
ICANN84 | AGM – ICANN84 GAC Communique Drafting (3 of 6)
Wednesday, October 29, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC Communiqué Drafting Session on Wednesday, 29th of October at 15:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. With that, I will hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Cabellero.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. So here we are. This is the fourth, if I'm not mistaken. Let me check. this is the fourth Communiqué Drafting Session. We're going to have 60 minutes for this session, and then right after the coffee break, another 60 minutes running from 4:30 to 5:30. So, let's see how we do during these 60 minutes. And for that, I'll hand over the floor to Fabien, who's going to walk us through the details of the things we still need to cover so far. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. So, we left off on the Regional Internet Registries discussion, where we understand work is still ongoing to finalize the text. So, that was an issue of importance. So, we suggest that we park that and come back to that when the differences are resolved. In the meantime, we're suggesting maybe to a warm-up, before

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.

diving back into some substantive discussion, to go through internal matters and specifically start in the Strategic Planning Session. You may recall that the purpose of this section in this Communiqué, in the Dublin Communiqué, is to endorse the new 2025-2026 GAC Annual Plan. So, we've proposed text to that effect here.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much, Fabien. And for this, I will kindly ask my colleague from Switzerland to help us with the reading. Would you please go ahead, Jorge? Section 4, GAC Strategic Planning.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Nicolas was just munching the delicious snacks from our Japanese friends. GAC Strategic Planning. As part of the continued implementation of its Strategic Plan 2024-2028, the GAC finalized and endorsed its new 2025-2026 Annual Plan, which lays out expected outcomes over the next year for each of the nine GAC strategic objectives in the following areas. 1. Role for governments in ICANN. 2. Effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee. 3. Future rounds of new gTLDs. 4. DNS abuse. 5. Domain registration data. 6. Universal acceptance. 7. Impact of new technology on Internet Unique Identifier Systems. 8. Internet Governance Awareness. 9. Internet Number Resources.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much for that, Switzerland. We have already discussed, we have already reviewed, we have already agreed in

terms of the contents of the Strategic Plan, so I really think we don't need to review it again. So, if everyone is okay with this text, we will just green it and proceed. Unless, of course, unless I see any hand in the room or online. This shouldn't be controversial so far because it's something already discussed. So, again, for the sake of clarity, simplicity and efficiency, I recommend we green it and move on. Unless anybody tells me otherwise. And I see no hands in the room. I have a hand from Argentina. Please go ahead.

MARINA EIRAS

Thanks, Chair. Argentina, for that record. I'm just wondering which were the changes made to the GAC Strategic Plan, if there were any, because I remember that we were about to endorse it the other day and there was a section maybe related to the ASP, I don't remember, that, or whose text was subject to any change.

MARCO HOGEWONING

thank you for that question. For the record, this is Marco speaking on behalf of the Netherlands. I indeed suggested we should look at it, but in the end we've decided to agree as the text as is, so no further changes were made to the text that was presented before the meeting.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you for that, Netherlands. Would that answer your question, Argentina?

MARINA EIRAS

Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Perfect. Any other comment or question regarding topic number four, GAC Strategic Planning? No hands, so let's move on. Please green the text and move on. Then we have topic number five, which is capacity development, and for that I will kindly ask my colleague from Egypt, Christine Arida, to help me with the reading.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sure, Nico. So on number five, capacity development, it reads, during ICANN 84, the GAC had three capacity development sessions. Two sessions were dedicated to the new gTLD program next round, including interactive discussions with ICANN work on the applicant's journey, public interest commitments, PICs, registry voluntary commitments, RVCs, and GAC early warnings. GAC members also shared experiences and perspectives from the 2012 round of new gTLDs, stressing the importance of early engagement in the application and evaluation processes and consensus building. To this end, the future targeted capacity development initiatives may assist the GAC in preparing for its defined role in the next round. Other topics discussed in capacity development sessions were artificial intelligence and its possible uses in the DNS and the GNSO policy development processes. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Egypt, for that. I'll open the floor for comments or questions at this point as regarding this paragraph. Any objection? I don't see any hand online. I don't see any hand in the room. No objections. So thank you very much. Please green it, green the text, and let's move forward. Thank you very much for that. Fabien, can you walk us through the other parts of the communicate that we still need to cover?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Absolutely. So then let's scroll back down to issues of importance. So we'll go over in the next round of new gTLDs a new section we've added, which was proposed by WIPO regarding IGO protections, but I think we're waiting for Brian to join us to put that section for discussion. Is Brian in the room? Oh, there he comes in time. Telepathy. So yeah, thank you for showing up on time, Brian. We were about to start discussing IGO protections and the text that was sent a while ago. So without further ado, let's go ahead with the reading. Ian, would you please go ahead?

