
MINUTES OF MEETING

ICANN75 Annual General Meeting, 17-22 September 2022

MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP	2
Opening Plenary Session	2
PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	3
Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	3
WHOIS and Data Protection (incl. Accuracy)	4
DNS Abuse Mitigation	6
GAC WORKING GROUPS	8
GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	8
GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)	8
CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	9
Meeting with the ICANN Board	9
Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)	12
Meeting with the country code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)	13
Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	14
INTERNAL GAC MATTERS	15
GAC Wrap-Up Session	15
Attachment 1 - ICANN75 Hybrid Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST	16
Attachment 2 - ICANN75 Action Points Compilation	18

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

79 GAC Members and 7 Observers attended the meeting.

GAC membership currently stands at 180 Member States and Territories, and 38 Observer Organizations. A list of ICANN75 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in [Attachment 1 - ICANN75 Hybrid Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST](#).

The ICANN75 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website at: <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann75-kuala-lumpur-communication>.

Presentations used by speakers during the meeting and supporting briefing prepared for the GAC can be accessed from the GAC website: <https://gac.icann.org/agendas/icann75-hybrid-meeting-agenda>.

Full transcripts for each session are to be made available from the ICANN75 Public Meeting website, via the relevant agenda items on the GAC's website agenda page listed above.

1.1. Opening Plenary Session

GAC Chair Manal Ismail, welcomed GAC participants to ICANN75. She noted the productive Capacity Building Weekend held for GAC participants and reviewed the GAC meeting agenda for the week – including committee and community events and sessions. She particularly noted that GAC plenary sessions were planned to focus on GAC priority topics and would include discussions on future rounds of new gTLDs, WHOIS and data protection and DNS Abuse mitigation.

GAC Support provided an overview of the meeting logistics and technical capabilities for the week. Notable information was shared for both in-person and virtual attendees.

The representative to the GAC from Malaysia welcomed the delegates and all attendees (both in-person and remote) then subsequently introduced themselves in the tour de table ceremony. The GAC Chair was pleased to welcome the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the GAC as a new GAC Member.

The GAC Chair then reviewed the results of the 2022 GAC Chair and Vice Chairs Election. She identified the candidates for the various positions as:

2022 GAC Chair Nominee

Nicolas Caballero (Paraguay) (first term)

and

2022 GAC Vice Chair Nominees

Ola Bergström (Sweden) (second term)

Shi Young Chang (Republic of Korea) (second term)

Francis Olivier Cubahiro (Burundi) (second term)

Zeina Bou Harb (Lebanon) (first term)

Nigel Hickson (United Kingdom) (first term)

The GAC Members in attendance then confirmed all the candidates by acclamation.

The GAC Chair explained that the new Chair and Vice-Chairs would officially begin their terms at the end of the ICANN76 meeting in March 2023. She advised that transition Plans for the GAC Leadership team would include updating all leadership mailing lists, inviting future leaders to join all upcoming Chair/Vice Chair (C-VC) calls, and making plans for a potential transition meeting/retreat in some form.

The GAC Chair briefly reviewed notable GAC work efforts since the ICANN74 meeting. She noted a number of recent SO-AC Chair interactions and GAC interaction with the ICANN Board/GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) that have included discussions of the community consultation on draft Terms of reference for a pilot of the Holistic Review; implementation of FY23 review recommendations that was prioritized; launch of a new Policy Transition Program Pilot; and discussions of DNS Abuse and WHOIS topics.

Attendees were reminded that the BGIG includes a subset of ICANN Board members and interested GAC members, and it has proven to be an effective vehicle for discussions to ensure effective Board/GAC collaboration and communication

Attendees were invited to review the GAC Correspondence page to review recent correspondence since ICANN74.

The GAC Chair noted that the committee had onboarded 49 new GAC participants in the 2022 calendar year so far.

Prior to concluding the session, the GAC Chair fielded comments from GAC members noting the success of the BGIG and a suggestion that the GAC find a way to acknowledge appreciation to the Board for its contributions to the group. In this context, it was also noted that the GAC Communique has evolved into the primary means for sharing GAC views with the rest of the community, although it does not always need to include GAC advice. Support staff confirmed recent research showing that while GAC Advice use has been less frequent during the COVID-19 pandemic, the GAC recently has been increasing its use of the Communique to identify issues of importance to governments.

