ICANN87 Bali | AGM – Joint Session: GAC and CSG
Sunday, October 18, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 WITA

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN87 GAC Meeting with the Commercial Stakeholder Group on Sunday, 18th of October at 16:30 local time. 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.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you'd 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'll be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I'll now leave the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Over to you, Nico. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone, to the last session of the day. This is a 60-minute session, so we'll be finished by 5:30, correct. So welcome. We have Osvaldo Novoa, my good

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.

friend from Uruguay. We have John McElwaine. Scottish last names are a challenge for me.

My apologies for that. And we have Mason Cole, and of course Susan Chalmers from the US, my distinguished colleague from Switzerland, Jorge Cancio, Vice Chair, and we have Manal Ismail, former GAC Chair, by the way, for this session. So the agenda, as you can see, we have three topics, provided we have enough time, but hopefully we will.

The first one is about DNS Abuse and some practical mitigation steps, and for that the shepherds will be Mason and Susan. The second one is on registration data, how to develop a workable model for accuracy and access and supplemental SSAD, and for that John McElwaine and Sushil Pal. Sushil, you want to join us here or you're gonna do it from the floor? Whatever you prefer. You're more than welcome to join us here.

SUSHIL PAL I get down with some confusion, so maybe...

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay, perfect. And then finally, provided we have enough time, we'll be talking about the review of reviews and the structural aspects, and for that our shepherds are going to be Mr. Novoa, Manal, and Tracy. I don't see Tracy here, though. Is Tracy in the room? Well, whatever the case, we have Manal Ismail here. Without further ado, let me hand the floor to Mason.

MASON COLE

Thank you very much, Nico, and good afternoon on behalf of the CSG, good afternoon to everyone at the GAC. I believe, Nico, this is either the first time or the first time in a long time that the CSG has had a bilateral with the GAC. So we're very pleased that the GAC was able to accommodate us and we look forward to a productive discussion. So thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Mason, always a pleasure to have you here. And you're right. Last time we had a bilateral, was it Istanbul? Three years ago, at least. Two or three years ago. Okay, so before we actually go to the slides, we kind of agreed of addressing the GAC the questions. And for that I'll hand the floor to John. Over to you.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks, Nico. John McElwaine for the record. I'm the IPC president. And the question that we received was what are the CSG's views on the existing 15-day timeline for verification of registrant email or telephone number? Does the CSG foresee any particular challenges with requiring verification to be completed before a newly registered domain name becomes operational?

I think a good place to start with our answer is with some statistics. This particular question gets covered quite well by the INFERMAL study which we're probably all aware of, but in that study done fairly recently, it was found that if there was pre-registration

verification, then it would be associated with a 70% decrease in malicious activities.

Essentially what that study was finding was that low friction, having APIs, free hosting, free email type things, was associated with a 400% increase in malicious activities.

Another study done quite recently on the .be, it was millions of domain names, a peer-reviewed study, found that when you had some AI involved in the early on verification of domain names, that achieved a 30% reduction in the domain names being revoked for being involved in malicious activity.

So what the studies have shown, and it makes sense, is that cheap domain names with low friction are more likely to be used for unlawful activities. So part of that friction can be a verification system.

But the CSG's view is that the existing timeline of 15 days is okay, but the verification procedures themselves are hollow, they can be easily gamed and are subject to throwaway data because a lack of accuracy. We recognize there'll be some challenges on implementing a more rigorous verification regime, particularly operationally for registrars.

However, in our view, it's in the public interest to strengthen these verification regimes to prevent malicious registrations. And in fact, businesses including registrars are already doing a lot of this similar verification, particularly when they're signing up new

customers. It's very common these days when you sign up to a new service, you have to enter in your name, your email address.

And how many of us have then experienced the time out we have to take while an email is sent to that email address for us to verify that we are actually receiving the email and that we are who we are. So that's something that goes on all the time now.

