

GAC ICANN83 Prague Communiqué: Issues of Importance (16 June 2025) - ICANN Board Comments for Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) Call

Version 1.3

Updated (1 October 2025)

Issues of Importance

The section below contains comments related to the [ICANN83 PRAGUE Communiqué](#), in support of the BGIG Meeting @ 7 October 2025. **This scorecard will not be presented to the Board for resolution.**

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communiqué)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
<p>1.a. Domain Name Registration Data: Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)</p>	<p>The GAC looks forward to reviewing the draft final report of the RDRS Standing Committee foreseen to be ready in August 2025. The GAC expresses its concerns regarding the reduced use of the tool in light of the departure of certain registrars from the pilot and reiterates its recommendation that RDRS participation should be made mandatory for all gTLD registrars to increase its utility. The GAC also welcomes the increased use of the tool by law enforcement requestors as per the latest metrics report of May 2025 and renews its call for the RDRS to continue operating beyond its pilot period and for enhancements to be made to the RDRS as previously identified by both the ICANN Board and the GAC, including improved integration for requests related to privacy and proxy services. To that end, the GAC welcomes the Board’s comment during ICANN83 that ICANN is developing an analysis of which envisioned enhancements to the RDRS would require new policy development and which ones could be completed based on existing recommendations or policies. The GAC looks forward to ICANN completing this review and sharing it with the community as soon as possible, as the GAC expects it will be useful in outlining possible next steps.</p> <p>Further, the GAC notes that work on authentication solutions for law enforcement requestors is proceeding in the Urgent Requests work track. The GAC reiterates that one important enhancement to the RDRS would be to ensure it can incorporate these future authentication solutions. Promoting awareness and education regarding the RDRS should also remain an important priority. To that end, it may be warranted to contemplate policy requiring links to RDRS (or successor systems) from Registration Data Directory Services that Contracted Parties are required to provide. The GAC further emphasizes the need to improve the RDRS platform’s usability, particularly for small actors and first-time requestors, through user interface enhancements and clearer guidance for users.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Board also looks forward to discussing the draft final report of the RDRS Standing Committee issued in August 2025 with the GNSO Council later in the year. ● The Board acknowledges the GAC’s concerns regarding reduced use of the tool in light of several registrars’ withdrawal from the pilot and notes that over 47% of domains under management are still represented by registrars remaining in the pilot. ● The Board welcomes the recommendation of the RDRS Standing Committee to continue operating RDRS beyond the pilot’s end in November 2025 – until a long-term solution is in place. The Board reiterates its support for implementation of the following previously identified enhancements as necessary for RDRS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mandatory participation of gTLD registrars in line with policy recommendations from the EPDP. ○ Development of an authentication/accreditation mechanism in parallel with the Board-GAC-GNSO Council discussion on a timeline for processing urgent requests ○ Development of requirements for an API for requestors and registrars. ○ Consistent policies governing access to nonpublic registration data for domains registered under privacy/proxy providers and policy development to require registrar-affiliated privacy/proxy service providers to participate in RDRS. ○ Development of options to support voluntary ccTLD participation in RDRS by ccTLDs using RDAP. ● As noted during ICANN83, the Board has requested that ICANN org provide an analysis of which envisioned enhancements to RDRS require new policy development and which enhancements could be completed based on existing recommendations or policies. This review, when complete, will be useful in outlining possible next steps for RDRS, as the GNSO Council considers the outstanding SSAD policy recommendations. ● The Board supports the GAC’s request to ensure RDRS incorporates future authentication solutions for law enforcement requestors, as part of the authentication work track for Urgent Requests, and acknowledges that requiring contracted parties to include links to RDRS or a successor system from the Registration Data Directory Services (RDDS) would require additional policy work. ● The Board continues to encourage ICANN org to promote awareness of and education for RDRS during the remainder of the pilot and until a long-term solution is in place and to consider implementing other platform enhancements that improve the user experience and provide clearer guidance for first-time requestors.
<p>1.b. Domain Name Registration Data: Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data</p>	<p>The GAC appreciates recent progress made in the two parallel tracks of work regarding Urgent Requests for disclosure of domain name registration data. In the authentication track, the GAC supports the ongoing efforts of the PSWG to develop technical mechanisms to authenticate the identities of law enforcement requestors submitting Urgent Requests. The GAC appreciates the participation of ICANN community members in the Practitioners Group established by the PSWG to work on this issue, as well as the ongoing collaboration with ICANN staff whose expertise has been invaluable in the exploration of potential solutions.</p>	<p>The Board recognizes the GAC’s continued interest in developing an urgent request timeline and notes that the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team (IRT) is at work with the aim to establish an agreed timeline as quickly as possible. Following ICANN83, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, Registry Stakeholder Group, and GAC IRT leads each submitted Urgent Request timeline proposals for consideration. The IRT held its fourth session to discuss the proposals received and achieve alignment on concepts within them. The Board understands that there are additional IRT sessions scheduled to discuss and finalize the proposed language for the Urgent Request timeline. The Board appreciates the GAC’s constructive feedback and continued collaboration on this effort.</p>

