ICANN87 Bali | AGM – Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO Council
Sunday, October 18, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 WITA

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the ICANN87 GAC meeting with GNSO Council on Sunday 18th 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 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 you, Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Welcome back, everyone. I hope you enjoyed the fantastic Indonesian coffee. We have a very fantastic lineup of speakers today. We have Ashley Heineman to my right, we have Sebastian Ducos, we have Jennifer Chung, we have Susan Payne, of course my distinguished Vice Chair, Jorge Cancio from

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.

Switzerland, we have Sam Dimitriou, and the future in three, four days GAC Chair, Mr. Ian Sheldon from Australia.

So, welcome back, everyone. We're going to be talking about, as you can see on the screen, we're going to be talking about a couple of current issues including DNS abuse, the whole thing about the 15-day verification and accuracy thing, the SSAD, which stands for, and this is for the benefit of the new GAC members System for Standardized Access Disclosure, and hopefully we will agree on the next steps and common priorities. And then we'll open the floor for questions and AOB.

So, without further ado, let me give the floor to my distinguished colleague Susan Payne. The floor is yours.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you very much, Nico, and thank you, sorry, to GAC colleagues for welcoming us here to meet with you, and we really appreciate this opportunity to continue the dialogue that we've been having in previous meetings.

Wanted to just, from the outset, really express our appreciation for some of the engagement we've had from your topic leads on some of our active policy efforts, so particularly the DNS abuse PDP 1 and the SSAD supplemental recommendation team, where members from the GAC have been active and very engaged participants in those working groups, and also for the engagement of topic leads

on our sort of planning for this discussion and intersessional discussions.

Also like to thank Sebastian Ducos as well, who is our GNSO liaison to the GAC and has been working very hard with, again, with colleagues, topic leads from the GAC on planning for these meetings and sort of trying to ensure that we're on the same page in terms of the things that we'll be discussing.

I think there's quite a big agenda that we have on the list there, and so I don't want to spend too much time on introductory remarks, but just to say that those efforts, particularly the PDP 1 on DNS abuse, is making really good progress, is well ahead of schedule, and SSAD SRT will talk about it a bit more in detail, but again, it's a work effort that's going, I think, very well and moving along very, very promptly.

So, I think with that, probably we should just move on to the actual topic of DNS abuse, which is the first topic of interest, and I'm going to pass on our side to Jennifer Chung, but I think the GAC will go first.

NICOLAS CABALLERO No, no, it's all right, we can go straight ahead. These are basically the GAC talking points. What we expect at this point is for the GNSO to provide an update on the PDP 1 the progress, the current status, and I assume that for that I have to give the floor to you now, Jen. So, over to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you very much, Nico. Thank you, Susan. This is Jen Chung. I'm the Vice-Chair of the GNSO Council, but in this aspect, I'm talking as the topic lead for the Council on DNS abuse and, of course, the mitigation PDPs that are going on. So, in response to the questions, and I'll tackle first the PDP 1, we acknowledge and thank, of course, the GNSO Council for being a very constructive part of PDP 1.

As Susan has mentioned earlier, PDP 1 has been ahead of schedule. We've been very intensely working through a lot of things. We are currently moving into the development of the final report phase of this work.

We are looking at the public comments. We published our initial report in August, and this is the public comment input that the working group currently is working through for this meeting. We're focusing systematically through it. We've already had three really good, very efficient working group sessions.

There is a fourth one later on this week, and what we're looking at really is to look for any new information, implementation considerations, and also any unintended consequences or drafting ambiguities, and that is really coming in from a lot of the really good public comments we have received. I believe we received 42 public comments. I'm not going to kind of go through the statistics, but it is available also for that.

The intention, of course, is not to reopen or settle discussions because the working group really took quite a lot of considerable time and effort to go through a lot of these things, but when there's new information or where that we can have clarification on inconsistencies and unintended inconsistencies or consequences, these are the things that the working group is looking to address, especially in these working sessions.

The second part of the question on PDP 1, of course, capturing and continuing good practices, of course the answer is yes. We were taking in all of this, noting that this is the first time we are doing a PDP that is so focused, the chartering is very narrow, and of course the speed of which this PDP is progressing its work is really phenomenal, especially in terms of what we currently understand as usual PDP timelines in in ICANN. So, having this new focused PDP effort, we are certainly taking a lot to learn from that.

