to the point, and of course, nothing precludes any kind of edits, any kind of further suggestions you might or might not have. But the idea is to produce a consistent and robust Communique, if possible, by the end of the third Communique Drafting session. If not, it's still not the end of the world. We'll still have yet another session at 3:30, and that will really be your last chance to reach agreement. That session will be running from 3:30 to 5:00. That will be a full 90-minute session that will be running in parallel to the other parallel session on the working groups, on the how we meet working groups, so to say.

So with that, let me give the floor to Fabien to walk us through the parts of the Communique that, on the one hand, we received text, and on the other hand, on the pathway forward. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Fabien Betremieux from the GAC support team. We're putting the text on the screen, and we're going to scan down the document and, indeed, identify where we stand. I'm just going to pause a second here until you can see the

---

text. We've received, indeed, input on several topics that were discussed yesterday, as well as topics that were identified, but for which there was no text. So let's scroll down.

Introduction, we read yesterday. Inter-constituency activities and community engagement, as well, we've read through all that section. There's just that 1.1 slight edit that we will fix. Then, in terms of internal matters, we've also read that section. In the GAC working groups and the PSWG report, we identified that one paragraph may need to be revisited once we consider text on issues of importance regarding to DNS abuse, so we'll come back to that. GAC operational matters, we've read, as well. Staff has suggested that the second paragraph may not be necessary, so we might want to come back to that at some point. We've read the rest of the section. There was an addition by Egypt on capacity development. We'll get to that, as well.

Issues of importance to the GAC section 4, we've received the text regarding registration data, RDRS, urgent requests, accuracy of registration data. So this is all new text that needs to be read and considered and approved. We've also received text on DNS abuse, still an issue of importance. Regarding next round of new gTLDs, yesterday, the text on IRT was agreed. We've received several edits regarding the Applicant Support Programs, so we'll review those. We have text on GAC readiness, as well, that was added, discussed to some extent, and edited, so we'll need to finalize that text. On

governance of the regional Internet registries, there was text discussed yesterday and agreed. Please go ahead, Marco.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, I'm not sure if everybody's aware, but I saw some comments on the GAC list pertaining by Malaysia on this, so I wonder if Malaysia is in the room to elaborate on their comments that were made on the list.

Very good point, Netherlands. Do we have Malaysia in the room today? Please raise your hand. Malaysia, GAC representative, or online? Do we have Malaysia in the room or online?

GULTEN TEPE

Nico, this is Gulden speaking.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yes.

GULTEN TEPE

Our Malaysia GAC representative just indicated that he's on his way on the chat. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Defer to next session. Let's defer.

- 
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Would you like to go ahead, Malaysia, please? He's on the way. All right, all right, all right. Thank you. Okay, back to you, Marco.
- MARCO HOGEWONING My suggestion is we defer this to the next session and give Malaysia a chance to make it into the room.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Netherlands. Fabien, let's move on with a review of the different sections of the communiqué.
- FABIEN BETREMIEUX So next, community statements of interest. Again, here, text that was agreed, deferral of the fourth ATRT review, same. This is why it's in green, because it was accepted or agreed upon yesterday. We haven't received any edits on those. So let's scroll down now to GAC consensus advice to the ICANN Board. We've received text regarding policy development related to DNS Abuse. So we might want to edit maybe the heading, but we'll discuss that. I believe this is all the text we've received. And so we're in your hands in terms of where you'd like to start. We could start.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO I would suggest to start from the beginning in order to have some logical way forward.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Usually what we do is we start with the most substantive parts, including advice, and we work our way up, starting with the most significant, substantial text where there may be more discussion, and then go towards the top of the communique where items are easier to agree upon or more factual. Does that make sense?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So, do you agree with that? Should we start with the GAC advice? I also agree that this is the most important part. So maybe we should start here. But again, it's up to you in terms of text and the length of the text and everything is we have a lot more text before section five. But from a logical point of view, it would be good to start here. And I have Switzerland and European Commission, Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. And good morning. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland for the record. Just a logistical question. I was trying to get into the Google Doc, and it doesn't really work. I don't know if you've changed the URL now. So maybe it's on my end. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Switzerland is probably some sort of issue with your computer, because the access is still open. So it should be fine. Sorry, European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, Chair. I was just suggesting that since the text of the advice pertains to the same topic, DNS abuse, that we have on issues of importance, I would say that the two need to be read together. Because we have text on DNS abuse in both parts of the communiqué and would make sense to have those read together.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, European Commission. And I agree with you, because that was more or less my thinking at the beginning when I said that we should start there. But again, I'm in your hands. Egypt.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you, Nico. Like Switzerland, we're not able to access the communiqué. So I had the same question.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Yeah, right. So we've verified on our end, and it seems that the link is available. So here when I'm connecting to it from a different session, as not logged into our system, I seem to be able to access it. So I'm a bit challenged at the moment to address your challenge. So what we can do is--

