JULIA CHARVOLEN	Welcome to the GAC Communique Drafting Session on Wednesday, 29 October, at 16:30 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standard of Behaviur, ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six human languages and Portuguese. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking, in case you will be speaking a language other than English. I will now hand the floor over to Nicolas Caballero. Thank you, and over to you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you very much, Julia. Welcome back, everyone. I really hope everybody had the chance to get some good Irish coffee, because we don't have that much text, that much territory to cover so far, apart from the DNS abuse text, which, it is my understanding, just arrived. So without further ado, let's dive in. And for that, I will kindly hand the floor to my colleague from Australia, who is going to be doing the reading. Ian, over to you.

| IAN SHELDON | Thank you, Nico. Four, DNS abuse. During ICANN 84, the GAC confirmed a two-pronged approach to its work on DNS abuse, focusing on, one, advancing policy progress, and two, developing the capacity of GAC members on the subject. Regarding policy, the GAC notes that the 2024 DNS abuse contract amendments served as an important first step, but more must be done to address the problem. Phishing, botnets, malware, and other forms of DNS abuse impose a tremendous cost upon the public, and adding new strings to the internet will increase the surface area for bad actors to perform these attacks. To prepare for this, the ICANN community must work together to ensure that sound and effective policies are put in place before the delegation of new strings. |

On this note, recalling its ICANN 83 advice to the ICANN board, the GAC recognizes the extensive efforts made by the ICANN community prior to ICANN 84 to proactively initiate DNS abuse policy work. Swift progress should continue. In its submission to the ICANN public comment proceeding on the Preliminary Issues Report, the GAC notes that the issue report prioritizes the issues specified for policy development, while appreciating that it also identifies and explains a variety of additional policy gaps underlying DNS abuse within ICANN's remit, many of which are of high importance for the GAC.

During ICANN 84, the GAC discussed participation in upcoming policy development work, including the need for the Charter to recognize GAC alternates to enable the GAC to participate

effectively. The GAC also noted with interest a point raised during discussion that there are different ways to automate the registration of a large number of domain names and therefore policies should be effective while remaining technologically neutral. Additional policy issues outside of those targeted by the PDPs were discussed, including the absence of an obligation for the contract parties to report on the abuse notices they receive and act upon. Without this data, the impact of the contract amendments on DNS abuse, as well as the role of compliance in enforcing these new obligations, cannot be accurately measured. Further, the GAC supports ICANN providing DNS abuse contract compliance data in standardized, open, machine-readable formats in order to support evidence-based policy development and enforcement. The GAC continues to prioritize the commencement of policy development. At the same time, the GAC will follow efforts to address the additional gaps raised by the preliminary issue report, all of which should ensure that critical DNS abuse factors are effectively mitigated.

In its dedicated session on DNS abuse at ICANN84, the GAC welcomed a presentation by the host country ccTLD.ie on designating effective policy, as well as TWNIC and .asia on their innovative Trusted Notifier Network. The GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity outside of ICANN's remit and considers voluntary initiatives such as Trusted Notifier programs to be promising in this regard.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Again, the text seems a little bit lengthy, but I'm okay because I understand that there were way too many issues, way too many topics, way too many things to talk about, and there's a need to express that and convey the message. So, other than that, I'm very happy, especially, very especially, whoever wrote this automatically has my love because of the reference to the open source and all the rest, so I don't know who sent this, and my congratulations, of course. So, let me open the floor here for comments or questions. My only criticism, my only slight criticism would be that it is a little bit lengthy, but again, other than that, I'm very happy with it. So, I'll stop here and open the floor for comments, questions or edits. And I have Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I guess the last sentence of this item is referring that we also think that activity outside of ICANN's remit is also important. So, maybe we should include an also activity outside of ICANN's remit. I recognize the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity also outside of ICANN's remit or something in that direction. So, that's it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Switzerland. So, let me read just that last sentence. It would be the GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity outside of

ICANN's remit and considers voluntary initiatives such as trusted notifier programs to be promising in this regard also outside of ICANN's remit. And I'll stop there. Is that what you ... it sounds weird to me, but again ...

