GAC ICANN81 Istanbul Communiqué: Issues of Importance (18 November 2024) - ICANN Board Comments for Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) Call
DRAFT Version 1.3
Updated **(29 January 2025)**

Issues of Importance
The section below contains comments related to the ICANN81 Istanbul Communiqué, in support of the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) Meeting @ 10 February 2025. **This scorecard will not be presented to the Board for resolution.**

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
1. **Next Round of New gTLDs: Applicant Support Program: Outreach, Engagement and Communications**	The GAC welcomes ICANN org's outreach, engagement and communications in under-represented and underserved regions relating to the Applicant Support Program (ASP) with activities undertaken in "target countries". With a view to having effective targeting and ensuring that the ASP achieves the key objective of facilitating global diversification of the new gTLD application program, the GAC recommends that ICANN org consults and engages fully with GAC members to: 1. Identify target countries, in keeping with the regional approach for selection in the next phase of the outreach, engagement and communications activities, which are expected to commence in January 2025; 2. Obtain support and guidance on how best to navigate and engage within the selected countries including the public sector. Additionally, the GAC welcomes the recent announcement that the ASP applicant readiness materials will be published in the six UN languages, and strongly recommends that all materials developed for the ASP be translated and published into the working languages of the GAC (six UN languages plus Portuguese). The GAC welcomes the invitation extended by ICANN org to interested GAC Members to provide additional assistance on the awareness and promotion of the ASP in the relevant regions or jurisdictions.	1.ICANN org looks forward to continued collaboration with GAC members on country and regional level targeting for the duration of the outreach, communication, and engagement efforts currently underway. This will include continued direct communication between ICANN org - primarily the Regional VPs - and GAC members, in both formally structured settings, such as regional webinars and ICANN public meetings, as well as in less formal conversations. Given the workload and turnover that GAC members experience, ICANN org will maintain its monthly IRT Outreach updates and briefings at ICANN meetings - open to all community members. This will enable the GAC to collectively, and as individual members, suggest target organizations, methods of approach, and direct introductions to public sector and country-based organizations where they are able to do so. ICANN org will continue to update the body of outreach materials available on the Next Round website, including the Champions Toolkit, which is available in the ICANN languages. ICANN org will also continue offering training and demonstration sessions of the toolkit, and remind GAC members of the offer of remote ICANN org speakers or assistance from ICANN Engagement team members in producing and delivering local events or webinars. With regard to translations, ICANN org is aware of the GAC's and broader ICANN community's desire to have Next Round outreach materials available in languages beyond the ICANN languages. To be responsive to this request, and while taking into account resource availability, ICANN org will be launching a program that will make use of new and available technologies that will allow the development of translations of existing materials in additional languages beyond the ICANN languages, based on demand. More information about this program will be provided during ICANN82.
2. **Next Round of New gTLDs: Applicant Support Program: Application and Evaluation Fees**	The GAC takes note of the announcement of the application and evaluation fee for the next round of new gTLD applications expected to be USD $227,000 subject to formal approval by the ICANN Board upon the adoption of the Applicant Guidebook. The GAC further notes that the maximum fee waiver percentage (85%) will result in an approximate application fee of USD $34,050 for ASP supported applicants. Consistent with previous GAC Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and the ICANN77 Washington D.C. Communiqué urging the reduction or waiving of fees to the maximum	2. ICANN org understands and acknowledges the financial challenges that potential ASP applicants may face, even allowing for the maximum evaluation fee waiver and the provision of pro bono assistance. This is feedback we have heard from the GAC and from audiences in a number of countries around the world, since outreach, engagement, and communications activities have focused almost exclusively in developing regions, including small island developing states. The 75-85% discount for applicable gTLD evaluation fees for supported gTLD applicants is a percentage-based discount that reflects the same level of discount provided to supported applicants in the 2012 round. The SubPro Final Report did not indicate changes to the level of fee reduction provided. In the ASP Funding Plan that was reviewed with the IRT and updated following the public comment on the ASP Handbook, the ASP-IRT Sub-track advised that the minimum should be 75%. The ASP-IRT Sub-track did not advise changing the 85% maximum amount of fee reduction. Based upon ASP-IRT and public comment input, the ASP Handbook indicates a 75-85% fee reduction, depending on the number of applicants that qualify for support.