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communiqué)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
	<p>In the policy track, the GAC urges rapid progress in the Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team (IRT) discussions regarding the timeline for responses to authenticated Urgent Requests. The GAC urges the IRT to advance its discussions promptly, as the IRT has not yet resolved the timeline for responses to Urgent Requests after its three 90-minute discussions to date, including a meeting at ICANN83. The GAC reiterates its position that given the vital public safety interests related to Urgent Requests, responding to such requests within 24 hours is considered an appropriate timeline, which is also in line with ICANN’s proposal for consideration by the IRT. The GAC encourages exploration of what conditions would facilitate Contracted Parties processing Urgent Requests within this timeline.</p> <p>The GAC intends to continue following both work tracks. Swift progress is essential, as the GAC notes that after its Advice in the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué issued 15 months ago, and despite the GAC’s Follow-Up on Previous Advice in the ICANN80 Kigali Communiqué, the policy regarding Urgent Requests is still not in place.</p>	
1.c. Domain Name Registration Data: Accuracy of Registration Data	<p>The GAC continues to emphasize the importance of accuracy in domain registration data. The GAC remains concerned about the pause in the work of the Accuracy Scoping Team since 2022 and encourages the new GNSO Small Team on Accuracy to learn from the previous scoping experience. At the same time, the GAC welcomes the separate preliminary ideas shared during ICANN83 by the GNSO regarding the work of the new GNSO Small Team covering possible next steps on accuracy, based on responses given by the GAC and other community members to the GNSO’s recent threshold questions. In particular, the GAC notes with interest the idea to investigate shortening the timeline for registrars to perform registration data validation and verification. The current timeline under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement is 15 days. However, presenters during the ICANN83 briefing on DNS Abuse observed that attempts to mitigate phishing attacks require swift action because cybercriminals often register many new domains in just a few hours, exploit them, profit from abusive activities, and abandon those domains within just a few days. This is increasingly exacerbated by the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as discussed by the presenters.</p> <p>The GAC looks forward to receiving information about the final recommendations made by the GNSO Small Team and any other possible next steps on accuracy. In addition, the GAC noted the explanations provided by the Board during ICANN83 regarding accuracy-related requirements in ICANN’s contracts and looks forward to additional details, as discussed in the session, regarding how ICANN ensures compliance with the full set of accuracy requirements. The GAC also welcomes further information from Contracted Parties on their practices related to accuracy. The GAC notes that receiving further details and clarifications to address questions from GAC members would be helpful to inform continued discussions within the GAC.</p>	<p>The Board notes the GNSO Council in August adopted four preliminary recommendations from the Council’s Small Team on accuracy on possible next steps and looks forward to hearing from the Council how it will proceed with those recommendations.</p> <p>ICANN Contractual Compliance (Compliance) enforces accuracy-related requirements via investigations resulting from external complaints, as well as audits to assess compliance with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). In July 2025, Compliance launched the Registrar Program audit, by issuing the Request for Information (RFI) to selected registrar auditees. The 2025 RFI includes accuracy-related requirements under the RAA, specifically, requirements related to verification, validation and accuracy-related investigations. The Board understands that the RFI was refined from prior RFIs to further test the selected auditees’ compliance with these requirements. As with prior audits, Compliance has committed to providing accuracy specific reporting following the conclusion of the 2025 audit. Prior accuracy audit reports are available here and here.</p>
2. DNS Abuse	<p>DNS Abuse remains a significant concern for governments involved in ICANN. The GAC welcomed last year’s contract amendments establishing obligations for Contracted Parties to mitigate and disrupt DNS Abuse, as a first step. Further work is necessary,</p>	<p>See the Board’s Scorecard Response to ICANN83 Consensus Advice 1.a.i. “Policy Development Related to DNS Abuse”, included below, with minor updates regarding the Issue Report:</p>