JORGE CANCIO   In the second but last line, before the outside, also outside of ICANN's remit, line before the outside, also outside.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Okay, that changes. Because it was a little bit weird. So, I'll just read that part. So, the GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity also outside of ICANN's remit and considers voluntary initiatives and so on and so forth. Are we okay with that, US? I see your hand. Please go ahead.

USA   Thank you, Chair. Yes, the point of the last sentence is to focus on abusive activity that is outside of ICANN's remit. Perhaps, instead of also, that is ... I'm just having a little bit of trouble with also, but ... Also wanting to support Switzerland's objective here.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much for that, USA. Anybody against? Let's try to be more efficient here. So, anybody opposes using that is instead of also? Eswatini, go ahead.

ESWATINI	How about even?
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Even instead of that is? So again, I don't have any kind of hard feelings in this regard. I would be equally happy with that is or with even, but again, we're entering Shakespearean territory once again, so I'll defer this to our Shakespearean friends.
INDIA	How about including those? GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity, including those outside ICANN's remit. Including those outside.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, India. So, again, we have three things to choose from. UK?
UK	Just from my bit, people have maybe other views. Including those would work, but I think that is, would be probably the most straightforward, but it's a good suggestion from colleagues from India to say including those. I think that would work in this context as well, more so than even.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, UK. Netherlands?
MARCO HOGEWONING	Isn't those plural? So, shouldn't it be DNS activities, including those? Sorry to nitpick on native speakers.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Indeed. Thank you, Netherlands. Good catch. But again, it will depend on which word we use, because if it's activity that is outside ICANN's remit or activities, plural. Including those. Any other? Australia?
IAN SHELDON	For what it's worth, my vote is for that is keeping it simple, and perhaps we can return to substantive discussions.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you for that, and I absolutely agree. Again, unless you tell me that there are strong feelings, let's just try to keep it simple and straightforward and maintain that is. So, it should read, the GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity that is outside of ICANN's remit. Can we leave with that? Or you really think it changes meaning in a dramatic way? USA?

84 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PREP WEEK

USA	I realize that we could be splitting hairs here, but the purpose of the Trusted Notifier Program was to address a broad range of DNS abuse activity, including activity that is outside of the technical definition. So maybe just for good measure, it would make sense to use a lowercase a to address DNS abuse activity. So, it's, again, really, really minor point. But, and the ccNSO and the GAC bilat also focused on the difference between domain abuse and DNS abuse activities. So, thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Perfect. Thank you very much. USA? I have Egypt next.
EGYPT	Thank you, Chair. I was just wondering, because it's not the same meaning. So, I was wondering about what we really want to say. Are we saying DNS abuse activities that are outside, or activity that is outside ICANN? Or are we saying inside the remit of ICANN and outside the remit of ICANN? Because we are not comparing apples to apples. That is, has a meaning. And also, including those the other options meant inside the remit of ICANN and outside the remit of ICANN. So, it depends on the meaning that we are, that we want to say.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you for that, Egypt. It is my understanding that we have already referred to DNS abuse activities within the ICANN environment. We're just reading the last part of the sentence in

order to try to convey the message that DNS abuse activity that is outside ICANN will also be addressed. Is that the case, US? Or am I misunderstanding anything? I might be wrong, and I stand to be corrected, Egypt. But that was my understanding. Over to you.

CHRISTINE ARIDA   No, I'm just trying to ask the pen holders. Did they intend to say inside ICANN's remit and outside ICANN's remit? Or just outside ICANN's remit? Because it's not a matter of simplicity. It's a different meaning. The options we were trying to compare, each has a different meaning. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Egypt. USA, please.

USA   Thank you, Egypt. If I recall correctly from the presentation, the trusted notifier programs include activity that is within the ICANN DNS abuse definition as well as activity that is outside of that definition. It's a broader swath of activity, generally. So to answer your question, it is both.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Egypt, are you okay with that? Because I see your hand up.