The GAC Chair noted that “issues of importance” have proven to be an effective vehicle which serve as a form of brainstorming for GAC Members until committee views have matured into more formal advice which can then be provided to the Board. She noted that Communique drafting procedures had been introduced during the pandemic to help identify these types of issues and views earlier in the Communique production process.

2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

2.1. Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs

The GAC topic lead provided an update on recent developments relative to Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, notably progress on the preparation of the upcoming GAC/GNSO Council dialogue on closed generics. Following ICANN74, the GAC selected six (6) representatives to take part in the facilitated dialogue with the GNSO Council. GAC members noted that an intersessional discussion on GAC positions relative to closed generics would be helpful to guide GAC representatives throughout the dialogue. GAC representatives on the facilitated dialogue are expected to regularly coordinate with GAC members throughout the process, while no official GAC consensus call is expected to be held on this matter. The GAC topic lead and the GAC Chair noted that the facilitated dialogue is expected to focus on the development of a compromise framework in keeping with the GAC Beijing Advice whereby *“exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal”*.

ICANN org provided information on recent developments pertaining to the upcoming GAC/GNSO Council dialogue on closed generics, noting that representatives to the dialogue for the GNSO Council are expected to be appointed by the end of ICANN75. To this effect, the dialogue on closed generics is set to commence post ICANN75. In terms of next steps, ICANN org flagged that if the dialogue results in an agreed framework, this will not preclude upcoming policy work via appropriate GNSO and ICANN Bylaws process. If the dialogue does not result in an agreement, the issue will be brought back to the ICANN Board for consideration.

In preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, GAC members strongly encouraged ICANN org to share an analysis of changes to policy recommendations from the 2007 Policy Development Process (PDP) and the 2021 policy recommendations as set forth in the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs Policy Development Process (SubPro PDP) Final Report. Such analysis would help GAC Members and the wider community prepare for the upcoming round of New gTLDs in an effective manner.

The GAC received an update from the GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC regarding the upcoming GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) on Applicant Support including the open call for volunteers for such effort. The GAC reaffirmed its continued interest in the improvement of Applicant Support for the next round of new gTLDs, noting the importance of active GAC participation in the upcoming GGP. In this regard, the GAC calls on the GNSO Council to allow broader participation from interested GAC participants, as well as other members of the community, beyond the single member per Advisory Committee presently envisioned by the call for volunteers communicated to the GAC. GAC members noted that interested GAC members should be allowed to join GGP meetings as participating observers - which is not currently envisaged based on the call for volunteers received. The GAC recommends consideration by the GNSO Council of adopting a more open model to these upcoming meetings and the overall GGP.

The GAC topic lead encouraged GAC membership discussion intersessionally including potential consideration of GAC advice on topics of interest to the GAC.

Action Points:

- **GAC Support** to schedule an intersessional GAC meeting to review GAC positions on closed generics in preparation for the GAC/GNSO Council dialogue.
- **GAC Members** interested in matters pertaining to Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs are encouraged to reach out to GAC Support or GAC Topic Leads to join the GAC mailing list on this topic.

2.2. WHOIS and Data Protection Policy (incl. Accuracy)

Topic leads from the GAC Small Group on WHOIS/EPDP/GDPR reminded the GAC of the Importance of this subject matter in light of the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services (28 March 2007). They recalled the extent of the continuous and multi-phase **efforts undertaken since 2018 to define a new policy framework for Registration Data Services in compliance with data protection law**, and provided an update on the latest developments. These efforts include the development of policy regarding the processing of registration data, access to and disclosure of registration data, and the consideration of potential policy regarding the accuracy of registration data. In terms of timeline for the delivery of a new comprehensive framework, an overview of ongoing processes highlighted many uncertainties.

The GAC was briefed on **ICANN org's proposed Draft Registration Data Consensus Policy**, resulting from the ICANN Board's adoption (15 May 2019) of the EPDP Phase 1 Policy recommendations which sets out requirements for collection, transfer, and publication of gTLD registration data. A draft GAC Comment will be

submitted for GAC members' review in October. It is expected that the GAC Comment may include concerns discussed during the session, such as:

- The impact of adopting data collection, data transfer and data publication requirements in absence of a system for access and disclosure to legitimate third parties with appropriate legal bases and lawful purposes (contrary to the original intent/understanding of GAC representatives involved in the EPDP process to have both policy and system implemented together);
- The potential detrimental impact of adopting this Consensus Policy on the effectiveness of a simplified WHOIS Disclosure System currently contemplated as a proof of concept;
- The continued lack of clarity on the distribution of data controllership responsibilities between ICANN and Contracted Parties which have yet to conclude their negotiations of Data Processing Agreements;
- Inappropriate timeframes for responding to urgent disclosure requests related to circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation.