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communique)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
	<p>however, to stem the increasing cost to the public of phishing, malware, botnets, and other forms of DNS Abuse.</p> <p>During the ICANN83 DNS Abuse session, the GAC appreciated learning about the anti-abuse practices from the local host country code top-level domain (ccTLD) – cz.nic - and the latest analysis and findings in the Phishing Landscape 2024 report by Interisle. These interventions underscored the vast scale of phishing campaigns, the substantial costs imposed on society, and the critical importance of proactive DNS Abuse prevention and mitigation. The rapid weaponization of domain names used for phishing campaigns makes swift action essential. The GAC continuously explores a wide range of options, including proactive practices, collaboration within the broader ecosystem, requirements for registrants offering subdomain services, as well as links between addressing DNS Abuse and work on domain name registration data.</p> <p>The GAC is pleased that several community stakeholder groups share its view that more work is needed to address DNS Abuse. Continued efforts are necessary, and the upcoming new round of generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) set to open next year, underscores the urgency to act swiftly.</p> <p>In particular, the GAC has discussed, both before and during ICANN83, several proposals for further policy work. These discussions involved representatives from the Net Beacon Institute, which recently issued a White Paper proposing different PDPs to address DNS Abuse, and the Contracted Parties House. It is encouraging to see that the GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse plans to deliver its recommendations on this topic before the next ICANN meeting. The GAC believes that the full spectrum of ideas so far discussed—including both proactive and reactive measures—deserves attention. The discussion has included specific issue areas, such as associated domain checking, bulk registrations, gating Application Programming Interfaces (APIs), investigating subdomains, public reporting of abuse statistics, the relationship between the timeliness of registration data verification and DNS Abuse, and transparency reporting obligations. Given the time constraints leading up to the next application round for New gTLDs, the GAC recommends prioritizing specific topics, as outlined in the GAC's ICANN83 advice.</p>	<p>As the Board and GAC discussed on 31 July 2025, the Bylaws spell out specific steps required to initiate a PDP. These steps are necessary to ensure that PDPs are properly scoped and undertaken in compliance with ICANN's mission, commitments, and core values.</p> <p>The Board is pleased that the GNSO Council has recently requested an Issue Report from ICANN org on DNS Abuse, as recommended by the GNSO small team on DNS Abuse. This Issue Report, which is a critical milestone in the process to launch a PDP, will include an exploration of the three policy enhancements highlighted by the GAC as priority items, as well as additional items discussed in the small team's report, and a proposal for a narrowly chartered PDP(s) that can be completed swiftly. We encourage the GAC to review the Preliminary Issue Report during the public comment period.</p> <p>The Board appreciates the collaborative and thoughtful manner in which the GAC, GNSO, and broader community have worked to ensure that stakeholder input on priority issues was invited and considered. The Board is encouraged by the momentum that has been built within the community to seek practical and meaningful solutions to address DNS Abuse.</p> <p>The Board looks forward to the analysis that will be performed by ICANN staff in the development of the Issue Report. This report will help identify any gaps in contractual obligations and/or best practices appropriate for policy development or other mechanisms. The Board recognizes the critical role of the Issue Report in advising the GNSO Council on whether a PDP is warranted and if so, on what issues/gaps. The Bylaws-mandated step to develop the Issue Report is in place to ensure that a PDP is appropriately scoped within ICANN's Mission and the policy issues are well defined. While this means that a PDP will not be finally initiated by ICANN84, the Board appreciates the commitment from the community and ICANN staff to establish the foundation to initiate the PDP as expeditiously as possible, presuming the Council determines a PDP is warranted.</p> <p>While the GNSO Council's Small Team on DNS Abuse has recommended that the GNSO Council initiate a narrowly focused PDP, the GNSO Council will ultimately decide whether or not to launch a PDP following community input on a Preliminary Issue Report and consideration of the Final Issue Report transmitted to the Council. The Board is grateful to Org for preparing the requested Preliminary Issue Report promptly and looks forward to the Final Issue Report. The Board also urges the Council to continue to prioritize this topic, to consider the Issue Report at its earliest availability, and to act decisively without undue delay on the matter of initiating a PDP.</p> <p>ICANN org has briefed the GAC topic co-leads on the path to launching a PDP on DNS Abuse before the end of the year. To this end, the Board urges the ICANN organization to provide all necessary support to enable a timely initiation and conduct of a potential PDP, and stands ready to assist and support the successful conclusion of this important project.</p>
3.a. Next Round of New gTLDs: Implementation Review Team (IRT)	The GAC noted the submission by the IRT of the complete draft of the Applicant Guidebook for Public Comment. The GAC recognized the tremendous efforts of the IRT in the delivery of this milestone in preparation for the Next Round of New gTLDs, and thanked the GAC's IRT representatives for their participation in this critical work.	The Board welcomes the GAC's recognition and joins the GAC in recognizing the efforts of the IRT as well as all the IRT members that supported this effort.
3.b. Next Round of New gTLDs: Applicant Support Program	The GAC recalled the agreed compromise ¹ between the GAC and the Board which resulted from the GAC-Board Bylaws Consultation on the ICANN80 GAC Advice ² , including the Board's agreement to conduct a review at the halfway mark of successful Applicant Support Program (ASP) applications. The GAC recalled the Board's agreement	The Board understands that ICANN's regional VPs for Global Stakeholder Engagement are able to share country-level statistics with GAC members with the purpose of informing additional outreach and engagement efforts. The Board understands that, during ICANN83, ICANN staff proposed that if a GAC member would like to offer targeted outreach and support to ASP applicants from their country, they are welcome to share a government point of contact that ICANN org staff can then share

