ICANN | GAC

Governmental Advisory Committee

Seattle, United States of America, 17 March 2025

GAC Communiqué – Seattle, United States of America[1]

The Seattle Communiqué was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting, during the ICANN82 Community Forum, with some GAC participants in Seattle, United States of America, and others remotely. The GAC's discussions during this public meeting are reflected in the GAC Meeting Minutes and the transcripts of all sessions, available at https://gac.icann.org/meetings-records/. The Communiqué was circulated to the GAC immediately after the meeting to provide an opportunity for all GAC Members and Observers to consider it before publication, bearing in mind the special circumstances of a hybrid meeting. No objections were raised during the agreed timeframe before publication.

I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Seattle, United States of America, in a hybrid setting including remote participation, from 8 to 13 March 2025.

Seventy five (75) GAC Members and eight (8) Observers attended the meeting.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN82 Community Forum. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

---

[1] To access previous GAC Advice, whether on the same or other topics, past GAC communiqués are available at:
https://gac.icann.org/

II. Inter-Constituency Activities and Community Engagement

Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed:
- Priorities and Plans for the New ICANN CEO
- Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2)
- Next Round of New gTLDs - Applicant Support Program
- Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data
- Accuracy of Registration Data

Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed:
- Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL) Study
- GAC-ALAC Priorities in the World Summit on the Information Society+20 (WSIS+20) Review Context

Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed:
- Quantum Computing and Impacts on Existing Encryption Technologies
- INFERMAL Study

Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed:
- Accuracy of Registration Data
- Collection of Billing Contact by Registrars (in the Context of the Registration Data Policy)
- Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data
- INFERMAL Study and GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse
- New gTLD Next Round Implementation Review Team
- Latin Script Diacritics Policy Development Process
- Improved Communications Between GAC and GNSO Council

Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH) of the GNSO

The GAC met with representatives of the CPH and discussed:
- WSIS+20
- Next Round of New gTLDs
- Authentication of Urgent Requests from Law Enforcement

- INFERMAL Study

Meeting with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) of the GNSO

The GAC met with representatives of the NCSG and discussed:
- Human Rights Impact Assessment on DNS Abuse
- gTLD Applicant Support

Meeting with the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

The GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed:
- Policy Gap Analysis Update
- ccTLD Models

Cross Community Discussions

GAC Members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN82, including a Dialogue on the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest and a community feedback session on the theme "How We Meet".

III. Internal Matters

1. GAC Membership

The GAC welcomed Monaco as a Member and the African Parliamentary Network on Internet Governance (APNIG) as an Observer.

There are currently 184 GAC Member States and Territories and 40 Observer Organizations.

2. GAC Leadership

The GAC thanked its outgoing Vice-Chairs, WANG Lang (China), Zeina Bou Harb (Lebanon) and Nigel Hickson (United Kingdom) for their valuable support and contributions to the GAC.

The end of the ICANN82 meeting marks the start of a new term for the incoming GAC Leadership Team, which is now composed as follows:

Nicolas Caballero (Paraguay) (Chair)
Ian Sheldon (Australia)
Thiago Dal-Toe (Colombia)
Christine Arida (Egypt)
Marco Hogewoning (The Netherlands)
Jorge Cancio (Switzerland)

3. GAC Working Groups

The GAC endorses the PSWG 2025-2026 work plan[2].

- **GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)**

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. In the week prior to ICANN82, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest.
The PSWG participated in briefing the GAC during the session on developments concerning WHOIS and Registration Data Issues, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work.
Key takeaways involving PSWG workstreams included potential improvements to the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and continued progress on work related to "Urgent Requests" for disclosure of registration data.

---

[2] https://gac.icann.org/work-plans/public/pswg-work-plan-2025-2026.pdf

The PSWG appreciated the various presentations and discussions on the findings concerning the Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL) Final Report which provided valuable input for progressing the work on addressing DNS Abuse.

- **GAC Internet Governance Group (GAC IG Group)**

The GAC appreciates the Internet Governance (IG) Group's contribution and activities, and its first webinar, held on February 17, titled "Shaping the Digital Future: WSIS+20 Review and the Future of Internet Governance." The webinar focused on discussing the plans and expectations of key UN organizations and departments regarding the WSIS+20 Review process. Additionally, it was considered that a webinar dedicated to the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines (NETmundial+10) may well be of interest ahead of ICANN83.

The GAC also took note of the ongoing work of ICANN org on the WSIS+20 process and Internet Governance.

4. GAC Operational Matters

Pursuant to GAC Operating Principle 53, GAC Members agreed on a proposal to proceed with a process to revise the GAC Operating Principles regarding the timing of annual committee leadership elections and the terms of the GAC Chair and the GAC Vice Chairs.

GAC members in attendance agreed to revise GAC Operating Principle 31 to adjust the committee's annual election cycle to conclude during the second meeting of the calendar year. This revision will enable leadership transitions to take place at the end of the ICANN Annual General Meeting when the ICANN Board and other ICANN communities also begin their leadership terms.

GAC Members in attendance also agreed to revise GAC Operating Principle 21 to adjust the term of the GAC Chair to three consecutive terms of two years and the terms of the GAC Vice-Chairs to two consecutive terms of two years.

Consistent with the GAC Operating Principles, the revision proposals will now be subject to a 60-day consultation period. The committee plans to make a final decision about the proposed revisions during the GAC Meeting at ICANN83 in Prague, Czech Republic. The GAC's Operating Principles Evolution Working Group will develop any needed transition procedures to effect the changes if they are ultimately approved.

5. Capacity Development

Consistent with the decision to focus GAC capacity development efforts on the next round of New gTLDs for the coming year, the GAC held three capacity development sessions related to:
- Geographic gTLDs (geoTLDs) to familiarize GAC members with the objectives and practices of these registries, in preparation for expected applications of this nature in the next round of New gTLDs, and the role governments may be called to play in the process;

- ICANN's Next Round Champions Toolkit, with the aim to encourage its use by GAC members to help raise awareness about the Applicant Support Program for the next round of New gTLDs; and
- The "Registrant's Journey" showcasing, in an interactive session, the lifecycle of domain registration, enabling GAC members to engage and familiarize themselves with the options and decisions a registrant may encounter in the domain name registration process.

The GAC thanks the GeoTLD Group, the GNSO Registrars Stakeholder Group, as well as ICANN org for their efforts in facilitating the capacity development sessions.

The GAC leadership and Underserved Regions Working Group co-chairs will assess the results from the post session survey and will work with the working group to propose future programming of this effort.

6. GAC Strategic Planning

The GAC Leadership provided a progress report on the delivery of the expected outcomes consistent with the GAC's Strategic Plan 2024-2028 and the GAC Annual Plan 2024/2025[3].