Should the ICANN Board approve this Consensus Policy after the ongoing public Comment period, it is expected that this policy would replace the current Temporary Specification by the end of 2024, at the conclusion of an 18-month transition period.

A GAC Member noted that regarding impacts of the EPDP process on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation, the GAC had issued advice to the ICANN Board related to the resuming of the policy implementation¹ which has been suspended since 2018. Another GAC Member recalled that the ICANN Board has not rejected any GAC Advice related to EPDP/WHOIS matters, wondering whether any solutions were being considered in relation to this advice.

During ICANN75, ICANN org introduced its **design proposal for a WHOIS Disclosure System**, to serve as a proof of concept for the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure (SSAD) initially recommended by the GNSO Council to the ICANN Board at the conclusion of Phase 2 of the EPDP Process (24 Sep. 2020). This results from the GNSO's request (27 April 2022) for the ICANN Board to pause consideration of these recommendation due to concerns that ICANN org's Operational Design Assessment (ODA) did not provide *"enough information to confidently determine the cost/benefit of the SSAD recommendations"*. GAC topic leads presented the key features of the proposed WHOIS Disclosure System which is envisioned to be a free central portal for intake of requests, and their automatic routing to appropriate registrars. It is anticipated that such a system could be delivered by Q4 2023. Several risks and concerns were discussed, including the absence of identification of requestors which may hamper lawful disclosure of data, uncertainty as to adoption of the system by registrars (participation not mandatory), and the ability of this system to inform the demand for an SSAD. The GNSO is expected to provide its feedback on this proposal in the October/November 2022 timeframe.

Several GAC Members discussed certain features for the proposed system: welcoming the centralization of requests, at no cost to requesters; calling on the need to ensure that requests from law enforcement remain confidential, with appropriate accountability and transparency on the handling of the data collected; stressing that the system be effectively promoted to ensure maximum participation by registrars and requestors.

Several GAC participants expressed concerns with the proposed voluntary participation of registrars and the absence of specific requirements for their response to disclosure requests, including a feedback mechanism to ensure that status of requests are updated appropriately.

¹ See GAC Advice in the [Kobe Communiqué](#) (14 March 2019) and Follow-up on Previous GAC Advice in the [Marrakech Communiqué](#) (27 June 2019) and [Montréal Communiqué](#) (6 November 2019)

A GAC Member highlighted the importance of delivering a WHOIS Disclosure System, in particular given its importance in the mitigation of DNS Abuse.

Regarding the status of the GNSO's **Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team**, representatives of the GAC in this process recalled recent GAC positions and reported on the recently published preliminary report (6 September 2022) which recommends that:

- A Registrar Survey be conducted on the status of accuracy of their domains under management.
- A Registrar Audit be considered regarding procedures for determining the accuracy of registration data.
- A pause of the Scoping Team's work on only those proposals that require access to registration data until such time when it is sufficiently clear whether proposals that require access to registration data are a viable path to assess the current state of accuracy.

It was noted that the Scoping Team further recommends the GNSO Council to:

- Request ICANN org to proceed with their outreach to the EDPB as a matter of urgency
- Request ICANN org to proceed with a Data Protection Impact Assessment in connection with the scenario(s) in which the processing of data takes place
- Call out the importance of finalizing the Data Processing Agreement between ICANN and Contracted Parties.

A GAC Member expressed the hope that the recommended work will be approved and enacted as soon as possible.

2.3. DNS Abuse Mitigation

Co-chairs of the GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) recalled the importance of mitigating DNS Abuse which threatens Internet users and consumers, and the security, stability, and resiliency of DNS infrastructure. The importance of this matter for the GAC was recognized in the adoption of the GAC Beijing Safeguard Advice (11 April 2013), the subsequent establishment of the GAC's PSWG (11 February 2015) and the GAC Statement on DNS Abuse (18 September 2019). It was also recalled that ICANN's contacts with Registries and Registrars are not deemed to provide sufficiently clear and enforceable obligations.

The findings of recent Phishing and Malware trend studies by the Interisle Consulting Group were discussed, in particular the significant increase in measured attacks and domains involved, as well as the overrepresentation of New gTLDs in both phishing and malware domains (compared to ccTLDs and legacy gTLDs).

