

---

## GAC Meeting with the GNSO Council

### Session 4

---

#### Contents

<a href="#">Session Objective</a>	p.1	<a href="#">Talking Points &amp; Questions</a>	p.1	<a href="#">Background</a>	p.2	<a href="#">Further Information</a>	p.2
-----------------------------------	-----	--	-----	----------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	-----

#### Session Objective

The GAC and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) meet at ICANN Meetings to discuss policy matters of interest to both parties.

The agenda for the session is scheduled to focus on an exchange on the following topics:

**1. High Level Government Meeting**

- a. GAC Leadership to update the GNSO Council on the main take-aways from the HLGGM.

**2. GNSO Statements of Interest (SOIs)**

- a. Discussion of GNSO letter and next steps for both groups to consider (*see the [Transparency & SOI Briefing](#) for further information*).

**3. New gTLDs**

- a. Applicant Support Program
- b. GNSO Council update on singular/plural issue
- c. Implementation Review Team (IRT) update
- d. Resolution of contention sets (*back-up item: pending news from Board*)
- e. RVCs (*back-up item: pending news from Board*)

**4. Diacritics**

- a. GNSO Council update

**5. WHOIS**

- a. Urgent requests

- b. Data accuracy
- 6. **DNS Abuse:**
  - a. GNSO Council update on the Contracted Parties House summit meeting and summary of the output document.

## Talking Points & Questions

### 1. High Level Government Meeting

- a. GAC Leadership to update the GNSO Council on the main take-aways from the High Level Government Meeting (HLGM).

### 2. GNSO Statements of Interest (SOIs)

- a. Discussion of GNSO letter and next steps.

The GAC is very appreciative of the GNSO letter on SOI which clearly articulates the current position of the different GNSO constituencies and the status of the GNSO. The GAC is of the view that highest standards of transparency are cornerstones for the accountability and legitimacy of ICANN policy processes, and would like to explore how to move forward on this dossier so that all participants in ICANN can, as appropriate, give their affiliation or that (as required) of their clients. The GAC looks forward to the Board taking action on this matter in consultation with the whole community.

What is the GNSO Council's take on such Board plans?

Would the GNSO Council welcome a request from the Board to introduce requirements on transparency consistent with the ICANN Bylaws?

### 3. New gTLDs

- a. GNSO Council update on singular/plural issue

The GAC is aware of the recent progress in the pending SubPro recommendation 24.3, wherein the ICANN organization has formulated a preliminary approach (i.e., straw person text) to solicit additional input for the GNSO's deliberation. The GAC is keen to learn the GNSO's perspective on the straw person proposal and the projected timeline for developing an approach addressing the singular/plural matter.

Furthermore, the GAC wishes to reiterate ICANN's objective of mitigating string confusion. In light of this, the GAC seeks the GNSO's stance on the following inquiries: Should ICANN disregard the potential for string confusion resulting from the singular/plural issue in the absence of objection or request? If so, what are the

subsequent mitigation procedures when a request is made long after both the singular and plural strings have been adopted? If not, what measures will the GNSO implement to identify and prevent the potential occurrence of the singular/plural issue?

b. Implementation Review Team (IRT) update

The GAC is keen to continue engaging actively in the IRT, through its Appointed Representative, Alternate, and participants.

- i. Will the proposed \$92,000 RSP fee affect new entrants ability to participate in the next application round for new gTLDs, and if so, in what ways?

c. Resolution of contention sets

The GAC is keen on hearing from the Board's reaction to the GAC's Washington Consensus Advice on resolution of contention sets. While we receive the Board's reaction we would be interested in hearing the GNSO Council's views on alternative systems to resolve contention sets (different to auctions) between commercial and non-commercial applications. And we would also be interested in your views on the possibility of effectively ruling out the use of "private auctions". Does the GNSO Council see an appropriate way forward regarding both aspects?

d. RVCs / PICs)

*(if applicable)* The GAC is concerned about not having heard from the Board on this issue, not least as it is an outstanding issue for the Next Round of New gTLDs.

#### 4. Diacritics

- a. The GAC wishes to request a status update on the work being done on Latin Script Diacritics in New gTLDs and specifically, the ".quebec" issue as it relates to fostering a multilingual and inclusive Internet, including a tentative timeline for decisions and actions.

#### 5. WHOIS

a. Urgent Requests

The GAC would welcome a status update from the GNSO Council on where we stand on this issue, based on the San Juan Communiqué in which the GAC advises the Board to "to act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on Urgent Requests for domain name registration data". The GAC would particularly welcome some indications of what the GNSO think would be the most relevant approach for restarting a conversation on this topic given that the halt of the IRT work.

b. Accuracy

The GAC welcomes any updates from the GNSO on the status of the Data Protection Specification (DPS) between ICANN and the Contracted Parties. While the GAC understands that the GNSO views completion of the DPS as a prerequisite to restarting the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team, the GAC notes the Board's recent comments that completion of the DPS will not grant ICANN access to nonpublic registration data that would enable wide-scale accuracy studies. Given this information, the GAC welcomes the GNSO's views on ICANN org's Assessment of Registration Data Accuracy Scenarios (October 2023), and in particular on the two proposed alternative approaches put forward: providing historical data via ICANN's audit program and engaging with contracted parties on identity verification practices (including those of ccTLDs). The GAC further welcomes GNSO Council's estimation on a concrete timeline for restarting the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team.

**6. DNS Abuse**

- a. The GAC welcomes a GNSO Council update on the Contracted Parties House Summit and a summary of the output document developed following the meeting.

## Background

With the pace of GAC participation in ICANN policy development activities changing in recent years, it has been observed that information sharing with various parts of the ICANN community is more valuable than ever to help GAC members understand the context of various DNS issues. At recent public meetings, the GAC has interacted with various community groups from the gTLD space including business, intellectual property and non-commercial interests. This meeting with the GNSO Council will continue that strategic communications approach.

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) is a body within the ICANN community responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains. The GNSO is the largest Supporting Organization within the ICANN framework.

The GAC normally meets with the Chair and other members of the GNSO Council at each ICANN public meeting to discuss issues of common concern and identify methods for better cooperation. The current Chair of the GNSO Council is Greg DiBiase. Vice Chairs are Nacho Amadoz and Tomslin Samme-Nlar. The GNSO Liaison to the GAC is Jeff Neuman. The GAC's point-of-contact to the GNSO is Jorge Cancio (Switzerland).

The GNSO is a “federation” of different stakeholder groups. It is made up of two “Houses” - one “house” for parties contracted to ICANN (Registries and Registrars) and a second “house” for other non-contracted parties – commercial and non-commercial interests.

The GNSO Council and the GNSO stakeholder groups have different roles within the GNSO. The Council undertakes the role of manager of the policy development process. The Council is populated by representative members of the various GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. Comparatively, the stakeholder groups themselves (including the Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) and the Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) are focused on operational considerations, sharing information and helping their members understand the overall GNSO activities and responsibilities. Various stakeholder groups participate directly in policy development working groups.

Prior to ICANN Public Meetings, the leadership teams of both the GNSO Council and the GAC meet via teleconference to identify the most pressing issues that merit further face-to-face discussions at the upcoming meeting.

### Further Information

Further information about the GNSO and its policy development process is available at <http://gns0.icann.org/en/about>. GNSO web site – <https://gns0.icann.org/en>

### Document Administration

<b>Title</b>	ICANN80 GAC Session Briefing - GAC Meeting with GNSO Council
<b>Distribution</b>	GAC Members (before meeting) and Public (after meeting)
<b>Distribution Date</b>	Version 1: 29 May 2024