And it may not have been that way back in 2013. So know your customer shouldn't be a controversial idea we believe. And part of that is because no business, including a contracted party, wants to have bad customers as a client. It only costs them time, expense, headache dealing with the issues that can be caused as a result.

Again, as I mentioned before, that 15-day period comes from the 2013 RAA. So that was obviously developed more than 13 years ago. And that required registrars to verify a registrant's email address or telephone number within 15 days of registration. Transfer or change in the registrant data.

If verification failed, the registrar must then manually verify or suspend the domain name. But until then, the domain name can resolve and be used as normal. Technology we believe has caught up. So we believe that there can be a shortening of that 15-day period.

And the verification should be more than just syntactical. It should be operational. It should be actually checking to make sure that the email address works or that the phone number works. We're

seeing governments calling on this, the NIS2 directive, regulations, etc., that are being implemented by various countries in the EU.

So, long and short of it is the CSG supports verification being reduced to a window that would be reasonable, something 24-72 hours, or that verification would be a condition of activation of the domain name. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much for that, John. Let me pause here in order to see if there are follow-up questions in this regard. I don't see any hands in the room or online. So, okay. Thank you so much. Anything else, John, on your side, or we're good regarding the questions so far?

JOHN MCELWAINE I think we can move on. Are you good? Yeah.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. So moving on, I'll give the floor now to Mason. Please go ahead.

MASON COLE Thank you very much, Nico, and thank you, John, for covering that question for the CSG. Well, the slide is already there, good. The CSG has made DNS Abuse a significant priority in terms of policy development. And we wanted to first set the stage a bit and talk about areas where the GAC and the CSG are already in alignment.

So I looked back at some GAC communiques and some other public information from the GAC, and I'm pleased to say that the CSG and the GAC already are aligned on many of these issues.

And you can see from this table, for example, that on associated domain check, which is a PDP that's underway right now, and on both the bulk registration and API friction, which is a PDP that will soon get underway, the GAC and the CSG already are aligned.

And you see other areas of alignment as well, such as public reporting of abuse statistics, registration verification as it relates to DNS Abuse, and transparency reporting obligations.

There were only two areas in terms of CSG priorities where either an issue has not been taken up by the CSG, in this instance investigating subdomains, or has not been taken up by the GAC, in that instance mitigation of exact match domains. So I'll cover those issues here shortly in terms of the rationale for why these are CSG priorities.

Next slide, please. So what we're seeing in terms of DNS Abuse, tools are starting to make their way into gTLD and ccTLD policies and contracts. And I'm sure this is well known to the GAC, but there's an updated .us management contract that's in play right now that contains some of the same provisions called for by the community. So things like measures to proactively prevent DNS Abuse, accurate, verified, and validated contact information for registrations in that ccTLD. So this is pleasing to see.

Next slide, please. Again, in the area of broadening tools, we're seeing that tools are starting to show their utility. In this instance, associated domain check, if you saw the OCTO report from September 18th on the analysis for associated domain checks, over half of all reported maliciously registered domains in gTLDs were registered or used in combination with other domains. And a subset of reported abuse can be detected earlier using some associated domain methods compared to reliance on just standard security feeds alone.

And you can see some other areas here where these measures are coming into play. And so the community is now creating policies to address these problems. Next slide, please. So here is a bit about the rationale behind the CSG's thinking on next steps on DNS Abuse. And three out of the four CSG priority areas were addressed in the small team output before the GNSO issues report was put out at the start of policy development for DNS Abuse.

So transparency and reporting mitigation actions taken, if that's not in place, we have a lack of surety in abuse handling, and if there's no follow-up in terms of a report to the abuse reporter, that leads to uncertainty and unnecessary additional reports.

On mitigation of exact match domain registrations, that's not an area that was addressed in the issues report, but it's a CSG priority because there's significant financial and reputational damage done to companies and their users due to exact match domain registrations like I put an example in here, name login.com. It could

be any company or organization. These are used for phishing and fraud and disinformation. And this is a problem for businesses and organizations worldwide. So it's a CSG priority.

