

Board-GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) Call

23 April 2026 - 1300 UTC

Summary Notes

In the spirit of issue spotting and candid information exchange, these high-level staff summary notes are intended to reflect the general nature of the discussion during the BGIG meeting. Certain specific aspects of the meeting discussions are provided to enable understanding of the flow and context of the discussions.

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome Remarks - ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha
- Opening Remarks - Marco Hogewoning and Greg DiBiase
- Discussion of the ICANN85 GAC Issues of Importance
- AOB
- Closing Remarks

Reference

- [ICANN85 Mumbai Communiqué](#) (16 March 2026)
- [ICANN Board Comments on Issues of Importance in the ICANN85 Mumbai Communiqué](#) (20 March 2026)

I. Opening Remarks

Tripti Sinha (ICANN Board Chair) welcomed GAC participants joining this discussion of the Issues of Importance to the GAC from the ICANN85 Communiqué.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice-Chair) expressed the GAC Chair's apologies for the meeting and noted he will be chairing in his absence. Marco concurred on the importance of these calls for the intersessional work of the GAC.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked the GAC for the Communiqué and Issues of Importance.

II. Discussion of the ICANN85 GAC Mumbai Communiqué Issues of Importance

1. Domain Name Registration Data

a. Urgent Requests for disclosure of Registration Data

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) confirmed that the ICANN Board understands the GAC's perspective in seeking that the 24-hour response timeline to Urgent Request for disclosure of registration data be made effective through the implementation of the associated law enforcement authentication mechanism, without requiring a new GNSO Policy Development Process. The ICANN Board highlighted the work expected toward this goal. The ICANN Board is currently expecting confirmation from the GNSO Council on their plans to this effect. Subsequently, ICANN will proceed to finalizing the Consensus Policy on the 24-hour response timeline for Urgent Requests. The GNSO is additionally expected to update the language of EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 18 as part of its expected work on SSAD Supplemental Recommendations. Regarding the implementation of an authentication mechanism, the ICANN Board is seeking the GAC's feedback on the best way to advance the logistical work, for example, in a testing group or other transparent multistakeholder effort to support preparation of contracted parties and requestors.

T Santhosh (India) sought clarification as to whether the implementation of an authentication mechanism would be conducted under an existing or new ICANN Bylaw or GNSO process.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) clarified that no new policy development effort is envisioned beyond the SSAD Supplemental Recommendation process, and the implementation effort that will be required between ICANN and relevant parties once a law enforcement authentication mechanism is accepted.

Gemma Carolilo (European Commission) expressed support for efforts proposed by the ICANN Board, including through a testing group, to operationalize, with relevant stakeholders, the work that has been led by the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) to design law enforcement authentication mechanisms. She also expressed satisfaction with the progress achieved and the consensus reached on the 24-hour response timeline for Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data. While looking forward to ICANN's planned updating of the Consensus Policy accordingly, she requested an indication of when this is expected to be completed.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) indicated that once the GNSO Council correspondence is received, ICANN org should be able to proceed to updating the Consensus Policy in a short time frame, possibly within a week or so.

Owen Fletcher (United States) welcomed the ICANN Board's support for the 24-hour response timeline and the related updating of the Registration Data Consensus Policy which he is looking forward to. He expressed support for ICANN taking a role in managing community engagement to help prepare requestors and contracted parties to utilize the future law enforcement authentication mechanisms, while at the same time continuing to collaborate with the GAC PSWG and ongoing law enforcement work to develop these mechanisms. He sought clarification from the ICANN Board on the scope of the expected GNSO consideration of Urgent Requests as part of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations process.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) clarified that, as part of its expected work on SSAD Supplemental Recommendations, the GNSO is expected to incorporate a reference to the law enforcement authentication mechanism, and thus reflect the new paradigm that has been agreed upon as part of implementation of the 24-hour timeline for response to Urgent Requests.

T Santosh (India) sought to understand whether the testing group proposed by the ICANN Board in relation to law enforcement authentication mechanisms would be of an operational nature or whether this will be subject to the GNSO PDP process.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) explained that the proposed testing group is one of the Board's suggestions towards finalization of the work on authentication mechanisms, that it would not be a GNSO PDP, and that it would involve representatives of the GAC PSWG who have been developing these mechanisms, as well as registrars and members of the community who would use them, for the purposes of testing and validation.