The GAC Leadership will work with GAC Topic Leads and Working Group chairs to develop the next GAC Annual Plan 2025/2026 for consideration by GAC Members before ICANN83.

---

[3] https://gac.icann.org/activity/gac-strategic-planning

IV. Issues of Importance to the GAC

1. Domain Name Registration Data

a. Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data[4]

The GAC notes action is still pending on its Advice on this matter contained in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and its Follow-Up on Previous Advice in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué. However, the GAC appreciates its productive trilateral discussions with the Board and the GNSO Council regarding the GAC's proposal to pursue two tracks of work in parallel: one on determining the appropriate response time to authenticated Urgent Requests, and another supporting Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) efforts to develop a scalable authentication process for Urgent Requests.

The GAC appreciates its shared understanding with the Board and GNSO Council that the existing Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team (IRT) is the best venue to discuss the response timeline for authenticated Urgent Requests. The GAC urges the start of these IRT discussions as soon as possible and looks forward to a timeline from the GNSO. While the GAC recognizes that an agreed-upon authentication solution must be in place to finalize the approach to Urgent Requests, the GAC also expects that starting IRT discussions in parallel will assist the community in advancing toward consensus on the response timeline. The GAC reiterates its previous position from the ICANN77 Washington Communiqué that, given the vital public safety interests related to Urgent Requests, responding to such requests within 24 hours is considered an appropriate timeline. The GAC also notes the previous Board's statement that "*a much shorter response timeline, i.e., minutes or hours rather than days, would seem to be more appropriate*"[5].

The GAC supports the PSWG's establishment of a Practitioners Group to advance its technical work toward authentication solutions, which is focused initially on authenticating law enforcement requestors.

b. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)

The GAC notes with interest the Board's support for maintaining and enhancing the RDRS. The GAC supports this concept and suggests that steps towards improving the pilot system should already be taken based on the results of the first year. The GAC sees substantial room for the RDRS to generate additional value, including for requestor communities, especially if the system can be adequately enhanced based on users' feedback and usage metric reports. The GAC recommends taking steps to make RDRS participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars.

---

[4] Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data in "*circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation*". See GAC Chair Letter to ICANN Board (23 August 2023)
[5] https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2024/correspondence/tsinha-to-dibiase-03june24-en.pdf

The system's ability to address requests for data underlying privacy and proxy registrations should be improved. The RDRS should incorporate APIs to better facilitate RDRS usage by requestors and registrars and to make it ready to incorporate future authentication solutions for law enforcement requestors.

The GAC reiterates its invitation to the Board and the ccNSO to explore ways to overcome the existing challenges to allow the voluntary participation of ccTLDs in the system. In its engagement with the RDRS Standing Committee, the GAC will continue to follow the development of a final report to the GNSO Council to convey findings from the RDRS pilot. The GAC also continues to support efforts to promote awareness and usage of the RDRS and to identify further improvements to the system's usability.

c. Accuracy of Registration Data

Accuracy of domain registration data remains a pressing concern for the GAC, who continues to urge greater progress on this issue at ICANN. The GAC remains particularly concerned about the pause in the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team since 2022. The GAC notes that the GNSO is considering possible next steps on this issue based on responses received to its recent threshold questions, including a submission from the GAC. The GAC also notes the importance of data and evidence guiding any discussions about policy changes. In that respect, the GAC considers that it would be helpful to receive more information about the current levels of compliance with existing requirements related to accuracy in ICANN's Registrar Accreditation Agreement. The GAC also welcomes any ideas that may allow for an assessment of the effectiveness of the current practices in ensuring accuracy of registration data. Furthermore, the GAC supports engagement with Contracted Parties, ccTLDs, and any other stakeholders who could share good practices in relation to this issue.

d. Other Public Policy Concerns Regarding Registration Data

When reviewing the progress of implementation of its strategic plan[6], the GAC noted concerns related to one of its expected outcomes for 2024-2025, "*to track developments related to the collection and publication of registration information related to legal entities.*"

In particular, the GAC is concerned by the lack of any progress regarding the implementation of EPDP Phase 2A recommendations, which the Board adopted in 2022. The GAC reiterates its position expressed in the ICANN77 Communiqué that "*contracted parties should collect and make data of legal persons publicly available.*"

Additionally, the GAC supports transparency regarding the entities involved in a domain name registration. Registration data is most useful when it accurately reflects the full reality of how a registration occurred. Hence, the data should make clear the distinct roles, responsibilities, relationships, and contact information of the chain of entities involved, beginning with the registry, the registrar, and then identifying those additional entities, if any, between the registrar and

---

[6] See https://gac.icann.org/work-plans/gac-strategic-plan-2024-2028.pdf

registrant, such as resellers. The GAC emphasizes the need to require the collection and publication of reseller data. The latter is especially critical to identifying the parties responsible for selling domain names directly to registrants and to highlight an important point of contact that may be best positioned to provide meaningful data on these registrants and/or to support investigation and mitigation of abuse that may be conducted by those registrants.

2. Next Round of New gTLDs

The GAC received a detailed update from the ICANN org in anticipation of the next round of generic Top Level Domain Names (New gTLDs), expected in 2026. The ICANN org provided updates on the important efforts undertaken by the Implementation Review Team (IRT) to implement policy recommendations for an updated Applicant Guidebook (AGB) by May 2025. These efforts cover topics of significance to the GAC and are critical for the successful launch of the next round. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement on the important topics highlighted below, including updates on the Applicant Support Program, Application Fees and Refunds, and ICANN's global outreach plans

a. Applicant Support Program

The GAC welcomes the launch of the Applicant Support Program (ASP) and the engagement of ICANN org with the GAC on its progress, and welcomes the monthly updates received on numbers and regional diversity of applications. The GAC is eager to see the ASP play an important role in making the upcoming round successful.

The GAC wishes to see equitable participation in the application process, and thus the GAC requests a clearer picture about how many applicants from specific countries within the broad categories of ICANN regions are actively applying to the ASP. Providing precise distribution data to the GAC, rather than relying on general regional data, will empower GAC members in underserved countries to partner with ICANN org and the broader community to significantly boost outreach and engagement efforts in specific countries. This more granular data, which, as indicated, is available through "applicant's primary place of business information", is critical for targeted action.

Furthermore, some GAC members expressed their concerns with the low number of applications progressing beyond the "Draft" or "Initiated" status. With just over 10% of applications progressing to the "Submitted & In Review" stage to date, the GAC recommends that ICANN org promptly identify potential obstacles preventing these applicants from proceeding forward with their applications. With this information being made available, the GAC, ICANN org, and the entire community are invited to collaborate to develop and execute strategies that expedite these applications to the submitted stage. This will allow for timely assessments, decisions and resource allocation to be made based on available budget and resources ensuring the process remains efficient and effective.

