ICANN87 Bali | AGM – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC
Tuesday, October 20, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 WITA

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN87 GAC meeting with the ICANN Board session on Tuesday, 20th of October at 15:00 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 will be speaking in case speaking in 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 Ian Sheldon, GAC Vice Chair. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Good afternoon. My name is Ian Sheldon. I am the current GAC Vice Chair, and unfortunately, our current Chair has had to depart

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.

the meeting early, so he has asked me to step in and cover his chair duties for the remainder of this meeting.

I'd like to start by very much thanking the Board for coming and meeting with the GAC. We find these exchanges incredibly fruitful, productive, and collegiate, and very much looking forward to an excellent exchange this afternoon. So, I might pass the floor to Tripti before we get started. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Ian. The Board very much appreciates this meeting. We look forward to a good, candid conversation on issues of concerns and topics that might impact public policy.

But before we run the agenda, I would like to explain that Theresa Swinehart is joining us this afternoon in place of Kurtis Lindqvist, our CEO, because he had to leave last night for Switzerland to attend to -- he had a minor medical emergency. So, between his two deputies, John Jeffrey and Theresa Swinehart, they will step in for him when necessary. So, she is representing Kurtis. So with that, I'll turn it back to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. The agenda is reasonably straightforward. We'll work through first, the ICANN Board's questions to the GAC before working through the GAC's questions to the Board. And then hopefully we'll have some time at the end for other business. With

that, perhaps we can move to the next slide. Yes, over to you. Thank you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right, we just reversed the order. So, these were our questions to the GAC from the Board. And I'll read the first question and turn it back to Ian. So, as you know, the RIR has been working on its governance documents. So the recommended draft RIR governance document outlines ongoing commitments each RIR must meet.

So the question is, do these operational requirements reflect the GAC's observations in the issues of importance from the ICANN85 Communiqué? And does the GAC have other areas for consideration, such as potential public policy concerns, to share with us or the ASO about the current draft? Ian, back to you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Tripti. I think Marco will be reading out the GAC's response to this question. Thank you.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, thank you, Ian. Thank you, Tripti. The GAC has reviewed the recommended draft RIR governance document against our observations from the ICANN84 Dublin and ICANN85 Mumbai Communiqués, and our overall assessment is positive.

The GAC emphasized public interest stewardship of Internet number resources, monitoring and auditing against objective and measurable operational criteria, and consistency with ICANN's multistakeholder approach. We feel that the draft addresses much of this through ongoing operational requirements, audits, and compliance reviews, and it recognizes governments as part of the numbering community.

The GAC also reiterates the importance of an appropriate and constructive role for the ICANN community in the recognition and derecognition processes, as highlighted in Dublin, and would welcome further clarity on how this could be reflected in the subsequent implementation arrangements. Overall, the GAC welcomes the progress made and encourages timely consideration of the governance framework. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA Thank you, Marco.

IAN SHELDON I have one hand from the floor. I don't know if India would like to follow up with a comment to supplement Marco's response?

T. SANTHOSH Yeah, thank you, Ian. And in addition to what Marco has mentioned about the various Communiqués, which has mentioned about the progress being carried out on the RIR governance structure, the priority is to have an open ICANN public comment process on the

recommended draft before going for the further approval as well as adoption, because it will give an opportunity for the GAC to review the comments which has been already addressed.

And also, this will provide wider community inputs to assess the material changes and the remaining concerns before the final framework is finalized. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA Yeah, thank you for that comment. Indeed, there will be a public comment process when we're done reviewing the -- We have their draft, but there will be that step. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Perhaps we can move on to the next question.

TRIPTI SINHA Sure. So, the next two questions relate to the 2026 round. So, the first question is, how is the GAC coming along with its own preparations to keep up with this recent round, the 2026 round of new gTLDs?