It's being integrated into the process via the council's PDP 3.0 initiative, and of course a lot of the board readiness exercise that the council did earlier. I think that addresses a more holistic way of looking at how the policy development process in ICANN is progressing, a lot of the pain points that we've identified there as well, ensuring, of course, both the board and the Org liaisons to the PDP performing the roles in the way that is expected, and also to identify the issues when the policy is actively being developed.

I think that was also some learnings that we took from our board readiness work that the council finished then. Did you want to pause and kind of go to the next one, or should I?

NICOLAS CABALLERO: As a matter of fact, maybe we should go ahead with the second part PDP 2, and we can go straight to the question. Could you please elaborate on the expected timeline for the PDP, PDP 2 basically, and then I'll stop and I'll open the floor for questions. Go ahead, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you very much, Nico, for that. So PDP 2, as you are aware, we are currently doing the charter drafting efforts. I believe we've had already six calls on this. I do think that both our liaison to the GAC, Sebastian Ducos, and also, of course, Manal Amida from the GAC side, to try to look at how GAC can, of course, give input as well to this process, and I think we've settled on something that actually would work, that respects the GNSO process as well.

The chartering itself is something that is the responsibility of the GNSO council. Indeed, of course, now that we know that the progress for PDP 1 is going so well, that's why we have a little bit of, I guess, bandwidth to be able to look at chartering the next effort.

In fact, we took that public comment lull, if you will, to actually start the work on this. The expectation is that PDP 2 chartering will continue after the Bali meeting, of course. There will be a little bit

of overlap there, but beyond that, the future DNS abuse work will be considered in a wider prioritization effort.

I think in previous meetings, we have mentioned that the council has been looking to refine a mechanism where the way council prioritizes work is more transparent and observable by the rest of the community as well, as actually being a tool for councilors in council to be able to sequence work in many, many dimensions and considerations.

For the work items that are specific to DNS abuse, of course, looking at the final issue report, there are a number of gaps that are still remaining. That will form a part of the prioritization exercise that will look at the nuances of prioritization on those gaps and sequencing of those gaps.

I think the expectation as well after this meeting and probably going into the next iteration of council is to, of course, have the small team on DNS abuse back together to look at this with greater detail. Then finally, of course, we can't forget that GAC representatives have been really very constructive in their engagement with this. Also, kudos to the topic leads that have been very constructive in conversation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Jen and Susan. Before we move to the GNSO questions and talking points, let me pause here for a little while, I would say. This is a 60-minute session. Please keep your questions

brief and straight to the point. Let me open the floor for comments or questions at this point. All right. I see no hand in the room and I see no hand online. So moving on, please, Gulten.

Next slide. The GNSO, there we go, GNSO talking points and questions. For that, let me handle the floor back to you, Susan, or should I give it to somebody else?

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Nico. Yes, so we thought it would be helpful to also raise with the GAC. We're very interested in understanding your processes and how you work as well. So, obviously, when we're developing policy around domain name registration data and DNS abuse mitigation, that requires a sort of balancing of things like law enforcement and public safety objectives with privacy, data protection due process, and the rights of registrants, including things like rights for recourse where there's a problematic or erroneous action.

And so we're really interested in understanding from GAC members their insights on how you all view that balance and how it informs the approach that you take in both when you're participating in the development of providing advice to ICANN, but also, I think just generally in the work that you do in your home nations as well.

So, what processes do GAC members follow when reviewing and developing their position on ICANN policies, and do GAC members typically consult with experts on some of these other issues, such

as privacy or data protection, when you're discussing matters on these issues within ICANN?

And similarly, how do GAC members' experiences and expertise with due process and redress mechanisms in a broader public policy environment help to inform the policy work that we're doing here on these sorts of issues on domain names?

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Thank you, Susan. So there you have the questions. The floor is open. The questions are, as you can see there, what process do GAC members follow when reviewing and developing their position on ICANN policies? And the second part of the question would be, do GAC members typically consult with experts or other authorities within their governments on matters discussed within ICANN? That's the first question. Let me pause there in order to see if we have answers from the floor. Okay.