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Let's go back to issues of importance.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Right. So we'll ask our colleagues to look into the technical issue and potentially reach out to you and see if we can help. And in the meantime, we'll use the screen if you don't mind.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, rest assured, we're going to be reading the whole thing and you'll be able to see everything on the screen right here. And by the way, this is one of the beauties or the not so nice fact of not having our own ERP system. But anyways, that's a discussion for some other day. So let's go back to issues of importance. And then we'll come to Section 5, to the consensus advice, given the fact that, as the European Commission correctly pointed out, they are directly related. So if you can scroll up, please.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Right. So let's go to issues of importance on DNS abuse. Right. So we'll read that part, then come back to the advice and then go work our way up again. So it's Section 2. There you go. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

DNS abuse. Okay, this is Section 2. And for the read, I'm going to read this part and then I will request kindly request my vice chairs to help me with the reading. That is Egypt, Australia, Netherlands, Colombia is not here. But I swear to God the next time he shows up we'll make him work big time. That's for sure. So, Tiago, if you're listening, Colombia we'll be waiting for you for Oman. So this is



DNS abuse. This is part two of Section 2, if I'm if I'm not mistaken. Right. Section 2, topic number 2.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Section 4. The importance.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I got confused with the other one. Yeah, yeah. You're right. Section 4, topic 2, DNS abuse.

DNS abuse remains a significant concern for governments involved in ICANN. The GAC welcomed last year's contract amendments, establishing obligations for contractual parties to mitigate and disrupt DNS abuse as a first step. Further work is necessary, however, to stem the increasing cost to the public of phishing, malware, botnets and other forms of DNS abuse.

During the ICANN83 DNS abuse session, the GAC appreciated learning about the anti-abuse practices from the local host country code top level domain, ccTLD, cz.nic, and the latest analysis and findings reported by Interisle. These interventions underscored the vast scale of phishing campaigns, the substantial costs imposed on society and the critical importance of proactive DNS abuse prevention and mitigation. The rapid weaponization of domain names used for phishing campaigns makes swift action essential. The GAC continuously explores a wide range of options, including proactive practices, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, and links between addressing DNS abuse and work on

---

domain name registration data. Can you scroll down a little bit, please?

The GAC is pleased that several community stakeholder groups share its view that more work is needed to address DNS abuse. Continued efforts are necessary and the upcoming new round of generic top-level domains, (gTLDs) set to open next year, underscores the urgency to act swiftly.

In particular, the GAC has discussed, both before and during ICANN83, several proposals for further policy work. These discussions involved representatives from the NetBeacon Institute, which recently issued a white paper proposing different PDPs to address DNS abuse and the Contracted Parties House. It is encouraging to see that the GNSO small team on DNS abuse plans to deliver its recommendations on this topic before the next ICANN meeting. The GAC believes that the full spectrum of ideas so far discussed, including both proactive and reactive measures, deserves attention.

The discussion has included specific issue areas, such as associated domain checking, bulk registrations, gating APIs, investigating subdomains, public reporting of abuse statistics, the relationship between the timelines of registration data verification and DNS abuse, and transparency reporting obligations. Given the time constraints leading up to the next application round for new gTLDs, the GAC recommends prioritizing specific topics as outlined in the GAC's advice.

And let me stop here in order to see if we have comments, questions, or edits. Okay, I don't see any hand online or in the room. And let me check once again, just in case, to make sure. And I see the CTU. Go ahead, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Nigel Cassimire, CTU. The second paragraph, the last sentence, is kind of long and I got lost in it. Yes. The GAC continuously explores a wide range of options, including proactive practices, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, and links between addressing DNS abuse and work on domain name registration data. This is the last part. I'm a little confused with the ands. The last option, is it links between addressing DNS abuse and work on domain name registration data?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

It is my understanding that that should be the point. Because when you talk about registration data, and again, the linkage between addressing that DNS abuse, which is basically-- sorry.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Maybe if we change that and, just before links, to as well as, that might make it a little--

- 
- NICOLAS CABALLERO      Okay, so it would read, the GAC continuously explores a wide range of options, including proactive practices, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, as well as between addressing DNS abuse and work on domain name registration data.
- NIGEL CASSIMIRE      As well as links. As well as--
- NICOLAS CABALLERO      I'm sorry. Yeah, yeah. As well as links. I'm sorry. I didn't see that. I'm reading a little bit. It's kind of far away. So, thank you. Yes. Would that be okay for everyone? Anybody against? All right. So, thank you, CTU. Thank you. Any other comment? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on, please, Fabien. Let's scroll down and get to the next part we need to address.
- NIGEL CASSIMIRE      Right. So, we're going to go to the advice, since this issue of importance refers to the advice on the same topic.
- NICOLAS CABALLERO      Perfect. Thank you so much. And for this, I will kindly ask my colleague from Australia to give me a hand. Would you please go ahead, Ian?

