

ICANN | GAC

Governmental Advisory Committee

Dublin, Ireland, 3 November 2025

GAC Communiqué – Dublin, Ireland¹

The Dublin Communiqué was drafted and agreed in a hybrid setting, during the ICANN84 Annual General Meeting, with some GAC participants in Dublin, Ireland, and others remotely. The GAC's discussions during this public meeting are reflected in the GAC Meeting Minutes and the transcripts of all sessions, available at <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 Dublin, Ireland, in a hybrid setting including remote participation, from 25 to 30 October 2025.

Seventy (70) GAC Members and eight (8) Observers attended the meeting.

The GAC meeting was conducted as part of the ICANN84 Annual General Meeting. All GAC plenary and working group sessions were conducted as open meetings.

The Governmental Advisory Committee acknowledges and mourns the passing of Stefano Trumphy and Peter Major, former and long standing GAC Representatives of Italy and Hungary respectively, who made distinguished contributions to the GAC, ICANN, and the development and governance of the Internet. They will be remembered for their warmth, thoughtfulness and collegiality in advancing, in many fora, the global public interest.

II. Inter-Constituency Activities and Community Engagement

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

Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board and discussed:

- ICANN Board and ICANN organization policy priorities in 2026
- ICANN Code of Conduct
- GAC Strategic Planning
- Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)
- Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data
- ICANN Review of Reviews

The GAC also discussed the Meetings Strategy Working Group's recommendations², which were approved by the ICANN Board and explicitly factored the simplicity of visa applications and ease of entry as key criteria for meeting venue selection. The GAC noted with concern that despite this, on-site participation of some colleagues and community members from underserved regions continues to be impeded. Barriers to on-site attendance limit participation from underserved regions and negatively impacts collective outputs when we aim to enhance engagement within ICANN. The GAC welcomes further discussion with the Board on this matter through future BGIG calls.

Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The GAC met with members of the ALAC and discussed:

- DNS Abuse enforcement trends and transparency
- Review of ICANN Reviews
- New gTLDs Applicant Support Program

Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

The GAC met with members of the SSAC and discussed:

- Importance of Free and Open Source Software in the DNS Industry
- Impact of String Collision and Similarities on Security and Stability
- DNS Abuse Preliminary Issue Report
- Possibilities for Cooperation Between SSAC and GAC

Meeting with the Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

The GAC met with members of the ASO and discussed revisions to the Governance Document for the Recognition, Operation, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries.

² <https://meetings.icann.org/en/future-meeting-strategy>

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

The GAC met with members of the ccNSO and discussed:

- Use of Bulk Registration of Domain Names in Cryptocurrency Investment Fraud
- Roles of Governments and ccTLDs in Domain Abuse Mitigation

Meeting with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

The GAC met with members of the GNSO's Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and discussed:

- Human Rights Impact Assessments and the GAC Communiqué
- Registration Data Request Service, Urgent Requests and Registrant Data Requests
- DNS Abuse Mitigation
- ICANN Reviews

Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and discussed:

- Registration Data Request Service
- Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data and Law Enforcement Authentication
- Accuracy of Registration Data
- DNS Abuse Policy Development

Meeting with the WSIS+20 Co-Facilitators

The GAC met with the WSIS+20 Co-Facilitators and discussed the current status of the WSIS+20 Review Process.

Cross Community Discussions

GAC Members participated in relevant cross-community sessions scheduled as part of ICANN84, including on the Review of ICANN Reviews.

III. Internal Matters

1. GAC Membership

There are currently 184 GAC Member States and Territories and 41 Observer organizations. The GAC acknowledges that the Digital Cooperation Organization (DCO) has joined the committee as an Observer organization.

2. GAC Leadership

The GAC elected as Vice-Chairs for the term starting after ICANN85 (March 2026) and ending at the close of ICANN90 (October 2027)³:

Ian Sheldon (Australia)

Zeina Bou Harb (Lebanon)

Marco Hogewoning (The Netherlands)

Jorge Cancio (Switzerland)

Gloria Katuuku (Uganda)

3. GAC Working Groups

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

The PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG contributed to the meetings between the GNSO and GAC on DNS Abuse and Registration Data Issues, to a meeting with the ccNSO on online scams, and meetings with the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) regarding human rights matters which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work. Key takeaways involving PSWG workstreams included the scope of Policy Development Processes (PDPs) to address DNS Abuse, law enforcement authentication, the next steps regarding the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and continued progress on work related to Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data.

³ The new terms of GAC Vice-Chairs are consistent with revised GAC Operating Principle 21 and 31. See <https://gac.icann.org/operating-principles/operating-principles-june-2025>

- **GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group (GOPE WG)**

The GOPE Working Group Co-Chairs updated the GAC on recent activities carried out by the Working Group. The GOPE WG continues its discussion on revision of the GAC Operating Principles. Since ICANN83 the Working Group reconvened and decided a three-pronged approach including: finalizing changes to leadership tenures as voted upon by the GAC membership; finalizing changes to the Operating Principles deemed as administrative only; and considering outcomes of the Review of Reviews process in the Working Group's activities. The GOPE Working Group will continue its meetings post ICANN84.

4. GAC Strategic Planning

As part of the continued implementation of its Strategic Plan 2024-2028⁴, the GAC finalized and endorsed its new 2025/2026 Annual Plan⁵ which lays out Expected Outcomes over the next year for each of the 9 GAC Strategic Objectives in the following areas:

1. Role for Governments in ICANN
2. Effectiveness of the Governmental Advisory Committee
3. Future Rounds of New gTLDs
4. DNS Abuse
5. Domain Registration Data
6. Universal Acceptance
7. Impact of New Technology on Internet Unique Identifier Systems
8. Internet Governance Awareness
9. Internet Number Resources

5. Capacity Development

During ICANN84, the GAC held three capacity development sessions. Two sessions were dedicated to the New gTLD Program: Next Round, including interactive discussions with ICANN Org on the Applicant's Journey, Public Interest Commitments (PICs), Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs), and GAC Early Warnings. GAC Members also shared experiences and perspectives from the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program, stressing the importance of early engagement in the application and evaluation processes, and consensus building. To this end, future targeted capacity development initiatives may assist the GAC in preparing for its defined role in the next round. Other topics discussed in capacity development sessions were Artificial Intelligence and its possible uses in the DNS, and the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP).

⁴ <https://gac.icann.org/work-plans/gac-strategic-plan-2024-2028.pdf>

⁵ <https://gac.icann.org/work-plans/gac-annual-plan-2025-2026.pdf>

IV. Issues of Importance to the GAC

1. Next Round of New gTLDs

The GAC welcomes the approval of the Applicant Guide Book (AGB) and commends ICANN staff and the many volunteers from the ICANN community, including the GAC, on their contributions to this important milestone in the New gTLD Program: Next Round.

a. Applicant Support Program Implementation and New gTLD Next Round Outreach

The GAC recognizes that the Applicant Support Program (ASP) is meant as a key instrument, intended to enable applicants from underserved regions and economies to participate in the Next Round of new gTLDs.