Let me read the second question. How can GAC members' experience and expertise with due process and redress mechanisms in broader public policy help inform the development of policies for gTLD domain names? What I can say, like right off the bat and I have a hand from Switzerland, is that it depends on the country. All countries have different systems.

All countries have different consultation mechanisms. Some of them depend on the ICT ministry. Some of them depend on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Some others depend on the Ministry of

Economy, believe it or not. So again, it's too broad. I couldn't, I mean, we don't have a specific answer for this, but Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. I was more or less voluntold, but I think also to break the ice. On the first question, I can share the national experience. For many years, what we do is to have coordination between the different departments and ministries that are interested in what is discussed in ICANN. Then we go through the ICANN agenda, the GAC agenda. We discuss each of the topics and we see what the inputs are from the different departments, agencies, ministries, and whenever there is something we have to discuss, we discuss.

Otherwise, it's mostly the other agencies who rely on the expertise we have internally in our office, our own office, which deals with and has the authority on domain names and numbering and telecom regulation in general. So that's, let's say, the typical experience when things get a bit more, let's say, political.

We might have interactions also at a more political level and whenever there is a broader interest in the wider community, we also consult our multi-stakeholder community or we inform them about what is happening, for instance, about the new round or the ASP program or things like that. We normally inform the wider community.

That's on the first question, and on the second, I am really struggling to understand what the question is. So, I don't know if you could be more concrete or elaborate on what you would expect as an answer or what elements you consider important. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you very much. Switzerland, before I give the floor to, I assume it's Germany. Can I kindly ask the technicians to turn up the air conditioning a little bit or turn it down, I mean, depending on how you see it, because it's getting a little bit warm here and I assume you feel the same.

So, all right, over to you, Germany. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. It's not Germany. Sorry, sorry. This is the GNSO Council. Go ahead, please. Volker Greimann.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, thank you, Volker Greimann from the RrSG. Maybe to just provide some clarity in our interest here is that in many countries the local ccTLD is also operated by a government body or a body that is affiliated with the government or regulated by local government through laws and regulations that apply to that ccTLD. And in those cases it might be interesting to see whether the GAC representatives have or the governments have implemented similar regulations that apply to their ccTLD and have maybe already gathered some information and experience with what they're proposing for the gTLD space.

So basically, the question also includes the question of whether GAC members are trying out their proposals in their own little local fishbowls first and then expand it to the global stage first, or if the practice is rather to propose policy or support policy that has not been trialed locally yet and then see whether it can be applied locally afterwards.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you for the question, Volker. I assume that question is for the full GAC. Thank you. And the floor is open. Anybody? All right, so while we get you that answer, Volker, I have India next. Please go ahead, Sushil.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you, Chair. This is Sushil from India. I think with regard to the question of GNSO Council, I think government also has a very multi-stakeholder approach and it does try to balance the public safety with data protection, and that is the reason government has come out with its own data protection policies.

I think like in our case, the very fact that we have a Data Protection Act that itself strikes this balance of public safety objective with privacy and data protection, and it does allow that if the data is sought, personal data is sought for the lawful purposes, then one is bound to give, and that's where the public safety comes in.

So I don't think there is any challenge in government's mind or in government affairs with regard to this balancing act. It does play

pretty well through the notification of acts and rules. However, how do we implement it on the ground in the internet governance space? That's definitely a challenge for the law enforcement authorities, and that's the reason we're having all this conversation for the authentication of LEAs and verification or ID verification of registrants. Those are the challenges which government is facing.

We also have a very good handle as to how this works, because we engage very closely with our own ccTLD. Sorry, I'm being warned to slow down. We engage pretty closely with our own ccTLD. So, we have pretty much very good handle over even the technical aspects, and we definitely engage with a lot of technical experts, including as well as other government agencies, which my colleague Jorge from Switzerland mentioned.

With regard to the second question, I think given the ccTLD experience we have, we have been raising a lot of concerns going forward to the question as to what can help inform the development of policies for gTLD.