Issue	Issue Text (from the Communique)	ICANN Board Comments
	extent possible, this figure may still be too prohibitive for many prospective applicants from underserved regions, particularly when combined with additional costs and fees. Accordingly, this may constitute a major challenge for applicants from these regions, thereby threatening the ASP's objective of facilitating global diversification and inclusion within the new gTLD Program. To mitigate this, the GAC urges ICANN org to: 1. Build awareness of the new gTLD Program and the ASP among traditional financial institutions and the investment community in all targeted countries. 2. Engage with development financing agencies (e.g. the World Bank and Regional Development Banks), donor/grant funding organizations, and similar entities, to promote awareness of the benefits of the New gTLD Program. 3. Facilitate "matchmaking" between financing or funding entities and potential applicants with a view to providing financial assistance for ASP supported applicants.	ICANN org efforts to broaden the scope of outreach activities commencing in 2025 will include efforts in Europe and North America that focus on targeting organizations the GAC has mentioned, including: development banks, financial and grant-making institutions, the investor community, sovereign funds, as well as economic development agencies of both national governments and IGOs. Indeed, such organizations as well as regional development banks are in scope for all ICANN regions. While ICANN org is known by, and has contacts in, many of these entities, GAC suggestions, advice and offers of introductions to these institutions are welcome. Noting that ICANN org is not in a position to broker direct links between funders and applicants, ICANN org will encourage funding organizations to make themselves known to, and interact with, potential applicants while identifying venues and platforms that facilitate such connections. We invite GAC members to be in contact with their regional ICANN Engagement team members, to attend the monthly IRT Outreach updates, or to send suggestions to engagement.newgTLDprogram@icann.org.
3. **Next Round of New gTLDs: Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort/Private Resolution of Contention Sets**	The GAC greatly appreciates the constructive dialogue with the Board following the Advice issued on this topic in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué and ICANN77 Washington D.C.Communiqué, and especially the community dialogue held by the Board at the request of the GAC since the Kigali Meeting. The GAC further appreciates the decision to prohibit the private resolution of contention sets, including private auctions. As envisioned in the GAC Chair letter to the ICANN Board, the GAC has held discussions at ICANN81 on the proposed path forward set forth by the ICANN Board. The GAC generally welcomes the Board's proposal including to provide applicants with an opportunity to apply for an alternative string in case of string contention, and intends to submit a formal communication to the Board to this effect. The GAC will seek further dialogue with and guidance from ICANN org as it relates to implementation details of this proposal.	ICANN org's next round team will gladly provide further details and clarifications around the replacement string's implementation details. To summarize, to potentially reduce the instances of string contention, applicants will be encouraged to designate a Replacement String alongside their original choice of string. Designating a Replacement String may provide applicants with the option to avoid contention before the list of applied-for strings is finalized. Applicants can avoid contention in such cases by replacing their original applied-for string with their designated Replacement String, subject to the conditions and criteria detailed in this section. Applicants should note that choosing to replace their applied-for string does not preclude their Replacement String from being placed in contention at a later stage of the application process as a result of singular/plural notification, String Similarity Review, or String Confusion Objection. Following the publication of the list of new gTLD applications on Reveal Day, there will be a period of time to change their original string with their Replacement String via the application system. Applications in which the original string is replaced will then proceed through the remaining stages of the gTLD application process on the basis of the Replacement String, which will from that point on be treated as the applicant's applied-for string. Applicants who opt for their Replacement String will be unable to revert to their original string at any stage during the program. Applicants who do not indicate their intention to use their Replacement String during the designated period will be unable to do so later in the application process and will proceed on the basis of their original applied-for string. The current draft of the language related to contention procedures, including the procedures for the replacement string option can be found here: https://community.icann.org/display/SPIR/1.+Working+Documents?preview=/315490346/493486088/EXT_String%20Contention%20Procedures_V02.docx.

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
4. **Next Round of New gTLDs: Latin Script Diacritics**	The GAC engaged in discussions regarding the Policy Development Process (PDP) on Latin Diacritics during the GAC/GNSO bilateral meeting. The GAC notes the recent GNSO decision to initiate the Latin Diacritics PDP. The GAC expresses its support for this initiative, particularly in light of the strong community response during the public comment period, which garnered wide support favoring the initiation of this PDP. The GAC looks forward to the progress of this significant initiative as it seeks to foster a more inclusive and multilingual Internet.	The ICANN Board and ICANN org are prepared to support the community when the Latin Script Diacritics PDP has an adopted charter and begins its work. The Board encourages the GAC to engage with the PDP, either via GAC member participation in the PDP or more indirect methods, like discussing the topic during bilateral meetings with the GNSO Council.