IAN SHELDON

IGO protections. The GAC takes note of the ongoing discussions in the SubPro Implementation Review Team and GNSO Council concerning the inclusion of reserved international governmental organizations, IGO identifiers in the scope of string similarity evaluation in the next round of new gTLDs in which applied for strings are evaluated for string similarity against the list of reserved strings. The GAC takes note of letters from the ICANN Board and the

ALAC to the GNSO Council supporting this inclusion. Against the backdrop of the GNSO policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs that applied for strings must not be confusingly similar to a reserved name and must not infringe existing legal rights and the 2007 GAC principles that the introduction of new gTLDs must make proper allowance for rights in the names and acronyms for IGOs, the GAC continues to monitor this evolving topic and anticipates further discussions and inputs following the ICANN 84 Dublin meeting.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. So I'll give you some time to digest the text my colleague from Australia just read. In the meantime, we have Netherlands. Go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Marco for the Netherlands. Maybe the proposal of this text could clarify on the use of the word input. Is this meant to be inputs to the GAC or is this meant to be inputs to other processes and therefore outputs of the GAC? This is the GAC Communique. This is the GAC speaking. So do we anticipate people putting stuff towards the GAC or are we as GAC anticipating to put stuff out? Just asking for clarification. Brian has a microphone meanwhile.

BRIAN BECKHAM

Thank you, Marco, for the question. Indeed, the idea is that the inputs would be from the GAC to the council, to the board, to the community. And just one textual edit in the second line, it should say intergovernmental, not international governmental. Apologies for that. And maybe while I have the floor, I can take just a moment and I'm happy to chat offline in the interest of time. But just to give a brief synopsis of this, because I know there are a number of new delegates here in Dublin this week. The issue of IGO protections, as you can see from the text there, goes back quite some time and has been a longstanding issue of interest for the GAC and for IGOs. The concept of protection of IGO identifiers in the domain name system has been included in a number of communiques over the years, including in the form of GAC advice. There was a letter many years ago from the United Nations Secretary General to member states on the topic of the protection of IGO identifiers in the domain name system. So the idea here in the text is meant to be, as I hope is as evident, a placeholder. There are ongoing discussions in the SubPro IRT and in the Council concerning implementation of work in the SubPro, which has very recently come on our radar. There was an email from Tracy Hackshaw from the UPU to the GAC list on the 17th of September, and I replied on the 19th of September, if that's helpful, to scan your inboxes with some background on the topic. So that's probably good for a summary, and again, happy to answer questions or chat offline if it's useful to provide further background on this longstanding file.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Thank you, Brian, for that background. I have Switzerland and then Netherlands.

JORGE CANCIO Thank you, Nico, Jorge, Switzerland, for the record. So first of all, allow me to support the introduction of this para and thank Brian and WIPO for being our burden-sharer and topic leader on this longstanding issue. And apart from that, I just made a friendly amendment to the text in order to make clear what 2007 document we are referring to as maybe not all colleagues were around in that time.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Thank you, Switzerland, for that additional background. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING Thank you, WIPO, for your clarification. If that's the case, may I suggest we replace the word inputs in the last sentence to contributions to make it a bit more ambiguous with regards to the direction?