Gabriel Andrews (United States, Co-Chair of the GAC PSWG) expressed appreciation and support for ICANN's proposal to incorporate more formally the community's engagement in the development of the law enforcement authentication mechanisms.

b. Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and System for a Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD)

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) recalled the Board's decision not to adopt the 18 SSAD Phase 2 policy recommendations as a package, in order to enable the development of Supplemental Recommendations by the GNSO based on experience gained through the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) pilot. He noted that this approach is intended to allow the GNSO to update the recommendations and better align policies related to access to non-public gTLD

registration data, taking into account the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis and community input, including from the GAC.

Greg DiBiase highlighted that the Board expects the Supplemental Recommendations to address key elements identified by the community, including mandatory registrar participation, clarification of requests related to privacy and proxy registrations, the inclusion of service level agreements to ensure timely responses—particularly for urgent and authenticated requests—and the development of authentication mechanisms, with priority given to law enforcement authorities and a phased approach for other user groups.

Greg DiBiase further noted that while the RDRS is a voluntary pilot, a future SSAD system developed through consensus policy would be binding on contracted parties. He also referred to ongoing work on authentication mechanisms, including engagement with law enforcement authorities.

With respect to ccTLD participation, Greg DiBiase indicated that this was not included in the Board’s communication to the GNSO but remains open for further exploration on a voluntary basis.

He emphasized that the GNSO retains responsibility for determining the scope and timeline of the Supplemental Recommendations work under the bottom-up policy development process, while noting the expectation that this work should proceed in a timely manner. He expressed appreciation for the GAC’s engagement on this issue.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) welcomed the progress made and the Board’s efforts to move the issue forward, noting the complexity of the process and the GNSO Council’s acknowledgement of the urgency of this work. He indicated that the GAC looks forward to the GNSO taking the next steps.

c. Privacy and Proxy Services

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the Board is aligned with the GAC’s interest in seeing the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) recommendations, which are currently in implementation, finalized.

Greg DiBiase further noted that this work should be aligned, to the extent possible, with the RDRS or any successor mechanism resulting from the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations process. He indicated that the PPSAI implementation team is coordinating with the RDRS team to ensure strong coordination between the current policy implementation work and planned discussions on the future of RDRS or a successor mechanism.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) noted that the GAC is also becoming involved in the PPSAI work and highlighted alignment between the PPSAI and SSAD/RDRS processes as the key takeaway. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that the two processes proceed in parallel and converge appropriately.

2. DNS Abuse Mitigation

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the Board and the GAC are aligned in being encouraged by the launch of the GNSO PDP work on DNS Abuse, while also recognizing the importance of making the timeline as efficient as possible without compromising the quality of the work.

Greg DiBiase noted the GAC's continued interest in additional issues identified in the DNS Abuse Issue Report, including DGA botnet attacks, the need for a centralized reporting mechanism, questions around verification of registration data, transparency of reporting, subdomain abuse, and reducing the time for registrant contact verification. He noted that while the GAC supports the current PDP work, the Board understands the GAC's view that these other issues should not be lost from view.

Greg DiBiase indicated that the Board agrees these are important issues and supports efforts to make the PDP work as effective and efficient as possible. He also noted that, from a PDP perspective, future work will need to be appropriately scoped and supported by adequate community and staff resources. He further noted that the Board is considering other ways to address related topics in the meantime, including collaboration with the community, engagement with the GNSO on its prioritization work, and consideration of work being undertaken by third parties and other community initiatives.

Martina Barbero (European Commission) thanked the Board for its feedback and noted appreciation for the flexibility shown in taking GAC comments into account in relation to the PDP work plan and timeline. She noted that the GAC is keen to hear more from the GNSO on its prioritization efforts. Martina Barbero clarified that the GAC's interest in parallel workstreams does not necessarily mean launching multiple PDPs at the same time, using the 15-day verification issue as an example of a topic where the GAC is seeking continued dialogue with the community rather than necessarily an immediate formal policy process.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) responded that the Board is aligned with the value of having such discussions, including on verification, and noted that some efforts could take place in parallel without necessarily requiring a formal PDP.