The GAC noted the ongoing uncertainty on the reduction of the ASP fee, which will be set between 75% and 85%, determined by the number of applications received. Some members suggested that specifying an 85% reduction now might encourage further applications from underserved regions.

This approach is particularly crucial to ensuring that applicants from underserved regions receive adequate support and opportunities to participate fully.

b. Application Fees and Refunds

GAC members continue to have concerns on how the applicant fee level will affect applications from underdeveloped and underserved countries. Some members also queried the level of applicant refunds, especially where an application is withdrawn early (for various reasons). In such circumstances a refund category above the planned 65% might be appropriate.

c. Global Outreach and Promotion of "ICANN in your Language"

The GAC encourages ICANN org to further develop and promote its on-demand translation of the New gTLD Program materials ("ICANN in Your Language") to enhance outreach and engagement in the next round, extending coverage beyond the 6 ICANN languages.

3. ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest

The GAC has addressed the matter of transparency and Statements of Interest (SOI) in prior GAC Communiqués since ICANN76 and issued a letter to the ICANN Board Chair on this subject, since transparency in ICANN's Multistakeholder Model remains a top priority for the committee. The GAC notably included language to this effect in both the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué and the ICANN81 Istanbul Communiqué, recalling that ICANN Bylaws require ICANN and its constituent bodies to "*operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness*."

The GAC firmly supports transparency within ICANN, and considers it inconsistent with the ICANN Bylaws if ICANN participants are permitted to decline disclosing who they represent. Therefore, the GAC recalls its input to the Public Comment proceeding on the draft ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest, and reiterates its support for the proposed draft, as well as the approach to a General Ethics Policy that includes this Code of Conduct. The GAC welcomes the cross-community discussion held on this matter during ICANN82.

Going forward, the GAC is of the view that the clear line approach contained in the draft Code of Conduct, stating, inter alia, that "*Specifically, all who participate in ICANN processes are required to disclose the interests influencing their participation*" and "*When disclosure cannot be made, the participant must not participate in ICANN processes on that issue*", must be maintained in the final

version of the Code of Conduct. Such simplicity and clarity is the cornerstone for a well-functioning and applicable framework.

ICANN org should support consistent implementation of the Code of Conduct by developing brief and simple guidance on its application, by providing specific training and educational materials to community leaders and participants, tasked with applying and respecting the Code of Conduct, as well as by foreseeing adequate data collection points and periodic review tools on its practical application.

The GAC intends to continue reviewing the progress of this process, and engaging with the Board and community on the matter, and looks forward to a speedy completion and adoption of the Code of Conduct.

4. DNS Abuse

The GAC appreciates the perspectives on DNS Abuse received in conversations with different constituencies at ICANN82, and specifically in meetings with the GNSO, CPH, SSAC and ALAC. These interactions seem to reflect converging views on the relevance of newly available data and evidence (i.e., from the INFERMAL report, Domain Metrica, and the implementation of the DNS Abuse contract amendments) and on the opportunity to plan further work on this critical public policy issue prior to the next round of New gTLDs.

The GAC underscores that it would be helpful to receive more information on ICANN Compliance's updates on the implementation of contract amendments, and their proactive efforts related to investigation and enforcement (such as audits) of said amendments. At the same time, the GAC highlights the importance that all parties, notably all registrars, cooperate to the utmost extent in fulfilling the new contractual obligations, including duly and timely addressing of abuse complaints filed by law enforcement authorities. Furthermore, the GAC emphasizes the need for Contracted Parties to share information and evidence on DNS Abuse within the community and encourages them to quickly act on DNS Abuse reports. The GAC also values the investments of ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) in providing data points for discussions on how to address DNS Abuse. This work from ICANN is helpful and conducive to better decision-making around potential next steps.

The GAC discussed the results of an internal survey aimed at gathering input from GAC members on DNS Abuse policies, practices, and expectations regarding future GAC work on this matter. Building on these results, and on the newly available data and input from other groups, the GAC intends to deepen discussions on next steps regarding the prevention and mitigation of DNS Abuse.

The GAC finds the INFERMAL report especially insightful as it contains findings that may further support the need for a targeted Policy Development Process on DNS Abuse, something that was among the options for further work mentioned in the ICANN81 Communiqué. The GAC supports engaging in discussions with the GNSO Small Group on DNS Abuse and other community members

to determine whether any policy development building on the findings would be advisable. In particular, the GAC considers it important to look further into the topic of bulk registrations of domain names as one of the most correlated drivers to DNS Abuse, according to the INFERMAL report.

The GAC notes that it would be worthwhile for OCTO to examine the common or underlying factors beneath various variables such as economic incentives, bulk Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) etc. The GAC welcomes further discussion of other findings in the INFERMAL report, including that registration discounts and free services such as hosting were correlated with more abuse, and that contact information validation and registration restrictions were correlated with less abuse. In addition, the GAC notes the observation from multiple presenters that such discussions should include the economic implications for registrars and registrants, possible impacts on legitimate users, and corresponding deterrent effects.

The GAC also considers that proactive practices for addressing DNS Abuse, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, and links between addressing DNS Abuse and work on domain name registration data, should be further examined. Finally, the GAC encourages registrars to explore the use of AI-powered DNS Abuse detection systems and it invites the community to further discussions around privacy and proxy services and their role in DNS Abuse.

5. WSIS+20

ICANN82 witnessed many exchanges between community members interested in the WSIS+20 process, including in bilaterals held between the GAC and other constituencies as well as in a dedicated GAC plenary session. The GAC welcomes the ongoing engagement program of ICANN org on the WSIS+20 process. The GAC intends to continue facilitating exchanges on the matter between its members and other constituencies, showcasing the contributions of the multistakeholder approach to the development of our digital future.

V. Next Meeting

The GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN83 Policy Forum in Prague, Czech Republic on 9-12 June 2025.

ICANN82 | CF – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 PST

GULTEN TEPE

Hello and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC meeting with the ICANN Board session on Tuesday, 11th of March, at 15:00 local time. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and make sure to mute all other devices when you're speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that I will leave the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Welcome everyone, and a special welcome to our colleagues from the from the ICANN Board, Alan, Chris, Becky, Tripti, Kurtis, and my distinguished Vice Chair, Nigel. It's great to have you all here at ICANN82 in Seattle for the session with the GAC. We have a very important agenda today covering several key topics of concern to

governments worldwide, I would say. We'll be discussing priorities and plans for the new ICANN CEO who happens to be sitting right to my, to my right. Kurtis is a crucial time for ICANN and we're eager to share our perspectives on the path forward. We'll also be talking about ICP, that is Internet Coordination Policy. As everybody knows, this is a complex area, and the GAC is looking forward to a productive exchange of views with the Board.