PSWG leaders highlighted a number of ICANN Community activities such as the development of tools by Registrar and Registry stakeholders to facilitate reports of DNS Abuse and envisioned collaborations to enhance reporting of DNS Abuse mitigation activity and trends. It was noted that the GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse is expected to recommend a tightly focused Policy Development Process (PDP) be initiated on the topic of malicious registrations used for the distribution of malware, phishing or the operation of Botnet command and control systems [The Small Team's report to the GNSO Council was eventually released on 10 October²]. While one GAC Member acknowledged positive movement in the community towards solutions and expressed support for such proposed PDP, another doubted that this would be timely and effective in light of recent outcomes of GNSO PDPs. It was suggested that this be discussed further, and that the GAC considers the SSAC's proposal going forward.

² See <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2022-October/026096.html>

After two notable contributions in 2021 (SAC114 and SAC115) - which recommended that DNS Abuse mitigation best practices be incorporated into all future New gTLDs and that the ICANN and wider DNS Infrastructure community consider a Common Abuse Response framework - **SSAC is now seeking to create a cross-community roadmap to deliver an effective and enduring community collaboration to mitigate DNS Abuse**. This would include the consideration of all possible mechanisms to support such an objective and the creation of a work plan and an associated timeline.

Following its presentations to the GAC since ICANN72, a GAC Member continued its discussion of malicious registrants' strategy of **"domain hopping" to avoid detection and accountability** upon report of abuse. This was identified as **enabled by a lack of specificity of anti-abuse provisions** in ICANN's contracts. A GAC representative in the SSR2 Review Team signaled that the Review Team had tried to address these matters. A GAC Participant suggested Know-Your-Customer type approaches, such as those implemented by some ccTLDs in order to prevent abusive registrations.

Several GAC Members noted the absence of a clear and unique **definition of DNS Abuse**, while another suggested that a common definition should not be an end in itself and not prevent making progress on specific issues.

3. GAC WORKING GROUPS

3.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote effective access to domain name registration data. The PSWG took part in the Capacity Building Weekend, orienting new GAC members on the issues of WHOIS data and DNS Abuse. The PSWG also led a session to update the GAC on DNS Abuse that included: 1) references to recent studies showing rising rates of phishing and malware threats, and their impact on Internet users; 2) updates on various initiatives from the community to support the mitigation of DNS Abuse; 3) a follow-up presentation by a GAC Member highlighting the need for action to improve the specificity of standard contracts and also suggesting information sharing at a registrar level to allow for proactive measures to combat forms of malicious activity by registrants; and 4) looked at how potential contract changes may be used to incentivise or reduce the burden on Contracted Parties in carrying out DNS Abuse preventive and mitigation measures. The GAC PSWG indicated its intent to work with the various stakeholder groups to find common ground on measures to improve contracts.

The PSWG continued its active participation to support the GAC Small Group through participation in the Phase 1 Implementation Review Team, the GNSO Small Team discussing ICANN org's Operational Design Assessment of the SSAD recommendations, WHOIS Disclosure System design, and the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team. The PSWG emphasized the importance of accurate registration data to deter and investigate DNS Abuse. The PSWG participated in the update to the GAC on domain name registration data issues. With regard to ICANN org's proposed design of a WHOIS Disclosure System, the PSWG noted this could be a valuable addition that could lower overall risk through the use of a prototype to reduce the unknowns for specific technical and operational concerns, and ease the burden on users in accessing the right contact point. However, the PSWG also noted that this effort must inform and not replace a more comprehensive system for access to registration data.

The PSWG continued its outreach, holding discussions with a number of constituent groups within ICANN and public safety bodies. The PSWG co-chairs shared amongst PSWG members the WG's 2022-2023 Work Plan, which will be circulated to the GAC for its affirmation before ICANN76.

3.2. GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)

The GAC USRWG held a well-attended Capacity Building Weekend (CBW) on Saturday 17 and Sunday 18 September 2022, on a variety of topics aimed at giving GAC participants an opportunity to learn or increase their knowledge on the aspects of the GAC and its role in the ICANN multistakeholder model, its structure and operations. It was also a chance for GAC attendees to become acquainted with different community groups in order to facilitate future dialogue, and share experiences and best practices to enhance GAC internal collaboration on ICANN matters.