Tomonori Miyamoto (Japan) noted the importance of effective PDP work and emphasized that the second planned DNS Abuse PDP should also be initiated and completed in a timely manner,

including in view of the upcoming delegation of new gTLDs. He welcomed voluntary collaborative initiatives, including trusted notifier programs, but stressed that these should not halt or replace policy consideration. Speaking from Japan's perspective, he noted that stakeholders continue to face real-world challenges beyond the current definition of DNS Abuse, and emphasized the importance of transparency regarding registrar actions in response to abuse.

T Santhosh (India) asked about concrete steps regarding the 15-day verification window and whether this work would be addressed before the conclusion of the first PDP. He also asked whether the Board could commit to a specific next step on centralized DNS Abuse reporting, such as requesting an options paper or feasibility study. Finally, he asked about ICANN's role regarding subdomain-level abuse, including in relation to actors beyond the strict scope of existing contracts, such as hosting providers, DNS operators, and Computer Emergency Response Teams.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) clarified that abuse involving subdomains can still be included in abuse reports to registrars, and that registrars are expected to mitigate abuse where a malicious subdomain is associated with a domain name they manage. On verification and centralized reporting, he indicated that the Board could not provide concrete action plans or timelines at this stage, but noted that ICANN and the Board understand the GAC's perspective, agree that further work is needed, and are considering the best path forward in consultation with the community and in alignment with PDP work.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) noted, from a GAC leadership perspective, the GAC's interest in moving forward and expediting work on DNS Abuse, while recognizing the time and resource constraints associated with PDPs. He welcomed the progress of the first PDP and looked forward to the second PDP advancing. He also asked for clarification regarding the Board's reference to further due diligence, including who would be expected to conduct it and whether there was any sense of timing for starting or completing that work.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) clarified that the Board understands the DNS Abuse work as involving two back-to-back PDPs. With respect to due diligence, he indicated that this could involve ICANN org, the Board, and potentially the broader community, noting the need for flexible and innovative ways to address these issues in parallel with formal PDP work. He added that there was nothing more specific to report at this stage.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) welcomed the continuation of dialogue with the community to identify collective and innovative solutions.

3. Next Round of New gTLDs

a. Applicant Support Program

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) recalled that the Board had expanded funding for the Applicant Support Program (ASP) to accommodate up to 75 qualified applicants, beyond the originally budgeted 45, in alignment with the GAC's long-standing advocacy for the program. He noted that the GAC had also expressed support for preserving the ability to apply the maximum base fee reduction of 85 percent to all qualified ASP applicants.

Greg DiBiase explained that an 85 percent discount for up to 75 applicants would require additional funding beyond the amount on which the Board had previously sought community input. He noted that the Board had therefore requested community feedback on the additional budget needed to provide an 85 percent discount if all 75 applicants qualify. If feedback is positive, the Board would consider the additional funding through a separate resolution.

Greg DiBiase further noted that the Board remains aligned with the GAC on the value and importance of the ASP and is also supporting monitoring and evaluation activities, including surveys of ASP applicants.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) thanked the Board for its efforts to increase funding to support applicants.

Tracy Hackshaw (UPU) expressed support for the Board's recognition of the issue and willingness to go further in light of the success of the ASP application process. He noted the hope for positive community feedback and for the 85 percent threshold to be made available to all 75 qualified applicants.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked Tracy Hackshaw and noted that the Board would provide updates once community feedback had been received.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) noted the GAC's hope to see 75 successful applications and ASP-supported applicants thrive through the remainder of the process.

b. Community Applications

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted the Board's appreciation for the GAC's support for the release of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) guidelines. He reported that ICANN org had announced on 18 March 2026 that Analysys Mason had been selected as the CPE vendor, and that the Evaluation Guide had been opened for Public Comment on 24 March 2026.