NICOLAS CABELLERO Thank you very much. Any comment, question, or edit?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Just to note that we have prepared footnotes for both the original policy recommendation for the introduction of new gTLDs that dates back to 2007-8, as well as for the GAC principles. And on the international government organization versus intergovernmental organization, Brian will take that offline with you, because we've checked historical references, and so there's a bit of confusion, and we want to make sure we use the proper term.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you. So other than that, we should be fine with the text. Can you please clean it up in order to read again, in order to see if everybody agrees? And then we move on. So no need to read the whole thing again, unless anybody has any objection to any of the paragraphs or sentences or specific points within the text. This is a good moment to say so I see no hands online, no hands in the room. Perfect, let's move on. Please green the text, and let's move on, Fabien. Back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you. So that's green now. It should be. It looks like somebody's selecting the text, so we can't really see whether it's been green, but it should be. So we're moving on next to, we're continuing in issues of importance. So we've read community statement of interest. We've read ICANN review of reviews. DNS reviews, we're still waiting for the text. So now we have text on domain registration data.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Fabien. And for this, I will kindly ask my colleague from Colombia to help me again with the reading. Thiago, would you please?

THIAGO DAL-TOE

Domain registration data. A, urgent request for disclosure of registration data. Registries and registrars should be required to provide a swift determination and response to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to the life, seriously bodily injury, to critical infrastructure or of child exploitation. The GAC notes action is still pending on its advice in the ICANN 79 San Juan communique and its follow up on previous advice in the ICANN 80 Kigali communique regarding the expeditious establishment of a policy on urgent requests for disclosure of domain name registration data. The GAC reiterates the importance of ongoing work on urgent requests in the two parallel tracks previously agreed by the GAC, the ICANN board and the GNSO council.

The GAC expresses satisfaction with the progress achieved by the registration data implementation review team, IRT, in the policy track on establishing a timeline to respond to urgent requests. The GAC notes the current proposal for a 24 hour timeline to address urgent requests with potential extension to 72 hours in case of force majeure is in line with previous positions expressed by the GAC and the ICANN board. The GAC intends to provide a submission to the

recently opened ICANN public comment proceeding on the draft text for the urgent requests section of the registration data policy given the importance of this issue to the GAC. After the public comment proceeding, the GAC urges swift action to finalize the timeline must be uniformly followed by the contracted parties to be fit for purpose based on the urgent scenarios involved. The GAC also suggests that support for urgent requests submission should be integrated within the RDRS to optimize usage of resources.

In the authentication track, the GAC welcomes the update it received from the PSWG regarding its ongoing efforts through the practitioners group to develop technical mechanisms to authenticate the identities of law enforcement requesters submitting urgent requests. The GAC does not believe new policy development is needed to allow for urgent requests to utilize the authentication mechanisms being developed by the PSWG for law enforcement requesters. Instead, usage of these mechanisms should be considered part of the implementation process for the existing registration data policy. In this respect, the GAC appreciated the ICANN board's statement during the bilateral meeting at ICANN 84 that authentication mechanisms could be incorporated with no new policy development. The GAC encourages the board and the GNSO Council to work together to identify the most effective path to swiftly integrate outcomes from the PSWG's work on authentication mechanisms in the policy on urgent requests. Since the authentication mechanisms are needed for the implementation of urgent requests policy and those mechanisms are expected to

require technical interfacing with ICANN systems, the GAC continues to appreciate the participation of ICANN staff and community members in the PSWG's law enforcement authentication practitioners group. The GAC supports the PSWG's efforts and urges the necessary parties to continue prioritizing this work. Full stop.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Columbia. If you can scroll up a little bit, please. There's just one thing in the second paragraph that calls my attention, before I open the floor for comments and edits, of course. It's right at the end after timeline. It says swift action to finalize the timeline and then the timeline, again, must be uniform. Can we use it instead of repeating the timeline? And this is just a minor edit. So it would say, after the public comment proceeding, the GAC urges swift action to finalize the timeline. It must be uniform and followed, but again, it's just a suggestion. I'll stop there and open the floor for more comments, questions, or edits. So we'll bracket the timeline there and we would use it if everybody agrees right now. If my Shakespearean friend to my left tells me otherwise, we can always, and thumbs up. any other comment or question in this regard? And I have a hand from the USA and then India. USA, please go ahead.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you. This is Owen Fletcher, alternate representative for the US. I think the topic lead's original phrasing with the timeline is

more specific and the repetition of the word timeline is okay for me.
Thanks.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Perfect. So erase the brackets. Thank you, USA. I have India next.