While acknowledging a significant increase in applications in the pipeline since ICANN83, the GAC notes the limited number of applications and geographic imbalance in the ASP. Despite extensive outreach efforts by ICANN and stakeholders in a spread of regions, the number of completed applications remains lower than expected. The current low uptake and limited geographic breadth poses a risk to the credibility of the program. It may impact the overall objective of the Next Round of new gTLDs to further diversify and broaden the global base of the domain name system (DNS).

The GAC requests ICANN to follow-up on its commitment to facilitate communication between applicants and their respective government through sharing the GAC Representative's contact details. This will help interested governments to better assist applicants in their country to move through the ASP.

The GAC recognizes the efforts by ICANN Org to support ASP applicants in the process and the extension of the deadline to finalize those applications that are in the pipeline. Given the low number of expected complete applications, the GAC considers it important that an adequate ex post analysis is performed to identify problems and provide input to improve any future programs of a similar nature beyond the 2025 ASP.

The GAC appreciates a dialogue with ICANN org to ensure outreach on the Next Round can help in improving global diversity of the DNS sector and encourage applications from underserved regions.

b. Additional Fee for Evaluation of Geographic Names During the Next Round of New gTLDs

With respect to the evaluation of Geographic Names (section 6.5 of the AGB), recalling the GAC input to the public comment related to the draft Applicant Guidebook (AGB) filed on July 23rd 2025, the GAC expects clarifications with regard to the justification for the introduction of additional fees in comparison to the 2012 round where a similar procedure was in place.

In addition, the GAC is of the opinion that the AGB text as proposed introduces some ambiguity in the role of the Geographic Names Panel (GNP) and the application of the fees associated with their conditional review. The GAC recalls its concerns with the text on this topic, and finds that an additional fee should only apply in exceptional cases, excluding the general case where the authenticity of supporting documents can be confirmed by the relevant GAC representative as described in the relevant section of the AGB.

c. Latin Script Diacritics

The GAC understands that a dedicated Policy Development Process (PDP) on Latin script diacritics is underway to develop policy for gTLD strings that include diacritical marks and have ASCII-equivalent applications, reflecting how many Latin-script languages are written. Despite the PDP's progress, the GAC has learned that the PDP will not be completed in time to include its outcomes in the Applicant Guidebook (AGB). The GAC is of the view that the recommendations of this PDP should be part of the conditions governing the Next Round of New gTLDs.

The GAC understands that there may be viable solutions to resolve this issue without delaying the launch of the Next Round whilst providing proper notice to prospective applicants. The GAC requests the Board to work with the GNSO to ensure the integration of PDP recommendations into the application and evaluation processes of the Next Round of New gTLDs.

d. IGO Protections

The GAC takes note of ongoing discussions in the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team and GNSO Council concerning the inclusion of reserved Intergovernmental Organizations (IGO) identifiers in the scope of String Similarity Evaluation in the Next Round of New gTLDs, in which applied-for strings are evaluated for string similarity against the list of reserved strings. The GAC takes note of letters from the ICANN Board and the ALAC to the GNSO Council supporting this inclusion.

Against the backdrop of the GNSO policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs⁶ that applied-for strings must not be confusingly similar to a reserved name, and must not infringe existing legal rights, and the *2007 GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs* that the introduction of new gTLDs⁷ must make proper allowance for rights in the names and acronyms of IGOs, the GAC continues to monitor this evolving topic, and anticipates further discussions and contributions following the ICANN84 Dublin Meeting.

⁶ [Policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs](#) (8 Aug. 2007) [adopted by the ICANN Board](#) (26 Jun. 2008)

⁷ GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs (28 March 2007):
<https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/gac-principles-regarding-new-gtlds>

2. Community Statements of Interest (SOI)

The GAC welcomes the recent adoption by the Board of the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest, looks forward to a swift and efficient implementation of its provisions, and would welcome regular updates on its application and effects.

3. ICANN Review of Reviews

The GAC recalls the essential character of the ICANN Reviews as mandated by the Bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN's accountability, transparency, and governance. Accordingly, the GAC stresses the importance of the Review of Reviews to address the concerning challenges in the current system for accountability at ICANN⁸, not least regarding the backlog of recommendations. The GAC expects to engage actively in this effort to ensure future reviews are efficient, effective, and aligned with ICANN's commitments to transparency and accountability.

4. DNS Abuse

During ICANN84, the GAC confirmed a two-pronged approach to its work on DNS Abuse, focusing on: 1) advancing policy progress, and 2) developing the capacity of GAC members on the subject. Regarding policy, the GAC notes that the 2024 DNS Abuse contract amendments served as an important first step, but more must be done to address the problem. Phishing, botnets, malware, and other forms of DNS abuse impose a tremendous cost upon the public, and adding new strings to the internet will increase the surface area for bad actors to perform these attacks. To prepare for this, the ICANN community must work together to ensure that sound and effective policies are put in place before the delegation of new strings.

On this note, recalling its ICANN83 Advice to the ICANN Board⁹, the GAC recognizes the extensive efforts made by the ICANN community, prior to ICANN84, to proactively initiate DNS Abuse policy work. Swift progress should continue.

In its submission to the ICANN Public Comment proceeding on the Preliminary Issue Report¹⁰, the GAC notes that *"the Issue Report prioritizes the issues specified for policy development"* while appreciating that it *"also identifies and explains a variety of additional "policy gaps" underlying DNS Abuse within ICANN's remit"* many of which are of high importance for the GAC¹¹.

During ICANN84 the GAC discussed participation in upcoming policy development work, including the need for the charter to recognize GAC alternates to enable the GAC to participate effectively. The GAC also noted with interest a point raised during discussion that there are different ways to

⁸ As discussed in Issues of Importance to the GAC in the [GAC Prague Communiqué](#) (16 June 2025)

⁹ See section V.1.a p.11 of the [GAC Prague Communiqué](#) (16 June 2025)

¹⁰ [Preliminary Issue Report on a Policy Development Process on DNS Abuse Mitigation](#)

¹¹ See [GAC Comments on the Amendments to the Base gTLD Registry Agreement \(RA\) and Registrar Accreditation Agreement \(RAA\) to Modify DNS Abuse Contract Obligations](#) (17 July 2023)

automate the registration of a large number of domain names, and therefore policies should be effective while remaining technologically neutral.

Additional policy issues outside of those targeted by the PDPs were discussed, including the absence of an obligation for the contracted parties to report on the abuse notices they receive and act upon. Without this data, the impact of the contract amendments on DNS Abuse, as well as the role of compliance in enforcing these new obligations, cannot be accurately measured.

Further, the GAC supports ICANN providing DNS abuse contract compliance data in standardized, open, machine-readable formats, in order to support evidence-based policy development and enforcement.