The CBW focused on the following main topics of interest to GAC participants:

1. Onboarding basics (e.g. describing the GAC, its operations and its place in the multistakeholder community);
2. Key GAC topics (e.g. Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, DNS Abuse and WHOIS); and

3. Overview of the DNS (e.g introduction to ccTLDs and gTLD Registries and Registrars' roles and responsibilities).

A post-workshop survey was conducted to determine the efficacy and efficiency of the Capacity Building Weekend and can be found in the [ICANN75 GAC CBW Report](#). Overall, the CBW received strong positive feedback.

As a result, it is envisaged that topics covered at a high-level during the CBW will be elaborated in the lead-up to ICANN76, and a more long-term framework will be developed in order to conduct future onboarding, capacity building and outreach sessions of the GAC at future ICANN Meetings.

4. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

4.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC met with the ICANN Board on 19 September to discuss the following agenda topics:

- Collaborative Actions to Achieve Strategic Priorities;
- GAC Advice;
- Global Internet Access and Connectivity;
- WHOIS Disclosure System/Proof of Concept Design Paper;
- DNS Abuse Mitigation, and
- Compliance enforcement.

A full transcript of the session is appended to the GAC ICANN75 Communiqué. These session minutes are intended to provide a high-level review of the session discussions and their context. In preparation for the joint meeting with the Board, the GAC had shared a total of five questions with the Board, and the Board shared one question for discussion.

The GAC Chair and ICANN Board Chair welcomed attendees to the joint meeting and offered brief opening remarks, noting the shared appreciation of the ongoing discussions between GAC and Board members. The GAC Chair then proceeded to review the GAC and Board questions for discussion.

1. ICANN Board question to the GAC

- **What collaborative actions should the Community, Board and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities?**

Manal Ismail, GAC Chair, reported on GAC discussions relative to the Board question which mainly focused on the three "Priority Work Areas" identified in the 4 June 2020 paper entitled "*Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model - Next Steps*":

- Prioritization of Work and Efficient Use of Resources
- Precision in Scoping the Work
- Consensus, Representation, and Inclusivity

GAC members recommended for the ICANN org to consider community input at key checkpoints throughout the year, creating regular reports identifying actions taken to achieve priorities. Furthermore, the GAC recalled its key role in understanding and advising the Board and community in the context of ICANN's

strategic goals related to geopolitical developments, welcoming engagement in such work with the ICANN Board. As part of the discussion relative to the Board question, a question for the Board emerged relative to the status/timeline of the strategic planning process and how the GAC can get more involved in such a planning process. Maarten Botterman, ICANN Board Chair, reported that the start of the next strategic planning cycle is occurring early next year and that the Board appreciates the GAC's eagerness to participate since it is essential to develop the plan in an inclusive manner.

2. *Handling of GAC Advice*

- **The GAC indicated its interest in receiving information about how GAC advice had been handled during the first round of new gTLDs**

Göran Marby, ICANN CEO, reported that shortly before the meeting, the GAC had been supplied with a summary paper describing ICANN Board and org actions in response to GAC advice from the 2012 new gTLD program. He hoped the summary document would provide more context on the existing policy development process (PDP), especially relative to the GAC's impact on the first portion of the new gTLD program. Becky Burr further underscored the importance of clarity within the Applicant Guidebook with respect to how GAC advice on the delegation of new gTLDs can best be formulated for the Board to address and act upon.

3. *Global Internet Access and Connectivity*

- **Specific Country/Regional Support Efforts:**
 - Regarding ICANN org support for Ukraine, GAC Members sought an update on ICANN's recent efforts
 - GAC Members also asked the Board for information about whether ICANN has offered similar support to other countries or regions in the past? Would such support be considered in the future for other circumstances?

Maarten Botterman reported that ICANN provided 1 million dollars to provide direct support to Ukraine, via an organization responsible for evaluating how such funds should be dispersed. The Board Chair noted that ICANN is not tasked with dispersing those funds directly, and in response to Ukraine's request for the purchase of satellite, has not considered investing in specific technologies directly at this stage.

Nigel Hickson, UK, noted support for ICANN's initiative. Ukraine underscored the importance of uninterrupted Internet access especially where Internet infrastructure is compromised. The Ukraine representative to the GAC encouraged Board members to take all necessary measures to ensure the remaining funds are utilized to ensure Internet access for the population of Ukraine. The ICANN CEO reaffirmed this is the first instance where ICANN has provided financial support for exceptional situations, noting the organization is evaluating its effectiveness, how to improve it moving forward - potentially considering whether such support can be further provided through an ICANN grant program.