---

IAN SHELTON

Thank you, Nico. 1. Policy development. A, the GAC advises the Board to direct the GNSO to develop and publish an issues report prior to ICANN84 addressing the following: The bulk registration of malicious domain names and the ability of registrars to investigate domains associated with registrant accounts that are the subject of actionable reports of DNS abuse.

Rationale. Before new strings are added to the DNS as a result of the next round, further work on DNS abuse is needed to stem the increasing cost to the public of phishing, malware, botnets, and other forms of DNS abuse. Further, the GAC strongly supports a significant shift and step change in how PDPs are conducted at ICANN and encourages policy work that is targeted and clearly scoped to achieve results according to shorter timelines.

The GAC appreciates the wealth of proposals for further policy work recently expressed by different parts of the community and maintains they all deserve attention. Can you please scroll up? The GAC supports multi-stakeholder action to achieve consensus policy outcomes and encourages, for the time being, prioritization of specific issues such as malicious use of bulk registrations. Given this timeline, the GAC encourages progress on commencing narrowly scoped PDPs between ICANN83 and ICANN84.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

And we'll pause here in order to see if we have comments or edits. As you know, this has to do with our comments or my comments yesterday about the guy parachuting from Andromeda Galaxy and

asking what the timelines, and the policy development processes were expedited or not expedited, or any kind of PDP and the time it takes and the seven years. There was an example yesterday. I'm not going to get into the details, but you understand what the point is, right? I mean, seven years for a PDP. And I have two hands. One from Netherlands and I understand that's a hand as well, Switzerland, right? Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the record and good morning, colleagues. It's Marco speaking for the Netherlands. Question to the authors of this text and towards clarification. It's still really early. I'm only on my second cup of coffee. But considering that we kind of have a layered advice here, we advise the Board to direct the GNSO. I have a bit of trouble understanding the prior to ICANN84. Do we want the Board to instruct the GNSO prior to ICANN84 or do we want the actual report published before ICANN 84? So, I think a bit of clarification on that text and a bit of text editing could help in making sure that we get the desired results. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Yes. Thank you, Nico. I'm struggling with finding the Zoom link. So, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. This is a piece of

---

advice and we are seeing it for the first time. I think I would ask for some time to digest it. I have even less coffee in my veins than Marco. So, I struggle and I have many questions. Like, is the Board really entitled to direct the GNSO? Is that the language we use? And then the language of the advice is a bit vague in my humble opinion.

So, I'm not sure whether we could be more precise both on what we want the Board to ask from the GNSO. It should be the GNSO council, I guess. And, yeah, because the rationale is more precise. So, I think probably it needs some reworking or at least some digesting on my part. And I would ask that we don't lose too much time right now with it, because I guess I'm not the only one in this situation. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

If I may, from the GAC support team, as a matter of process, our understanding is that an issue report is drafted by ICANN staff and then provided to the GNSO Council for initiation of the PDP work. So to your question, it wouldn't be the GNSO Council that would conduct the work of the issue report. So that's one aspect. And you also referred to how does that work for the request of an issue report. And so that's in the ICANN Bylaws Annex A, Section 3, I believe.

There is the possibility for the Board to request an issue report, for the GNSO Council to request an issue report, and for advisory committees as well. So you may want to look in that section if you

---

wanted more details on how that works. And then just one suggestion as far as the heading of this advice. Should we then complement policy development and add on DNS abuse for clarity or on DNS abuse mitigation? It's just a question for clarity.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

It's a good question. I would keep it more general because this is not the only part of the full spectrum with which we have an issue with the time, not only with time, but there are many other issues as well, participation, chairing, and so on and so forth. But the main point, as far as I can see, at least, and this is the first time I'm reading this as well, has to do with the timing being the gist of it, right? But again, I'm in your hands. I see a hand from the European Commission. Please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you, chair. And thank you, colleagues. I think it's very good to have feedback because this is an important piece of advice. So to clarify a couple of things, the advice is focused on DNS abuse. So it is policy development related to DNS abuse, although the considerations regarding the fact that policy development should happen in a more efficient way and swiftly is a general consideration, but this advice pertains to DNS abuse.

Then in terms of the objective, I think Fabien explained very clearly the fact that an issue report is a first step towards a policy development process in case an issue is found. We kind of doubt



---

that an issue would not be found as regards DNS abuse on the topics we have identified, so that the issue report would be the beginning of a policy development process. The idea of the Board requesting the issue report, it's because, and perhaps again, this has not been properly explained in Russian, so we welcome feedback, is that so many parts of the community are calling for additional policy work. And from our point of view, the Board is the best place considering that this is a general understanding that more work is needed.