The GAC continues to prioritize the commencement of policy development. At the same time, the GAC will follow efforts to address the additional gaps raised by the Preliminary Issue Report, all of which should ensure that critical DNS abuse vectors are effectively mitigated.

In its dedicated session on DNS Abuse at ICANN84, the GAC welcomed a presentation by the host country ccTLD (.ie) on designing effective policy, as well as TWNIC and DotAsia on their innovative trusted notifier network. The GAC recognizes the importance of stakeholder collaboration to address DNS abuse activity that is both within and outside of ICANN's remit and considers voluntary initiatives such as trusted notifier programs to be promising in this regard.

5. Domain Registration Data

a. Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data

Registries and registrars should be required to provide a swift determination and response to Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, of serious bodily injury, to critical infrastructure, or of child exploitation. The GAC notes action is still pending on its Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and its Follow-Up on Previous Advice in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué regarding the expeditious establishment of a policy on Urgent Requests for disclosure of domain name registration data¹². The GAC reiterates the importance of ongoing work on Urgent Requests in the two parallel tracks previously agreed by the GAC, the ICANN Board and the GNSO Council.

The GAC expresses satisfaction with the progress achieved by the Registration Data Implementation Review Team (IRT) in the policy track on establishing a timeline to respond to Urgent Requests. The GAC notes the current proposal for a 24-hour timeline to address Urgent Requests, with potential extension to 72 hours in cases of force majeure, is in line with previous positions expressed by the GAC and the ICANN Board. The GAC intends to provide a submission to the recently opened ICANN Public Comment proceeding on the draft text for the Urgent Requests section of the Registration Data Policy, given the importance of this issue to the GAC. After the Public Comment proceeding, the GAC urges swift action to finalize the timeline. The timeline must be uniformly followed by the

¹² See GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board on Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data in section V.2.a p.14 in the [GAC San Juan Communiqué](#) (11 March 2024)

Contracted Parties to be fit for purpose based on the urgent scenarios involved. The GAC also suggests that support for Urgent Request submission should be integrated within the RDRS to optimize usage of resources.

In the authentication track, the GAC welcomes the update it received from the PSWG regarding its ongoing efforts through the Practitioners Group to develop technical mechanisms to authenticate the identities of law enforcement requestors submitting Urgent Requests. The GAC does not believe new policy development is needed to allow for Urgent Requests to utilize the authentication mechanisms being developed by the PSWG for law enforcement requestors. Instead, usage of these mechanisms should be considered part of the implementation process for the existing Registration Data Policy. In this respect, the GAC appreciated the ICANN Board's statement during the bilateral meeting at ICANN84 that authentication mechanisms could be incorporated with no new policy development. The GAC encourages the Board and the GNSO Council to work together to identify the most effective path to swiftly integrate outcomes from the PSWG's work on authentication mechanisms in the policy on Urgent Requests. Since the authentication mechanisms are needed for the implementation of Urgent Requests policy, and those mechanisms are expected to require technical interfacing with ICANN systems, the GAC continues to appreciate the participation of ICANN staff and community members in the PSWG's Law Enforcement Authentication Practitioners Group. The GAC supports the PSWG's efforts and urges the necessary parties to continue prioritizing this work.

b. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)

The GAC is of the view that ICANN should maintain a permanent and centralized mechanism to channel domain registration data requests to registrars, and registrar participation should be mandatory to ensure the usefulness of the mechanism for requestors. This mechanism should also require participation by privacy and proxy services affiliated with registrars. The GAC calls for efforts to ensure adequate and timely improvements to the RDRS to reassure the community that it can evolve into such a permanent, centralized, and globally accessible mechanism. The absence of an adequate centralized system creates inefficiencies, as requestors such as law enforcement agencies would need to approach each registrar independently.

The GAC provided a submission to the recent Public Comment proceeding outlining its views on the final report of the RDRS Standing Committee. In this submission, the GAC supported the continuation of the RDRS after the end of its two-year pilot period, its improvement to address the needs of requestor communities, and efforts to encourage participation by all registrars since the system is currently voluntary. To that end, the GAC welcomes the Board's decision to adopt a resolution enabling the continued operation of the RDRS. The GAC also understands the Board intends to issue a policy alignment analysis for public consultation, outlining next steps needed to achieve the Board's vision for the RDRS. The GAC intends to closely review this analysis document and will consider making a submission to the Public Comment proceeding regarding the analysis, noting that the analysis document will address the future of the RDRS more holistically than the RDRS Standing Committee report. The GAC urges the ICANN Board to prioritize further actions on this issue after the Public Comment period on the policy alignment analysis.

The GAC continues to support efforts to explore voluntary participation by ccTLDs in the RDRS.

c. Accuracy

The GAC continues to emphasize the importance of accuracy in domain name registration data for the security and stability of the DNS. The current state of work at ICANN, as well as relevant practices to ensure accuracy, were described by representatives from the community in a presentation to the GAC at ICANN84. The GAC notes the outcomes of the work of the GNSO Small Team on Accuracy and urges the GNSO to identify an implementation path for their recommendations. In particular, in relation to the Small Team's first recommendation, the GAC notes that the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) currently provides a 15-day timeline for registrars to validate and verify the contact information of registrants. Since malicious actors often utilize new domain names within hours of registering them, the GAC recommends that registrars be required to complete these validation and verification steps before a newly registered domain name can become accessible through the DNS, or before a domain name transfer can be completed. For example, this change could be achieved through policy development or through an amendment to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) and/or the RDDS Accuracy Program Specification. Verification of contact information could be performed, for example, through automated email or phone-based mechanisms at the point of registration or transfer.

In addition, the GAC appreciated the clarification expressed by the GNSO Small Team Chair that the recommendation to terminate the Accuracy Scoping Team, paused since 2022, would not imply the end of community work on this matter. The GAC is of the opinion that the ICANN community should have an ongoing active forum in which to continue discussing possible next steps related to accuracy, whether it is the Scoping Team or another entity. These discussions should be open to community members outside the GNSO, including interested GAC members.

The GAC notes the evolution of technologies and registration practices that may affect the accuracy and reliability of domain registration data. The GAC encourages ICANN to undertake holistic assessments of such emerging trends and to promote exchanges of best practices among registries and registrars toward developing globally consistent yet locally adaptable accuracy frameworks.

6. Governance of Regional Internet Registries (RIRs)

The GAC welcomed the update from the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) regarding the second draft of the Governance Document for the Recognition, Operation, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries. The GAC appreciates the efforts to provide a clear rationale for the changes and notes that many of the public comments on the first draft have been addressed.

The GAC underscores the importance of continued consultations with all stakeholders to align the governance framework, in a manner consistent with ICANN's core values of transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness.

In regard to subsequent implementation of the new governance framework, the GAC emphasizes that ICANN's multistakeholder community, including its Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, should have an appropriate and constructive role in matters relating to the recognition and derecognition of Regional Internet Registries.