¹ GAC Response to Board Update following Board-GAC Bylaws Consultation on ICANN80 GAC Advice (16 October 2024): <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/gac-response-update-following-board-gac-bylaws-consultation-on-icann80-gacadvice>

² GAC-Board Consultation Call on ICANN80 Advice (16 September 2024): <https://gac.icann.org/sessions/gac-and-icannboard-consultation-call-on-icann80-advice-asp>

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communique)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
	<p>to direct ICANN org to share results of geographic distribution of ASP applications with the IRT after 20 qualified ASP applicants to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any need for adjustments to Communications, Outreach & Engagement to target applications from underserved regions including developing countries, and if additional funding would be required if the number of approved applications exceeds the budgeted amount of 40-45. <p>The GAC recalls that country-level statistics can be made available by the relevant ICANN Government Stakeholder Engagement team if requested by a GAC member in their region. The GAC notes that this data will only be shared with the consent of applicants so that the relevant government can assist with targeted outreach and support.</p> <p>The GAC noted the current statistics presented by ICANN org on the status of ASP applications in process and, in particular, the very small number of completed applications submitted, given that there are only about 5 months left in the 12-month ASP application window. Furthermore, the GAC notes concern that the current process may not reach potential applicants who are least connected to ICANN’s processes. The GAC expressed concern that with the current pace of applications there may be no opportunity to conduct a review or determine any adjustments to the current Communications, Outreach & Engagement plan before the ASP application deadline. This review could identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the obstacles preventing applications from moving forward more rapidly, and recommend appropriate mitigation activities; draft applications that may not be completed before the deadline, and targeted improvements to ensure the ASP achieves its inclusive purpose. <p>The GAC is therefore of the view that such a review should now be conducted immediately, rather than after 20 qualified applications, in order to provide sufficient time for any project implementation course corrections, including Communications, Outreach & Engagement adjustments necessary to maximize the number of ASP applications completed and submitted for evaluation before the deadline.</p>	<p>with ASP applicants. This allows the ASP applicant to reach out to their government for support, if they choose, without ICANN compromising the business confidentiality of the ASP applicant.</p> <p>During the clarification call, the Board heard the GAC indicate that they would prefer ICANN staff reach out to ASP applicants to get their consent to share identifying information about them with the government indicated in the applicant’s jurisdiction; the Board notes that even with consent there are data governance as well as privacy and personal data protection concerns with this approach. On data governance, ICANN maintains strict internal controls to protect the confidentiality of applicant data. Access is limited to authorized personnel, and ICANN does not allow data to be exported or shared externally, including with governments. This avoids duplication, prevents misuse, and preserves trust in the application process. Once data leaves ICANN’s systems, ICANN loses oversight and it introduces significant confidentiality and legal risks. With respect to privacy and personal data protection, there are remaining privacy concerns with sharing applicant data externally, even with consent. It is not always clear whether consent is fully voluntary and informed, particularly when applicants may feel pressured to comply. In addition, cross-border data transfers present legal and operational challenges, as many jurisdictions require specific safeguards (such as adequacy decisions or contractual clauses) to ensure the legitimacy and protection of personal data.