

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.

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:

- 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,

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)

the GAC urges swift action to finalize the timeline. The timeline must be uniformly followed by the 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.