INDIA We're fine.

NICOLAS CABELLERO Thank you, India. Any other? There seems to be agreement in the room, which is always a good thing. can you scroll down so that the colleagues can get to see the full?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX If I may, Nico?

NICOLAS CABELLERO go ahead, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX If I may kindly request that as users of the documents, you're careful when you select the text to deselect it once you're done because it creates difficulties for reading on the screen. So yeah, it would be appreciated if you could sparingly use the selection features of the text,

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you for that, Fabien. Very good point indeed. Can you scroll up a little bit so that we can get to see the last paragraph? Any comment or question on the last paragraph? No, scroll up. There we go. before we move on to the next topic. Any comment or question? Or edit in the last paragraph? seeing none, please green the text and let's move on. So this is a second subsection under domain registration data. That's registration data request service RDRS. And for that, I'll do the reading. Whoever is selecting text or providing any edit at this point, is that you, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

No, it's not me. So one way to address this is to close collaboration in the document so that we control completely.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Let's close it for the next five minutes at least so that I can read.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So the consequence of us closing editing of the document is that you will not see suggested text on your versions of the document. You will only see it on the screen. So I just want to make sure you're aware. So we'll make sure that to accept changes as quickly as possible so that you do see the final text in your versions of the document. But the authoritative version with all the edits will be the one displayed on screen. So I just wanted to clarify that.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Fabien. And we're doing this just for better reading at this point. So this is B, this is 4B. Or is it 5? 5B, Registration Data Request Service, RDRS. ICANN should maintain a permanent and centralized mechanism to channel domain registration data requests to registrars, excuse me, and registrar participation should be mandatory to ensure the usefulness of the mechanism for requesters. This mechanism should also require participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars. The GAC calls for efforts to ensure adequate and timely improvements to the RDRS to reassure the community that it can evolve into such a permanent, centralized, and globally accessible mechanism. The absence of an adequate centralized system creates inefficiencies as requesters such as law enforcement agencies would need to approach each registrar independently.

The GAC provided a submission to the recent public comment proceeding outlining its views on the final report of the RDRS Standing Committee. In its submission, the GAC supported the continuation of the RDRS after the end of its two-year pilot period, its improvement to address the needs of requester communities, and efforts to encourage participation by all registrars since the system is currently voluntary. To that end, the GAC welcomes the board's decision to adopt a resolution enabling the continued operation of the RDRS. The GAC also understands the board intends to issue a policy alignment analysis for public consultation outlining next steps needed to achieve the board's vision for the RDRS. The

GAC intends to closely review this analysis document and will consider making a submission to the public comment proceeding regarding the analysis, noting that the analysis document will address the future of the RDRS more holistically than the RDRS Standing Committee report. The GAC urges the ICANN board to prioritize further action for their RDRS Standing Committee report. The GAC urges the ICANN board to prioritize further action for their RDRS Standing Committee report. I'll pause here in order to see if there's feedback from the room or online. I have a hand from Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I guess the first sentence should start with something like the GAC is of the view or the GAC considers that otherwise it's something is lacking.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. So we included that. The GAC is of the view that and so on and so forth. Any other comment? And I see a thumbs up. no hands in the room. no hands online, which means that we're basically in agreement. Thank you very much for that. And yet one last time. So we seem to be okay with it. So perfect. Thank you very much. Please green it, Fabien, and let's move forward. So on accuracy, I will kindly ask my colleague from Switzerland to help me with the reading. Would you please go ahead, Jorge?

JORGE CANCIO

Accuracy. The GAC continues to emphasize the importance of accuracy and domain name registration data for the security and stability of the DNS. The current state of work at ICANN, as well as relevant practices to ensure accuracy were described by representatives from the community in a presentation to the GAC at ICANN 84. The GAC notes the outcomes of the work of the GNSO small team on accuracy and urges the GNSO to identify an implementation path for their recommendations.

In particular, in relation to the small team's first recommendation, the GAC notes that the registrar accreditation agreement currently provides a 15-day timeline for registrars to validate and verify the contact information of registrants. Since malicious actors often utilize new domain names within hours of registering them, the GAC recommends that registrars be required to complete these validation and verification steps before a newly registered domain name can become accessible through the DNS or before a domain name transfer can be completed. For example, this change could be achieved through policy development or through an amendment to the registrar accreditation agreement and or the RDDS accuracy program specification. Verification of contact information could be performed, for example, through automated email or phone-based mechanisms at the point of registration or transfer.