And then as regards the question from the Netherlands, the original idea was to have the report prior to ICANN84, so to have the possibility to discuss it at ICANN84. So if language is not clear, perhaps this should, not that this would be requested prior to ICANN84, but to have possibly the report in place before ICANN84 or at ICANN84 for discussion. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. I personally don't see any kind of problem as establishing or trying to establish some clear timelines, given the fact that so many things have been dragging on for way too long, again, in my humble opinion, but it's up to us to decide, right? It's up to you to decide. As a matter of fact, I don't vote. My opinions are irrelevant because I'm in your hands, as I always say. But the clearer, I would say, the better, especially in times of timing, because that's the issue we all point out all the time, I would say. But Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. And thank you, Gemma, for the clarifications. I think there are many procedural questions that are open, and thanks also, Fabien, for illustrating us on the possibilities to request an issues report. Maybe if I may suggest that this is parked for the moment, and that Gemma also talks with our very able other interested delegations, so that we make sure that we use the right procedural way, because otherwise we get into places we don't want to be, losing time with questions on process.

And for instance, if we ourselves can request an issues report, and that is clear, maybe we should consider that as a possibility. Or if we don't want to do that, and we can, but we prefer to ask the Board, maybe we have to explain why and the rationale. So, yeah, it's a number of issues. I think it's well intentioned, and we have no issue with that. But let's try to do it right. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. And I don't have a problem with that. We can park this have more discussions during the coffee break, or I don't know, hallway conversations, no problem whatsoever. So we park this, move on with the less controversial, let's say, sections of the communiqué. And then after that good cappuccino conversation, we come back to this. Would that be a good way

forward? And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Perfect. So let's do just that. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So maybe we can go back to the top of the issues of importance section, and consider the text on registration data and work our way down the section that way.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

That sounds good to me. And for this, I will kindly ask my distinguished colleague from Egypt to help me, Vice Chair, by the way, Christine, to help me with the reading. Christine, over to you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Yes, thank you, Nico. Good morning. 1. Registration data. A, RDRS. The GAC looks forward to reviewing the final report of the RDRS Standing Committee foreseen to be ready in August 2025. The GAC expresses its concerns regarding the reduced use of the tool in light of the departure of certain registrars from the pilot, and reiterates its recommendation that RDRS participation should be made mandatory for all gTLD registrars to increase its utility. The GAC also welcomes the increased use of the tool by law enforcement requesters, as per the latest metrics report of May 2025, and renews its call for the RDRS to continue operating beyond its pilot period, and for enhancements to be made to the RDRS, as previously identified by both the ICANN Board and the GAC, including

---

improved integration and requests related to privacy and proxy services.

To that end, the GAC welcomes the Board's comment during ICANN83 that ICANN is developing an analysis of which envisioned enhancements to the RDRS would require new policy development, and which could be completed based on existing recommendations or policies. The GAC looks forward to ICANN completing this review and sharing it with the community as soon as possible. As the GAC expect, it will be useful in outlining possible next steps.

Further, the GAC notes that work on authentication solutions for law enforcement requesters is proceeding in the urgent requests work track. The GAC reiterates that one important enhancement to the RDRS would be to ensure it can incorporate these future authentication solutions. Promoting awareness and education regarding the RDRS should also remain an important priority.

Can we go down? To that end, it may be warranted to contemplate policy requiring links to RDRS or successor systems from registration data directory services. The GAC further emphasizes the need to improve the RDRS platform's usability, particularly for small actors and first-time requesters, through user interface enhancements and clearer guidance for users. And I'll stop here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt. So let's pause here in order to see if there are edits, comments, or any kind of clarification that might be needed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Maybe one comment from the GAC support team for accuracy and precision. Our understanding is that it is an initial report that is expected by August that will then be open for public comments and may lead to a final report. Eventually, that will be communicated with the GNSO Council. So we suggest that a reference to final report here be changed to either report or initial report, just to set expectations that it won't be the final report.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that. Where would that be? Can you highlight the text in that part? Ah, final report, okay. Yeah, because it's not the final report. It's going to be a preliminary report, right? So maybe we should address that little detail, if okay with everyone, of course. So should we put preliminary report or, I don't know, or first draft or something like that? And I have Netherlands. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

That was a different topic, not on the word final. I've got another comment.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX	And so I think our suggestion would be, at the very least, to just remove final. So report leaves it open to whatever, however it's going to be called, just for consideration.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you. I have the USA. Sorry, is that an old hand, Netherlands? Is that an old hand? Sorry, yeah.
MARCO HOGEWONING	I've got another comment. I'm holding until we resolve this. Thank you.
OWEN FLETCHER	Hi, Owen Fletcher. Thank you. How about saying we look forward to reviewing the draft final report? It does seem useful to indicate that the report in question is the final report, although it may be amended after the comment period. Thanks.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, USA. Netherlands?
MARCO HOGEWONING	Yeah, sorry for the confusion. Again, it's a lack of coffee. It's got nothing to do with the text by itself. But having it right in front of me, this is a huge block of text. And I would seriously call upon all authors to consider that not everybody's English is fluent when reading this. And this almost scares me. May I suggest that in

---

between existing recommendations or policies, we put a line break and then start a new paragraph saying the GAC looks forward to ICANN completing to at least visually break up the text. I'm also open from native speakers to other suggestions how to make this slightly easier to read for non-natives. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So thank you for that, Netherlands. Where would that exactly happen? Right there? Right after the full stop?