</p> <p>With regard to the immediate review requested, based on the GAC-Board compromise, the Board understood that the review of the half-way mark of 20 qualified applicants was in response to concerns about the first-come, first-serve approach; and it was intended to inform adjustments in Communications, Outreach & Engagement and if additional funding would be needed.</p> <p>Following the clarification meeting and subsequent correspondence from the GAC and ALAC, the Board understands that the objective of the review now being requested is to better understand the relationships between: ICANN’s awareness-raising and engagement efforts; the results to date in terms of ASP applications started; and the results to date of ASP applicants’ geographic distribution. The Board also understands that a second objective of this review is to report on how ICANN is providing support to existing ASP applicants to complete their application.</p> <p>The Board understands that ICANN staff have already issued a survey to ASP applicants to: identify potential obstacles and ways to improve the process, determine the likelihood of the applicant submitting a complete ASP application, and to collect contact details if the applicant would like the Applicant Counselor to reach out to them directly. As outlined in a 5 June 2025 blog, ICANN staff have developed additional ASP applicant readiness materials and have published the list of pro bono service providers and mentors for applicants to use if they need assistance completing their ASP applications.</p> <p>Regarding Communications, Outreach & Engagement efforts for the ASP to date, the Board understands that ICANN Communications and Global Stakeholder Engagement teams have been focused on raising awareness about the ASP in underserved regions, namely, Asia Pacific, Latin America, Middle East, and Africa regions. The Board understands that the Engagement teams created respective regional mappings of potential ASP applicants guided by the ASP eligibility criteria and the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) to better inform who to target for outreach.</p> <p>Lastly, additional communication and work has since taken place on this issue. See GAC and ALAC letter to the Board and ICANN Board response. As indicated in the Board response, the Board understands that ICANN staff proposed a discussion with the GAC and broader ICANN community to share updates on efforts to date to support applicants in the ASP pipeline, as well as to gather input and ideas from the GAC and broader community on how to best support applicant progression.</p>
3.c. GAC Readiness	<p>GAC members highlight the importance of GAC readiness in preparation for the Next Round of New gTLDs, notably regarding opportunities for GAC interventions after the “reveal day” of string applications. GAC volunteers are encouraged to collaborate with GAC topic leads to monitor timelines and milestones related to the next round</p>	<p>The Board appreciates the emphasis and interest in preparing GAC members to effectively participate in the Next Round of new gTLDs. The Board agrees with the importance of facilitating GAC readiness and strongly supports collaborative efforts—among GAC volunteers, ICANN community, staff, and Board to achieve this. The Board recognizes that there continues to be annual turnover in GAC membership and that the new gTLD Program is anticipated to span several years. Therefore, ensuring that</p>