Greg DiBiase further noted that ICANN org continues to work closely with the SubPro Implementation Review Team to consider the SubPro recommendations on community applications and ensure clear guidance for applicants and the CPE panel.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) noted that the Public Comment proceeding was open and encouraged interested parties to make use of that process to raise any further concerns or support. He noted that the GAC looks forward to next steps in this work.

c. TLD Application Management System

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted the Board's appreciation for the GAC's feedback on the release and previews of the TLD Application Management System (TAMS), as well as the GAC's broader interest in support for the application review period.

Greg DiBiase indicated that the 2026 Round Team has been and will continue working closely with the GAC support team on dedicated sessions to support GAC preparations for reviewing applications. He noted that, on Reveal Day, all public sections of confirmed new gTLD applications will be posted on the 2026 Round website in a format similar to 2012, allowing search and sorting. He further noted that additional information will be made available to GAC members to facilitate their review of application information.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) expressed appreciation for ICANN org's support and for taking into account GAC comments, including in relation to tools that may assist with processing internal reviews.

A question was raised in the chat regarding whether the Geographic Names Panel would have guidance to assess strings that may be perceived as geographic identifiers by relevant communities, and whether semantic similarity would be considered in string similarity evaluation.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) indicated that this question would need to be taken back for follow-up.

Theresa Swinehart (ICANN org) confirmed that ICANN org would come back with an answer.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) reiterated appreciation for the support being provided to the GAC in what will be a significant task for the Committee and its members during the application review period.

4. UDRP Review

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) acknowledged the GAC's comments on the independent joint report by WIPO and the Internet Commerce Association (ICA) and understanding that the UDRP review is in the GNSO's queue and part of the GNSO Council's broader prioritization exercise. He indicated that the Board anticipates that the GNSO Council will duly consider the WIPO-ICA report, along with potentially other relevant inputs, to inform its deliberations on prioritizing and scoping future policy development on the UDRP.

Brian Beckham (WIPO) thanked Greg DiBiase and noted that WIPO remains available to assist and remains in touch with Council colleagues. He noted that WIPO looks forward to next steps, while recognizing that the work is currently in a holding pattern.

5. Governance of the Regional Internet Registries

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the Board understands that the GAC had received an update from the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) regarding work on a new governance document for the Recognition, Operation, and Derecognition of Regional Internet Registries. He noted the GAC's view that the document should reflect considerations such as the public interest, transparency, and compliance with ICANN's multistakeholder approach.

Greg DiBiase indicated that, like the GAC, the Board is closely following this work and looks forward to reviewing the final RIR Governance Document. He noted that, consistent with the ICANN Bylaws, the Board will notify the GAC prior to Board action if the proposed document may impact public policy concerns, and will take into account any timely GAC advice.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) welcomed the Board's comments and noted that the GAC looks forward to the final document. He further noted that while the process should not be rushed, the GAC would welcome opportunities to support a faster or smoother process if appropriate.

T Santhosh (India) welcomed the Board's indication that it would notify the GAC of any public policy implications and take into account any GAC advice, noting that this is in line with the GAC's ICANN85 Communiqué.

6. Root Server System

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted that the GAC had received information from the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) regarding the structure of the Root Server System and ongoing governance work in this area. He noted the GAC's interest in learning more about security-related measures, including incident detection, mitigation and reporting.

Greg DiBiase indicated that the Board appreciates the GAC's focus on the governance, operation and resilience of the Root Server System. He noted that RSSAC had proposed a process for the dissemination of security incident information in RSSAC062, and that the Board will soon begin its consideration of the RSS Governance Working Group Final Report. He encouraged continued discussions between the GAC and RSSAC on the Root Server System, including questions related to resilience and security.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair) welcomed the Board's comments and noted the GAC's interest in future work and next steps following the Board's consideration of the Final Report. Speaking also in his national capacity, he noted interest in understanding what ICANN org, as a root server operator, could do to help address gaps while governance work continues.

7. Review of Reviews

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) noted the Board's appreciation for the GAC's continued participation in the Cross Community Group (CCG) on the Review of Reviews. He noted the GAC's interest in how important reviews, including the Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review and the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review, would be accommodated in the refreshed proposal, as well as how the overall cadence and workload of reviews would be structured.