The second part of the question is, can you share examples or generalizations of work GAC representatives have done in their countries to help governments or applicants prepare? Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. For the GAC's responses to these questions, I might give the floor to my colleague, Jorge. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Ian. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland and Vice Chair for the record. So happy to be here with you. And thank you for the questions. We will answer both questions with one answer, which is that the GAC has been doing significant preparatory work to ensure that members and observers are ready to engage effectively once applications are published.

And building on discussions at ICANN86 and also prior meetings, the GAC leadership, topic leads, and GAC support developed an operational readiness framework, together with supporting materials for GAC member early warnings and for the consideration of possible GAC advice. The early warning guide and template have already been reviewed and approved by the GAC, while the broader operational framework and advice approach are being finalized as we speak.

With the reveal day now having taken place on October 7th, the focus is shifting from preparation to application review, and the GAC community members have begun reviewing applications and any replacement strings ahead of this meeting of ICANN87, where the GAC is exchanging preliminary observations and identifying potential public policy issues.

Following string confirmation day on 17th of November, the GAC will move into the formal review period, including the 104-day GAC member early warning window.

Capacity development sessions during this meeting at ICANN87 have already taken place with the goal of ensuring that members understand the available mechanisms, timelines, and practical processes for engaging in the round. At the national level, preparations naturally vary among GAC members.

We are 185, I think, and then we also have observers, but may include coordination across relevant government agencies, raising awareness of the round among domestic stakeholders, and engagement with potential applicants. The GAC's capacity development efforts so far have also sought to support members in understanding the processes and tools available to them at the national level. With this, I give the floor back to Ian.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Jorge. I see no hands, so perhaps we can move on unless there are further comments from...

TRIPTI SINHA: No, thank you very much for that response. Did you have any questions?

THERESA SWINEHART I think from an Org standpoint, if there is just anything else that we can do to help support the GAC, please do let us know around that. So, thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. If there are no further thoughts, perhaps we can continue on to the next slide, please. So the first of the GAC's questions to the Board: "What specific measures is the Board considering within its remit and in coordination with ICANN Org, the GNSO, and contracted parties to advance work on DNS abuse gaps that do not require a full PDP, alongside PDP 1 and PDP 2?"

TRIPTI SINHA Thank you for the question. Jim Galvin is going to take this one for the Board. Go ahead, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN Thank you, Tripti. First, want to say thank you for the question. The Board certainly joins the GAC in seeking to advance DNS abuse mitigation as efficiently as possible. Recall that in addition to identifying a number of potential gaps in mitigating DNS abuse, the GNSO Council's final issue report on DNS abuse sought to differentiate between the need for policy development or a non-policy development approach would be more appropriate.

So currently, in that evaluation, the only non-policy gap for which there was broad community support, including commentary from the GAC, was to pursue improving the coordination on DGAs. And

that, in fact, as part of that report, was suggested to be addressed by OCTO directly with the community.

So, that's the only item currently that exists that we expect to move forward from the GNSO. It's important also to keep in mind that mitigating DNS abuse is not something where we just fix the problem. The steps we are all taking collectively as a community are important, yet they're incremental in nature.

We have a baseline with our recent DNS abuse amendments that are working and are demonstrating our collective interest in mitigating DNS abuse. And we, the Board, really would like to allow for that already committed work to reach a successful conclusion without distracting from the progress that PDP 1 and eventually PDP 2 are hopefully going to achieve.

The Board would welcome the GAC, in fact, in helping to identify if there are any other specific gaps that should be pursued where policy development is not needed. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you for the response. I might pause to see if any of my committee members had any thoughts on your question immediately, Jim. I see India. Please.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you. I think GAC in its earlier Communiqués has already indicated for the 15-day verification timeline to make it concurrent with the activation. That's something on which discussions have

been going on with the contracted parties, as well as with ICANN as well.

And also, keeping in view the recent study of the Oxford, which was recently released in the Oxford Journal of Cyber Security, wherein about 1,600 malicious domains were -- 16,000 malicious domains across 190 TLDs and 200 registrars were analyzed.