The GAC would welcome continued dialogue with ICANN and the Regional Internet Registries on operationalising the new framework to maintain trust and confidence in the Internet numbers governance system.

V. Next Meeting

The GAC is scheduled to meet next during the ICANN85 Community Forum on 7-12 March 2026.

ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC
Monday, October 27, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC meeting with ICANN Board on Monday, 27th of October at 15:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. With that, I'll now hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, depending on if you're online or which part of the world, as we always do during ICANN meetings. And a very warm welcome to our esteemed colleagues from the ICANN Board. Of course, it's a pleasure to have you with us for this session. We're looking forward to a productive

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.

and collaborative conversation to make the most of our 60-minute, one-hour together. We have planned to briefly touch on a few key topics that are top of mind for the GAC, and these include our shared efforts on DNS abuse mitigation, the ongoing work around registration data, and we're going to get right into the details a little bit later, the governance of the RIRs, or Regional Internet Registries, as well as preparations for the next round of new gTLDs. And finally, the important review of reviews. You might have heard the very interesting conversations and discussions that happened no more than 20 minutes ago. So we're eager to hear your insights and perspectives on these areas, so thank you again for joining us. Without further ado, let's begin. Next slide, please. There we go. Thank you. So this is a question that the Board kindly sent to the GAC. I'm not going to read the question. It's a little bit long, but for that and ... Oh, I'm so sorry. You're right. I forgot to introduce the Board itself. We have Kurtis Lindquist to my right. I'm so sorry about that. You're right. I have the vice chairs on this side of the table Netherlands, Australia, and Switzerland. Thank you so much, and thank you for reminding me, Kurtis. I'm a terrible ... Anyways, and we have Tripti Sinha, the chair of the Board. We have Becky, and we're going to talk about Becky's departure, or planned departure, or for sure a little bit later. We have James Galvin, and the rest of the Board members, Patricio, Chris, Greg, Sajid, and of course, Amitabh Singhal. And I'm not seeing the rest of the Board here. There's Chris just walking by, and Miriam over there, and Sarah's probably somewhere else. So, there we go. So, welcome again. Sorry about that, and thank you for reminding me, Kurtis,

certainly. So, without further ado, let's dive in. And the question the Board had for the GAC reads, what does the GAC believe should be the Board's and the ICANN organization's policy priorities in 2026, taking into consideration the new five-year strategic plan, the WSIS+20 review, and the recently launched cross-community group on the review of reviews? So, we have five topics. On the first one, on DNS abuse mitigation, the GAC speaker will be Susan Chalmers from the USA. On the second one, RDRS and domain name registration data, I will give the floor to the European Commission, and after that, we'll talk about governance of RIRs, and the speaker will be Marco Hogewoning from the Netherlands. On next round of new gTLDs, and along with applicant support and GAC readiness and so on and so forth, the speaker will be Canada, and then finally, on review of reviews, I'll give the floor to our former GAC chair, Manal Ismail from Egypt. So, without further ado, Susan, I don't know if you would like to go ahead at this point. The floor is yours.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States, and along with my counterparts from the European Commission and Japan, one of the topic co-leads on DNS abuse for the GAC. Together, the topic co-leads developed input for the strategic objective. I would describe it as being two-fold. The first is advancing policy work at ICANN on DNS abuse, and the board will be familiar with our efforts towards that, in particular, our ICANN 83 advice in Prague. The second component of the strategic objective is to build up

resources for GAC representatives to be able to understand the topic better. That's all I have to say.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, USA. I have the European Commission next. Please go ahead, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. And together with a group of countries, we are topic leads in the area of domain name registration data, the USA, Canada, and we have a number of other colleagues from the GAC participating to this work stream. This is a topic which has been on the agenda of the GAC for many years, and frequent in the interaction with the board. So this comes as no surprise that we still believe this is a priority for the year ahead, not only because there are some parts of the policies that still need to be addressed, but there are long-term objectives. And these are, for example, linked to the fact of having a reliable and stable accessible system to access registration data, to introduce requests, being the RDRS or successor system. We want to complete the policy on registration data which is pending the urgent request file since some time now. So this is an important piece of the puzzle to have a comprehensive policy. And we are consistently supporting the need for increasing the accuracy of domain name registration data, not as a mean in

itself, but as a tool that should lead to increased resilience of the DNS overall.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, European Commission. On governance of RIRs, I'll give the floor to my distinguished colleague from the Netherlands, Marco. The floor is yours.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. Good morning, good evening, wherever you are. I think ICP2 is a very foundational document regarding the second N, as Hans Petter called it this morning in his speech. So the GAC has been very actively engaging with the ASO in reviewing that and then working on the revised governance document. Looking forward and from the interactions between the GAC and the ASO, there appears to be some urgency on both sides to get this finished. So with regards to the question put forward, I think what the GAC is looking and hoping for is that once the board is presented with the final draft, that we're looking at a fast process to come to a decision and then further on subsequently also to work with the board and ICANN Org in implementing this in an expedited fashion. The document closes a few important loopholes and gaps. So I think that from this perspective, it would be the priority for 2026 to really get a revised governance process and associated reviews into place as soon as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Netherlands. Canada is going to walk us through the issue of next round new gTLDs. David, the floor is yours.

DAVID BEDARD

Thanks Nico, thank you chair. So as we look ahead to the new round, the GAC is interested in the application of insights from past experiences to help shape a more inclusive and resilient domain name system. Our priorities include fostering a competitive environment that enhances user trust and expands choice. We also aim to bridge gaps by encouraging participation from under-represented regions through the applicant support program and supporting the growth of internationalized domain names. Ensuring robust safeguards for DNS security and stability remains essential, especially as it relates to global public interest implications like DNS abuse and geographic names. As we approach the release of the applicant guidebook, we look forward to its thoughtful implementation and remain available to work together constructively with the board and the wider ICANN community.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Canada. And finally, for the ICANN review of reviews or ROR, a new acronym, Manal Ismail former GAC chair, is going to take the floor. All yours, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Nico, and thanks to the board. So the GAC is very much interested in the output of the review of reviews. We are conscious of the aggressive deadline time frame that we have, and I hope the GAC looks forward to the cross-community group accomplishing its final report in due time. We have two representatives on the group and also co-chairing the work of the group and look forward to its output. Worth noting that this feeds directly into the first strategic objective of the GAC in relation to role of governments within ICANN. So I leave it at this and we look forward to the outcome from the group.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Manal. So this is where we are. I don't know if you would like to give any feedback before we move on, Tripti or Kurtis or Vicky. Please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA

So first, thank you very much, Nico, for inviting us to this meeting. As you know, the board always looks forward to our exchange at this meeting. So in terms of your feedback to our question, what I'm delighted to say is that we're very much aligned. As you know, DNS abuse mitigation, as well as features of registration data, its accuracy and urgent requests is also front of mind for us and very much at place. We're very aligned there. Recently, regional internet registries with the revision of ICP2 has come to the front burner. I'm

delighted that the governments are taking an equal interest and engagement in it and we are quite focused on that. The next round, as you know, is barely six months away. And as I said earlier this morning, we are quite very engaged in ensuring that we extend a hand to applicants in areas that require more support and ensuring that this new program is available around the world to different regions. And review reviews, again, Manal being one of the coaches shows the GAC's engagement here. So we're delighted and it is part of our process to continue to evolve in our own effort at continuous improvement. So we are very much aligned here and I see that our priorities don't differ in this regard. So thank you very much for your input.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Tripti, Kurtis, is there anything you would like to say? Or Becky, rest assured I'll give you the floor with enough time to talk about anything. Next slide please, Gulten. So this is a quick overview of the GAC topics. The first one being the ICANN Code of Conduct, GAC strategic planning, registration data, request service, RDRS, urgent requests, and ICANN review of reviews, as I said before. Next slide please, Gulten. So on the ICANN Code of Conduct I'll very quickly read this and then I'll give you the floor to you, Becky, or to Tripti, or to Kurtis, or to whoever you tell me to give the floor to. The GAC shares its appreciation with the board for adopting last month the new ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest, or the code, the timely adoption of the new code prior to the end of 2025 strongly

signals ICANN's commitment to a culture of honesty, transparency, preparedness, and accountability. GAC members are interested to see how quickly the new code can be integrated into various community processes. And for that, I assume I'll give the floor to you, Tripti? Please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA

So again, thank you for the question. As you know, this is a very important topic to the board, and as we've witnessed, it's been an equally important topic for the GAC. So the recent approval of the Community Participation Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest was a critical and important milestone for us. It was developed in response to community requests and shaped through extensive consultation, and we'd like to thank the GAC for your support on this initiative throughout the community's discussions. We are firmly, we firmly believe in transparency and accountability of our community and ourselves. We think it was important to provide this clarity for participants and to demonstrate the integrity of ICANN.

So the new code strengthens the requirements that ICANN community members disclose, that they disclose their interests and affiliations when participating on committees and working groups and other ICANN-related activities as we craft policy together and to ensure that we know where the participants are coming from and what their backgrounds are, so we have a better understanding of their positions. It sets clearer, more consistent

guidelines for what participants should disclose, such as clients, employers, affiliations, and other relevant interests.

The code is now in effect, and an org is working with the community, particularly with the SOAC leaders, to see how we can properly support its implementation. The organization also put out a call to action to community members prior to this meeting to review the code and also to make any updates to your statements of interest that align with this new code. And the code is new, and as with all new things, we will work together as a community to apply it in practice. And over time, we hope that we will continue to develop additional tools and resources to support it and also include training for community leaders and other participants and have a unified statement of interest. And we're also committed to revisit this code on a periodic basis, so we will look at it in two years and see if we need to in any way true up the code. So with that, Nico, back to you. Do you have any questions?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Tripti. I was going to ask my distinguished colleagues, if there are questions, please bear in mind we don't have that much time, so I kindly ask you to be concise, precise, and straight to the point. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico, and thank you, Tripti, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So first of all, let me congratulate you for really a

swift progress on this question. It's a good example of how this community can move forward in a speedy way, and looking forward to seeing periodic reviews and data on how the code is applied, how effective it is, and to prepare also the review you just mentioned in two years' time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. I don't see any other hand. So next slide, please, Gulten. So as regarding the second topic, which is the GAC strategic planning I'll give you some background during ICANN 84. The GAC, we intend to confirm our 25-26 annual plan covering nine key topic areas of interest to governments, and I'll read this statement very quickly, and my apologies to the interpreters in this case. But so beginning last year, the GAC has devoted resources to developing, implementing, and updating strategic and annual plans to bolster the committee's proactive stance in ICANN deliberations, increase the committee's readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness Thank you very much for joining us today. I'm very pleased to be here to assist in communicating the GAC's priorities throughout the multistakeholder community. Among the GAC's expected outcomes for calendar year 26, the committee is looking to establish a periodic informal exchange format between the GAC leadership and the relevant board committee for a regular assessment of ICANN's performance in

terms of openness, inclusiveness, transparency, and accountability in the spirit of the multistakeholder approach. DNS abuse mitigation will be a committee priority for 2026, with GAC members devoting substantial time and attention to the GNSO PDP regarding that matter. It is also a high priority for the GAC to ensure the continued operation of the RDRS and make participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars. For the next year, among nearly 60 expected outcomes, believe it or not, but there are 60 expected outcomes, the GAC is also committed to readying its membership for the role in the next round of new gTLDs, devoting in turn substantial resources for capacity development of all committee participants with appreciation to ICANN staff for its support in this area, and toward implementing the new ICANN continuous improvements program framework. I'll stop here in order to see if we have reactions from the board, and for that, let me know if I should give the floor to Jim, Becky, Kurtis, or to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'll start and then turn it over to my colleagues. So first, we ourselves recently concluded our own strategic planning process, so we appreciate the significant time and effort that the GAC has spent in updating its strategies and its annual plan. So we look forward to engaging with the GAC as it assesses ICANN's commitment to its multi-stakeholder governance model, and of course the concomitant values of openness, inclusiveness, transparency, and accountability. So being clear with the board and the rest of the community about your key priorities and desired

outcomes is very helpful towards consensus building as we craft policy and do work together and move the work of ICANN forward. The priority topics mentioned with the GAC are, as I said earlier, very well aligned with our priority items for the board, and we welcome continued collaboration to ensure a common understanding. Becky, would you like to add?

BECKY BURR

The only thing I will add is that the reference in here to periodic informal exchanges between GAC leadership and the relevant board committees is extremely welcome. I think that we've demonstrated in our more informal, more engaged communications over time that talking, discussion, is the way to move the ball forward collectively and collegially. We are, as Tripti said earlier, very much aligned in terms of priorities, so I'm not speaking for myself as a committee chair, but I'm willing to bet that the ICANN board's committee chairs will welcome those discussions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. The floor is open. Comments or questions at this point before we move on? I don't see any hand online. one hand from Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Maybe as caretaker of the GAC strategic objective number one, where this

periodic exchange is placed, I'm looking forward to exchanging with you and looking into how we can implement this in the most informal and flexible fashion possible so that we have that dialogue on an ongoing basis. Thank you, and thanks also for welcoming this initiative and this idea. Thank you, Becky.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. The floor is still open. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, Gulten, next slide, please. Thank you. So, the third topic is registration data request service, and there's some background. I won't read the whole thing, but basically the GAC and the board have aligned on a number of objectives for the future of the RDRS, including continuing RDRS operation past its pilot period, making RDRS participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars. That's something to be discussed, of course. Better facilitating requests through RDRS for the data underlying registrations made with a privacy or proxy service, a very important detail, and creating APIs for both registrars and requesters, and also considering options to enable voluntary participation by ccTLD operators. So, I'll stop there in order to see if we have some feedback from the board at this point. Should I give the floor to Becky? Becky, all yours.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, and I'm going to apologize in advance. This is that we are in a very complex state of affairs here. We have policy related to the temporary specification, the SSAD that has not been adopted by

the board. That's in play. We have the RDRS Standing Committee's final report, and taking all of those things together and in recognition that we're at the end of the two-year pilot for RDRS, the board will, intends to adopt a resolution on Thursday asking ICANN to continue operating the RDRS for two years, for up to two years, until December 2027, while the community completes related policy work on the SSAD recommendations, and by the community, by the way, it's not just the community, it's the board as well.