Greg DiBiase further noted the GAC's interest in ensuring that the final proposal is driven by a functional approach, with each review having a distinct purpose and clear added value, and that the review system be communicated in clear, plain language. He indicated that the Board agrees that it is essential to clearly state the purpose of individual review components and how they interrelate, and that a clear process and resource definition will be critical to building a sustainable system in support of ICANN's mission.

Manal Ismail (Egypt) thanked the Board for sharing its views on the GAC's Issues of Importance, including the Review of Reviews, and welcomed the alignment between the Board and GAC on this topic. She noted that the GAC had recently received the refined outline and had not yet had an opportunity to discuss it internally. She expressed appreciation for the openness and inclusiveness of the process and the Board's valuable participation, and looked forward to the compiled report providing a complete picture of the review system, including review categories, cadence and timelines.

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked Manal Ismail and encouraged continued progress on the work.

III. Closing Remarks

Greg DiBiase (ICANN Board) thanked participants for their feedback and for raising important issues, noting that the discussion had been constructive.

Marco Hogewoning (GAC Vice Chair), on behalf of the GAC, thanked the Board for its review of the GAC's Communiqué text and responses, and expressed appreciation for the time Board members dedicate to working with the GAC through BGIG calls and other processes.

Tripti Sinha (ICANN Board Chair) echoed appreciation for participants' attendance and engagement, noting that these intersessional meetings are very helpful. She looks forward to seeing participants at ICANN86 in Seville and adjourned the meeting.

Attendees:**GAC**

Marco Hogewoning, Netherlands
Jeyhun Huseynzade, Azerbaijan
Suada Hadzovic, Bosnia and Herzegovina
David Bedard, Canada
Rida Tahir, Canada
Mislav Hebel, Croatia
Finn Petersen, Denmark
Alvaro Nadal Florentino, Dominican Republic
Manal Ismail, Egypt
Christine Arida, Egypt
Gemma Carolillo, European Commission
Martina Barbero, European Commission
Janne Hirvonen, Finland
Rudy Nolde, Germany
Mzia Gogilashvili, Georgia
Ton Hsuen, Hong Kong, China
T. Santhosh, India
Pradeep Verma, India
Aditya Vikram Dube, India
Shivangi Pathak, India
Cathal McGuinness, Ireland
Ashwin Sasongko, Indonesia
Adriano Daddario, Italy
Tomonori Miyamoto, Japan
Zeina BOU HARB, Lebanon
Amina Ramallan, Nigeria
Wiktor Skwarek, Poland
Coral de Cielo Cano Gallardo, Peru
Waleed Aloriny, Saudi Arabia
Aboubakry KANE, Senegal
Sasa Kovacevic, Serbia
Inaki Giloses, Spain
Lucas Prêtre, Switzerland

Benjamin Harbich, Switzerland
Cheng-Nan Chiang, Chinese Taipei
Deniece Serrette, Trinidad and Tobago
Yurii Matsyk, Ukraine
William Rau, United States
Owen Fletcher, United States
Shanea Lewis, Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)
Tracy Hackshaw, Universal Postal Union
Guilherme Canela, UNESCO
Brian BECKHAM, WIPO

Gabriel Andrews, PSWG
Laureen Kapin, PSWG

ICANN Board

Tripti Sinha
Amitabh Singhal
Chris Buckridge
Constance de Leusse
David Lawrence
Gregory DiBiase
James Galvin
Miriam Sapiro
Patricio Poblete
Sarah Deutsch
Wes Hardaker

ICANN Org

Kurtis Lindqvist
Alice Jansen
Christian Wheeler
Eleeza Agopian
Elisa Busetto
Erika Randall
Gino Marliani
Jamie Hedlund
Janis Karklins
Jason Kean
Karen Lentz
Kristy Buckley
Lars Hoffmann
Lisa Carter
Marika Konings
Russ Weinstein
Steve Chan
Theresa Swinehart
Vinciane Koenigsfeld
Wendy Profit

ICANN GAC Support Staff

Mary Wong
Fabien Betremieux
Julia Charvolen
Gulten Tepe Oksuzoglu