EGYPT	I forgot it. But anyway, if the intention is both, then I don't think that provides the intended meaning. Thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you. Egypt, do you have alternative text for that part?
EGYPT	We already had multiple other options. I don't want to introduce new ones. But I mean, including also, including those.
IAN SHELDON	Perhaps the US put it succinctly. Activity that is both within as well as outside of ICANN's remit. And keep it reasonably brief and simple.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Australia. Would the US be okay with that? And I see nodding. So looks like we're reaching agreement here. So let me read that part again. The GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity that is both within and outside of ICANN's remit and considers voluntary initiatives, blah, blah, blah, and so on and so forth. Is that okay with everyone? Egypt, are you okay with that? Okay, any other comment or question? Or edit? I see no hand online. And I see no hand in the room. So perfect. Thank you so very much. Can you please green the text, Fabien? And by the way, walk us through the other parts that we still need to address at this point. Over to you, Fabien.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX   So I think this completes the review of issues of importance. The entirety of the section of the communiqué has been read now and agreed upon. So we're left with the rest of the communiqué. So maybe we can take it from the top. In particular, we have a section in the introduction that recognizes the passing of two longstanding GAC representatives. And then we can continue down.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Perfect. Let's do just that right from the beginning, but you will need to make it. There we go. So can you scroll up a little bit? Up. There we go. GAC communiqué, Dublin, Ireland. The Dublin communiqué was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting during the ICANN 84 Annual General Meeting with some GAC participants in Dublin, Ireland, and others remotely. The GAC's discussions during this public meeting are reflected in the GAC meeting minutes and the transcripts of all sessions available at, and you have the link there. The communiqué was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC members and observers to consider it before publication, bearing in mind the special circumstances of a hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication. That is in case we actually don't receive anything in that 72-hour period after the publication of the communique. So I'll continue with the introduction. If you can scroll down a little bit, please. Thank you.

Introduction, the Governmental Advisory Committee, GAC, of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, ICANN, met in Dublin, there's a period there, Dublin, yeah, Dublin, Ireland, in a hybrid setting, including remote participation from 25 to 30 October 2025. X number of GAC members and X number of observers attended the meeting. Of course, we will complete that afterwards, once we have the final numbers and the confirmation. The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN 84 Annual General Meeting. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings. The Governmental Advisory Committee acknowledges and mourns the passing of Stefano Trumpy and Peter Major, former and longstanding GAC representatives of Italy and Hungary, who made distinguished contributions to the GAC, ICANN, and the development of and governance of the Internet. They will be remembered to the warmth, thoughtfulness, and collegiality in advancing in many fora the global public interest.

Comments or questions? Netherlands, go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING   I appreciate recognizing the sad passing of our former colleagues. May I suggest we say the GAC representative of respectively Italy and Hungary to keep it clear who's who?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Oh. Thank you, Netherlands. So it will go representatives of Italy and Hungary, respectively. Thank you very much. Any other? Okay, seeing none, at this point, I would kindly ask you to observe a minute of silence in the memory of Stefano Trumpy and Peter Major. Thank you very much. That was to honor the memory of both distinguished colleagues. Thank you very much. Fabien, back to you. We need to move on in order to, so please walk us through.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX   So I think we're left with the just sort of declarative section of the activities, the various topics that were discussed with the ALAC, SSAC, ASO, ccNSO, NCSG, sorry, I'm speaking a bit too fast, GNSO, the WSIS+20 co-facilitators, the cross-community discussions. You're speaking too far away from the microphone. So the only piece of substance that is left is the report of the [GOPE] working group, to some extent. So we've, we're waiting for a text from the PSBG that I've not received indications about, so I'm not exactly sure what's the status there, but this is really the last piece of substance reporting on the activity of the GOPE working group. Did you send it? I did not receive, let me check my e-mails just to make sure. So maybe we can just go to a GOPE, I'll check, but I won't.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Okay, so while we receive the additional text, I will kindly ask my colleague from Egypt to help me with the reading. We're talking