Concurrent with the resolution, the board is going to publish an RDRS policy alignment analysis for public comment. We had been calling that a gap analysis, but we really thought a better way to think about it is because we are looking at policy recommendations to think about this as how we align the various policy elements that are in the water table, so to speak. That analysis, which is going to be published for public comment, is going to explore path forwards in a couple of areas. First of all, we have an existing policy recommendation as part of the EPDP policy recommendation that all registrars be required to participate in a registration data access request system, and so as we have discussed many times, the board supports that community recommendation and we know that we are aligned with the GAC in supporting that community recommendation, so part of the path is how we get from where we are with the SSAD recommendations to an RDRS policy that mandates the inclusion of registrars, that implements the previous community recommendation. Also, we want to understand the

path forward for a requirement for registrars with affiliated privacy and proxy services to also respond to RDRS requests for underlying data as part of the system. We are interested in understanding how we can get to better integration for registrar systems and requester systems at the request portal in order to cut down overhead and duplication of efforts, both for registrars and for requesters. Inclusion of some service level agreements, including service level agreements related to urgent requests, the accreditation system for law enforcement, and options, operational options for ccTLDs to participate on a voluntary basis.

It's important to know that the GNSO Standing Committee's findings, which are out there, make several recommendations that align with this path forward, so we think that there's a lot of overlap and we just have to identify the path that gets us from where we are today to where we want to be. Some of that may involve new policy, but others of it, and we hope, much of it will involve the process that we have worked through with the GNSO Council to modify policy recommendations related to the SSAD. The resolution that you're going to see outlines the expectations for the continuing operation, offers a possible roadmap, notes where the possible actions aligned with the Standing Committee's recommendations, and we are looking forward to getting the community's input on that because that input will help us understand how the board and the GNSO Council consult on the pending consensus policy recommendations that are still outstanding for the board's consideration.

Because we have those outstanding recommendations, the Standing Committee advised the Council to recommend that the board reject the 18 SSAD recommendations as they were adopted in a package, not to take those off the table, but in order to initiate the supplemental recommendation process that we used very effectively in connection with the next round recommendations. We really did learn how to get from a recommendation that came from the community that the board could not accept in the form that it appeared. The Council worked with us closely to provide supplemental recommendations without having to go back through an initiated policy development program. So the intention is to amend the recommendations while using available mechanisms and incorporating lessons learned from the RDRS pilot. Boiling it down to its essentials, we hope that you will take a look at the alignment analysis when it's published at the end of the week and I'm sure that we will continue to have the GAC support and input as we work through the process of aligning the policy recommendations that we have with the community's policy recommendations, the Standing Committee's report, and the alignment that the GAC and the board have stated numerous times with respect to RDRS.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. I'll open the floor now for questions or comments on this topic and I have a hand from India. Please go ahead.

INDIA

Thank you, Chair, and thank you. Thanks to the ICANN board for raising this important topic. So during our BCIG call also, India has emphasized that accurate, authenticated, and accessible registration data by authenticated users are vital for ensuring DNS security, trust, and accountability. We support the evolution of the RDRS into a mandatory, which is mentioned in the second bullet, centralized, interoperable, and a permanent mechanism, which we have been raising it from ICANN 82 with the board, which all registrars should utilize to avoid fragmentation emanating from indigenous systems developed by them. This will enable timely and lawful access for verified requesters, including law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, given the challenges faced in implementing the SSAD, which was mentioned by Becky, the RDRS was introduced as an interim solution for registration data access. However, considering its performance and the recent enhancement made, and the significant investment of time and effort of the community, it is timely to evaluate the RDRS as a potential permanent mechanism for legitimate and authorized data access.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, India. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. I would like to first offer as a consideration that we continue appreciating the fact that there is a strong alignment between the board and the GAC as regards as the final outcome to be achieved out of this process. The GAC has expressed these views in the recent public comment to the GNSO Standing Committee report. So this is something which is very positive. We see alignments of intent and we also look forward to see the resolution approved on Thursday. This has been very informative from your side, Becky, to provide all these new elements. There are two areas that I would like to touch upon. One concerns the extension of RDRS. We think it's very positive to further extend RDRS. We also would like to see this developing into a permanent tool. But in the meantime, we would really support the idea that technical improvements being made before we end up with the other second term of the RDRS, because we already had two years pilot, now we're going to have an extension. And improvements are needed for the user friendliness of the tool, but these are also needed as a way of supporting the community of registrars who are still sticking to that.

And we have spoken about it with the GNSO yesterday. We had feedback that some registrars believe they have better system than RDRS, that this would be lacking compatibility or interoperability with the RDRS, which is a type of argument which in 2025 we have a bit difficult to understand. We are pretty sure that the systems can be connected in a way that works well so that users have one

interface and on the other side it's managed the way which is the most appropriate for the registrar's community. So this is the second point. We believe the mandatory participation is key for the system to hold, because we have seen that with a voluntary system there has been a decrease of participation, both in terms of the registrars and the requesters consequently. So this is something which is important because the system needs to work and needs to be used for it to have a sense of being in place. The very last point concerns the voluntary participation of the ccTLD operators. This is an element that the GAC has supported for a long time. We understand this is the case also for the board and we have spoken about it with the ccTLD. So this is not the very first priority while we have a good system in place for ccTLDs, but we would like to recall that this is an important element to look at.