- **Broader Community Systemic Issue:**
 - With an eye toward the broader aspiration of closing the "digital divide", GAC Members asked how can the GAC best approach the Board or ICANN org to examine issues like DNS market concentration (e.g. registrar demographics)?

The ICANN CEO noted that the answer to closing the digital divide is within the policy development process for Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs. He noted the importance of ICANN continuing to convey the notion

that the Internet is for everyone and every keyboard/script. He said further resources need to be allocated to inform the public of the importance of diversifying the Internet.

4. *WHOIS Disclosure System*

- **GAC Members sought the latest updates from the Board regarding the WHOIS Disclosure System/Proof of Concept design paper for the WHOIS disclosure system.**

Becky Burr noted the Board's understanding of the value of simplified submission requests for access to WHOIS data by individuals, and how such a process would positively impact registrars' processing of those requests due to completeness of information received. She further noted that the proof of concept paper is not intended to replace or override policy work conducted by the ICANN community via the GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP), but may provide information about usage which would help analyze and assess further work on the EPDP Phase 2. It was shared that the Board is currently looking for input from the GNSO Council on this item, including the opportunity to implement privacy/proxy accreditation.

5. *DNS Abuse Mitigation*

- **GAC Members asked, does the Board have any plans to facilitate and implement DNS Abuse mitigation (e.g. from malware, botnets, piracy)?**

Jim Galvin, ICANN Board Member, noted that the Board shares GAC concerns about DNS Abuse, and he shared the view that progress has been made in this topic area since 2013. He reported that ICANN contracted parties are currently collaborating to mitigate abuse with the Board's support on this and other forthcoming initiatives. GAC Members were advised that the Board will continue its ongoing discussions with the GNSO Council and its Small Team on DNS Abuse, while in parallel ICANN org will continue to research DNS Abuse and improve the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (**DAAR**) project.

6. *Compliance Enforcement*

- **How can the GAC help the Board and the wider Community undertake to improve the reporting, handling and enforcement of contract terms?**

Maarten Botterman underscored the importance of broader community feedback and suggestions for improvements in the area of contract compliance. Additionally, ICANN org and the ICANN Board will continue to develop and submit reports to the community, including the CEO report.

7. *Statement from Russian Federation*

Prior to the conclusion of the session, the GAC Russian Government delegation provided a statement regarding the upcoming ITU Secretary General election and the importance of continuing the mission of connecting people around the world and protecting "rights of communication".

8. *Session Close*

Maarten Botterman expressed the Board's thanks for the meeting and noted the Board's appreciation for the support and interest provided by the GAC relative to ICANN's strategic plan. Manal Ismail thanked Board members and attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

4.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)

The GAC met with members of the GNSO Council and followed up on its ICANN74 discussions. Regarding the **WHOIS Disclosure System**, the GNSO Council provided an update from the small team reviewing the SSAD Operational Design Assessment (ODA). GNSO Council members noted the small team has been preparing a response to the ICANN Board with a proposal to simplify the project into a ticketing system where members of the public could submit requests to registrars, and where said requests would be tracked, logged and for the registrar to handle. Such a system would be tasked with tracking the flow of requests to registrars, and their responses. ICANN org presented a progress report documenting a cost estimation that is cheaper to develop and run compared to the previous version, and the GNSO Council is gathering feedback on such a report. GNSO Council members noted this is a work in progress, and that next steps to be expected are not in the hands of the GNSO but a decision is in the ICANN Board's hands. The GNSO Council will provide input to the Board from the small team, but ultimately the Board will be the decision making body to decide whether the pilot goes ahead. The EPDP Phase 2 recommendations are currently in the Board's hands, but a potential transition between the pilot program and the SSAD is not expected before the WHOIS Disclosure System is expected to take effect after at least a year of its development and implementation. GAC members further noted that while the ticketing system is important, EPDP Phase 2 recommendations cover more ground, and would welcome the possibility of providing input to the progress report, for potential input to be taken into account during the piloting portion.