about section three, GAC working groups, GAC operating principles, evolution working group, GOPE WG. Christine, please.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sure, thank you, Nico. So the GAC operating principles evolution working group, GOPE WG, reads as follows. The GOPE working group co-chairs updated the GAC on recent activities carried out by the working group. The GOPE WG continues its revision of the GAC operating principles. Since ICANN 83, the working group convened and decided a three-pronged approach, including finalizing changes to leadership tenures as voted upon by GAC members, finalizing changes to the operating principles deemed as administrative only, and incorporating ICANN's continuous improvement framework in the working group activities. The GOPE working group will continue its meeting post-ICANN 84.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Egypt, I have a hand from Lebanon. Go ahead, please.

LEBANON

Thank you, Nico. Can we please scroll up a little bit till the meeting with the WSIS+20 co-facilitators? Because the sentence here doesn't look good. The GAC met with members of the WSIS+20 co-facilitators and discussed. So it's either the co-facilitators office or team or something, but can we say members of the co-facilitators?

84 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PREP WEEK

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you for that, Lebanon. We were not discussing that part of the communique, but thank you for the catch I agree with you. The GAC met with the WSIS+20 co-facilitators, that should be the… Thank you very much. Unless anybody else tells me otherwise, of course. No problem? We're okay with that. So okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Lebanon. So we'll move on now. Okay, before we review the text we just received, is everybody okay with the text as regarding the GOPE working group? Any problem there? I see Manal. Yes, Egypt, go ahead.
MANAL ISMAIL	I don't have a problem per se. I'm just wondering whether we're already incorporating ICANN's continuous improvement framework in the GAC operating principles? It's more of a question.
IAN SHELDON	Thanks Manal. I think it's a good question. I think we're still considering whether to incorporate it and perhaps we need to amend that language. But I don't know if Guo Feng has any thoughts on that point either, but I'd be amenable to finalizing changes.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	That's a very good point, Egypt. Thank you so much for raising that point. It is my understanding that China and Australia were the ones in charge of vetting this part of the text. Yeah, I would also have some sort of observation I would say because of the implications mainly.

And I'm not a lawyer but there are things to take into account there. So I don't know, Ian, if we can work out some alternative language only for that phrase, for the last part of the paragraph. Would that be possible? Or China? Sorry, Guo Feng your hand. Go ahead.

GUO FENG   Thank you, Chair. Maybe we can change the incorporating into perhaps considering incorporating, considering to incorporate ICANN's continuous improvement framework, etc., etc. And another minor suggestion from me is related to the second sentence of this paragraph. I think that it is the whole gag who can revise the operating principle. We as the one who boundly discuss, and we study, we discuss, and we study.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, China, for this. I have the UPU next.

UPU   Thank you, Chair. In regards to that communication, sorry, continuous improvement framework, I recall, I think it was at ICANN 82, if I'm not mistaken, we agreed to, I'm not sure what it is, incorporate, but the GAC agreed to incorporate the CIF when it was approved into its work. Not sure, but specifically about the working group, but I'm just trying to understand the difference between the working group and the GAC's work, because I think that was a community-wide discussion and so on. I was the person on the committee, so that's why I'm pointing that out. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you. UPU, would you like to address that?

IAN SHELDON	Just quickly, because I can see Manal is also in the queue. At the last working group meeting, Rob came and gave a briefing on the continuous improvement framework, but I don't believe we made a decision or had a recommendation to the broad committee on whether we should incorporate it into the working group or whether it should be a separate work stream that the GAC needs to pick up. So my suggestion here is perhaps we can change it to just, and consideration of ICANN's continuous, which leaves the question of incorporation or not still open.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Very good point, Australia. Thank you for that. I pretty much agree with that, but I have Egypt next.