BECKY BURR

Thank you and indeed there is alignment between the GAC and the board on this issue, but there is also on the issue of mandatory participation of registrars in a data request system. We have an existing policy recommendation that registration by registrars be mandatory. So we don't view this as something new or extraordinary. We think that this comes out of the policy work that the community has already done and so I think we're all in harmony on that particular issue and I recognize the need to continue to make enhancements as we go along. I don't think anybody's contemplating leaving the system entirely as it is and not making tweaks that make sense. Obviously you're right. We have identified

APIs both for registrars and users to make access and use of the system easier as it is a critical piece of the work to be done. So I think on that and of course on voluntary participation by CCs, we're in alignment as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that. I'll give you the floor right away, Kurtis. Before that, I really think that a little detail to take into account is also accessing the source code and a good way forward was shown by Ireland by INEX, Eileen in terms of having the source code available for all interested participants. I understand it's GPL2. I'm not sure about the licensing system, but that's a good way for the same way Norway showed us the way back in June during the IGF and all the solutions they have in as FOSS free and open source software. I really think that's the way forward. But again, that's my opinion. I'm not speaking on behalf of the GAC, of course. It's just an idea. The floor is yours, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Thank you. Becky actually said what I was about to say that obviously the implementation or improvement will follow the policy, and as Becky said, we have identified, I think, several issues that we could work on to make this more usable, more manageable, but without knowing that this is the future and the future policy, then there's a little bit of a chicken leg, but we have that list identified, we have that work, but I think Becky covered it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Kurtis. I have the USA next.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you. Hello, I'm Owen Fletcher, United States alternate GAC representative. On the bullet point about better facilitating requests through RDRS related to privacy proxy registrations, can you, I think we will be interested to see the details of what that looks like, and wondering just the nature of whether it'll be a requirement or optional or just what it might be. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

So what happens on that is going to come out of the analysis, the alignment analysis. There is ongoing work on privacy and proxy, privacy and proxies, but the question is whether we need policy specific to, and how the policies that come out of the S, the group of SSAD policies, how those affect participation by privacy and proxy. So that is something that we will be very interested to hear from the community on, because there are, there's the privacy and policy, privacy and proxy policy that has some implementation issues. There are the, or that is in implementation, and the, and then the SSAD recommendations that do address some privacy and proxy related issues. Meanwhile, there are registrars who are participating in the, in RDRS, and who are making data available from affiliated privacy and proxy providers. So we have a source of experience and information that should be very helpful as we go

forward on that. Again, I think we've discussed numerous times that the value of RDRS, the value of having privacy and proxy data available through RDRS, and so I think we're in alignment on that. There's more to be determined based on public comments, and then an analysis when we hear back on the policy alignment analysis.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Becky, thank you USA for the question. The floor is still open. Any other comment or question before we move on? I don't see any hand. Next slide, please, Gulten. So this is topic four, urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. I'm not going to read the background, because as you can see, there's, and next slide, and thank you, and we'll get straight to the question on slide number 10. I'll just read the question. The GAC would like, sorry, the GAC would welcome the board's views on how to meet the terms of the prior trilateral agreement between the board, the GAC, and the GNSO, which included two parallel tracks as part of the implementation of consensus policy, so that this work could be concluded expeditiously, and that urgent requests, when their circumstances occur, can be submitted, authenticated, and responded to in a timely manner, consistent with the vital public safety interests involved, and I'll stop there in order to see some reaction. Becky, back to you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you. And again, this is another place where there are a lot of moving parts, so I will try to be clear. The requirements for handling urgent requests for non-public data, there was a recommendation as part of the SSAD recommendation, but it was not adopted, it was not included in the registration data policy due to an agreement among all of us that there was further discussion needed, and we've all had the calls to discuss a path forward, and the work, as agreed, is proceeding on two tracks with members of the GAC's public safety work, working group, discussing options for authentication, and exploring with ICANN how to implement RDRS, how to implement that in RDRS, the authentication piece, and ICANN Org is holding a series of meetings with the IRT for the registration data policy to discuss urgent request response timelines, assuming, as you have, that an authentication mechanism is in place, because we've all agreed that is a necessary precondition.

We've opened a public comment period on the proposed language regarding the timeline, and we're very much looking forward to those. The language that is open for public comment now defines an urgent request is a disc, as a disclosure request that's submitted by an authenticated requester and meets the circumstances of imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or of child exploitation, and that proposed language does, that provide the timeline associated with this limited categories of requests, and I know you all know about the timeline, because the

GAC's been participating very actively in that process, so we're making good progress along those lines.

We need, so there are a couple of things. I think we have a policy recommendation. We don't need new policy with respect to urgent requests, because we have a policy recommendation, and now we have the language that's out there for comment. The authentication mechanism wasn't part of the policy, but we think that there's a path forward to revise the recommendations related to disclosure requests in the EPDP Phase 2 regarding the temporary specification, and that could provide a clear enforcement path that the GAC is seeking, rather than initiating a new PDP process. We think that we can use this path to effectively address concerns by providing the enforcement of the timeline on authentication mechanisms through adjustments to EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. Now, there's a tweak, just to be clear. The RDRS right now is voluntary. We're talking about a mandatory policy with respect to urgent timelines, so those things need to be decoupled a little bit, but as I said, we don't think that, we think that we can get to an enforceable provision of responding to the urgent request timeline in response to an authenticated request without new policy. I know that you would like me to tell you exactly what the timeline would be. I can't tell you that, but I think we are agreed that we want to move as quickly as possible on this, but I hope that it helps to understand that we don't think that we have to have new policy again with respect to the urgent request enforcement.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. I'll open the floor for comments or questions. Please bear in mind, please try to, please bear in mind that we only have ten more minutes, so be precise, concise, and straight to the point. European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Becky, for this presentation. As you from the board know and, of course, the GAC knows, being very engaged on this issue, we have, indeed, urgent requests on issues of importance and advice on multiple occasions, stressing how critical it was for the GAC to have this piece of policy out. We have actively engaged in the implementation review team. The PSWG has committed a lot of resources to ensure that we would work on the authentication system, which was a requirement raised by the board and the GNSO, which the GAC agreed to, so there was consensus on this. What the concerns we have raised and we have raised with the GNSO already, we are happy now to hear your reply now, was that the language that is being put forward for public comment would imply that new policy development would be needed for the authentication system to be enforced. We fully share the objective that any part of the policy needs to be fully enforced, but what we cannot see is that while we are going into the verifying details of the implementation, we need to have new policy on how we implement, because this risks to become not only an endless process, but also a precedent for the future. Because the

issue of authentication is not part of the policy recommendations, but has been considered as a critical element in order for the policy to be implementable in a way, in the correct way. So for what concerns, my understanding is that you are going to propose a review of the EPDP phase one recommendation number 18. I have no idea what this implies in terms of reopening of the discussion, but just at this point, a word of caution that we wouldn't want to reopen the whole policy. This is an outcome agreed by the community, so of course any modification should be surgical and compatible with what the community wishes. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

And let me just say absolutely. The modification process is a process that we did work through several times with the GNSO Council in the context of the next round, and we think we know how to do that both surgically and efficiently from a time perspective.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. I have India next.

INDIA

Thank you, Chair. Now we have the view that against further delays, which is caused by treating LEA authentication mechanism, which was also mentioned by the European Commission, should not be a separate policy process. As a GAC representative in the registration data policy implementation review team have already emphasized the authentication mechanism and was always intended to form

part of the implementation, but not as a consensus policy track. We also recommend that ICANN organization should act expeditiously to design and deploy an authentication tool for verified LEAs. Governments and GAC representative shall be consulted to provide validated list of authorized LEAs within their jurisdiction to ensure that only legitimate requesters seek information. Further, as mentioned, that the tool for urgent request should also be embedded within the RDRS tool itself. Otherwise, the concerned countries will be requesting 1,000 odd registrars for any misuse happening.