Also, the next round of gTLDs and the Applicant Support Program. We'll be discussing the Applicant Support Program and how it can be improved, how and when, I would say, the sooner the better, of course. Also, registration data for which we will specifically focus, on the one hand, urgent requests for disclosure, basically ensuring that these requests are handled efficiently and appropriately. And on the other hand, accuracy of registration data, which is a longstanding issue, and we will discuss the GAC view on the importance of this topic.

So these are all, as you can see, vital issues that impact the global internet, and we really appreciate the Board's engagement in these discussions. We are especially concerned with the registration data and how it affects law enforcement and intellectual property rights and many other things. Our goal today is to have an open and constructive dialogue to ensure that ICANN's policies and actions align with the public interest.

So welcome again, and thank you. Let's get started. And with that, let me give the floor to the Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA	Thank you, Nico, and allow me to express my thanks, the thanks on behalf of the Board. We really appreciate us coming together to have these conversations. And in particular, I'd like to take a moment to say we've had some very good intersessional meetings, and we've really appreciated the collaboration that has come out of those meetings in moving the next round issues forward. So, we deeply, deeply appreciate that engagement. And with that, I'm going to turn it right back to Nico to run the questions. Nico, back to you.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Tripti. Next slide, please, Gulten. So, the topic number one, priorities and plans for the new ICANN CEO. This, to my right, to you, Kurtis. So, on the one hand, welcome, Kurtis Lindqvist, given the new CEO has now been with ICANN for nearly, is it three months already, Kurtis? And three days. Basically, we would want you to please share what overall impressions you have gleaned about the ICANN community, especially the GAC at this point. And I don't need to read the other two questions, but let's start with the first one. Over to you, Kurtis.
KURTIS LINDQVIST	Thank you, Nico, and thank you to GAC for the very warm welcome here and also the info call we had a few weeks ago. So, that was very, very kind of you. So, there's quite a few questions in here in one set, so I'll try to go through them a little bit one by one.

So, on the first part, on the impressions of the ICANN community and the GAC, I think my first months here, the first few months has very much been on trying to understand the needs, and views, and thoughts of the community, and the stakeholders, and staff, and trying to understand what issues you see and opportunities. And I said this to both staff and in some of the other sessions this week is that I really mean what I said in the opening speech, that everyone has an opinion about ICANN, and that's something very positive, right?

But I think when you're coming into this role as the CEO, you also have to be very careful to bring all those perceptions with you, but you actually have to base it on the feedback and the thoughts and comments that I get from all of you and for myself an opinion on this. And we did as part of these three months, me and Russ Weinstein, who's also new as the SP policy. We met with all the SO/AC leaderships and many of the SO/AC groups as I did with the GAC, and there was very, very valuable feedback and input we got from those sessions to build and form those opinions.

I think one is something that my takeaway is that there is a lot of willingness and openness from all the communities and how do we work more efficiently, better together to deliver a policy that is, I was going to say high quality, but policy that serves its purpose in a timely manner, I would say, and that we have an efficient and open dialogue in the policy development. And I think that's something that was pretty unanimous across all the groups. We talked about how do we drive that. And I think this openness to cooperation and listening and working through this is my first

impression of this. And I think that's a fantastic part of this. And of course, the GAC has a very important role in this, and the discussion we were having so far has been very, very positive in that.

On the priorities, what I had said with the Board when I started and we said was that I would take this first month to listen and understand the community and the stakeholders and what their priorities are and form this opinion. As I said, I didn't come into ICANN with this grand vision of what I want to accomplish. I want to accomplish the best outcomes for the community and what the stakeholders believe is in the interest of ICANN and set the priorities based on this, and that we develop goals and objectives that are in support of the strategic plan that we're about to adopt. And also, that is in line with what the community have expressed to me in the dialogues and discussions I've had.

So we're working through these priorities. I'm formulating them. We had this in the previous session as well. The timeline for this is that I will define together with the executive team what we believe are the CEO goals or objectives, as we call them now. The CEO objectives, what's the desired outcomes, what are the key metrics in these?

And we will agree them at the next Board workshop in Hanoi in the first week in May, I think it is. And these will then flow into the priority setting for all the executive staff and the organization as part of the fiscal year 26. So that's the timeline, the schedule, how we plan to define these objectives and the work from this. And that will set the priorities. But very much this is to deliver the strategic

plan as the wish of the community and the operating plan that you will know as well.

The next part of the question was about the efficiencies and how we drive this. I should just say that the transparency and accountability question is something that's very much on the Board's mind. You might have seen from the other public sessions we've had over the last two days. It's been a very reoccurring topic on how we address and deliver that. And I think that's coming on later in here as well. So maybe believe that for that discussion. But I think on the efficiency and delivery of this mission, that's very much how we get measured and how we try to do this.

As I said, the goals that we're looking for is that how are we going to focus and deliver this strategic plan? But it's also how do we work internally? How do we structure ourselves? What are the tools we use? And there's a lot of work we're doing within the organization to address these and think through what the processes are. How do we serve our, I was going to say customers, but stakeholders in the processes we have and we deliver towards the community or towards the stakeholders. And this ranges from processes, staffing, resourcing, all the way to systems and tooling.

And one example that we talked about the Board the other day is also the work that's currently going on in E&IT, where we're doing a complete rehaul and re-evaluation of all the system and tooling we're having to ensure that we are uplifting that to an efficient way so we can work with efficient modern tools in a cost-effective manner. And this is something that we're looking and analyzing

throughout the entire organization. How do we drive this efficiency? How do we deliver this in the best and most optimal way? So that's a process that's ongoing, and we'll start some more of this as we go along around this.

The last part of the question about the internet governance ecosystem and especially in WSIS+20. So the modalities were published Monday. That was yesterday actually. Feels like a week ago, but it was yesterday. And we published them, and of course we will work towards this. We presented a strategy that we have for the Board and the Board workshop this weekend on the topics that we believe we should be really addressing and working towards both in the IGF and WSIS+20 context.

We really believe that engaging the SO/AC leadership and SO/AC groups, using them as an outreach strategy, but also engaging with the GAC and all of the GAC members, of course, and all the countries to the government engagement team we have to work through those topics and follow that strategy is something that we really believe is important for us to get the support we want.