EGYPT	Thank you, and thanks, Feng and Ian. I tend to agree with Australia, maybe consideration of, but I would leave it even more open and say consideration of outcomes from the review of reviews process or whatever this ends up to, we will see how this would impact the GAC and reflect it into our operating principles. Is this okay?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you for that, Egypt. It makes sense. Even though the other way would have been simpler, but I don't have any kind of strong feelings in that regard. I'm okay either way as well, so. And again your hands, if there's anything to change you just tell us and we'll do it. For the time being, let me read that part for the sake of clarity and efficiency. I'll read from the second sentence on. So it would say, it would say, since ICANN 83, the working group reconvened and decided a three-pronged approach, including finalizing changes to leadership tenures as voted upon by GAC members, finalizing changes to the operating principles deemed as administrative only and consideration of, there's a problem here, but anyways, and consideration of outcomes of the review of reviews process in the working group's activities. I think the genitive should be here, considering or finalizing because. But anyways, Netherlands.

MARCO HOGEWONING   It is not a hill I'm willing to dive for, Marco, for Netherlands for the record, but I'm struggling a bit with why this is in here. For sure, the co-working group is doing tremendous work, but this is the ICANN 84 communique and it now mostly refers to work done and decided on the ICANN 83 meeting. Or am I misunderstanding this?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Netherlands. Now going back to the paragraph, do you have any practical change to be included or you want to erase the whole paragraph? Is that your point?

MARCO HOGEWONING | Yeah, it's more sort of seeking clarification maybe from the co-chairs on what's the message we're trying to convey here in terms of this is a communique following the meeting we had here in Dublin. So are we looking forward to future work of the GOPE or are we reflecting what was done during this meeting?

NICOLAS CABALLERO | Thank you, Netherlands. China, please.

GUO FENG | Thank you, Marco, for your question. To me is that perhaps we put a paragraph regarding this working group here. We want to update the whole committee of the recent development of this working group. And actually some of the element now covered in this paragraph is new the review of reviews and also the working group discussion on the operating principle. It was happened in our recent conference call. Yes, I hope that will help.

NICOLAS CABALLERO | Thank you. Thank you very much for that, China and Netherlands. Whatever the case, we need to fix this because on the one hand, we said a three-pronged approach including finalizing and we're using the ING form there. Then we say finalizing again. Finalizing changes to leadership tenures, blah, blah, blah. And then finalizing changes again to the operating principles. And then we say it should be considering outcomes. Okay, so it's a little bit better now. I'm not

convinced yet that is the best wording, but again, I would defer this to the experts in the room. Seeing no hands, I would assume that we're okay with this and it would be the three ING forms, the last one being considering outcomes of the review of reviews process in the working group's activities. The GOEP working group will continue its meetings post ICANN 84. Are we okay with it? Any strong feelings? And I see no hands. I see no hands in line, no hands in the room, which I would assume we are in agreement. So Ian, would you be so kind as to read it for the last time in order to see it makes sense to everyone?

IAN SHELDON   The GOPE WG co-chairs updated the GAC on recent activities carried out by the working group. The GOPE WG continues its discussion on revision of the GAC operating principles. Since ICANN 83, the WG convened and decided a three-pronged approach, including finalizing changes to leadership tenures as voted upon by GAC members, finalizing changes to the operating principles deemed as administrative only, and considering outcomes of the review of reviews process in the working group's activities. The GOPE working group will continue its meetings post ICANN 84. A minor suggestion, I think we probably need to be consistent on the use of WG or the use of working group. We just need to pick one of those two and bring consistency to the paragraph, but we can fix that in a review.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Okay, seeing no hands, let's move on. Fabien, please green the text and walk us through the next sections. So we're just walking up for the PSWG text. Okay, thank you so much. And for this, I will kindly request our colleague from the Netherlands to help with the reading.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, happy to. Mr. Chairman, so item 3, under GAC Working Groups, the GAC Public Safety Working Group, PSWG in brackets, the GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG contributed to the meetings with the GNSO and GAC on DNS abuse and registration data issues, to a meeting with the ccNSO on online scams, and meetings with the non-commercial stakeholder group NCSG regarding human rights matters, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work. Key takeaways involving PSWG work streams included the scope of policy development processes in brackets PDPs, to address DNS abuse, law enforcement authentication, the next steps regarding the registration data request service, RDRS, and continued progress on work related to urgent requests for disclosure of registration data.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Netherlands. So we'll pause here in order to get some feedback from the room, or online participants. Netherlands, please.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Following Australia's comment on the previous one, I also spot some minor inconsistencies here between using the GAC PSWG and PSWG, but we can again fix that in review, but probably good to look for some consistency.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Netherlands. Well noted. Any other editorial comment? Okay, perfect. Seeing no hands, no objections, let's move on. We'll green the text and move on. Fabien, back to you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX

So I think we've covered all the substantive parts of the communiqué. We can probably go back to inter-constituency activities and community engagement and review or read, to the extent you'd like, the various reports of those meetings. Then we have a few sections in internal matters, and that will be all. Right, we've read the meeting with the ICANN board, so that was read and agreed.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, so I'll start reading. Section two, inter-constituency activities and community engagement. Okay, please scroll down, and then we

have here a meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC. The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed DNS abuse enforcement trends and transparency, review of ICANN reviews, new gTLDs applicant support program. As regarding the meeting with the security and stability advisory committee, SSAC. The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed importance of free and open source software in the DNS industry, impact of string collision and similarities on security and stability, DNS abuse preliminary issue report, possibilities for cooperation between SSAC and GAC. As regarding the meeting with the address supporting organization, ASO, the GAC met with members of the ASO and discussed revisions of, sorry, revisions to the governance document for the recognition operation and the de-recognition of regional internet registries. Meeting with the country code name supporting organization, ccNSO. The GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed use of the main name in cryptocurrency investment fraud, roles of governments and ccTLDs in DNS abuse mitigation. And I'll stop there because there's a question from Australia.

IAN SHELDON

Sorry, just a minor point. I think it should be domain abuse mitigation in the ccNSO meeting. You mean the title? The role of governments and ccTLDs in domain abuse mitigation as distinct from DNS abuse which has a slightly different meaning. Could you please repeat that, Australia, for Fabien? ccTLDs in domain abuse mitigation. But perhaps Marco has a different opinion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Netherlands?
MARCO HOGEWONING	No, I was nitpicking on the first sentence where it's probably better to show use of domain names, plural.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you very much, Australia. And Netherlands. I have the USA next.
SUSAN CHALMERS	My apologies. Susan Chalmers, United States. I was just going to suggest pluralizing domain names but also point out that it was the bulk registration of domain names in particular that was the focus of the presentation. So if that could somehow be reflected, that would.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, USA. So it should read the use of bulk domain names in cryptocurrency and so on. Is that correct? Yes, the use of bulk registration of domain names. I'm not sure it needs to be capitalized. Thank you. Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX   I was just going to say the capitalization is because it's sort of the usage of titles we've done that generally, so.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you again, USA. So it would read use of bulk registration of domain names in cryptocurrency investment fraud, roles of governments in ccTLDs in domain abuse mitigation. Are we okay with that? And I see nodding in the room. So I'll continue reading. Meeting with a non-commercial stakeholder group, NCSG. The GAC met with members of the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and discussed human rights impact assessment and GAC communique, registration data request service, urgent requests and registrant data requests, DNS abuse mitigation, and ICANN reviews. As for the meeting with the generic names supporting organization GNSO, the GAC met with members of the GNSO council and discussed registration data request service, urgent requests for disclosure of registration data, and law enforcement authentication, accuracy of registration data, DNS abuse policy development. Meeting with the WSIS+20 co-facilitators, the GAC met with the WSIS+20 co-facilitators and discussed the current status of the WSIS+20 review process. Cross-community discussions, GAC members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN 84, including the review of ICANN reviews. And I'll stop here in order to see if there's feedback from the room. These are non-controversial issues, but again, the floor is open. Okay, see, oh, please go ahead.