I think if you can bring in better ID verification or KYC and just making registration compliant as a condition before you make the domain registration active, I think that itself will take the gTLDs very far while ensuring cyber security. This is being demonstrated as many ccTLDs are putting these things in place. We saw the Denmark example in the last session, and we have more examples in many such countries. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. Susan, Jan, anything to add to this? Are you okay with the answer? I see you're taking notes, so we're good. Okay, thank you. Indonesia next, please.

ASHWIN SASONGKO This is about gTLD, generic top-level domain. I think what we have to, for my concern at least, is because names can be so many in the world and so many in every country, and so many islands, for example, it's related to geographic names, for example. We have to get agreement from the related countries.

Now, in countries where we have 17,000 islands and small islands and so on, there might be possibilities where some countries apply for a particular name and it directly becomes one of the names of our small islands, which is not well known. Even in Indonesia, the name might not be recognized by many people. It's different, like Bali, for example.

Everybody knows Bali, but if you are talking about many small islands, thousands of them, this will be difficult to remember directly. But it may happen later when the application is agreed and so on, then the people from that small island might provide complaints and so on, and so it may become a discussion between two or more countries. I think in this case, GAC should be able to quote-unquote make intermediaries, talking between GAC

members for this particular possible dispute. That's just my concern, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Indonesia. I beg you to be a little bit shorter, a little bit brief and straight to the point. I can see your point, Indonesia, because correct me if I'm wrong, but there are more than 1,200 islands in Indonesia, right? 1,200, is that correct? 17?

ASHWIN SASONGKO Oh my god. Island in Indonesia, 1,700. 17,000. Some of them have official names reported to the UNGEGN, but some of them have local names. Not only that, there are official names and there is also a cultural name. So, that's the kind of things which might be more difficult for us.

A particular city might have an official name, City X, but the cultural name, where all those areas are called the city, is City Z. And when Nico applied for City Z, well there is no name of City Z in Indonesia, official name. But suddenly, three million people at City Z complained to the government, why you give City Z the name to Nico? He never come here. That kind of things that may happen and I just wonder how, between GAC members, we can discuss it on a nice basis. That's all.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you. Thank you very much, Indonesia. Would you like to respond to that? All right. So I have Farzaneh. Please go ahead. Please be brief, that's all I'm asking you.

FARZANEH BADEI Thank you; Farzaneh Badei. I'm a member of the council but also a member of non-commercial stakeholder group. I see in chat that there are many good examples of how different law enforcement and different authorities try to balance these rights and notice that they have data protection principles.

We really would appreciate it if those principles can also inform the work that GAC does in their communique when you are talking about disclosures systems. Also, we talk about like data subject rights, as well as other, like you have a public safety group, maybe also GAC member can use their abundance of expertise in data protection to also like have a group that discusses data protection for domain name registrants. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much for that, Farzaneh. Well noted. We need to move on. Next slide, please, Gulten.

So, we're going to be talking about the 15-day verification and accuracy. These are the GNSO council questions. I'm not going to read the whole thing because everybody got a copy of this beforehand. Let's get straight to the questions, if you don't mind, Susan, unless you want to. Unless you want to provide some

background, and I'm very happy to give you the floor, but we can go ahead straight with the questions.

So the first one reads, have registration or verification requirements or shorter time frames for addressing abusive registrations resulted in measurable improvements in preventing or mitigating DNS abuse? And I'll pause here in order to see if there are comments or questions or answers, for that matter, for this question. All right, and I see no hand in the room or online.

Let's get to the next question, which is, are the data status metrics or operational experience that could help assess the effectiveness of these approaches? And I have a hand from India. Please go ahead, Sushil.

SUSHIL PAL I think answering the first question, I think yes, it has in case of a ccTLD release. I think we've mentioned that in the last comment as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, India. That was regarding the first question. So, moving on to the second question, floor is open, and I see Denmark. Go ahead, please.

FINN PETERSEN Sorry, I was not online with my computer, so I couldn't raise my hand there. On the first question, I mentioned during the last

session the experience in DuckDk and how they have transformed for, let's say, a more-loose registration policy to actually use EID and also for foreigners, a risk-based approach. And the amount of abuse in the measurements they got there was actually reduced with, I think, a factor of 50.