Next slide, please. Standardization of responses from registrars and registries, again noted in the issues report. Our rationale here is that inconsistent or non-substantive responses and timing equal inefficient mitigation and then needless follow-up on the part of reporters. So this is again a CSG priority.

Next slide, please. And then finally, risk-based validation, and this was noted in the issues report as well. So our concern here is that the level of validation that's carried out in generic TLDs today, which consists of only syntactical and operational validation, are subject to throwaway data. And I know this has been covered with the GAC before, but we've seen that ccTLDs that more stringently validate their data have lower instances of abuse.

So we know that registrars in some instances already fully validate user data to reduce fraud for certain parts of their operations, namely high-dollar auctions, so there's some merit to the procedure. And our position is that register first and ask questions later falls short of community needs.

Next slide, please. What do we want to do in terms of next steps? We can maybe use these questions to kick off a discussion on DNS Abuse, but we'd be curious to know about the priorities that the GAC would want to see the community pursue now that PDP 1 and

PDP 2 are underway, and we understand those are GAC priorities, they are for the CSG as well.

And then I'm also happy to tell you that the CSG and the contracted party house are engaged informally on additional steps such as best practices, agreement on common data sets, and then anticipation of and mitigation of event-driven abuse such as, for example, holiday shopping scams. So I'm going to stop there now, Nico, and if you'd like to open the floor, we'd be happy to take questions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Perfect, I was gonna suggest exactly that. So the floor is open. Questions or comments? Oops. Oh, Manal? I'm sorry, there's a hand from the European Commission. Go ahead, please, Martina.

MARTINA BARBERO: Thank you very much, Nico, and thank you very much, Mason, for the very helpful presentation. I appreciated the Excel table with the alignment, that's very visually useful. I think one of the questions, because you're asking question to us and what are our priorities, but one of the questions is also in terms of the prioritization exercise that GNSO is doing.

Because we understand that from the issue report there are many topics on which we're aligned and what goes first I think is kind of also depending on this prioritization effort that we've been hearing very briefly about in the bilateral between the GAC and GNSO.

But we didn't have time to dig into that, we were very rushed at the end. So I guess that you're part of that conversation and maybe you can let us know a bit what the prioritization, how does it look like, and for you how are you trying to influence a bit the prioritization.

MASON COLE

Thank you very much for the question. Yes, of course, we're aware that the GNSO is in the amidst of a prioritization exercise which we endorse. We're confident that all of the CSG priorities as they relate to DNS Abuse probably won't make it into the immediate prioritization.

ICANN has a great deal of business to deal with and we don't have the expectation that every need is going to be met immediately. However, that's not going to prevent our advocation for DNS Abuse mitigation measures because those that we represent are negatively impacted reputationally, financially, and otherwise by abuse. So to the extent that we can cooperate with our GNSO colleagues to advance DNS Abuse as priority matters for the GNSO, that's what we intend to do.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Mason. Thank you, European Commission, for the question. I have Peru next.

CORAL DE CIELO CANO GALLARDO: Thank you, Nico, and thank you, Mason, for a very substantive presentation. Allow me to offer a national perspective, bearing in mind that any advice is a matter for the GAC as a whole. First, Peru would see value in the GAC prioritizing the follow-through of PDP1 and untimely launch of PDP2 on the bulk registrations, given the evidence presented in the OCTO report.

Second, regarding common data sets, we would encourage that they reflect abuse trends across all regions, including Latin America and the Caribbean, so that mitigation measures respond to a generally global picture. Event-driven abuse should likewise consider regional and national events, not only global commercial seasons.

Third, on risk-based validation, we share the objective of reducing throwaway data with a view to a balanced outcome. Strict identity validation should remain proportionate, compatible with national data protection frameworks, and accessible to registrants in developing regions. Finally, we would welcome continuous CSG engagement on subdomain abuse, and we note with interest the exact match proposal, which could also merit consideration of geographic names.