In addition, the GAC appreciated the clarification expressed by the GNSO small team chair that the recommendation to terminate the accuracy scoping team paused since 2022 would not imply the end of community work on this matter. The GAC is of the opinion that

whether it is the scoping team or another entity, the ICANN community should have an ongoing active forum in which to continue discussing possible next steps related to accuracy. These discussions should be open to community members outside the GNSO, including interested GAC members. As mentioned by a speaker from the SSAC, the GAC notes the evolution of technologies and registration practices that may affect the accuracy and reliability of domain registration data. It encourages ICANN to undertake holistic assessments of such emerging trends and to promote exchanges of best practices among registries and registrars toward developing globally consistent yet locally adaptable accuracy frameworks.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Switzerland. That was a little marathon for you. For my taste, the text is a little bit long, but again, I'm just the GAC chair. I'm in your hands. Just an observation. The floor is open for comments or questions or edits at this point, and I have the UK.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you, Craig Stanley Adamson, UK, for the record. I agree, this is quite long. Just one bit, maybe we can simplify one sentence, for example, in the second paragraph. In the second sentence, the GAC is of the opinion that, and I think that whether it is the scoping team or another entity, it's a bit superfluous, maybe. So I'd just suggest

maybe cutting that bit if you really wanted to keep it a bit better suited at the end of the sentence rather than in the middle.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much for that, UK. So I'll just read that part. So it would be the GAC is of the opinion that ICANN community should, that the ICANN community should have an ongoing active forum in which to continue discussing possible next steps related to accuracy, whether it is the scoping team or another entity. Is this okay for everyone? Any strong feelings? And I see nodding in the room. Anybody against? Perfect. So we're good. I have the European Commission. Please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. I just wanted to offer an apology because the text is indeed long, however—this comes with a however—as colleagues are aware, we have been discussing this issue for a very long time and this is also a topic, together with other subjects in the registration data, a big topic, I would say, that takes always a lot of time during the ICANN meetings because we discuss this with several constituencies. In this case, we are taking some time and text, hence, to explain the position that the GAC had been discussing also in previous ICANN, which is the need to shorten the time for validate and verify the registration data, which currently is 15 days. Since we had the novelty of the report from the GNSO small team on this matter, which we have heard also during the roundtable at the

end of the session, we wanted to acknowledge the process. So there is a report. What is the recommendation and what is the GAC position on this issue of the 15 days timeline? So it is a bit detailed, but hopefully it is clear because also this needs to be actionable for the board, the GNSO and others.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much for that, European Commission. I have Switzerland next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Chair. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Just a comment, and I hope this is taken as a friendly comment, but I think we all feel that these texts are way too long and they are also very descriptive to a certain extent, mentioning what a speaker said in a session. Maybe for the next time it would be good to really go to the core of it, specify what we as GAC are really wanting out of the different processes, what's the gist of it. And that also would allow for colleagues who are not so much into these issues to react The communiqué reading, as it is very difficult, especially for non-native speakers as myself, to digest such a lengthy and complex text.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you for that, Switzerland. The floor is still open. No hands online. A hand. Bangladesh.

BANGLADESH

Thank you, Chair. Just in the last paragraph, if we go to the ... So, as mentioned by speaker from SSAC, the GAC notes that, this is just my, I don't know the culture that we are noting something as a whole GAC and we are suggesting something, but only referring to a particular speaker. So, I think it actually weakens the later part of the paragraph. So, I think we can start from the GAC notes, the evolution, rather than referring to a single speaker. That's my suggestion,

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you so much, Bangladesh. European Commission, any strong feelings in that regard? The simpler, the better, I would say, unless you tell me that is a significant part of your, no, we're okay, perfect. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