So, it was very low, and you can see on statistics, if you have a proper way to validate your data, then the abuse goes down. And I don't know what the effect will be, to be frank, on the 15 days, because in Denmark on national ccTLD, they have, for more than 10 years, have zero days. They don't put anything in the zone before it has been validated, and there seems to be no problem in validating things before. Of course, if you have a very old system and not a modern company, I don't know what the problem they might have, but it's possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, Denmark. I don't see any other hands, so let me read the third question, which is, have implementation challenges, unintended consequences, or limitations emerged that could help inform consideration of similar measures in the gTLD space? Let me pause here in order to see if we have answers from the GAC. And I have the European Commission, and then Peru. European Commission, please, go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico, Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. Nico, if you allow me, I would quickly go, because we wanted to contribute across the three questions, which we appreciate very much from the GNSO, so I will quickly go through the three.

So we have had in the past a presentation for the GAC from the Registry Operator for the European Union, the dotEU, and which we consult regularly also to be updated on their methods and how their methods may impact or not the DNS abuse prevention and mitigation. And so, we have in the past expressed, provided information about the fact that our registry uses a combination of tools that go, fall into the category of preventive measures.

So basically, we are talking about pre-delegation checks. It's actually a combination of preventive abuse detection mechanisms, registration, data verification. And then, of course, there is the timely intervention. And here we are talking about a timeline before the domain names are delegated into the zone. Of course, there are also actions being taken where the DNS abuse is detected after a domain name is delegated into the zone.

And the experience is that there is, the lessons learned that we have gotten from our registries that no measure alone is working as a silver bullet, but a combination of these preventive measures can really have an impact. In particular, they have seen a limited number of abusive domain names becoming active in the dotEU namespace. They could identify earlier potentially malicious

registrations, and also these reduce the need and the cost for downstream enforcement action, because if action was taken earlier, then the cost of mitigation was reduced.

Also, overall, these increased confidence in the accuracy and reliability of registration data that are available for abuse investigations. The registry, as it's been presented a few times on the GAP, they have a system which is risk-based and it's AI-based, Abusive Prevention Early Warning System, APIUS, and they combine it also with manual checks.

So regarding the second question, which is about the data and metrics, what we have seen consistently, this was discussed also in the previous session, is that, of course, reporting on DNS abuse is not necessarily consistent over time, and also sometimes it's difficult to track the effect of preventive measures, because in a way, if the domain name that was being registered for malicious purpose does not enter the zone, then it's difficult to see whether this would effectively lead to DNS abuse or not. But in terms of empirical evidence, our registry informed us that, for example, in 2025, they have conducted an analysis regarding the domain name that were registrations that were processed.

And then also, they checked in terms of a proxy, what happened for the domain names that did enter the zone, but then later appeared on external block lists, which is a sort of a proxy for malicious registrations. And what they have seen is that there was a number of domain names that finally did enter the zone, even after the

checks, and that appeared on block lists that was significantly lower in comparison to the previous period.

So I'm going to post in the chat later also the reference of the website where they have scientific publications about the methodologies they are using, so you can see precisely the data. But we do have some empirical analysis.

And the third part, which is actually something very important to us, because it is clear that we need to balance strong verification requirements with the need and the rights of legitimate registrants in order for them, first of all, to be allowed to have a domain name, but second, to have a smooth registration experience. And so, the methodology that needs to be used needs to take into account the rights and the experience of the registrant.

And this, of course, may require an investment upstream in the way the methodology is defined, also in terms of the uses of automation and operational processes. And in general, that risk-based controls, they help reducing the sort of blank checks across the board, and so allow for most of the registrants to have a smooth experience. At the same time, risk-based controls can also generate false positives.

So this is something that is continually being used. And my last point is that precisely, that considering that this is an evolving phenomenon, and we keep hearing about the fact that malicious

actors continuously adapt, then there is a continuous refinement of the detection and verification mechanisms.

So, to make sure that these are up to date, and that we reduce, to the extent possible, the possible disadvantages for the registrants, and also the issues of the false positives. We are from the European Commission convinced that it's important to include remedies, and make sure that the policies addressing DNS are just considered the appropriate redress mechanism. And this, of course, is something which is common between the ccTLD and the gTLD space. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much, European Commission, for that very detailed set of answers, and I really hope, Susan, that you had time to take some notes. Thank you so much. I have Peru and then India. Go ahead, please.