WOLFGANG HOLZAPFEL	Yes, Wolfgang from Germany. Just a small one. The word communique was missing the great accent, not the great, the other one, the acute accent, sorry. Way up, here, and human right impact assessment and GAC communique, thanks.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Germany. Thank you very much, good catch. Any other? Okay, so please green the text. Thank you so much, Fabien, back to you. Okay, so please green the text. Thank you so much, Fabien, back to you. Our next section, internal matters, GAC membership. Perfect. And for this, I will kindly ask again my colleague from Egypt, Christine Arida, if you could please help me reading.
CHRISTINE ARIDA	Yes, sure. So internal matters, one GAC membership. There are currently 184 GAC member states and territories and 41 observer organizations. The GAC acknowledges that the digital cooperation organization, DCO, has joined the committee as an observer organization. Number two, GAC leadership. The GAC elected as vice chairs for the term starting after ICANN 85, March 2026, and ending at the close of ICANN 90, October 2027. Can you scroll down? Ian Sheldon, Australia. Zeina Bou Harb, Lebanon. Marco Hogewoning, Netherlands. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland. Gloria Katuuku, Uganda. Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you very much, Egypt. Absolutely non-controversial. And by the way, let's give a big round of applause to our colleagues on the election. Thank you very much again. So back to you, Fabien. Is there anything we still need to cover?
FABIEN BETREMIEUX	Yes. Section seven? Well, actually I need to renumber, sorry. So that would be section five, I believe. And that's next meeting.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	The GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN 85 community forum on 7-12, March 2026. Any hard feelings on this? Any strong opinions? Is there anything you would like to change in this part, Netherlands? All good? Should we mention, that's a good point, should we just say Mumbai, include Mumbai ICANN 85, Mumbai community forum, or something along those lines?
FABIEN BETREMIEUX	So we certainly would do that if that's what you'd like. We usually do not.
MARCO HOGEWONING	It's not a big deal, I think, but we've seen some last minute variation of locations of meetings, so it's just a suggestion to just keep the usual practice of not naming the location.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Yeah, yeah, for the sake of practicality, we'll keep it like that, unless there are strong reasons. India, are you okay with that? Hopefully that will not be the case. I'm crossing my fingers, but . So any other thing, Fabien, Benedetta, that we have not covered so far?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX   I think this is it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Benedetta, over to you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI   Thank you very much. It's not actually a concern, we're just a flag. Under issues of importance, we have an additional text, sorry, I'm just scrolling up, that's pending the board vote on the applicant guidebook. So I just wanted to flag that in case you're looking to wrap all of it up. This text is pending on the board vote tomorrow.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX   Which should, if this is what we expect, the committee review period will start tomorrow. We have time to potentially adapt to circumstances.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Very good point indeed, Fabien. I have the USA and then Netherlands.

USA	Thank you, Chair. Given that there is the decision that is pending, we prefer to use the session tomorrow to revisit. Thank you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you. USA, Netherlands?
MARCO HOGEWONING	Valuable comments, as the author of this particular text. I would argue that we would still welcome the approval of the applicant guidebook, if not tomorrow at a later date. It doesn't say tomorrow here, it will basically say we welcome the approval of the AGB. Which in the unlikely event, the votes tomorrow won't happen, I think the text is still valid. But that's my personal view and I was the proponent of this text.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Netherlands. USA, would you be okay with that, even though I don't have any kind of problem using, of course, the session we have allocated the time for tomorrow morning? But it would imply that, anyways, back to you.
USA	Thank you, Chair. We would appreciate the opportunity to consult with capital on this text prior to finalizing it, and therefore hold the session open tomorrow for this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Perfect. Thank you so much. Netherlands your hand up again. Is that a normal hand? OK. All right, so over to you, Fabien.
FABIEN BETREMIEUX	We just wanted to, we are showing the agenda for tomorrow, just to highlight that the board meeting happens at the end of the day, after all the GAC sessions. So just wanted to make sure you were aware. So the board decision would only come after all the remaining GAC sessions, just as an FYI.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	And that's another very good point, which means that we would, there would be no point in having the meeting tomorrow morning, because we would have, we will have the information at, yes, at 4:30 PM. I'm in your hands. I'll be here tomorrow, that's for sure. So we can have the session, but discussing, I don't know, butterflies in the garden, or some other important topics. But certainly not this topic. With all due respect, again or we can go play golf together, as I always say. But no, seriously, European Commission, and then USA.
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Thank you, Nico. I think that we have reached an unprecedented level of efficiency this time around. At the same time, so we wouldn't want to have other two sessions, especially if not new information is coming in between the two. However, we appreciate the possibility to use at least one of the sessions to go once more through the