A small nit to pick on the last paragraph, the second sentence, it encourages, given that the first sentence talks about the evolution of technologies and registrations, we might want to say the GAC encourages, just to make sure it's us and not the emerging technology.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Netherlands, good catch. Any other comment or edit? It seems to be fine for everyone. So, if you allow me, I will kindly ask Fabienne to green the text and move forward. So, thank you very much. Thank you, everyone, for your contributions. Again, for the

sake, for our own peace of mind, and for the sake of simplicity, any text submitted, the shorter, the more concise and straight to the point as possible will be enormously appreciated. Thank you so much. So, let's move on.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, Nico. So, the next, the last piece of substantive text here in issues of importance is governance of the regional internet registries. I believe there's still work ongoing, so we have to park this for now. Unless, advise otherwise, we would suggest for the last 15 minutes to go.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Hold on, I have India.

INDIA

Regarding the governance of RIRs, I have to send a test in consultation with the GAC rep of Russia to Fabien.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, India.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

Thank you, India, well noted. So, we'll include that text instead of the one we have on the screen. And where is, it's the red one, the one in red letters. Or the whole thing? It's just the part in red. So I'll just read the new text for the sake of time. So, it would read, in regard to

subsequent implementation of the new governance framework, the GAC emphasizes that ICANN's multi-stakeholder community, including its supporting organizations and advisory committees, should have an appropriate role in matters relating to the recognition and de-recognition of regional internet registries. So, there we go. Thank you. Comments or questions? Any edit? Can we leave with this text? Let me rephrase, anybody objects to this text? UK, please go ahead.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you this, I think, is broadly fine in my eyes, but it has lost, obviously, quite a bit of the key part of the sentence, which is unfortunate. I completely appreciate the Russian Federation's position around recognized consultative role, but I do wonder whether we could just strengthen it a tiny bit, and we say, should have an appropriate and constructive role.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you for that, UK. India, would that be acceptable? No problem? Thank you so much. Any other edit? I don't see any hand online. I don't see any other hand in the room. So, thank you so much again. Please, if you allow me let's move forward, green the text, and let's move on. Back to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So, this is it for issues of importance, and now we would suggest, for the last 10 minutes, that we go all the way to inter-constituencies

activities, section two of the GAC communique, where we report on the various engagements of the GAC, and start with the meeting with the ICANN board, in particular.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you so much for that, Fabien. And for that, I will kindly ask Egypt, Christine Arida, our distinguished vice chair, to help with the reading. Christine?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

So, meeting with the ICANN board. The GAC met with the ICANN board and discussed ICANN board and ICANN organization policy priorities in 2026. ICANN code of conduct, GAC strategic planning, registration data request service, RDRS, urgent requests for disclosure of registration data, ICANN review of reviews.

The GAC discussed the meeting strategy working groups recommendations, which were approved by the ICANN board, and explicitly factored the simplicity of visa applications and ease of entry as key criteria for meeting venue selection. The GAC noted with concern that despite this, on-site participation of some colleagues and community members from underserved regions continues to be impeded. Barriers to on-site attendance limits participation from underserved regions and negatively impacts collective outputs when we aim to enhance engagement within ICANN. The GAC welcomes further discussion with the board on this matter through future BGIG calls.

NICOLAS CABELLERO	Thank you so much. Egypt, any comment? Australia? Switzerland was first, so please go ahead, Jorge.
JORGE CANCIO	I was first. Thank you, Nico. It's a tiny issue. It's barriers to on-site attendance limit instead of limits, I think.
NICOLAS CABELLERO	Thank you, Switzerland. Good catch. Australia?
AUSTRALIA	I was going to suggest just the inclusion of the GAC also discussed, just to provide a little bit of continuity here with the dot points above and make it clear it's part of the full meeting with the board.
NICOLAS CABELLERO	Thank you very much. I have the CTU.
SHERNON OSEPA	So basically, we have a slightly different, let's say, suggestion that we would like to suggest to be considered. And let me just read it, and then we can decide if we're going to approve it or no. So the GAC raised the issue of ICANN board-approved meeting strategy in which the simplicity of visa applications and ease of entry were explicitly included as key criteria for meeting venue selection. The GAC noted with concern that despite this on-site participation of some