On that particular topic, we have said that we believe that the IGF is imperative to ourselves, a very key topic in this, and we would like to see the IGF strengthened and made permanent. But we believe there's another important part of the multi-stakeholder model, just like ICANN is, and we will work towards those strategies and outreach with you and with the other SO/AC groups, and in all the other forums, and together with our ISTAR partners in

delivering those messages. But I think that was my answer. It was rather long. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much, Kurtis. So let me pause here for a second. And at this point, I'll open the floor for questions. Two things to bear in mind. The first thing is that priority is going to be given to GAC members, given the fact that this is a Board-GAC interaction. So the absolute priority will be given to GAC members. And the other thing is, please keep your questions short and straight to the point, given the fact that we only have 60 minutes for this session. And with that, let me open the floor for questions, comments. I see a hand. Switzerland, please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO   Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. And thanks very much for being here, all of the Board members, and especially also Kurtis. Welcome to the GAC. So this is your first Board-GAC interaction with us, it's good to hear how you are approaching things, very much in a listening mode, also trying to understand the SOs and ACs. I think that's very important, and I guess in line with what is also our interest. But let me just share with you also a very specific point that is touched on the question of transparency and accountability.

So yesterday, we had this dialogue in the community on the question of the draft code of ethics for SOIs. And I just wanted to share with you that we are discussing this in the GAC. We will

probably have some communiqué language, so I will be very brief in trying to get to the core of our probable comments, which is please keep it simple and clear, support the implementation, and please be swift. We need this as soon as possible. We had many discussions, and if we get this done, it will be a very positive sign also for the other evolutions we are having at the wider level. So thanks very much. This is what I wanted to share.

KURTIS LINDQVIST   Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Switzerland. I have the UK next. Please go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON   Yes, thank you very much. Nigel Hickson, UK GAC. Thank you, Kurtis, for your reply to those questions. Thank you also for your address at the opening ceremony where you recognized the world, if you like, where we live in terms of the geopolitical considerations. Many of us have worked for countless years on the WSIS process and the IGF, and clearly it is going to be a key year in ensuring that the UN General Assembly discussions later in the year endorse what we think is a very important part of the multi-stakeholder process. It is good to see ICANN involved in that.

I recognize that ICANN has a mandate, and it is not going to shout from the rooftops on issues without its mandate, but perhaps you could just say a couple of words about the sort of considerations

that you are giving, or perhaps these will follow at another time, but certainly we think ICANN should continue its involvement as it has been doing in this overall IG system.

KURTIS LINDQVIST   Well, thank you, Nigel. I think that when I said this, you might have heard me say this before, so apologies, but I'm going to say this again. I think one of the fundamental things that I got asked when I was in Riyadh, because like Nigel, I was in Tunis in 2005 when all this came out, and one of the things that I think is worth recognizing behind this discussion when we had the ITU workshop in Geneva was that in Tunis in 2005, when Markus Kummer presented the idea of the IGF and the multi-stakeholder model was formed and cemented, we knew the concept, but we had nothing to show for it. Today we know the concept and we have something to show for it, and I think that's something that we need to really underline and showcase.

But I think what is becoming clearer in many discussions, and this is something we certainly support, is that we talk a lot about the success of the multi-stakeholder model, but I also think we need to talk about what has it enabled. I mean, I think the multi-stakeholder model and the open Internet, the one Internet we know today, has also enabled all this economic value creation, all the innovation, all the services, everything we know today that comes out of this, and I think we need to. Maybe sometimes forget that this is actually the enabler as much as it is a thing in its own right. And I think we need to really stress this part that this is one

of the most key topics that really undermines this, or underlines, or builds up all this value on top of it. And I think that's something that we really should push more about, and how the multi-stakeholder model is actually a foundation that enabled this as a principle.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much for that, Kurtis, I can take one more question, and for the sake of time, right after that we need to move on. European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO   Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. First of all, I would like everyone else to welcome our new CEO. It's great to have you with us, and also thank you very much for what you just shared. We strongly support the open Internet policy and all considerations showing how the open Internet has enabled thriving economies and societies. We fully align with the considerations that you just made.

In relation to ICANN inside the wider Internet governance ecosystem, we strongly support that ICANN continues trying to deliver effectively on its mission, but also perhaps one question is how you see in the future to even increase collaboration between the different organizations in the ecosystem so that all together with different prospects and different missions, continue delivering on the multi-stakeholder model and the ultimate objectives. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

The wider Internet governance ecosystem is quite wide, right? So, for example, we did this work with two workshops with the ITU and the Permanent Mission of Finland and South Africa, as I mentioned in the opening speech. That's one of the examples of how we are reaching out to other organizations to build and educate and bring this message out. And we held this training in New York and Geneva. We do work together with other ISTAR organizations, so our similar minded organizations that we cooperate with.

I think we're very open to working with other organizations and we do work with some other organizations that are working in this space. And we have active engagement programs with all of them. And if there are more organizations, we have the Smart Africa Cooperation for Africa. For example, I spoke there on Friday. We have similar intergovernmental or other government initiatives where we do this work. We also have ICANN staff engaging directly with national governments on a national level.

So we do a lot of this outreach all the time. And I think we're open to discussing with many more governments or organizations to bring this message out, because I think it's something that's very, very important. It's also part of the strategy that I talked about, we discussed it by the Board, is to go out and find and identify more of these organizations. So, for example, when I talked about bringing the private sector to actually highlight how this creates value, is to go work closer with those organizations as well to make sure we get this message out.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Kurtis. Moving forward, Gulten, please. Our next topic is ICP-2, Internet Coordination Policy. And as you can see on the screen, the GAC has noted and welcomes the recent adoption of the implementation and assessment procedures for ICP-2 compliance.   The question is, can the Board or ICANN leadership provide an update on the next steps with regard to this document and the timelines envisioned for ICANN org to implement the procedures laid out in the implementation document? And for that, I will give the floor again to Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Nico. As you know, the ICP-2 is a very important document that speaks to the creation of RIRs, and it hasn't been reviewed in many, many years. And it's an opportune moment for the RIRs to come together and consult on it. And I'm going to turn this over to my colleague, Christian Kaufmann, who will give you an update on where exactly we stand with that document. Christian?

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Thank you, Tripti. I want to dissect it a little bit and ensure we talk about the right things because there are actually two documents. The implementation and assessment procedure document you referred here to was something the Board ratified in December, and it has two main components. One is that the RIRs, after they are established, still have to comply with the rules. And second, that ICANN is responsible for investigating issues in case an RIR is

noncompliant, and then working together with the RIR to attempt to restore compliance.

The document we are talking about here does not change the spirit of the original ICP-2 document and just specified some details which were not specified 25 years ago. So with that part, there's actually not much implementation needed for point one. It's just a statement. And for point two, we are actually already there. They said when people talk about the ICP-2 as such or the update of the document, they usually talk about a slightly different initiative, which is about updating the older document.