MARCO HOGEWONING

My initial thinking is indeed this, but open to other suggestions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

So how about now? Would that be better? So basically, you want to avoid long paragraphs, right? Long chunks of text. But you don't have an issue with the content itself so far. All right. Anybody has an issue with any part of the content other than the edits. I don't see any hand. Anybody in the room? There are no hands online. And we have a recommendation to separate on a different spot. From Australia, would you like to speak to that?

IAN SHELDON

Sorry. Thank you, Ian Sheldon, Australia. I probably recommend breaking before further. So to keep that line with the previous paragraph and break there. Yes. Mostly because that sentence talks about this review, and it's better to keep that sentence with

---

the previous paragraph if you're not referring directly to the review.  
Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much for that, Australia. I have India next.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. Just a thought on which I would expect comment from other GAC members. Making RDRS mandatory for the registrars. This has been a conversation which GAC has been recording in almost past two or three communique. But we have not heard anything so far from the ICANN Board. So I don't know, will it be right to issue some advice on the ICANN Board to make the RDRS mandatory? Because that's the only platform which is going to be in force, I think. I guess SSAD is parked, I mean, forever. So I would be of the opinion that we should issue an advice to the Board on whatever, I mean, in whatever other form, so that there is a clear intent of the GAC to make RDRS mandatory as soon as possible by the Board. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India, for that. And just as a word of caution. I mean, we can, of course, give advice on that. But my humble recommendation would be to try to develop some sort of process or discussions like a small process, and do it for Oman or something like that in order to have enough time, because just as a word of caution, because we will need to discuss advice is a little bit more



---

complicated than issues of importance. I mean, in terms of the different sections of the communique. I don't have a problem with that. And as a matter of fact, I agree with you. But just a word of caution. Go ahead, India.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. I think point well noted. I don't want to hurry up for this. Maybe I take your point that whatever process we have to follow, but it would be more than keen to if someone, if any other GAC member can enlighten us as to what process needs to be followed, we're more than happy to follow that process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. And again, I mean, we could have done this if it had been Wednesday or Tuesday or something, the suggestion had been made, like a little bit before, but we only have three more hours. So being realistic, I don't really think we will achieve agreement for providing advice at this point. We can try, of course, but we might end up having dinner all together at 2am in the morning and still not have. It happened before, I'm telling you. You know, it happened before. But again, I'm in your hands. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. I think as the colleague from India has expressed, this is a strong wish from the GAC. The point that about not issuing advice on this is the moment is that officially RDRS is

---

still a pilot, and you cannot make mandatory a pilot. We have, I think, made very clear on a few occasions that we want this to be mandatory, that technical features need to be improved. And we also had expressed on several occasions that the possibility for ccTLDs to join should be contemplated. But to make advice on a pilot, I don't think it would lead us anywhere, because the reply would be we haven't yet finalized the pilot. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, European Commission. And that's even before having any kind of discussion with the full GAC. So it would have been a little bit more complicated. Is that an old hand, India?

SUSHIL PAL

Not really. I think if then maybe, again, not for this communique, but we need to consult among ourselves, because the pilot was meant to be for two years. And if this is the system we are looking at enhancement, then we should call an end to the pilot and look for the further strengthening of the system as soon as possible. That's the point. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, India. Thank you, European Commission. I have the USA next.

OWEN FLETCHER

Owen Fletcher, United States. I will withhold suggesting any comment on the process for developing advice. But I would note that, as is indicated in the text, the Board has expressed interest in this same goal, and among other enhancements to the RDRS. And since they are developing a review that would outline how they think it might be possible to achieve that range of outcomes, I would suggest we see what's in that report before considering whether this is potentially content for advice at Oman. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I agree with that. And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Anybody has strong feelings in this regard? I don't see any hand. Okay, perfect. Thank you so much. Thank you again, USA, India, European Commission. Let's move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, in this next subsection under issues of importance, registration data is urgent requests for disclosure of registration data.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Fabien. And for this, I will kindly ask once again the help of my good friend from the Netherlands. Marco, please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. So, item B, Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data. The GAC appreciates recent progress made in the two parallel tracks of work regarding urgent requests for

---

disclosure of domain name registration data. In the authentication track, the GAC supports the ongoing efforts of the PSWG to develop technical mechanisms to authenticate the identities of law enforcement requesters submitting urgent requests. The GAC appreciates the participation of ICANN community members in the practitioners group established by the PSWG to work on this issue, as well as the ongoing collaboration of ICANN staff whose expertise has been invaluable in the exploration of potential solutions.