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communiqué)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
	<p>applications process, including actively preparing for GAC Early Warnings, GAC Advice and other opportunities for input to applicants, the ICANN Board, and ICANN org.</p> <p>Some concerns were expressed within the GAC about potential increased spam and abuse in connection to the expansion of the DNS. It was suggested that the GAC consider, in advance of evaluating applications, how the Committee should approach discussions on Early Warnings and other instruments at its disposal in order to protect the public interest.</p>	<p>content, materials, recordings are “evergreen” and Next Round subject matter experts are available to new incoming GAC membership will be important components to support ongoing GAC readiness. In service of this aim, the Board understands that ICANN staff are working on capacity development/readiness materials as well as options for GAC leadership to consider in relation to engaging and supporting GAC members prior to the opening of the new gTLD Program and on an ongoing basis throughout the Next Round.</p> <p>Please refer to the Board’s response to ICANN83 Consensus Advice 1.a. outlining ongoing efforts by the Council’s small team on DNS Abuse in identifying further enhancements to ICANN agreements related to mitigating DNS Abuse.</p>
4. Governance of the Regional Internet Registries	<p>The GAC appreciates the ASO for providing an overview of the feedback received on the efforts to review and revise the RIR Governance document, currently in place as Internet Coordination Policy Two (ICP-2). Discussion covered common issues received during the public consultation period. Reflecting on the draft document that was subject to Public Comment, the GAC notes that it would appreciate more background on the rationale behind a number of changes that were introduced in this document. For the upcoming version, the GAC asked for a redline version, with brief rationale on feedback that was not accommodated. Additionally, a number of members asked for more information on the expected implementation and timelines to operationalize the outcomes. As an issue of importance, the GAC remains committed to provide the ASO with the necessary feedback in intersessional work and is looking forward to a broader community discussion during the ICANN84 meeting on the new revision of the draft RIR Governance document. A useful reference in terms of multistakeholder process are the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines, which could be considered by the ASO going forward.</p>	<p>Like the GAC, the Board welcomes the timely and important work of the ASO in reviewing Internet Coordination Policy 2. The Board encourages the GAC to continue its engagement with the ASO Address Council and also encourages governments to participate in RIR consultations. The Board notes that the second draft of the RIR Governance Document is currently available for Public Comment through 7 November and encourages governments to consider submitting input, particularly on areas that the GAC identified for more information. The Board also notes that ICANN has not provided substantive input on the second draft and shares the GAC’s interest in the broader community discussion.</p>
5. Community Statements of Interest (SOI)	<p>The GAC acknowledges the latest Public Comment opportunity shared by ICANN seeking comment on an updated version of the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. The GAC appreciates the continuing progress on this matter by the Board and staff, and reinforces the importance of concluding the effort by the end of this calendar year at the latest. The GAC welcomes the Board’s affirmation in its meeting with the GAC during ICANN83, that the updated Draft Code of Conduct would not expand existing disclosure requirements for GAC representatives.</p>	<p>The Board is thankful to the GAC for its continued leadership on and interest in this issue. The recent public comment forum on updates to the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest closed on 14 July 2025. On 14 September 2025, the Board considered the community inputs and adopted the Code of Conduct. ICANN org will be supporting the community in the roll out of the Code of Conduct, including in the development of forms, tools and training.</p>
6. Deferral of the Fourth ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT4)	<p>The GAC notes the intended deferral of the ATRT4 review process, as well as the decisions adopted by the Board recently on other accountability mechanisms as explained in the 27 May letter from the Board Chair to the GAC Chair³. In this regard, the GAC recalls the essential character of the ATRT reviews as mandated by the Bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN’s multistakeholder accountability, transparency, and governance. Accordingly, the GAC calls on the Board to expedite consultations on the matter with the multistakeholder community, with a view to finding a common ground approach for a way forward respectful of Bylaws obligations as soon as possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Board agrees that reviews are fundamental to ensuring that ICANN is delivering on its mission in a transparent and accountable manner, which is why it is imperative we have a reliable and effective model in place. Increasing the efficiency and efficacy of reviews to ensure that they align with community needs and the maturity of ICANN is essential to putting appropriate checks and balances in place for the long term. ● The Board’s resolutions included some work plan adjustments to ensure the community can participate in this collaborative effort that is shaping tomorrow’s reviews. The ICANN multistakeholder community plays a critical role in defining tomorrow’s reviews.

³ ICANN Board Chair letter to SO/AC Chairs - 27 May 2025: <https://gac.icann.org/advice/correspondence/incoming/20250527/update-on-icann-reviews>

Issue	Issue Text <i>(from the Communique)</i>	ICANN Board Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board commends the ICANN SO and ACs for the collaborative work that has gone into preparing the charter for a Review of Reviews Cross Community Group (Reviews CCG), which the Board approved on 5 September 2025. The Board also appointed two members to the Reviews CCG, James Galvin and Leòn Sanchez and will be regularly following the progress of the Reviews CCG work. The Board thanks the GAC for its participation in the Reviews CCG and looks forward to engaging with the community on this topic at ICANN84.