This update of the document would then, and that's what most people look for, contain two other parts, and that is the potential formal derecognition of an RIR and the transition to a successor. That whole process is currently going on with the SO/AC. They have initiated a broad policy process to update the document, and the intention is to show it and give it to us, the Board, for ratification by end of this year. That would be the short answer. How much time, Nick, do you want to spend on?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   You still have a good five minutes, so go ahead.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN   Then let me talk a little bit about how the process looks like for the ICP-2 update. The SO/AC started with updating the document by coming up with guiding principles. There are 24 of them, and you might either have seen them in the RIR survey, which was held

recently, or in the ICANN public consultation, and both are basically the same. The RIRs did it for their community. We did it for ours. The feedback of this consultation and the surveys were basically fed together and given to the SO/AC. They are currently writing an updated version of ICP-2, which is supposed to come out end of May, then it gets published.

The idea then is, again, to have a survey and a public consultation so that people which have seen the document the first time can actually comment on it. I think there will be also various webinars which introduce the document. I think we from the ICANN side will do it for our community as much as the RIRs for theirs.

Then over the summer, people can, as I said, comment on the public consultation or on the survey, and then around September-ish, the SO/AC will take that feedback all into account and then update, rewrite, I guess they will see what the feedback is, the document, and come up with a revised version. The revised version then gets published again in fall, and then this is also the travel season for RIRs with the various community meetings gets presented there, where then the RIR communities can comment on them again, and the whole thing hopefully comes to an end by end of the year.

That is the time when the Board, the ICANN Board officially, will get the document to ratify it. This said, we are not waiting until we get the final version at the end of the year and then get all very surprised about it. We basically follow the whole process, but also the document and the feedback. Whenever the document comes

out in May, we will have a webinar and actually talk about it in a Board workshop so that we are all on the same page with the suggestions, and we also, as we did last time, have a look on the public consultation feedback from our community to see what the feedback is there. So the various steps which I outlined is something the Board will follow as well and have a look, and potentially comment as well back to the SO/AC from our perspective. That's pretty much it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Chris. Let me open the floor at this point for questions for you, questions, comments, or both from the GAC, both online and in the room, and I have Netherlands next. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING   Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, it's Marco for the Netherlands speaking. And thank you, Christian, and of course Tripti, for giving us such an overview. I think I can speak for many GAC colleagues that we are indeed following the ASO process with interest. We already had some interactions with the ASO and are certainly looking forward to continue with that, indeed reviewing the drafts as they come along. As you said, we also do not like to be surprised with sort of here's the final document, so much appreciated. I think we are aligned there.

Coming back to the question as it is on the screen, and that's really about the implementation and assessment. I understand that future iterations of the ICP-2 might have different redress

mechanisms, but in terms, and if I paraphrase your answer, this document basically describes what ICANN can do in terms of testing the compliance of RIRs against the current ICP-2, and I think in that sense the question would be, how proactive are you thinking of implementing this? You mentioned like ICANN can act upon complaints, or are you more looking at periodic reviews of the RIRs in relation to the ICP-2 requirements, or are you strictly waiting for somebody to ring your doorbell? Thank you.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN   Thank you. So, first of all, a clarification. The implementation assessment procedure which we see here is for the current ICP-2, so if there are significant changes in the new document, then there is most likely a new implementation and assessment procedure, so that might actually look different in the future.

To answer the question about the noncompliance, I don't think, especially now as we have a new document coming up that we have scheduled regular audits or anything in that regard, so it is when there is reason to believe there is noncompliance or we want to look at it. So there is no schedule or particular whatever. So I guess it is more the question that if we are triggered or if someone triggers us, but not a proactive approach for that.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Christian. Thank you, Netherlands, for the question. Any other comment or question in the room or online? I don't see

any hand online. I don't see any hand in the room, so let's move on. Next slide, please, Gulten.

The next topic is Next Round of new gTLDs, ASP, that is Applicant Support Program, and for that I will kindly ask my distinguished vice chair from Colombia to read the question. Please go ahead, Thiago.

THIAGO DAL TOE   Topic three, Next Round of new gTLD, Applicant Support Program. The GAC welcomes the update from ICANN Org this meeting week on applications under Applicant Support Program (ASP). GAC members are concerned that while it appears there are almost 25 support applications in some form of preparation or submission, less than half come collectively from Asia/Pacific, African, and Latin American regions of the world. GAC members intend to work further with ICANN Org to enhance outreach and promotion of next round application opportunities to developing regions and countries. In the meantime, can the Board confirm expectations that application fees will be lowered to reflect an 85% fee reduction from the current 75% target?

TRIPTI SINHA   Thank you very much for your question. As you know, this is an important step in releasing the next round, and my colleague Alan Barrett will give us an update on this.

ALAN BARRETT
Thank you for the opportunity to address it. This is Alan Barrett. So the Applicant Support Program, of course, is an important part of the new gTLD program. We appreciate the GAC's interest in the program and the GAC's collaboration in outreach to potential applicants. ICANN org does provide monthly updates on the application process, and that would be where you've seen the statistics of the number of active applications.

Some of the applications in progress do not yet have geographic data associated with them, and that happens when somebody begins creating an application, but they've not yet finished submitting all the information. And if their geographic information is missing, there are eight applications in that state. And so if you exclude those eight, then in fact, the number of applications from the three regions you mentioned, Africa, Asia/Pacific, and Latin America, Caribbean, are actually more than half of the total. So it's less than half if you include the unknown or unspecified regions, but it's more than half if you exclude those.

So we are hopeful that we'll be able to do more outreach to those regions. ICANN org has spent about 85% of their engagement efforts in trying to reach those regions of Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean and Asia/Pacific. And the number of applicants received so far are much more than were received in a similar period in the 2012 round. So ICANN org will perform outreach, and we appreciate the GAC's continued outreach.

Then in answer to your question about the 85%, it really depends on the number of approved applications. If there are fewer than 45

qualified applicants, then the fee reduction can be increased. So if there are fewer applicants, then the fee reduction is increased. If there are more applicants, then the fee reduction is decreased. But regardless, it will be somewhere between 75% and 85%. It's also possible that the Board may be able to allocate a larger budget if there are many more applications. So can the Board confirm that fees will be lowered to 85%? We can't guarantee that, but we will try. It depends on the budget and the number of applications. I hope that helps. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, Alan. The floor is still open. Any other comments or questions, thoughts? And I have Netherlands. Please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING   Thank you, Nico. Thank you, Alan, for your elaborate description. I've mentioned it in previous sessions while discussing the ISP with ICANN staff. But from our perspective, and I understand there's still a lot of unknowns, but I think the process would improve if it's as predictable as possible. This is unfortunately not the only uncertainty that still is in the system, and I can imagine that especially for ISP applicants, we're still looking at differences that could rack up to $10,000-$20,000, and those are significant. So I would urge the Board to give as much clarity and predictability as possible to this process and to the applicants. Thank you.