And it was found that 90% of those malicious domains, they survived only for 2 days. After that, they did not even come up for a verification. And the mean life was about 1 day. And only 6% of those malicious domains actually lived beyond 15 days. That's something we would again request ICANN Board to marshal its resources, whatever is available with them, to take it forward. Thank you so much.

JAMES GALVIN

So, two comments. One is, thank you for calling out the 15-day verification timeline. That's actually part of the next question, and so I'll respond more fully about that.

But I did just want to observe that of all the things that you're talking about, they are part of the issues report, the topics that are there. So, they are actually in front of the community, the GNSO Council, and will be considered along with the prioritization process going on there. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Any other follow-up questions from my GAC colleagues? I see none, so perhaps we can move to the next question. So, as foreshadowed: registration data accuracy.

In light of the Board's 25 August 2026 letter identifying contractual negotiations and policy development as the two available mechanisms for modifying the 15-day verification timeline, and the Board's openness to considering other approaches (Board-GAC Call of 16 July 2026), what steps could the Board envisage to accelerate progress through these mechanisms or other avenues while respecting the multistakeholder process?

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, once again, for the question. And let me apologize in advance: this response is a bit lengthy, but let me see if I can get through this and cover everything that needs to be here. It's a general comment and a reminder: the Board is pleased to join with the GAC and the community in our joint commitment to the multistakeholder process as an effective means to address gaps in DNS abuse mitigation.

The Board, in particular, is very supportive of ICANN org's coordinated, cross-functional efforts to advance DNS abuse mitigation, including contractual compliance, technical research, publications, engagement with governments, and the broader community, and supporting consensus policy development. So, together, all of these things help strengthen our mitigation efforts.

They inform our community discussions and support evidence-based approaches to addressing DNS abuse. So, it's important not to lose sight of the other commitments to improving the DNS abuse mitigation landscape. This includes the work of the council, working with the community to scope DNS abuse PDPs to ensure a focused effort that can achieve consensus efficiently.

PDP 1 has been not even quite a year in execution, and as it nears completion, the GNSO Council has already initiated PDP 2, which seeks to put into place requirements to gain access to domain registration data at scale, and what's important here is this aligns with priorities the GAC has previously shared.

So, the Board understands that the council is in progress to amend the draft charter that's been circulating for PDP 2, and that the GAC, in fact, provided input to that team via the GAC's points of contact to the GNSO.

The Board certainly appreciates that the GAC got directly involved in working through that process as to what should be covered there and the priorities that are set by the council in terms of the PDPs. And we really would like to encourage and certainly appreciate the GAC finding additional opportunities to stay engaged with that GNSO process.

Now, more directly, with respect to the 15-day verification timeline, the Board is aware that it is one of the identified gaps in the GNSO Council final issues report on DNS Abuse Mitigation that would likely require a policy development process. It was not separated

out like the DGA issue that was mentioned earlier. So combining that with the changing DNS abuse landscape, the Board is supportive of the GNSO Council's efforts with the broader community to prioritize the identified gaps.

And the Board would welcome the GAC finding opportunities through its points of contact with the GNSO to engage in that prioritization process. That's our multistakeholder model. Now, since you asked specifically about contractual negotiations, the Board is certainly open to discussion regarding the use of contractual obligations.

Of course, as we all know, this would really require alignment between the negotiating parties on the importance and scope of the issues to be addressed, which in this case would require discussions within the community itself to establish their alignment before we could start contractual negotiations.

The Board is unaware of any other mechanism that would respect the multistakeholder process. You asked us explicitly to identify other means to do this, and we don't have anything else to suggest. We would, however, welcome the GAC helping to identify other potential mechanisms. We're certainly open to that discussion if anyone has a suggestion. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Jim. I think the GAC will continue to look for creative solutions to this challenge, and we're certainly looking to harness

all the various experts across the committee. Are there any follow-up comments or questions from the GAC on this point? India, please.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you. Thank you for a very long response. We understand that, yes, I think these negotiations will have to go through that contracted party house. I think, without a doubt, we're not asking to shy away from that. But we just want to expedite more. And secondly, because we often see that there is a demand for more and more evidence-based reporting. Although what we believe that we have enough of ICANN research, and we have enough of the publications coming out in the best of the journals which support these.