In the policy track, the GAC urges rapid progress in the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team, IRT, discussions regarding the timeline for responses to authenticated urgent requests. The GAC urges the IRT to advance its discussions promptly as the IRT has not yet resolved the timeline for responses to urgent requests after its three 90-minute discussions to date, including a meeting at ICANN83. The GAC reiterates its position that given the vital public safety interest related to urgent requests, responding to such requests within 24 hours is considered an appropriate timeline, which is also in line with ICANN's proposal for consideration by the IRT. The GAC encourages exploration of what conditions would facilitate contracted parties processing urgent requests within this timeline.

The GAC intends to continue following both work tracks. Swift progress is essential, as the GAC notes that after its advice in the ICANN79 San Juan communique issued 15 months ago, and despite the GAC's follow-up on previous advice in the ICANN80

---

Kigali Communique, the policy regarding urgent requests is still not in place. I believe that's it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that. Is that all the text we have? Can you scroll down a little bit? Okay, okay. So I do have an editorial recommendation there. Issued 15 months, the last paragraph, the very last paragraph, right? When it says advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communique issued 15 months ago. Not sure we need to specify that, because otherwise we would also need to address the Kigali communique issued a year ago or something in order to have some sort of consistency. No strong feelings about that, it's just a minor detail. I can leave with it, no problem, but you know. So let me pause here in order to see if there are other comments. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

As I was reading, I think I spotted a small editorial, I think, as the ongoing collaboration with ICANN Staff.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Any other editorial comment or substantive or whatever kind of comment you might have or edit, CTU?

---

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

Thank you, Chair. Nigel Cassimire. The issued 15 months ago, I read that to emphasize that faster action was expected because the sentence begins, swift progress is essential. As the GAC knows after his advice in that communique, issued 15 months ago, and despite follow-up, the urgent request is still it's not yet done. So I think I read that as kind of emphasizing that we really need swift progress and 15 months doesn't cut it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Perfect. Perfect. So just for the record, I don't have a problem with that. But yeah. Any other? Any other comment? I don't see any hand online. I don't see any hand in the room, which means that we're in agreement here. So basically, as we've been doing all the text that has been already being agreed upon will be highlighted in green. So again, one last chance. Everything all right? We're okay with this text? Perfect. Thank you so much. Let's move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

And the last subsection under issues of importance, registration data, accuracy of registration data.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so I'll be reading this accuracy of registration data. The GAC continues to emphasize the importance of accuracy in domain registration data. The GAC remains concerned about the pause in the work of the accuracy scoping team since 2022, and it

---

encourages the new GNSO small team on accuracy to learn from the lessons of that exercise. At the same time, the GAC welcomes the separate preliminary ideas shared during ICANN83 by the GNSO regarding the work of the new GNSO small team covering possible next steps on accuracy based on responses given by the GAC and other community members to the GNSO's recent threshold questions.

In particular, the guy notes with interest the idea to investigate shortening the timeline for registrars to perform registration data validation and verification. The current timeline under the registrar accreditation agreement is 15 days. However, presenters during the ICANN83 briefing on DNS abuse observed that attempts to mitigate phishing attacks require swift action because cyber criminals often register many new domains in just a few hours, exploit them, profit from abusive activities, and abandon those domains within just a few days.

The GAC looks forward to receiving information about the final recommendations made by the GNSO small team and any other possible next steps on accuracy. In addition, the GAC noted the explanations provided by the Board during ICANN83 regarding accuracy-related requirements in ICANN's contracts and looks forward to additional details as discussed in the session regarding how ICANN ensures compliance with the full set of accuracy requirements. The GAC also welcomes further information from contracted parties on their practices related to accuracy. The GAC notes that receiving further details and clarifications to address

---

questions from GAC members would be helpful to inform continued discussions within the GAC.

And I'll pause here in order to see if there are comments or questions. One thing I noticed is that we also need, we might need to separate paragraphs here in order to make it a little bit easier to read because otherwise it's some sort of marathon, paragraph marathon kind of thing. But anyways, let me pause here. And I have the USA.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you, Owen Fletcher, United States. How about breaking where the text turns from darker to the lighter pink, where it says 'the GAC looks forward to'. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Looks way better, in my opinion. The floor is still open. Edits, comments, questions. Jamaica, please go ahead.

WAHKEEN MURRAY

Morning, everyone. Wahkeen Murray from Jamaica, for the record. The first sentence, it's not immediately clear to me what exercise we're encouraging persons to learn from. So it reads, and it encourages the new GNSO small team on accuracy to learn from the lessons of that exercise. So it's not immediately clear what exercise we're referring to.



NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jamaica. Good point. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

My understanding-- oh, I see there's a hand raised.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you. So the exercise thing refers to the work of the accuracy scoping team, which has been a long process. And they issued a report. Ultimately, there were also several written contributions that went into the report. So it's, I would say, a compilation of reports, which in the end, had no conclusion for a series of reasons that were discussed also partially during the session. And hence, the whole exercise of the accuracy scoping team has been a kind of a big failure being imposed now from 2022.

So we mentioned to the GNSO that it would be important that the new work takes into account what happened previously. Because they posed a team, now they launched a new team. And it's important that the new team just doesn't start from scratch, but takes into account what happened earlier. And especially what were the points that led to a sort of failure. But exercise refers to

the accuracy scoping team. If it's not clear, I mean, we can add it, I think.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for the explanation, European Commission.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Sorry, my colleague suggests perhaps experience could be, I don't know, but differing to--

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, I was going to suggest the word experience as well. So this is telepathy, but yeah, I'm glad we're on the same page. So maybe experience would do it. I have Netherlands next.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Sorry to add another option, but maybe then, to adjust Jamaica's comments, maybe just say, learn from the lessons of previous work. Instead of having exercise or experience, simply state that this has been done before. So either say previous work or the previous small team. Also emphasizing that this has been done before.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Well, that's my understanding of experience. But again, I don't have any kind of hard feelings in that regard. So which way should we go? Should we say accuracy to learn from the lessons of that

---

exercise, of that experience, or of that previous work? What should we do? The floor is still open. I don't have any hand online. Can you please read the comment from Qatar in the Zoom room, Benedetta?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Yes, of course. We have a comment from Qatar in the Zoom room, noting experience is more suitable.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Qatar. Not because it was my idea, but if okay with everybody, I would stick to experience. But again, no hard feelings, no problem whatsoever. Which way should we go? We have three options, right? Accuracy to learn of that exercise, of that experience, or of that previous work. If you don't decide, I'll decide, you know.

All right, let's go with experience. Unless the UK has any sort of Shakespearean kind of suggestion. Previous experience would also work. Previous experience. Would that be okay with everyone? And I see thumbs up, and I see nodding. That would do it then. Okay, so let's go with previous experience. All right, so I'm not going to read the whole thing again. So let's scroll down. Are we okay with the second paragraph? Sorry, the UK. Go ahead, please.

---

ESTHER JAROMITSKI      MARGARETHE      Thank you, Nico. We are thinking about potentially it would be a good idea to add a little short sentence after just a few days. And that would read, this is increasingly exacerbated by the use of AI. As the presenters discussed how quickly AI tools are making it possible to create domains within even shorter timeframes now. If that would be.

NICOLAS CABALLERO      But how would that read? Thank you for that, UK, but how would that read? Do you have an idea?

ESTHER JAROMITSKI      MARGARETHE      Yes, so the few days ends, and then it's a new sentence. And it says, this is increasingly exacerbated by the use of AI.

NICOLAS CABALLERO      Okay, so let me read that part. Let me read that addition. So it should be after the full stop, right?

ESTHER JAROMITSKI      MARGARETHE      After the full stop, yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO      All right, so it would read, this is increasingly exacerbated by the use of AI. As the presenters discussed how quickly AI tools are

making it possible to create domains within even shorter timeframes now.

ESTHER JAROMITSKI      MARGARETHE      I think that we can just stop at use of AI, full stop, and then the rest is self-explanatory, I think, yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO      Thank you so much, UK. Is everyone okay with that addition? Anybody against? Okay, perfect. No other. Oh, sorry, US, go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER      Thanks, Owen Fletcher, United States. If we keep the sentence, could we still indicate in it that this is information given by the presenters, the same ones referenced in the previous sentence? Perhaps this is increasingly exacerbated by the use of AI as discussed by the presenters. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO      Thank you, US. I'll read just that part, right? So it would read, however, presenters during the ICANN83 briefing on DNS abuse observed that attempts to mitigate phishing attacks require swift action because cyber criminals often register many new domains in just a few hours, exploit them, profit from abusive activities, and abandon those domains within just a few days. This is increasingly exacerbated by the use of AI as discussed by the presenters. Full stop. Good, show me some thumbs up or something or some

nodding. Anybody against? Okay, and I see nodding and thumbs up, which is very helpful. Thank you so much. So Fabien, back to you, let's move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So we've addressed, if we scroll down, we've addressed DNS abuse as part of the issues of importance. The text was agreed and highlighted in green. So now we're moving on to section three, next round of new gTLDs, where we have agreed already on the first subsection, implementation review team. So now we're moving to Applicant Support Program, where we've received two pieces of input.