5. **General Ethics Policy and Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest**	The GAC has addressed the matter of transparency and Statements of Interest (SOI) in prior Communiqués and correspondence, notably in its ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué, and recalls that ICANN Bylaws require ICANN and its constituent bodies to "operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness." The GAC firmly supports transparency within ICANN, and considers it inconsistent with the Bylaws if ICANN participants are permitted to decline disclosing who they represent. Therefore, the GAC welcomes the publication of the proposed draft ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest, and the approach to a General Ethics Policy that includes this Code. The GAC intends to continue reviewing the proposal, and engaging with the community on the matter, and looks forward to making a submission under the public comment process.	The Board thanks the GAC for its contribution to the public comment forum on the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on Statements of Interest and General Ethics Policy. The GAC and many other commenters were supportive of the proposal, while other commenters raised concerns regarding the scope of disclosures required. Many commenters are also interested in seeing more about how enforcement of the Code of Conduct will be achieved. ICANN is in the process of organizing further dialogue among the community to better explore paths for enforcement, and to continue refining workable rules for disclosure. The Board looks forward to the GAC's continued participation in this important dialogue.
6. **DNS Abuse**	The GAC welcomes the constructive discussions on the topic of DNS Abuse with different ICANN communities at ICANN81. In particular, the GAC appreciates: a) the updates regarding the work carried out by SSAC on the impact of Artificial Intelligence on DNS Abuse, b) the invitation from ALAC for discussions on possible further policy work regarding DNS Abuse, including based on the conclusions of the recently released INFERMAL report, and c) the information on the work carried out by the ccNSO through their DNS Abuse Standing Committee survey. The GAC is interested in pursuing these conversations further. The GAC values the preliminary feedback received from ICANN Compliance and various parts of the ICANN community (Registries, Registrars and SSAC) on the impact of the DNS Abuse contract amendments in their first six months of implementation (April-October 2024). In particular, the GAC notes that the volume of abuse reports has increased in this period compared to the same period before the amendments entered into force, possibly due to increased filing by those	1. The Board appreciates GAC members' interest and involvement in ongoing community discussions on the topic of DNS Abuse. The Board shares the GAC's perspective on the importance of regular outreach and reporting on measurements and analysis of the effectiveness of the DNS Abuse amendments. To date, ICANN org has provided regular updates on the enforcement of the DNS Abuse mitigation requirements since they became effective on 5 April 2024, through multiple presentations and publications, including: ● On 28 June 2024, ICANN Compliance began publishing monthly reports detailing the number of reported instances of phishing, malware, botnets, pharming, and spam used to deliver DNS Abuse as well as how these were addressed, the related enforcement actions and outcomes. The reports start with April 2024 data and are updated every month. ● Before launching the new reports, ICANN Compliance provided an update on the enforcement of the DNS Abuse mitigation requirements during the Contracted Parties Summit in May 2024; and published a blog with a summary of enforcement actions and outcomes on 7 June 2024. ● On 8 November 2024, ICANN Compliance published a detailed report on the enforcement of the DNS Abuse mitigation requirements, complaints received, and cases processed during the first six months of enforcement.