CORAL DE CIELO GALLARDO Thank you, Chair. Speaking of national capacity, allow me to offer some reflections on question three, bearing in mind that national ccTLD experience are not direct corollaries to the gTLD environment. We share the objective of carbon DNS abuse at its source, and we recognize that verification before a domain becomes operational may reduce the window of opportunity exploited by malicious actors. Nevertheless, we believe that

certain challenges and unintended consequences warrant careful examination before similar measures are adopted.

First, accessibility registrants in developing regions, including micro and small enterprises, community organizations, and first-time users may face greater difficulty meeting stricter requirements, owing to limited access to reliable postal addresses, identity documents, or stable connectivity. Without clear procedures for correction and restatement, legitimate users could be disproportionately affected, undermining the inclusive growth of the domain name system.

Second, market impact. Compliance costs may weigh more heavily on smaller and regional registrants, potentially reinforcing concentration in the market and reducing choice for users in our region.

Third, effectiveness. Verification methods vary considerably in reliability. Checks that confirm only that an email address or telephone number is operational may offer limited assurance against determined bad actors. Moreover, if obligations are applied unevenly, malicious activity could simply migrate toward operators with weaker control rather than diminish overall.

Fourth, data protection. The collection and processing of additional registrant information should remain necessary, proportionally and compatible with the diverse legal frameworks applicable across jurisdictions, including those governing cross-border data transfers. With a view to addressing these concerns,

we would encourage the community to consider a phased approach supported by impact assessment, clear performance metric and periodic review, as well as capacity building for registrants and registrants in developing countries.

Such an approach would allow stronger safeguards to reinforce trust and security, while preserving openness and meaningful participation in the internet naming system. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, Peru. I have India next.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you, Chair. I'll just take a minute, I think, on these questions on the board. We actually implemented the revised agreement with registrars, enforcing the verification and the accuracy part of the registrant's data. Yes, there have been a few challenges when it comes to implementing.

First of all, about the result, I think. As a result of this, the domain name abuse in our country, as reported from the various agencies, have gone down in the range ranging from 70% to 90%. That's one big result. As a result of this, our position also, I think if you can see in the SURBL ranking, it has also improved from 27th in 2023 to now 61st. I think what I'm being told that the farther you are in this ranking, the better or more cyber secure you are. I think that's also in public domain, so it's being reflected there.

Regarding the challenges, yes, I think we had to engage more actively with registrars. However, as a result of our active engagement, almost 94% of total more than 4 million domains are with the registrars who are completely compliant to the KYC or registrar's data accuracy part of it. Also, in the renewal process and in the new registration, contrary to the perceptions of many of the other stakeholders that this will lead to the loss of business for the registrars, I think that is not the case. We have also seen a huge uptick in the business and in the new registrations.

We have seen 1.6 million registrations from May 25 to October 26, which is a big number, even though we had significant government domains taken out of the business. It would have been much more than close to about 2 million now, but even after net additions or deletions, it's 1.6 million in one year, three months, four months. About a million domains have also gone through renewal seamlessly without any problem. So that's the feedback from India. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you very much, India. I have Egypt next.

MANAL ISMAIL Yes, thank you, Nico. Just to note the good discussion in the chat as well and the links that are being shared. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you for that. Moving on, Gulten, because we're running out of time. Next slide, please.

These are the questions on this very issue, the 15-day verification and accuracy. I'm not going to read the whole thing because you have it right there on the screen. Let's get, if you don't mind, of course, Susan, let's get straight to the questions, the three questions over there.

"What categories of registrations, new registrations versus renewed ones, should be prioritized?" I don't know if you want to go question by question, so I read the three of them and we go, okay.