I'm mixing the first question as well as this one. Can we actually have some kind of enablement to make the DNS abuse reporting by the registrars mandatory so that this question of evidence-based reporting, I think, gets at least rest for some time?

Because as of now, whatever research reports comes out, it's all based upon certain sample. It's not a complete whole. And which leads to a different logic and different conclusions, different assertions, depending upon which registrar you are seeking to analyze. And some of the worst registrars, you don't even get their data to analyze and report. So is there any way possible, obviously

through the multistakeholder process, to put in place a mechanism for making the DNS abuse mandatory by the registrars?

JAMES GALVIN If I can ask a clarifying question to distinguish something. Are you asking about registrars executing their responsibilities in DNS abuse mitigation, or are you saying something about reporting mechanisms that are ineffective?

SUSHIL PAL What I understand as of now that all DNS abuse does not get reported. My request is to make it mandatory that all DNS abuse gets reported. And then definitely we can talk about evidence-based reporting.

JAMES GALVIN The observation I would make is that ICANN has no remit over reporters. That would be anyone on the Internet could be reporting abuse, so I'm not sure how we would make it mandatory to report abuse.

SUSHIL PAL For the registrars to report.

JAMES GALVIN I'm sorry, say again?

SUSHIL PAL For the registrars to report. All the DNS abuse for the registrars to report. Whatever is, because whatever community reports, I think it gets routed back to registrars for them to report. That's what I know. Correct me if...

JAMES GALVIN No, I'm not understanding. Registrars don't report abuse. They act on abuse reported to them. I'm not understanding your question, I'm sorry.

TRIPTI SINHA If I could clarify your question. I think what you're saying is that have the registrars report out on abuse that they are aware of, correct? That's what he's saying.

JAMES GALVIN No, there isn't any, Greg? Registrars and registries are not required to report statistics to ICANN on what they do with abuse. But they do have to show the actions they took when Compliance decides to check up on them and see what they're doing. So you're right, currently there's no requirement for reporting out on the actions that they take. That would be something that could be added to the list of considerations to the GNSO Council as it prioritizes work items. And the community could decide what to do with that. Thank you.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA Greg, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE Yeah. So, currently, registrars have an obligation to respond to abuse, and if there's inquiries from ICANN, they have an obligation to respond with more specificity on what action was taken. I don't think the ICANN Board would object to more stringent reporting requirements.

However, that would be a new contractual or a new requirement that would have to be developed by policy. And I think, I could be wrong, it's referenced in the issue report as well, the idea that there could be more standard responses to abuse reports. So I think it's an interesting idea, but again, that would be a new requirement which would require policy development.

IAN SHELDON Thank you for the clarification. I might give the floor to the US next. Susan, please.

SUSAN CHALMERS Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, United States. On the subject of DNS abuse reporting, it's a general area of interest, certainly for

GAC representatives. There's a diversity of views, I think, in how exactly to approach this subject. But in the meantime, at least, just to note that the US would encourage registrars to voluntarily and transparently report on DNS abuse reports they receive, how many were actionable, for example, what actions they took in response, and what the outcome of those actions were. But in the area of DNS abuse, certainly in our view, the priorities are achieving results from PDP 1 and 2. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN: So a quick comment in response. Thank you for that. I will offer there are, in fact, several registries and registrars who do routinely report out on their actions with respect to DNS abuse. So that is happening in some places voluntarily. I don't want to list names up here, but they're easily found. One can search and find those things. It's the issue of making it mandatory, which I believe was being asked for over here, which is, as Greg said, would require a policy development process. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah, I just want to add one piece to that is that within the registrar and registry ecosystem, there are parties working to develop systems, for example, that you can report abuse in a central reporting mechanism. There are organizations like NetBeacon that

have a centralized reporting feature. And that organization works with registries and registrars to develop statistics that are helpful in combating abuse. So I just wanted to note that this work is happening in the broader ecosystem in which more visibility on trends and how registrars are responding is happening.