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
	who submit abuse reports. The GAC also notes ICANN Compliance is keeping track of data regarding mitigation and disruption actions taken as results of DNS Abuse reports and welcomes ICANN Compliance's actions to enforce the contractual amendments. The GAC highlights the importance of regular reporting from ICANN Compliance, including on statistics about the ratio between the number of reports and actions undertaken, and more specific information about the types of disruption or mitigation actions taken. The GAC would also welcome information about practices stemming from the interpretation of the Advisory guidance, for example in relation to "actionable evidence." The GAC intends to continue reviewing measurements and analysis of the effectiveness of the DNS Abuse amendments. The GAC welcomes the shared understanding, as expressed by ICANN org and other parts of the ICANN community, that the contract amendments are a significant first step when it comes to initiatives aimed at addressing DNS Abuse. The GAC looks forward to further engaging with the community to identify priorities which could be considered for further policy and other types of work to address DNS Abuse. The GAC recalls some topics previously identified (such as guidance on key terms or capacity building to disseminate best practices), as well as discussions on possible targeted, narrowly scoped PDPs to further address DNS Abuse. The GAC also looks forward to reviewing and analysing further evidence and data on DNS Abuse provided by ICANN org, particularly through the INFERMAL report and the Domain Metrica project from the ICANN Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), and data and analysis from appropriate third parties. Finally, the GAC notes its interest in maintaining awareness not only of the efforts within the ICANN community related to addressing DNS Abuse, but also of the efforts within the broader ecosystem to address abusive activities.	• A report summarizing the key findings from the Registry Operators audit that was launched in October 2024 and included DNS Abuse mitigation requirements, will be published by ICANN Compliance upon the audit's completion. It is also worth noting that the Contracted Parties House (CPH) DNS Abuse working group holds periodic outreach meetings to discuss how the community measures the success of contractual amendments. 2. The Board notes ICANN org's commitment to building upon its DNS Abuse metrics, regularly scheduled and ad-hoc reports, and improving them over time. The Board looks forward to the community discussions that can be generated by the release of these various outputs. • In terms of enforcement metrics produced by ICANN Contractual Compliance (which are summarized under heading #1 above), ICANN org welcomes further input from the community. ICANN Compliance would like to know more about the specific information the GAC would like to see included regarding the "practices stemming from the interpretation of the Advisory." Specifically, whether the GAC is referring to additional context, such as examples of scenarios where the contracted party determined the evidence was not actionable (such as those on page 7 of ICANN Contractual Compliance's six-month enforcement summary report), or something else. • In terms of data and analysis produced by ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) on the topic of DNS Abuse, the Board welcomes the planned general availability release of ICANN Domain Metrica which is expected in January 2025, as well as the recent publication of the final report of the ICANN-funded project, Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL). Further work is already being planned based on the feedback gained to date on both initiatives, which are summarized in this blog. 3. The Board acknowledges the GAC's interest in evaluating priorities which could be considered for further policy and other types of work to address DNS Abuse. The GNSO Council has committed to consider data collected regarding the new contractual elements, to help determine whether there are additional measures needed to mitigate or disrupt DNS abuse. The Council is anticipated to shortly begin receiving briefings and reviewing available data in order to determine the appropriate next steps. The Board looks forward to following the progress of that discussion. It is important to recognize that policy development might not necessarily be the appropriate or only tool to help mitigate certain elements of DNS abuse.
7. Domain Name Registration Data: Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)	The GAC notes with interest the completion of the first year of the two-year RDRS pilot period and looks forward to the second year of the pilot. The GAC has observed the value of the RDRS and believes it should continue. The GAC remains supportive of efforts by ICANN and the RDRS Standing Committee to promote awareness and usage of the RDRS. In particular, the GAC supports efforts to identify and implement improvements to the RDRS interface to boost users' ability to navigate and submit requests via the RDRS, and regularly provide usage metrics that will help inform work toward an eventual Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD). The GAC reiterates its encouragement to include information about the RDRS and a link to it within the WHOIS	1. The Board is grateful to the GAC for supporting usage of the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) during the first year of the pilot and appreciates that the GAC sees value in continuing RDRS. The more users we have and the more feedback we receive, the better ICANN can make the system. ICANN org continues to implement system improvements based on community feedback and discussions with the GNSO's RDRS Standing Committee, as the committee begins to discuss recommendations for the final report to the GNSO Council in the second year of the pilot. 2. At the request of the RDRS Standing Committee, ICANN org has recently published two new metrics in the monthly RDRS Metrics Usage Report that provide data on the requestor's country and jurisdictional information on data processing. Recent enhancements to the user interfaces for both requestors and registrars have also been released and include: required address and phone fields for requestor, with an optional organization/affiliation field; increased open text field character limits (1000 to 2000); a link for scheduling RDRS user experience interviews with ICANN; updated "help" function and improved error messaging for unsupported top level domains (TLDs); and a streamlined process for registrars to reduce the number of click steps in request processing.