BECKY BURR

Thank you. And we agree that ultimately the urgent request should be embedded in a permanent this depends on all of the alignment, policy alignment work that comes out—A replacement for SSAD, however that comes out. It's just that the policy on urgent requests is in some ways distinct from RDRS. So we should be thinking of those as separate things.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Becky. And I see nodding in the room. Seeing no other hands online or in the room. Let's move on for the sake of time to the next topic, please, Gulten. Next slide. Which is I can review of reviews. This is very quick. How will the board participate in and monitor the recently started review of reviews to ensure that the effort is staying on track? Jim, go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, Chair. And lucky me, I get the easy question. I do think that first I should acknowledge that the board shares the GAC's interest in the priority success of the review of reviews. And toward that end, with my partner from the board, León Sánchez, we serve a unique role with Manal and Osvaldo Novoa from the GAC in being actual members of the review of reviews. This is unique because normally we would all only have observer roles in general. But we participate directly. So we all have that direct engagement and direct opportunity to obtain what we need to in order to maintain a status. And, of course, a thank you to Manal as serving as co-chair of the group, as she indicated earlier. In terms of our own internal logistics, you should just know that the board, we get updates every week from the CCG. Actually, since the group has started, we get updates on the reviews topic. We maintain it as an agenda item at our regular workshops, and we will for the coming year in order to watch all of this. And, of course, Leon and I have the opportunity to keep the board apprised of any issues as they may or may not arise as the path goes on. And obtain our own inputs and perspectives as needed from the rest of the board. And the board is engaged. We certainly, it was a topic at our agenda that we just had at this workshop this past weekend. And we had a relatively fulsome discussion about that, and we'll continue to do so.

meeting in ITU, and perhaps it will be better to achieve better cybersecurity. I met with the UNITU representative this morning, and perhaps I will talk with her also how to together, we all work together to have better activities against DNS abuse. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

So on the capacity building, as ICANN Org, we do actually engage in quite a lot of, Capacity Building for various ccTLDs, registry registrars, DNS operators, and we run several programs and best practices like kindness, and we provide data tools for the community like domain metrika, and these are all helped as part of this capacity building and the trainings we do around the world. We will happily partner with other groups or countries to provide this further in their country for DNS operators, we have done this in many places, we will happily work with each of the regional offices ICANN has to further do this capacity development, and I think you're right that the more capacity building we do will help fight DNS abuse, I don't necessarily know that itself, DNS abuse is driven by a lot of other factors, but the more capacity building we can do, the harder it will come and the stronger the fight against it will be, and that's something we're very committed to and we already run several programs, I'm happy to continue working on this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, next slide please, Gulten. Let me go over time, two or three minutes, in order to see if we have any A or B at this point, and a hand from, please introduce yourself.

VINCENT ROBERTS

Thank you very much, Vincent Roberts from Grenada. Mr. Chair, the GAC underserved regions working group expresses deep concern regarding the persistent and systematic visa challenges that continue to impede the participation of GAC members and community representatives from underserved and global majority regions. Complex and opaque visa processes, limited counselor access, and high rejection rates have repeatedly excluded qualified delegates from ICANN meetings, thereby undermining inclusivity and weakening confidence in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model.

Recalling the recommendations of the ICANN meeting strategy working group, which identify ease of visa access and entry as key criteria for meeting venue selection, the underserved working group observes that this principle has not been consistently applied. The resulting and recurring exclusion of participants from the very regions ICANN seeks to empower remains both predictable and preventable.

Moreover, the GAC underserved region working group notes that the Sao Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines explicitly call on processes to be, and I quote, mindful of power asymmetries between diverse stakeholders and empower stakeholders by providing them with the necessary information, resources, and

skills to participate effectively, meaningfully, and sustainably. Transparency measures should aim for making policy processes known, accessible, comprehensible, and actionable, unquote. The systemic visa barriers we identify represent a clear breach of this guideline.

In this regard, the underserved region working group urges ICANN and the ICANN board to adopt concrete measures to ensure equitable participation, including embedding visa accessibility assessments into venue selection processes, establishing a dedicated visa facilitation mechanism, engaging host governments to provide simplified or expedited entry procedures, and publishing transparent data on visa-related participation challenges. Ensuring fair and inclusive access to ICANN meetings is essential to safeguarding ICANN's legitimacy as a true global and representative multi-stakeholder institution. Thank you very much.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Thank you. We obviously share the desire that as many community members as possible should be able to attend in person in ICANN meetings, and this is something we work with. The visa evaluation is part of our site selection, and ultimately, visa granting is, of course, a national sovereign issue. We have no influence. We do work with host countries. We have worked with the Irish foreign minister here for a meeting in Ireland. As you know, we had to relocate with quite short notice here, which also impacted the

timeline to generate some of the invitation letters. What we have done for this meeting is we have actually generated the visa statistics. We have shared that with SOAC leaders. I believe Nico got it as well, the GAC leadership. That's something we can continue to do. We have analyzed this, and we're happy to continue to do that analysis to see what we can do. We have provided a lot more support this time. We continue to evaluate how we can do more to support visa applicants, both from the funded travelers and also the general participation where possible. But as I said, ultimately, this, of course, resides with the host country. But the visa evaluation is part of the site selection. We do look at visa issues as part of many other facets of the venue selection.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Kurtis. Thank you, Granada. That's all we have time for. But let me just say that today is a bittersweet moment because as we joined Becky Burr for her last official meeting with us, not only Becky, but also my good friend, Chris Chapman, and my also good friend, Maarten Botterman. But let me refer to Becky because some other vice chairs are going to be referring to Chris and to Martin. Becky, you have been a phenomenal force shaping policies and building bridges with your sharp mind tireless work and incredible grace. I also mentioned something along these lines during our last BGIG call, if you recall. So we will miss you, we will miss your laser-like clarity, warmth, and guidance more than we can say, while we wish you the very best in your new adventures, hopefully not that far away from the ICANN

environment. We're holding you, to your promise to stick around, informally at least. So you take with you our deepest gratitude and a standing invitation to always pop in as you will always have a home here. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

And thank you, Nico, and I've been informed that Maarten Botterman unfortunately isn't here. He's dedicated, as always, somewhere in this building discussing universal acceptance. I'm sure somebody can pass it on, but I think we should recognize his very constructive, his very open and soft approach throughout the nine years, but also especially the three years from 2019, 2022, where we served as the board's chair and took us ICANN community through the rough pandemic and the fact that we have to switch to fully virtually coming together, and as we just heard, getting together is really important for ICANN, so we should recognize his nine years on the board and, of course, thank him for that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Chris, the GAC thanks you for your service as vice chair and for your broader leadership across the ICANN community. You've consistently brought classic Australian eloquence, simplicity and clarity to the work, helping to lead many work efforts as well as champion broader APAC views. Looking forward to seeing you back in country.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]