I think additional policy is always helpful as well, but we should acknowledge this isn't happening in a void. There's a lot of community efforts that are advancing this specific subject.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Greg. I think it's important again to, as you've noted, recognize a lot of fantastic work that is happening out in the broader community and ecosystem. And perhaps this is something the GAC could schedule for a future meeting or an intersessional discussion to invite more of those community members to showcase more of that work to the full committee.

I do have one question in the chat from Europol, which I'll read out: "Are there any plans to address the use of anonymization tools for registration in the view of improving data accuracy? We are aware of the importance of general data protection principles. We don't want to ignore those. But very often threat actors leverage on the attack of clear identification practices and accountability on registered domains.

For example, due to the accessibility of email address that do not require the user to be directly addressable, the possibility of

identifying an offender is in line with the willingness to reduce DNS abuse from a general preventative perspective. Thanks."

JAMES GALVIN Yeah, was really a question there? And also, the transcript said "indiscernible", and I have to admit that even I didn't understand it when you said it. Could you say that again?

IAN SHELDON Try again. And I apologize for the Australian accent. "Are there any plans to address the use of anonymization tools for registration in the view of improving data accuracy?"

JAMES GALVIN Short answer, there are currently no plans.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. A quick response is a good one. Any other comments before we move to any other business or before we move off the registration data accuracy topic? I see no hands, so perhaps we could move on to the next slide, please.

SSAD urgent requests. So perhaps I'll read all three of these out and we can handle them together.

1. What outstanding issues must be resolved before the SSAD SRT's supplemental policy recommendations are ready for Board consideration?

2. Could the Board provide an update on the LEA Authentication Input Group, including progress on expediting authentication independently of the broader SSAD work and possible technical approaches to enabling the 24-hour urgent request response timeline?

3. When does the Board expect the urgent request obligations under the Registration Data Policy to take effect?

TRIPTI SINHA Thank you, Ian, for the question. Wes Hardaker will take this one for us. Wes?

WES HARDAKER Thank you very much for the questions. Because there are three long answers, I will take a brief pause in between to make sure that I've addressed each question. For those that have not met me, I am Wes Hardaker, the RSSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board.

For the first question, the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team has been conversing very frequently in both regular meetings and in work sessions, and the team is continuing this week during four work sessions at ICANN87, which includes an all-day face-to-face meeting last week.

The SSAD SRT is working to finalize all of its work, including addressing the policy alignment issues identified in the RDRS policy alignment analysis, and is considering potential SSAD costs. In fact, we just had a briefing about costs in one of the work

sessions this week. Greg DiBiase and I are the acting Board liaisons to the SSAD SRT, and are very closely following this work and actively participating in the group as well.

As for timing, the SRT currently anticipates publishing its recommendations for public comment in November of 2026, and submitting its final recommendations to the GNSO Council in March of 2027. Following the GNSO Council's consideration for approval, the recommendations will, of course, be forwarded to the Board for consideration.

If there are no follow-on questions to that, I'd be happy to go to the second one. Hearing none. Answering the second question, ICANN org has facilitated three Law Enforcement Agent Authentication Input Group sessions to date.

These sessions initially focused on establishing the group's purpose, scope, and the timeline, and have subsequently been discussing how the FBI and Interpol authentication mechanisms are being tested in the development version of the RDRS testbed.

Essentially, unlike policy discussions that have taken place within the SSAD SRT, this effort has focused on obtaining early feedback about the feasibility of a technical implementation once the SSAD recommendations are accepted and implementation in full is to begin.