ALAN BARRETT	Thank you, Marco. Let me try to give as much clarity as I can. The Board has allocated a budget of, I think it was $10 million to the Applicant Support Program. I stand to be corrected on the amount, but whatever it was, we divide that by the number of applicants, and if the result allows us to increase it above 75%, then we will do so.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, Alan. Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, let's move on to the next slide, please, Gulten. Topic number four, which is registration data. (A) urgent requests for disclosure, and for that, let me kindly ask the UK to read the question. Nigel, would you please?
NIGEL HICKSON	Yes, of course, Mr. Chairman. Urgent requests for disclosure. Following the recent second trilateral call between the GAC--
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Could you, please…
NIGEL HICKSON	Sorry, yes. I thought I was in a small room. My eyesight's very poor. Following the recent second trilateral call between the GAC, the ICANN Board and the GNSO on this matter, the 12th of February, the GAC understands that there is agreement to proceed with resuming EDPD Phase 1 IRT discussions to define an appropriate timeline for response to urgent requests for disclosure of

82 | COMMUNITY FORUM

registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily harm, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation.

In light of the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué GAC advice for the ICANN Board, which was to act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on this matter, the GAC would appreciate confirmation of when the Board expects ICANN org will reconvene this implementation review team. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA   Thank you for the question. My colleague, Becky Burr, will respond to that.

BECKY BURR   Thank you, and it's nice to be here. First of all, I want to start out by saying that we very much appreciate the GAC's participation in the trilateral calls. I think that the two calls that we had were quite productive, and as I'm sure we all know, there was general agreement that we should move forward on two tracks, that there will be continued work on the authentication piece, but that work on the timeline can proceed.   No new policy development processes needed. We will be proceeding with the implementation review team.

Currently, we are prepared and Org is prepared to hold working sessions with the IRT to discuss and establish the timeline, and the GNSO Council will be meeting tomorrow, and on its agenda for

tomorrow is this issue. Once they notify us that they're ready to proceed, Org will proceed to convene the IRT to kick off those discussions and to develop next steps and a timeline for those discussions. So we don't anticipate any extended delay. We anticipate being able to convene the IRT promptly as soon as we get word from the GNSO Council, and our understanding is that we will get word from the GNSO Council tomorrow.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, Becky. Any questions from the GAC to the Board at this point regarding this topic, that is urgent requests? And I have the European Commission. Please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO   Thank you, Nico. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. This is just more a comment than a question to acknowledge that we discussed this issue extensively again in our GAC sessions, and there was a general appreciation from the GAC about the trilateral calls we had with the Board and with the GNSO. This also shows that we could find alternative, productive, intersessional ways to move forward on this issue, which is very important for the GAC, and indeed we raised the point again with the GNSO, so we are all waiting for the deliberations this week or after the meeting of the GNSO to learn when the IRT will be starting again. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Thank you, European Commission. The floor is still open. Any other comments or questions from the GAC?
PRADEEP VERMA	Yeah, I'm Pradeep Verma here.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Excuse me, excuse me. Priority is given to India. India, if you would like to take the floor.
PRADEEP VERMA	I'm here only.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. My apologies. I'm sorry, I didn't know. Please go ahead. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
PRADEEP VERMA	Yeah, I'm Pradeep Verma, alternate GAC to India. So the question is actually not directly related to the agenda, but it's close to. So ICANN community is working on RDRs that will probably lead to the SSAD to get the registration data. However, there is some urgent situation where we have to immediately block some of the domain name that have some malicious activity or that need to be blocked on an urgent basis. So the process what ICANN has provided under the Contextual Compliance, so it takes a delay of around 10 to 15 days. So is ICANN is working to get expedited to reduce the delay

82 COMMUNITY FORUM

in the process of the Contextual Compliance or any mechanism they are adopting? Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you for the question. We are indeed working to expedite this process. When the recommendation came to the Board, there was a dispute about the time period. The time period then was generally that you needed to respond generally within 24 hours, but no later than two business days, but there was a possibility of another one. And when the Board looked at the description of what qualified as an urgent request, we felt that that timeline was not responsive to a situation where a child might be trafficked or where critical infrastructure was endangered.

So we actually said to the GNSO, we're not prepared to accept that timeline. We also said there is an issue with responding if we cannot authenticate law enforcement. And in order to respond quickly, the registrars need to be able to confirm that they are actually dealing with somebody from law enforcement making that request. We've had very good response from the Public Safety Working Group and members of law enforcement in this community who are working on one work track to create a system that would enable registrars to quickly authenticate that they're dealing with an actual law enforcement agent. And the timeline work that I was discussing is on a parallel track.

So as both of those works are proceeding, we are hoping that we will get, one, a very reliable system for authenticating that the request is coming for law enforcement, and two, as a result of that,

the ability for a registrar to respond promptly. I can't tell you what the absolute outcome of the timeline will be, but I can guarantee you, well, I probably shouldn't say that, but the Board would not accept 15 days under any circumstances.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Becky. And my apologies again to the India delegation I didn't see his name. My apologies. The floor is still open regarding Topic 4(A), Urgent Requests. I don't see any other hand in the room, so let's move to the next topic, please, Gulten. Topic 4(B), which is Registration Data and Accuracy of Registration Data. And for that, I'll give the floor to my distinguished colleague from Egypt, Christine, who's going to read the question. Please go ahead, Christine.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Sure, thank you, Nico. So on accuracy of registration data, since the suspension of the work of the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team in November 2022, the GAC has regularly stressed the importance of resuming work on accuracy as soon as possible. Recently, the GAC submitted its input to the GNSO Council's questions, aimed at providing a foundation for deciding on the next steps, which the GAC expects will soon follow towards resuming the scoping of policy work on accuracy of domain name registration data. The GAC is interested in hearing the ICANN Board's current thinking on this matter. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you, and thank you for the question. So the GNSO Council suspended the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team, giving the challenges it was facing in collecting data that would have enabled them to measure the level of accuracy in current registration data. The Council is divided, we understand, on whether continued work via a small team or another mechanism is the right way to proceed on this. This is not to diminish the importance of timely access to data that enables you to respond to malicious behavior, but a question of what the most effective way to respond would be.

In order to get a better sense of that, the Council leadership asked the various stakeholder groups and constituency structures to respond to a series of threshold questions to provide a foundation. The Council also asked ICANN org to answer some questions related to the current legislative landscape on that, which we have done, and those answers are available publicly.

Our understanding is that the GNSO Council is going to be reviewing the submitted responses. I understand that the small team that was working on this from the GNSO Council is now going through the responses, is collecting them, and going through the survey results, and then will come back to the GNSO to recommend next steps based on that feedback from the various communities, I assume including the GAC.