So the second one reads, "Applicable verification timeline to each category", that would be, and then, "Possible implementation path". Over to you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE

In fact, I'm going to pass to Ashley Heineman, who is the topic lead on this for us.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

Thank you, Susan. Ashley Heineman, yes, I'm the topic lead, but I'm also one of the Registrar Stakeholder Group Counselors on council. And first, before I dive in, I just wanted to first thank the GAC for the engagement we had on the webinar before coming to ICANN87, which was a couple of weeks ago now. I think it was a really helpful conversation. We were able to exchange some ideas

and conversations with respect to how registrars are currently handling verification of our domain names being registered.

And just to note that there's a variety of practices out there. There are some registrars who strictly follow the current requirement of the 15-day verification window. There are some that do it in a less amount of time, and there are some who do it prior to the domain going live.

So, just to make it clear, there's a variety of approaches that currently exist today. But in short, thank you again for engaging with us prior to this meeting. So when it comes to the categories of registrations, I just wanted to first note what the current practice is.

Right now, the 15-day verification window or the verification of data in general is applicable to new registrations. It is applicable to transfers of domains or any changes to existing information. So this verification process does not apply to renewals. And there's some really good reasons for why that's the case.

So, when it comes to prioritization, if we were to actually take any further action or further conversation on this, I think the focus should be on new registrations. I think we could look at domain names that have been transferred, but recognizing that that would be more complicated and there are additional considerations with respect to transfers as there might be a bit more of a potential for negative impact there. I will pause, and we can go to the next question, if you would like, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Of course, of course. So let's pause here in order to see if, on the one hand, if we're okay with the answer, and on the other hand, if there are other questions coming out from this. And I have three hands. I have India, the USA, and then Mr. Greimann. India, please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you. I think from the reply, I think, and even from the interaction of GAC with the RrSG, can we have a more forward-looking path for this timeline to become concurrent for the new registrations? I mean, are we given to understand that, or is there still a position to be made?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN So, the policy hasn't changed. So, unless there is an effort or an attempt to change the current policy or the requirements in our contracts, this would not, any changes would not apply to new TLDs. So, the existing 15-day verification period would apply. So, for there to be changes, there would have to be a policy development process or a change to our contracts. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Ashley. USA?

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you. Thank you for the question. And just with respect to your question, the United States would support that path or that option going forward, Ashley. If this discussion does proceed, at least from the national position, it should be scoped on new registrations. Of course, having so said, on DNS abuse, we continue to support prioritizing work in PDPs 1 and 2. And by the way, thank you so much for the comprehensive update in that regard earlier this session, Jed. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, USA. Mr. Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN

Thank you very much. Volker Greimann of the RrSG. I mainly raised my hand to provide a little color on two points, because I was part of the RIA negotiation team back in 2012 for the 2013 RIA. The main intent and push for this requirement back at the day was to increase the accuracy of WHOIS data, which was woefully inadequate at the time. There was a lot of invented data. The data was in no particular format.

So, we implemented a number of measures that were intended to improve the accuracy of the WHOIS data, and that had a direct effect on the accuracy and contactability of registrants. ICANN had various studies made until GDPR prevented the further publication of WHOIS, and those studies showed that accuracy has drastically improved for the WHOIS data until the time of GDPR. So in that

respect, the requirements met the day in fulfilling the need that was perceived at the time.

Now, I understand that this also has a role to play with DNS abuse, and while that wasn't the intended target of the amendments at the time, I think it's important to understand that this is currently not policy. This is a contractual agreement between ICANN and the registrars that the registrars voluntarily agree to, and the two paths to changing that are either a policy development process or another amendment of the RAA. Both paths are possible.

The latter is probably the faster one, considering the speed at which ICANN policy is being developed. If we go down that path, there might be a look at what would be the ideal targets, and we would certainly welcome input of the GAC on that, and whether, for example, verification at time of transfers is still required, because that was originally intended to catch those domain names that were registered before those new requirements came into place, to make sure that the domain names that had been grandfathered in and weren't required to be verified, because the pre-existing data didn't necessitate a verification, would be verified during that time, and the ICANN studies showed that this had met the requirements that were set out in the beginning when these requirements came up, so there might be some space to negotiate as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Volker. We're running out of time. I have the European Commission next. Please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Nico. Very briefly, first of all, to thank the GNSO for their openings in collaborating with the GAC intersessionally. I think it's very important that we continue this work, also after Bali. Actually, this is an open call for more of the sessions where we work together in between meetings, when we have identified issues of common interest. And this is also a call for having the GNSO clearly express whether they are interested in pursuing this work further, because this has been highlighted as a priority for the GAC for quite some time.