And this leads me to a specific question: which specific risk signals does the CSG envisage as triggers for enhanced validation, and how could such a model avoid placing a disproportionate burden on registrars in developing countries?

GULTEN TEPE On gTLD domains registered by small businesses and individual registrants, particularly in emerging markets. Thank you.

MASON COLE Okay, sorry, I wanted to make sure I had the question correct. Thank you very much for the question. It's a valid concern about the impact that friction in the registration process may have on small businesses or organizations in emerging markets. And we don't intend to needlessly get in the way of domain name registrations, but we do intend to try to implement measures that will be in the public interest in terms of-- I'm being asked to slow down. Thank you.

We do hope to implement measures that would be in the public interest in terms of the safety and security of the DNS and otherwise prevent some of the levels of abuse that we see now in gTLDs. So I hope that was helpful in terms of an answer.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Peru, thank you, Mason. There's a question in the chat room from Europol. The question is, any intention of trying to modify the verification process to address possible exploitation like one-time usage emails or anonymization services?

MASON COLE I don't want to try to speak intelligently to something I'm uninformed on, so I don't have a good answer to that. I'm sorry, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO All right, so thank you anyways, Mason, and thank you Europol for the question. So at this point, let me give the floor to the USA on DNS Abuse.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair, and we appreciate the opportunity to meet with the Commercial Stakeholder Group during ICANN87. On DNS Abuse, I just wanted to note for our new GAC colleagues in particular to give our new colleagues the lay of the land on how the GAC engages on this very crucial public policy topic.

The topic co-leads are the European Commission, Japan, and the United States. And there is also a GAC small group on DNS Abuse. We normally have 10 to 15 representatives from across all regions, it seems, joining an hour-long call each week to progress the committee's work on DNS Abuse.

I would just say generally speaking, and very much in alignment with the comments from our colleague from Peru, that we're very pleased with the fast clip that the PDP1 process is moving at. It seems that we are making good progress on that timeline, and that we understand, especially from our last session, that discussions within the GNSO Council are underway on PDP2 on the charter.

And as the GAC called for in its ICANN83 Prague consensus advice, we hope that like PDP1, we are working with a targeted and narrowly scoped policy development process. And with that, oh, also, .us contract was raised by our colleagues from the CSG. I will just note that we do post that contract in the interest of transparency, and you can find it on NTIA's website. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so much, USA. Before we move on to the next topic which is registration data, are there any further questions as regarding -- oh, WIPO, go ahead please.

BRIAN BECKHAM: Thank you, Chair, Brian Beckham from WIPO. I wonder, Mason, the question on the screen about PDP1 and next steps. One of the questions that came up in that PDP was the scope, in particular doing the associated domain check across registrars as opposed to just within one registrar's dataset. And so I wonder if the CSG has formed a view on that.

MASON COLE: Thanks for the question, Brian. Not formally, but we recognize how difficult it may be for registrars to share data across businesses. It would probably be somewhat easier for registrars who manage multiple accreditations under one corporate umbrella, under one ownership umbrella to do so.

We've talked with our colleagues in the Registrar Stakeholder Group and we understand the operational challenges involved in sharing data between competing registrars. So we've not formed a position on that until we have better dialogue with the registrars.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Okay. Any further questions? Ah, there's a hand from India. Please go ahead, Sushil. Oh, sorry, Santosh.

T. SANTHOSH Thank you, Chair. While we appreciate the priorities which CSG has taken forward, we would also like to mention about the other priorities which we have taken on the addressing registration data accuracy and also increasing the transparency in the reporting obligations along with a consensus policy on the subdomain abuse. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. Any further comments or questions? All right, seeing none, let's move on. Next slide, please. Here we go. Registration -- and for that, I'll give it back the floor. Should I give it to John? Okay, John, go ahead, please.