So we won't have an answer here in Seattle, but I expect that in short order, once the small team has gone through the survey results, it will go back to the GNSO Council with a recommendation on how to proceed. Let me just add that this, I know, is a topic that

is very important to a lot of people here and perhaps a little frustrating. And part of the frustration is it's difficult to access the data, so it's very hard to evaluate the ways in which the registration data is or is not actionable. We've been talking about accuracy and what accuracy means, and I think I've moved to a question of whether it's actionable. Does the data enable you to do what you need to do with that, whether it's contact the registrant or do something else?

And so I know that there are conversations within just the Contracted Parties, the registrars in particular, about what other steps might be available to get a better handle on this as well. So it's not just a GNSO Council issue, but I believe that there is a commitment among the Contracted Parties to look hard at the issue and see if we can collectively come together to begin to answer the questions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, Becky. The floor is still open. Any other comment or question? I have India again. Please go ahead.

SUSHIL PAL   Thank you, Chair. I think it's more like a larger business process issue. Is the Board thinking of laying down some timeline for any of the group, be it a GNSO or a GSE or any other stakeholder group, for coming to a decision with a defined timeline, or can it be open-ended to go on for more than three years? I mean, that's number one. And how comfortable is GAC with regard to the

implementation, with regard to the reconvening of the IRT, with regard to the agenda request? Do we see it happening before this ICANN meeting gets over, or we get to see it in the next ICANN meeting?

BECKY BURR

So the reconvening of the IRT is with respect to the urgent request issue. As I said, we expect that we will hear, we will be given direction from the GNSO Council at their meeting tomorrow. I don't think that the IRT would be reconvened while we're in Seattle, but it would be promptly done, and we're not talking about three months, three years, whatever. I think we all have a strong interest in getting that conversation started so that as law enforcement works on the authentication piece of the puzzle, the community can be working on the timeline policy piece of it. So is the IRT going to be reconvened while we're in Seattle? Probably not. Shortly thereafter.

On the other question, where we are right now is that the GNSO Council has the survey results in, and their small team is compiling them. They are working on it. They will come back to us on this. I don't expect that there's an appetite, either with the Board or with the GNSO Council itself, to drag this out. It is a complicated and difficult issue when we can't easily get our arms around what the nature of inaccuracy is and to the extent to which it occurs in the database. So I cannot tell you how quickly they will work. I think we will press them to work as quickly as they can, but we'll take some creative thought on all parts.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, India. Is that an old-hand?

SUSHIL PAL   If you permit. Obviously, a Board cannot be committing as to how quick the GNSO Council will be responding. I'm asking for larger organizational procedures so that one council or one body does not take the whole of ICANN or the community on a ransom. It's been pending for quite some time, and I don't think it's such a challenge when it comes to the ccTLDs. Pretty simple when it comes to the country ccTLDs, but it gets pretty complicated the moment it comes to the gTLDs.

I mean, it's beyond comprehension for quite a few of us as to why it is so complicated, I think. I mean, the larger question is, I think, maybe you define a timeline that one group cannot take more than two years to come to a conclusion, either accept or reject, whichever way, you know. Nobody is asking that decision should go my way, but then they should be able to take a decision rather than stalling a process for such a long time, any group for that matter. Thank you.

BECKY BURR   Thank you. I hear your frustration, and I think we all share a bit of that frustration. As I said, we do feel confident that the GNSO Council is working on this issue. I don't believe it's a delay tactic. I

believe it is a serious commitment to do the work, and we will be watching very carefully.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you again, Becky. Thank you, India. So, it's time to move on to the AOB session. We have five minutes for AOB, basically. So, again, the floor is open. Comments, questions, thoughts? And I have Australia. Please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON   Thank you, Nico. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia. And thank you, the Board, once again, for making time to have a dialogue with the GAC. I just wanted to draw your attention back to the how we meet session from earlier in the week and reiterate some of the comments the committee made about equitable time zones for meetings and discussions. I acknowledge there are practical considerations in working through some of these challenges, but I also wanted to draw out the important role that culture has in addressing some of these issues. I understand there's a lot of cultural inertia in having time zones that may be inconvenient for many to join. I'd very much welcome the Board's views on what you as this community's leaders might be able to do to help set some of these cultural expectations to address this issue. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA   Ian, thank you very much for that feedback. And I was asked in a meeting, some meetings ago, if I had a magic wand, what would I

get rid of? And it would be time zones. But we have heard this from many different constituencies and people in different parts of the region. So as Org begins to get input and then redefines the structure, that is going to certainly play a very key element in how it's structured. And just by sitting here on this stage, my colleague from Australia can attest to the fact that he does suffer quite a bit when we meet. So I hope that answers your question, Ian. A lot.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   So thank you to our Australian friends. By the way, I love your kangaroo pin, Ian. We have an Australian friend in common. Any other comment? I have Egypt. Go ahead, please.

MANAL ISMAIL   Thank you, Nico. And since Australia brought up the topic of how we meet, so I thought to bring to the Board's attention also the dates of the meeting. Normally, I know ICANN did a very good job to avoid big religious holidays and events. But in fact, the upcoming meeting in Prague overlaps with the Adha Feast, which is a big event within the Muslim countries. It's something like Christmas. So I know ICANN has been doing a great job on this in the past, and I hope it's taken into consideration again in the future. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQVIST   Sure. I mean, we do our best to try to avoid this. And I think this was mentioned in the how we meet session on Monday as well, that we do try to address these concerns within the availability of

venues, et cetera. But it's point taken, and we're absolutely aware of this, and we'll do what we can to avoid them when we can. So absolutely.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much. And that's all we have time for. We need to wrap up. Any final thoughts or remarks? Anybody from my distinguished colleagues from the Board? Tripti? Kurtis? All good? Thank you so much.

TRIPTI SINHA   Nico. We have Germany next--

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Excuse me?

TRIPTI SINHA   Germany next on the line.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Oh, I'm sorry. Germany, go ahead, please.

RUDY NOLDE   Only if we have time. Well, I'll keep it very short. It's on the RDRS pilot as it's now coming to an end, and we have already learned a lot from it, what could be improved. I just wanted to know if the Board has a timeline on next steps, how to improve it.

BECKY BURR

Is this on RDRS? I'm sorry. I just need to clarify. Yes. We are waiting for the RDRS Standing Committee's report to be finalized, and I know that's quite far along. I think we've had a very good conversation in the Board-GAC working group in terms of what the Board believes should happen next, and I think there's solid alignment based on what I heard between the Board and the GAC on the need to move forward on this. So I think we will be watching this very carefully, and also figuring out the way in which we move from the SSAD recommendations to a robust RDRS that addresses the issues that we need to do. There's some policy mapping work that needs to go on, and that I think will be started as soon as we get the final report from the Standing Committee.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Germany. Thank you, Becky. We need to wrap up now. Last but not least, let's give a big round of applause to our new CEO, Kurtis Lindqvist. A warm welcome. So the session is adjourned. Please be back in the room at 4.30. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]