Regarding the full scope, this is of course to be discussed, but I also understand from the historical perspective that has been just presented why the importance of focus on new registrations versus renewals, so I think there might be an opening from the GAC. We are also there to understand what is most useful, so I think this is not going to be a big problem, the exact scoping of the exercise.

As a last point, we are going into the opening of new strings, delegation of new strings. It's going to take some time, but still we have margins to act before the time, because what Ashley just presented is that as we spend, all new contracts will be based on the old rules, including the one on the 15 days' verification, and if

there is a sort of consensus that these rules might require some update, perhaps it's the time to do it now. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, European Commission. At this point, let me give the back to Ashley. We have four more minutes, maybe five, but we'll do what we can. Back to you, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you. Yes, I think we're really interested in continuing the conversation. I think we're interested in also learning from your experiences. We also want to make sure that if any changes are going to be complicated, not complicated, we know they'll be complicated, but if they're going to be contemplated, we want to make sure that we are considering this in a way that has a positive impact to our customers, and happy to continue talking about this, and thank you for being open and continuing the conversation in a constructive manner. Appreciate it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, Ashley, but we still have three minutes. We might be able to cover the SSAD. Again, SSAD standing for System for Standardized Access Disclosure. I'm not going to read the background statements and everything else. Let's get straight to the question. Does the GNSO still expect the SRT's completed recommendations to be sent to the GNSO Council for review early

next year before ICANN88, that is Lisbon? What main issues remain to be resolved through SRT discussions in the GNSO's view? Susan?

SUSAN PAYNE

So, I'm going to be really quick on this one. I think you guys also had a presentation earlier, a more detailed session on this, so probably you don't need too much detail from me, but yes, I would say it's been a very collaborative exercise. Your colleagues who've been participating in the work have been incredibly helpful and constructive, and that has been really appreciated.

It is very much on track. I think we are aiming, or that group is aiming to have something going out to public comment on the 10th of November or thereabouts, and obviously the comment input needs to be then reviewed and taken on board and a final package delivered. But I think, yes, I think we're still pretty happy with the progress and the timing on this.

A number of recommendations have been sort of consolidated and restructured. We've got a few open issues that are still being worked on, but really quite a lot of progress has been made even in the last couple of days, so it's moving very well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Susan. Next slide, please. We were supposed to be on the next slide. Next slide, please.

We have no time for this, but there are three or four questions that we can do intersessionally, via email or whatever. Very sorry not to

be able to give the floor to Sam and to Sebastian at this point, but you're always welcome. Thank you so much for this session. Thank you for your very detailed answers and for the engagement. Anything else you would like to add at this point, Susan, before we wrap up?

SUSAN PAYNE

Really quickly, I think, a couple of things. One, I could see that there was an enormous amount of engagement in the chat on that 15-day accuracy discussion. We'll take all of that on board. I know lots of examples were being put in there. I think we have some work to do to read all of that and really appreciate all of that input.

And then just to give an update, we've talked a lot about our prioritization of our workload. It's something that's ongoing. We've done a pilot exercise. Certainly, the methodology needs some work, and that will be worked on in the coming weeks and months. But we are planning to continue that discussion in our council meeting on Wednesday and hopefully have an idea of which projects are maybe ripe for us to press the button to start work immediately and which maybe need a little bit more scoping and prioritization within them.

And one, for example, would be there's a lot of different issues within the issues report on DNS abuse. And so we can say, yes, we should do more work on DNS abuse beyond the PDPs that are already planned, but we need to talk amongst ourselves about

which ones are included in that effort. And this 15-day conversation is one of those issues in that issues report.

NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you so much to the GNSO. Thank you, Sebastian, Ashley, Jen, Susan, and Sam. And this is my last meeting with the GNSO, as a matter of fact, because I won't be the chair. I won't be around anymore. So thank you so much. It's been a pleasure. And yeah. And for the GAC, please be back in the room at 4.30 after the coffee break. Enjoy your coffee. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]