ICANN org has shown some proposed wireframe workflow diagrams actually, I think, just yesterday during the input group,

that was on Monday, yesterday. The planned proof-of-concept test is anticipated to take place in December of this year, and a summary of findings and lessons learned is expected in March of 2027.

With respect to the third question, the Board requested the GNSO Council input on how to address an enforcement gap for urgent requests, as the policy recommendations in EPDP Phase 1 did not reference authentication providers, although the resulting language in the Registration Data Policy noted the requirement for an authentication provider.

In its reply, the GNSO Council noted that a policy for authentication providers must first be implemented in order for a 24-hour urgent request timeline to be enforced. The council suggested that such a requirement should come from the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team's work on authentication.

Consequently, the 24-hour urgent response timeline will become effective on the date that ICANN org fully implements a consensus policy that establishes an authentication process for requesters. An implementation of an authentication mechanism cannot fully begin, of course, until the Board approves the SSAD supplemental recommendations, which, as I said before, is currently anticipated in 2027.

I'd like to add, as I indicated a moment ago when responding to the previous question, that the lessons learned from the Law Enforcement Authentication Agency's Authentication Input Group

will hopefully ensure that an implementation is both possible and timely.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Wes. Any follow-up questions or comments? Greg, please.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks. I just wanted to add a little bit of color, as I'm also on the group. From the Board's perspective, this group has been working very fast and doing great work. They've had face-to-face sessions before each meeting. Their meeting schedule has been very aggressive. We're really down to the last couple issues before public comment, and the GAC liaisons have been outstanding in helping us move forward and get to where we need to go.

So I just think at a high level, it's worth noting that the Board is looking at this work and thinking that it's really -- It's only been in effect since May 2026. In ICANN years, this is going pretty fast. So just wanted to add that color.

WES HARDAKER: Let me add one more thing, that we really appreciate the GAC's presence in the SRT. And in fact, one of the things that was agreed upon this week was acceptance of some of the GAC's wording on a recommendation change. So, thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Cool. Thank you, Greg and Wes. I have a very short queue forming, so perhaps I'll give the floor to the European Commission. Gemma, please.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Ian. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. First of all, let me offer congratulations to the group, the SSAD SRT group. I want to echo what Greg just said. I think the work has been so far very productive and speedy, which is, of course, a very good result in its own. And also, I want to thank the Board for the answers they provided to the questions in relation to urgent requests and the SSAD.

I have a short follow-up question, particularly considering that urgent requests policy has been recently introduced in the Registration Data Policy, to seek confirmation rather from the Board that the SSAD SRT work is meant to translate the policy into the recommendations, to update the recommendations in light of the policy, and not rather to further specify the policy, amend the policy, or act on the policy. Thank you very much.

WES HARDAKER

So, if I can respond to that. I think we're actually going to talk about that in the answer to the next topic, but nonetheless, some decisions were made actually this week with respect to how to make sure that when the SSAD SRT is done with its recommendations, that there will be language included in it saying

that the other policy does not need to be further modified. That was sort of discussed this week. So granted, it's under active discussion, so take that with a grain of salt to some extent.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. India, Sushil, please.

SUSHIL PAL: Thank you. I understand that the pilot which is being conducted is for authentication between the Interpol and the FBI. And for operationalizing the 24-hour urgent request, we should ideally -- It's only a comment.

I think we should be running a pilot for a full authentication which actually ends with authentication with the ICANN central system, be it RDRS or SSAD, whatever. It has to -- At the end of it, it's a technical system through which the authentication will go to registrar. So if that can be done, at least then in that case, we're not doing pilot of half of the process, and we do a pilot of the full process.

That's only a feedback. We would engage with the early authentication input group any which way. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: If I can follow up on that really quickly. The way I have been phrasing the purpose of the Law Enforcement Authentication Input Group is to get as early feedback as possible. It is being tied to a

RDRS test system, not the production system. It will not be put in place because the policy is not finished yet. But the goal is to enable a more rapid interface for all agencies or all login mechanism, authentication mechanisms in the future.