colleagues and community members from underserved regions continues to be impeded by entry barriers. This limits contribution and perspectives from underserved regions and negatively impacts GAC collective outputs when we aim to enhance engagement with ICANN. I will be speaking about the GAC and how we are reducing on-site participation in ICANN's meetings from underserved regions. This was basically one suggestion that I got from our people back home as well.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, CTU. We have six minutes to decide which one or more, or the next session or four more sessions, so it's up to us to decide. I would like to start with Marco for the Netherlands, and for the sake of time, I'm in your hands, which way should we go? And I have two hands, is that an all-hand CTU, because I have a hand from the Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chair, it's Marco for the Netherlands, with respect to the text just proposed by the CTU, and it's quite long, but at first glimpse, I do not see it adding anything apart from being longer, so my suggestion is to remain with the original text that's currently highlighted in yellow.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Any other comment, edit, or question? So seeing no hands, and no other suggestions, I would kindly ask, oh, Eswatini, sorry, go ahead.

ANDREAS DLAMINI

Thank you, Chair. I'm noting the contribution from the CTU and the comment from the Netherlands. I think there is a lot of, I think there is a lot of contribution from the CTU, and I think there is something notable that comes with CTU's contribution, when you bring the issue of perspective. Remember when we were talking about the issue of law enforcement seeking data from registrars? I think that's a big issue, and I think that's a big issue that a lot of countries don't experience, or don't have probably an appreciation of. That is, not having, I can't contract registrars or registries within the jurisdiction, that makes a big difference when it comes to requesting information that has been given to the like-minded people, and then it's not even if they are in foreign countries, where they've got foreign legislation or laws or frameworks that are operating within. So there is the issue of perspective that comes with people that experience, which, again, when it comes to the issue of applications for the new gTLDs, gTLDs, that you'd find that when they talk of these figures of \$227,000, with the smaller countries, there's just the question of, if you talk of so much money, is the market there to even think of? So that the issue of perspective is quite important when it comes to these issues.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Eswatini. Even though, from a philosophical point of view, I would agree or not, and we could discuss this a little longer, maybe in a different context, my question to you is, in practical terms, do you have an alternative text at this point as regarding this specific paragraph we're discussing?

ANDREAS DLAMINI

Sorry, I was just adding the point that there is a difference that this CTU contribution is making to the ...

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much, Eswatini. We still have two minutes. Anybody else in the room or online? Sorry, Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you. And, of course, I fully agree that perspective is really important. And maybe we could find a way to introduce the word perspective in the first paragraph. But to highlight the nature of my comments, the first one says, the GAC welcomes further discussion with the board on this matter to future BGIG calls. The second one sentence says, the GAC looks forward to further discussions and engagement with board on this matter towards facilitating and enhancing on-site participation. I think that's basically looking the same, given that on-site participation is already mentioned. So that's where I'm going. I think I have no real issue with the substance of the CTU contribution, just that, especially in the first and last

sentences, it makes it noticeably longer and, therefore, also probably harder to read for non-native English speakers.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Thank you very much. I also see no big difference, unless you tell me otherwise, CTU. Can you please ... And sorry for going a little bit over time here, but, for example, as the Netherlands noted, let me read the last sentence, for example, in the first paragraph. It says, the GAC welcomes further discussion with the board on this matter through future BGID calls. I'll read the last sentence of the second paragraph. The GAC looks forward to further discussion and engagement with the board on this matter towards facilitating and so on and so forth. What is the real ... Is there anything substantive you want to address there, or anywhere else in the paragraph that you would like to point out?

SHERNON OSEPA

No, let me just be very clear on this. I'm not going to make this an issue. There may be different flavors when you do something. If you look, for example, at cars, you may have different brands of cars, and each one will serve, let's say, what they are meant to do. So we're not going to make this an issue. If the majority think this is what they would like to do that's fine with that. We don't have any problem with it.

NICOLAS CABELLERO

Perfect. Thank you so much. CTU, that was precisely the point, trying to get common ground and, if possible, consensus, which is the way we traditionally work. So again, unless there are strong feelings we'll keep the first paragraph. We'll green it, and we'll have a much-needed coffee break at this point. So it's 4.01. Sorry for going a little bit over time. We'll reconvene at 4:30. Thank you very much. Enjoy your coffee break. Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]