JOHN MCELWAINE Thank you, John McElwaine again for the record. So my three slides I wanted to put together firstly prior to the work that we've done this week, yes, this week on the SSAD, but the purpose of

them was to try to address some issues of alignment between the CSG and how we thought the GAC would be as well.

And the first one obviously is on the issue of urgent requests, which the CSG supports. And through the authentication portion of the SSAD, it's clear that the first group of authenticated users will be law enforcement agencies.

But we are developing in the SSAD small review team an authentication mechanism that should allow for other groups in the future to become authenticated and then hopefully those requests would have a higher degree of urgency, and I don't mean that in the sense of an urgent request, but would have a quicker response, perhaps more trusted activities associated with them.

So what we could foresee is that the authentication procedures currently being developed in the SSAD would allow for a framework that would include, beyond law enforcement, governmental and intergovernmental authorities, such as consumer protection agencies, cybersecurity professionals and actors, including within governments, intellectual property counsel, brand protection services and professionals, and then other trusted requesters.

So I think that is a good source of alignment and where the SSAD is moving towards, having an authentication process that would enable those types of groups to take advantage of the SSAD more than just being a regular requester. Next slide, please.

So this next slide has actually been surpassed by events at the last SSAD small review team, but what was clear from our prior work is that both the IPC and the GAC were trying to seek a policy where when you encountered a registration that was behind a privacy proxy, there would be an easy way to request that information through the SSAD system being developed.

We were hitting some hurdles on that, but thanks to your GAC representatives, a proposal was made that appears to have good consensus, good support within the SSAD small review team. And so that has been put into the draft policy. And we hope that continues to stay in the policy, because it will allow for there to be this seamless disclosure.

In other words, if through the SSAD system you provide all the information that a privacy proxy service requires for a disclosure, then they will, through that same system, provide that information.

I don't know how many of the audience here have been an actual user of the RDRS system, but prior to this, if you made a request and it was behind a privacy proxy, you ended up essentially getting a response back that your request was denied because the information was already public, and that is in fact true, it is the request, the information behind a privacy proxy is within the normal ICANN lookup system, WHOIS system.

But for those who aren't familiar with the process, it was a confusing answer, so I'm really happy to see that we're going to have one integrated system hopefully that will enable requesters

to make a request and then have it processed pursuant to the privacy proxy terms between that service provider and their customer.

We can move on to the next slide, please. Another area where I think there is alignment is making sure that there's meaningful response standards, prioritization, and accountability. And by that, we within the small review team have been working on certain target response times for a request.

The current registration data policy has already built into its policy a 30-day response window. But that doesn't necessarily mean that there should be a lesser response time for an urgent request, clearly, which is -- that doesn't seem to be controversial.

But we're hoping that there can be a shorter response time, as I mentioned in the first slide, for requests that are related to important but maybe not reaching the level of the current definition of an urgent request, so that could be things such as DNS Abuse, trademark infringement, counterfeiting, things that are serious and can also be crimes, but maybe doesn't rise to the level of an urgent request.

And I think lastly to mention is that the what we've been referring to as service-level SLAs, that is something where currently the policy of 30 days is far longer than what the actual time for a response had been under our experience with the RDRS system.

The RDRS system was issuing approvals for registration data within I think it was about seven or eight days and denials in around 16 days. So we hope to see some sort of target response time that is less than that 30 days, maybe wouldn't result in a compliance violation, but would be a message out there to requesters that they could expect a response back in less than 30 days.

So with that, I can kind of turn it back over for any questions or comments.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, John. So let me open the floor at this point for comments or questions. I have, I have Canada. Please go ahead, David.

DAVID BEDARD Thank you, Nico, and thanks everybody for coming to the bilateral today. We really appreciate the chance to connect.