So we certainly could not consider an implementation to be complete until it really had done sort of the end-to-end test that you just referred to. So that certainly will be done before implementation is fully finished, after the policy is passed, the ICANN Board has approved it, and implementation is final. The input group hopefully will allow that to be more rapid because we're getting very early feedback about how that technical mechanism will work. Hopefully, that makes sense.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. I have Canada next. David, please.

DAVID BEDARD: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Wes, for the thorough answers on these questions. We've really appreciated the Board's liaisons' participation in the SSAD SRT. So thank you so much for that. Just to follow up on our question three, Wes, I was just wondering if we're right in understanding that the Board would concur that no further policy work on authentication would be required after the Board approves both the recommendations and the implementation of the recommendations? Thank you.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you for the question. From our perspective to date, based on what we have available now, I am extremely hopeful, as I think Greg is, the other liaison, that the SRT is producing a final set of recommendations that will be truly complete and will address all of the issues that was in the letter the ICANN Board sent to the GNSO Council earlier.

Was it just this year? It is really amazing to me. Greg is right how fast this group has moved. Obviously, I cannot commit at this moment to say that everything will be complete because we don't have the full text to consider. But I certainly see, if I can speak for the Board, that there's nothing outstanding that we're concerned about.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you for the reply. Any other comments or questions from the GAC before we move on? I see no hands. Perhaps we can move on to the next slide, please. AOB. Any other items that the committee or perhaps the Board would like to raise? Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Ian. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland and Vice Chair for the record. Before we let you go 15 minutes ahead of the scheduled time, and if there are no other AOB, I thought that it is fitting that, as this is the Annual General Meeting, that we also express how important the collaboration is between this committee and the

Board, especially now that, at least on our side, also the leadership is changing.

And I think it would be also fitting in this occasion to thank those who are leaving the Board. I think it's not only our very own Nico Caballero, who unfortunately is not here and who has been really having a challenging time with his day job, the GAC chairing, and also the Board job, which is something that we don't see as closely, but obviously also our good colleagues, León Sánchez and Sarah Deutsch. So I just wanted to express those thanks.

IAN SHELDON: Any other requests for the floor? If I may, I would also probably like to reiterate that Nico loved his time on the Board. I think, despite having to juggle many priorities, I do know that it was a real highlight of his role here in the GAC and at ICANN. And I'm sure he's hopefully managed to find a way to convey this to you before his departure yesterday, but he very much cherished all the personal connections that he'd made.

So it's a shame he wasn't able to sit here in his final exchange with the Board, but I do know that he would always come back and tell us how great working with you all has been. And I very much look forward to building out some of those same connections as well. So I'm very much looking forward to it. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much. And we've enjoyed having Nico be the liaison from the GAC to the Board. And he was very engaged, and we intend to continue building on that relationship as we move forward. And thank you for acknowledging the departure of León and Sarah from the Board. So we've got three departing Board members and three incoming ones, I believe. So, thank you. Did someone else want to say something? I thought I saw another hand.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I would just like to thank the GAC for sending Nico to the Board. He is one of the more enthusiastic people I've ever met. And specifically, thank you for sending me a friend. I hope to keep in touch with him long beyond his service on the Board. He's a wonderful person and I've greatly appreciated his presence. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: Okay. Well, if that's all, thank you very much for your time today. The GAC continues to very much appreciate and enjoy these exchanges, and looking forward to continuing the dialogue. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Thank you for having us.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Ian, if I may, some small housekeeping arrangements on behalf of our Indonesian host. All GAC members and observers are, of course, invited to dinner. If you haven't registered yet and picked up your sticker, please report in the back of the room to the GAC support staff. They will help you out. Thank you. And the GAC itself continues at 16:30 with next iteration of our Communiqué drafting session, so please be back.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]