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
	lookup/Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) with a view to provide timely and relevant information to increase its visibility. The GAC will continue its engagement with the RDRS Standing Committee to support the Standing Committee's work toward constructive outcomes. In its bilateral meeting with the ccNSO at ICANN81, the GAC asked if any ccTLD managers might be interested in exploring potential voluntary participation in the RDRS. The ccNSO expressed certain concerns regarding the technical feasibility of such participation and the challenges posed by diverse national policies and regulations that may affect ccTLD operators. The GAC takes note of these concerns. However, given significant interest from requestors in having an ability to submit requests to ccTLDs, the GAC would welcome further discussion and input, on possible interest from ccTLD managers in RDRS participation on a voluntary basis, and how any related challenges might be overcome.	3. The Board encourages the GAC's continued participation in the RDRS Standing Committee to raise new ideas for system enhancements and encourages that GAC to help promote awareness and usage of RDRS. 4. The Board notes that information and links to the RDRS can be added in the RDAP output of registries and registrars via the GNSO policy development process and encourages the GAC to discuss this option with the GNSO Council. 5. The Board acknowledges both requestor interest in having ccTLDs participate in the RDRS pilot and the ccNSOs' concerns regarding the technical feasibility and challenge posed by the diverse national policies that may make ccTLD inclusion difficult. ICANN org is currently discussing logistical and operational options, including the requirement that only those ccTLDs using RDAP would be candidates for participation in the RDRS pilot.
8. **Domain Name Registration Data: Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation**	The GAC appreciates the efforts of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT) to explore whether and if so how the original PPSAI recommendations may still be implemented, in whole or in part. The GAC continues to encourage registrars and requesters to participate in the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and reiterates its encouragement for registrars using an affiliated proxy service provider to consider making disclosure decisions in response to RDRS requests for domain name registration data on behalf of their affiliated proxy service provider, where applicable. These steps will enhance the ability of the RDRS to generate useful data to inform next steps, including regarding Privacy and Proxy services.	The Board appreciates the continued support and involvement of GAC members in the current work of the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT). The Board welcomes the GAC's encouragement for registrars and requestors to continue participation in the RDRS, including for registrars to consider disclosure decisions in response to RDRS requests for domain name registration data on behalf of their affiliated proxy service providers.
9. **Domain Name Registration Data: Accuracy of Domain Name Registration Data**	The GAC remains interested in providing input on work at ICANN related to the accuracy of domain name registration data. The GAC welcomes the shared acknowledgment of the importance of accuracy as expressed during its bilateral meetings with the GNSO Council and the Contracted Parties House during ICANN81. Especially, the GAC appreciates efforts from the Contracted Parties to keep the registration data of their domain names under management accurate, including by accepting reports on inaccuracy and suspending domains with inaccurate registration data or taking other appropriate actions, and further encourages Contracted Parties to increase these efforts. In this light, the GAC appreciates continued engagement with relevant stakeholders on this topic, including to inform GAC discussions on this issue and possible paths forward. The GAC stresses the importance of resuming work on accuracy as soon as possible, particularly in light of the GNSO's recent decision to further	The Board appreciates the GAC's concerns regarding the accuracy of domain name registration data. The Board notes that the GNSO Council is currently considering its next steps regarding possible policy work on registration data accuracy by asking for the community's input on a series of questions. The Board looks forward to following the progress of that discussion. In December, ICANN alerted the Registration Data Policy IRT (https://lists.icann.org/hyperkitty/list/irt.regdatapolicy@icann.org/thread/NWYSSJGMIAQYJZJ57PUB7WAKS6S4ADDY/) that ICANN was preparing to finalize the implementation of the DPS. On 22 January 2025, ICANN launched the DPS add service, which enables the contracted parties to request to sign the DPS with ICANN (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/data-processing-specification-requests-en)

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
	extend a pause on the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team. The GAC also notes that during its bilateral meeting with the GNSO Council, the Council stated it will request input from community members, including the GAC, on questions related to domain name registration data accuracy, to inform possible ways forward. The GAC looks forward to considering these questions and to potentially providing a response. The GAC expects that, as soon as feedback is collected on the GNSO's questions, the community will resume efforts towards scoping policy work on accuracy of domain name registration data. In addition, the GAC welcomes ICANN's proposed Data Processing Specification (DPS) for gTLD Registries and Accredited Registrars and looks forward to receiving the final text once the feedback from the public consultation period is processed. The GAC also takes note of ICANN's remark that the DPS does not require Contracted Parties to provide ICANN with access to domain name registration data beyond the terms of the Registry Agreement (RA) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) and, hence, different alternatives need to be explored.	