communique, in case some colleagues need to consult with capital. But I would really stress, not two sessions, one. So let's decide which one we want, and we use it properly so that we go again through the communique. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Very good point, European Commission. But in that case, we will need to choose between the 9 AM session or the 3 PM session, which in any case will be before the actual voting. The thing is that the board meeting, and I'll be there, of course, is going to be at 4:30. So again, I'm in your hands. I see Netherlands and the USA. Netherlands?

MARCO HOGEWONING   My practical suggestion, and totally not because I do not want to get up early tomorrow morning, would be to take the second session for a final review and also have a gag wrap-up that allows for the maximum time for capitals and people to read this text and possibly come back with final comments. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Netherlands? USA?

USA   Yes, actually I was just going to ask if a wrap-up is planned as tradition.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Yes, indeed. We could have gone ahead with a wrap-up today, but if we have to do it tomorrow, we can go ahead and do it tomorrow. No problem. Again, in your hands. Any other suggestion? Otherwise, we'll reconvene tomorrow at 3:00 PM here. Again, unless anybody else has a better idea, the fact is that the board meeting is at 4:30. There's no way we can change that. No meaningful additional information will be added before 4:30. I would say before 5:30 tomorrow, because the voting actually happens right at the end of the meeting. But anyway.

GULTEN TEPE   European Commission in the chat just indicated preference for the morning session. Thank you, Gemma.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Yes. And we'll have a good discussion in that regard now, because we can reconvene at 9:00 AM in the morning, but again it's for us to decide.

MARCO HOGEWONING   Yeah, I'm now looking at schedule again. We are tomorrow morning conflicted with the Q&A with the executive team. So if people want to go to the Q&A with the executive team, we'll still meet at 9:00, but in a different room.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Netherlands. So we have a to be or not to be situation here, Shakespearean as usual. We can flip a coin, we can decide with some more logic and rationale behind. Or we can raise hands right away, which is not a usual procedure for the GAC. We tend to reach agreement, but in this case, given the fact that this is a very particular, and I wouldn't like to flip a coin in this case, so let's see, let's just try to get the temperature in the room. Who would like to come? Who would vote or who would be in favor of coming tomorrow at 9:00 AM in the morning? Please raise your hands. Thank you. 12. I counted 12. Am I correct? Please help me count because I'm nearsighted, so I might have ... who would be in favor of coming at 3:00 PM? Please raise your hands. Did you count the turns later? Okay, hold on, hold on. Please keep your hands up. There are 17 votes. Correct me if I'm wrong. I see 17 votes for 3:00 PM. No consensus here. This is unusual in the GAC. It's not the end of the world, and we will not be discussing nuclear secrets or anything like that, but so those who voted for the 9:00 AM session, would it be way too difficult to sleep a little bit more and come at 3:00 PM or you need to fly back to your capitals? But you would be okay? You would still be okay? Okay, so unless you tell me there are very strong feelings and very good reasons to show up at 9:00 AM tomorrow morning, let's reconvene at 3:00 PM And again, one last round of ... Just to make sure we're on the same page. No problem. Okay, thank you so much for your flexibility. Thank you very much. We'll stop here, and we'll reconvene tomorrow at 3:00 PM. Thank you very much. Enjoy the rest of the day. Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]