So the second paragraph that is now bracketed was proposed to be replaced by the paragraph immediately underneath. And this was proposed by India, Canada, and the Netherlands. And then at the bottom of the text, there is additional text that was proposed, and maybe Benedetta, do you want to speak to the last paragraph, the very last paragraph of that section? Yes. Because I think there was a proposal, an initial proposal that then was further discussed. So maybe we can discuss the details when we get to it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Yeah, yeah, yeah, I was going to suggest that. So let's concentrate on the two options we have so far. I'll read both paragraphs, and then we'll decide which one to keep, if okay with everyone. Who's selecting? Okay, okay, let me read that then. So the first option we

---

have would read, the GAC recalls that the ICANN Org has expressed its willingness to share the statistics of applications in draft and initiated stage to the GAC representatives of that country. The GAC notes that this data be shared with the GAC representatives with the consent of the applicants so that necessary assistance and support can be provided to the concerned applicant.

So that's the first version of the text, the first option we have on the table. The second would read, the second would read, the GAC recalls that country level statistics can be made available by the relevant ICANN government stakeholder engagement team if requested by a GAC member in their region. The GAC notes that this data will only be shared with the consent of applicants so that the relevant government can assist with targeted outreach and support. So we have option A, let's say, the first one, and option B. Which way should we go is a question for the floor.

Okay, I just learned that this is actually, that there's actually consensus for this paragraph that they have already discussed this paragraph. I mean, the authors of the different countries that were involved in producing this text and that there's no need for further discussion unless you tell me otherwise, of course. But so far, in other words, we don't have options A and B. We only have the newer version, which is option B, let's say, or the second paragraph. Is everyone okay with that second paragraph? Any comment or edit? Anything we might need to change?

---

I'll read it again just in case. It says the GAC recalls that country level statistics can be made available by the relevant ICANN government stakeholder engagement team, sorry, if requested by a GAC member in the region. The GAC notes that this data will only be shared with the consent of applicants so that the relevant government can assist with targeted outreach and support. Full stop. Are we happy with this? Okay, I see no hand. I see there's one hand. Papua New Guinea, please go ahead.

RUSSELL WORUBA

Thank you, Chair, and good morning, colleagues. Russell Woruba from Papua New Guinea. I think I agree with the team that the second one is more clear, and I believe that's the consensus they reached. ICANN Org in the first one, but it's the government SE team that's the one that's giving input. I think at the operational level, I think it's Chris and the team that Tracy is communicating with, like us from the region. We don't have any applicant yet from the Pacific. We've talked to the forum, but no one has come forward to give, probably because of business case or all that thing. So that's where it has to be clear that the government stakeholder engagement team be the one that would clear in this case. Thank you.



NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for the comment, Russell. Any other comment? If not, back to you, Fabien, and thank you again, everyone, and thank you for reaching consensus on that little piece of text. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So then if we scroll down to the end of this text, there was new input. So our understanding is that yesterday, the rest of the text was agreeable, not agreed, but agreeable. And there was this last paragraph that's highlighted here that I'm highlighting again, in addition, one additional layer of highlighting for discussion. This is new text. And so maybe, Benedetta, do you want to speak to who proposed it and further feedback on it?

BENEDETTA ROSSI

Thank you, Fabien. Yes, we received the text that is, as Fabien said, further highlighted. So the furthermore, the GAC shares ALAC's concern. That paragraph was submitted this morning prior to the session by Timor-Leste. And then that was submitted on the GAC mailing list and as a proposed addition to end the Applicant Support Program section. And then the topic lead, Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU, responded again on the GAC mailing list, since she's not able to be in the room until the next session, noting, I put it in the comment. I don't know if you want me to read it, Nico.

So Tracy wrote that I believe the current ASP communicate text appropriately reflects the sentiments you're raising with a suggested additional text. And we do not wish to sound

---

unnecessarily repetitive in conveying the point. However, I will invite colleagues to weigh in appropriately. My colleague, Nigel Cassimire in the CTU, may be well positioned to assist in this regard, as I will unfortunately be in another session this morning. With regard to adding the specific aspect of sharing ALAC's concern into the text, it is my understanding that following the GAC-ALAC bilateral at ICANN83, an intersessional discussion between interested GAC and ALAC members will be held, which may result in a substantive output. So a joint letter, which the GAC will of course be invited to review and potentially support through consensus.

It is at this stage we can perhaps more effectively and comprehensively communicate any shared concerns that both the GAC and the ALAC have with the current status of the ASP. When he refers to the current text, it's the text that's above, i.e., not with the paragraph added to more listing.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

My God, that's a lot of background for such a small piece of text. Anyways, we're running out of time, so I recommend we stop here. We get some good coffee and some hallway conversations, and then we go back and we start right there. If everyone agrees, of course. Any problem with that? Okay, so let's stop here. Please be back in the room at 10:45 and make sure to bring some extra espresso or something in order to be energetic for the next session. Thank you so much. Let's pause here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]