10. Domain Name Registration Data: Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data	The GAC reiterates that the issue of Urgent Requests for domain name registration data remains a high priority. The GAC expects that the process to address this issue will be prompt and effective. The GAC appreciates the constructive discussion with the ICANN Board at ICANN81 and that while action is still pending on the GAC's Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué and the Follow-Up on Previous Advice in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué, the Board has provided preliminary feedback on certain outstanding issues. In particular, the GAC would welcome further confirmation on the Board's tentative support for the GAC proposal to pursue two tracks of work in parallel: one on determining the appropriate response time to authenticated Urgent Requests, and another in which community members work together with the GAC and the Public Safety Working Group to develop a scalable authentication process for Urgent Requests. The GAC also expresses satisfaction with the Board's tentative feedback that a Policy Development Process (PDP) will not be needed and that the Board will explore efficient ways to move forward together with the GNSO Council. The GAC looks forward to having further trilateral discussions soon after ICANN81 to work out the details. The GAC appreciates the support expressed at ICANN81 by the ICANN Board and ICANN org technical staff for collaboration with the PSWG to discuss means of law enforcement identity authentication, which could pave the way to address broader challenges with authenticating	The Board appreciates the GAC's participation in the November trilateral discussion among the Board, GAC, and GNSO Council regarding the GAC's proposal for parallel work on authentication and policy development in relation to Urgent Requests for Registration Data. Since that meeting, the Board understands that the GNSO Council, in its role as manager of the GNSO policy development process, has discussed a way forward on the issue, and has communicated its thinking to the GAC in a letter of 15 January 2025, to prepare for an additional trilateral discussion. As noted in our ICANN81 session, the Board expects that follow-up discussions with the same group will be particularly helpful to align on the path forward. The Board welcomes the GAC's proactive approach to exploring solutions for authentication that could be useful in this context, and welcomes suggestions on how the Board can support progress in this effort. As noted during our ICANN81 discussion, the Board has begun to look at possible next steps to making the Registration Data Request System (RDRS) a permanent solution. We understand that the GNSO Standing Committee on RDRS, in which the GAC is represented, is preparing a report and that the GNSO Council is anticipating revisiting the SSAD recommendations. The Board believes it will be important to have coordination and alignment with work that the GAC may be undertaking on requestor authentication. Accordingly, the Board would be interested in the GAC's vision for possible paths forward. As the GAC mentioned a potential study group, the Board would be interested in how such effort could be scoped and supported, or alternatively, how the PSWG might continue to work with contracted parties and other stakeholders to bring a report to a future trilateral discussion. The Board also welcomes input on other suggested options that the GAC would propose. The Board reaffirms the importance of active GAC engagement to create workable solutions.

Issue	Issue Text *(from the Communique)*	ICANN Board Comments
	requestors seeking access to non public domain name registration data. The work within the PSWG on authentication solutions is off to a good start and the GAC would greatly appreciate the continued support and collaboration of ICANN technical staff, and input from other appropriate stakeholders, possibly via creation of a study group or a similar expert group dedicated to the issue.	
11. Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2)	The GAC was updated on the Number Resource Organization (NRO) and Address Supporting Organization (ASO) process to update the Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2) and the publication of a set of proposed principles that should inform the drafting of this update. GAC members are encouraged to review the proposed principles and develop any possible feedback, which may be submitted either through ICANN's Public Comment process or through the NRO website, where the same questionnaire is available. The African GAC members agreed to submit a collective input to the public comment process and also to work with other regional organizations within the ecosystem to fast track the process. The GAC also noted with concern the absence of African representatives on the ASO Address Council (AC). In that respect, the GAC encourages the African community to explore all avenues to quickly appoint community members to the vacant African seats of the ASO AC. The GAC welcomes the ICP-2 update process as a means to strengthen the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and looks forward to an outcome that supports the important role of the Regional Internet Registries in upholding a single, global Internet.	The Board appreciates the GAC's interest in the process of updating of ICP-2. The Board notes that ICANN recently conducted a Public Comment proceeding on the proposed principles for the next version of ICP-2. This was done in parallel with a Number Resource Organization (NRO) consultation on the same document. The Board appreciates the input given by African GAC members and looks forward to the ASO and all parts of the ICANN community, including the GAC, on updating this document.