John, this is just to say that I think the GAC is equally optimistic that the group is heading in the right direction, and I know that we're facing the public comment coming up on November 10th, and I think that we're feeling pretty good about that, and I just want to thank you for your positive engagement within the group, and I think that we're broadly aligned on many of the issues that were a bit challenging to work through, but I think that we're getting there, so just thanks for all your support and working through some of these issues. Really appreciate it. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE Well, I might add thank you for the solution that you proposed that really got the small review team to where it is right now. That was a big win for everybody involved in that, so thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO All right, I have India next. Sorry, sorry for the confusion, Nico. I don't know whether -- like not being there and me commenting from here, I mean, sorry for that. I think responding to the first question, while the immediate focus can be on the law enforcement authorities, I think for which, you know, the pilot is underway, which we saw in the morning discussion.

However, I think we believe that there should be a framework to include, you know, other legitimate requester categories, be it intergovernmental organizations or IP holders. And maybe they should require a fundamental redesign of the system in a phased manner, but let's see, I mean, how quickly and how fast we go even for the LEAs for that matter, that's one.

Further, even with regard to the LEAs, I think regarding authentication there was a question whether it will have to go through the registrar's authentication again. So we believe that with LEAs, there is already a pretty established system for the authentication, and once it has been done, then there should not be any duplication of authentication at the registrars' end, because

it has gone through a significant level of a due diligence and system checks at the government level.

And regarding the disclosure of privacy and proxy registration data, we consider that the effectiveness of the underlying privacy registration, it remains an important and still unresolved issue in the SSAD supplemental recommendation.

The discussions are underway, and as per present recommendations 3 and 8, we see that registrars may retain a discretion not only over disclosure itself, but potentially over what they are willing to consider requests for such data, which I mean, which India as a country do not support.

So I think our position is that registrars should be required to accept and substantially consider properly submitted requests for underlying privacy and proxy data, with clear and consistent obligations. Under recommendation 8, I think you also raised a concern about recommendation 8.7.3, which continues, still continues to have a language of "may," and we believe that this should be rather a must obligation.

And in this regard, our position is that the PPCI implementation discussions whereby relevant obligation would be incorporated directly into Registrar Accreditation Agreement could be a practical approach for ensuring registrars' accountability, reseller, and other intermediaries with their, within their contractual chains.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. Are you done, Sushil? Thank you so much. John?

JOHN MCELWAINE The only thing that I would mention is that with respect to that 8.7.3, we have gotten to a proposal that seems to have traction or acceptance within the small review team that would actually be a must. So we are trending in the right direction on that, and your comments are very much appreciated.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much. Canada, is that an old hand? Over to you.

DAVID BEDARD Yeah, thanks, just sort of to echo what John said, we have worked pretty hard within the SRT to come to ground on an agreement on the 8.73, which I think with some new numbering, it's 5.73, but happy to connect offline to talk about that further, but as John mentioned, we're sitting at a must in that recommendation now, so we're pretty satisfied with the direction that's taking. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Canada, and the floor is still open before we move on, before we move to the review of reviews issue. I want to make sure we exhausted whatever questions or comments you might have in this regard. And I'm looking at the floor, I don't see any hand in the room so far. No hand online.

Okay, next slide, please, Gulten. So for the review of reviews, Manal, I assume I will give you the floor. Is that correct? Cause I don't see Tracy in the room, so that makes you and Osvaldo as well. I'm sorry. Yeah, go ahead. The floor is yours, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Nico, and I think Osvaldo would like to go first. I think you have proposed the agenda item and happy to give you the floor first. Go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA Okay, thank you. First of all, we want to establish we recognize the importance of the reviews for the continuous accountability, transparency, and also of the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN. We think it's very important. We have, I would say, certain discrepancies with some of the decision taken, in particular regarding the structural review.

We think that almost since the creation of ICANN we haven't have a whole structural review. It's similar to the holistic review recommended by the ATRT3 six years ago. Which couldn't be started. The board recommended a pilot and I think it couldn't be completed.

So we think that should be the first thing we should do, a structural review of the whole ICANN, both SOs, ACs, the relationship with ICANN org, the relation with the board, the communication

between them, not a review of the board or the ICANN org, but yes the relationship with the rest of ICANN.

And I think that would be very important for the ATR since now what is recommended is two periodic reviews, the accountability and transparency and the structural review. We don't agree with the cadence of the reviews since the ATR has a cadence of five years, would be repeated every five years but the structural review every 15 years, which we don't think is justified.

It should be much shorter, 15 years in the internet ecosystem is a lifetime, everything changes. Initially the 15 years was based on an structural review that took 33 months, almost 3 years, that has now been reduced to 18 months, like the ATR, so we support the same cadence for both periodical reviews.

I think there is another slide. So basically, this is what I have just commented. We think the structural review has to be first. There lot of other efforts in particular the ATR would be affected by the results of a structural review, which would take 18 months, I think that's a good advance and the cadence should be much less than 15 years. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO So I have a quick question on that. So if you say more often than 15 years and we're all happy about that, but what would be the time frame? More or less?

OSVALDO NOVOA Well, we have several positions. Personally, I think it would be five, six years, both reviews the same. Others said between eight and 10 years, but never more than 10 years. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO So the answer would be no more than 10 years, that's a fair answer to consider. Thank you so much. There we go, the floor is open for comments or questions. Sorry, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL Thank you, Nico, and thank you very much, Osvaldo, first of all for your active participation within the cross-community group on reviews. I have to say that we haven't had an explicit discussion on structural reviews within the GAC, so I cannot claim there is an explicit collective position on that.

But from the cross-community group perspective it's worth noting that the proposal of the internet service providers and connectivity providers constituency has been discussed. And there was not really wide support of having the structural review goes first, except from the ISPCP. The group was more of the view that accountability and transparency review should go first.

It's already envisaged under the ICANN bylaws and meanwhile we saw that preparations for the structural review could run in parallel, to have it incorporated into the ICANN bylaws but also to have it aligned with the ICANN's strategic planning process or cycle.

Because we thought instead of having duplicated efforts we can benefit from the horizon scan I think it's called to feed into the structural review, so this would need some alignment from the structural review side. This is on which review should go first. And again, I'm sharing the discussions from the cross-community group side.

On the cadence again there was different views on the cadence some people saw 20 years would be good enough and some said 10, so 15 was a compromise that we were able to reach.

Again, it's a full-blown structural review looking into the ICANN ecosystem and the interrelationships between the different SOs and ACs, so it's quite an intensive review and we need to take into consideration as well having a good time between the reviews to accommodate for the implementation of the recommendations that comes out.

So we're trying to be flexible and at the same time be cautious that we do not repeat any challenges that we are trying to avoid from the previous system. Again, I leave it at this I'm not speaking for the GAC here. I'm happy to give you back the floor, Nico, and open the floor for GAC interventions. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Manal. And I'm doing exactly that at this point. Floor is open for comments or questions. Any hand in the room? I don't see any hand online though. So seeing none, let me ask at

this point, is there anything else you would like to add in that regard, Osvaldo? Before we wrap up?

OSVALDO NOVOA: No, I think that the discussion should be in the CCG not here so I just stated our position and we will continue in the working group. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: And thank you. Thank you very much for sharing your position and thank you for triggering this discussion within the GAC as I said it was not explicitly discussed before so thank you for bringing this to everyone's attention. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Indeed, and thank you, Manal, as well. So before we wrap up, is there anything, Susan, Jorge anything we need to address at this point, Mason, John, anything to add?

MASON COLE: I have one issue that's not on the agenda and that is on behalf of the CSG to thank you, Nico, for your service to the community as chair. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: My pleasure. Thank you so much then. I don't see any hand online or in the room. So we're wrapping up at this point. Let me just

remind you that tomorrow we'll see each other at 9:00 a.m. for the welcome ceremony and for the Tarek Kamel award. Thank you so much. The session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]