Relative to **Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs**, the GNSO Council liaison to the GAC provided an update pertaining to the Operational Design Phase (**ODP**), noting the Operational Design Assessment (ODA) is expected to be published in December. Regarding the upcoming facilitated dialogue on **Closed Generics**, the GNSO Council noted it is in the process of selecting its participants. Said selection is planned to occur imminently during ICANN75 since the broader team is scheduled to meet informally at ICANN75 (not to discuss substance). GNSO participants in the effort will be committed to finding a compromise solution between the two extremes. The GAC Chair noted the GAC's discussion of the importance of committing to finding a mutually acceptable way forward, and that the GAC has identified its participants for the dialogue. The GAC further looks forward to the discussion and has committed to briefing GAC membership throughout the dialogue to ensure ongoing guidance is provided during the dialogue without any delays.

On the upcoming **GNSO Guidance Process (GGP)**, GNSO Council members noted its review of the SubPro PDP WG Final Report and that the need for further policy work was identified. The GNSO Council decided to initiate a GGP on Applicant Support to take care of issues identified in the SubPro Final Report and a call for volunteers was submitted. The GAC is invited to take part in the process.

On **DNS Abuse** the GAC expressed its continued interest in this matter and asked for an update from the GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse. The co-chairs of the Small Team updated the GAC on recent activities, and its finalization of the Small Team report. The report from the Small Team is ready for GNSO Council consideration, and includes the note that policy decisions need to be attached to the mitigation of DNS Abuse, including the notion that other avenues may need to be explored to tackle DNS Abuse mitigation in a more effective manner. The Small Team reached out to the ICANN community, including the GAC, and based on input received suggested that DNS Abuse should have a life cycle. Such a cycle would start from phase 0, where DNS Abuse is yet to happen and can be preempted; moving to phase 1, which entails ensuring that the harmed parties know the steps required to report any abuse; phase 2 where the report is sent to the right party; phase 3, where the party takes action and, finally phase 4 where the report is submitted to ICANN's compliance team. The small team further recommends that additional outreach is needed, beyond ICANN and its communities, to governments, clients and national authorities for enhanced work on DNS

Abuse mitigation to occur. Finally, the small group outlined that contracted parties will need to review their contracts relating to DNS Abuse to improve their language in order to include that further action must be taken against DNS Abuse, since current language only states that reasonable action must occur. The next steps are for the Small Team to bring its report to the GNSO Council and draft a letter to contracted parties to initiate this recommendation for their consideration. The GAC reiterated that the committee will continue to closely monitor the results of the Small Team.

On **Accuracy of Registration Data**, the GNSO Council provided an update on the Accuracy Scoping Team efforts since ICANN74, noting that the Scoping Team is reviewing the types of audits and will begin consideration of the write up on recommendations for next steps shortly. A new chair for the Scoping Team will need to be appointed since the current chair stepped down. The GNSO Council liaison to the Scoping Team noted that it would be helpful for the GAC to further elaborate on its recommendation for the Scoping Team's use of commissioned studies, and provide specific recommendations on what commissioned studies it is referring to and whether this would extend to the use of third parties. The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would further elaborate and provide clarification to the Scoping Team.

4.3.Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

The GAC met with the ccNSO regarding updates on topics deemed of interest to the GAC.

The first topic related to the **ccNSO Policy development process (PDP) on Review Mechanisms**, aimed at reporting on and recommending a policy for a review mechanism with respect to decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs. The ccNSO reported on the key elements of the draft policy for review mechanism and the decisions covered by the country code review manager (ccRM), responsible for managing and implementing all aspects of the review process; with the objective to identify any significant issues in how the IANA Function Operator (IFO) followed its procedures or complied with the relevant policy making its decision, and ultimately to provide an avenue for a party affected by an action of the IFO.

Regarding the **ccNSO Domain Name System (DNS) Abuse Standing Committee (DASC)**, the ccNSO noted that country codes don't have a policy remit in this area, they don't create global standards and ccTLD domains are low on lists of reported abuse. Nevertheless, the ccNSO decided to form a standing committee that will act as a forum for discussion, information sharing and education. There are two subgroups, one will undertake a survey of all ccNSO members on what are the practices of the different country codes on issues they are working on in terms of policies, procedures, abuse measurement. The results and data will be used as an authoritative resource when it comes to communicating internally and externally outside of the cc community. The second subgroup will be dedicated to communication and resources. The ccNSO seeks to have a dedicated email list for DNS Abuse topics to create a repository of resources for registries and educate other stakeholders in the ICANN ecosystem.

The GAC noted that many countries or national laws will define DNS Abuse differently which will be interesting to see how it plays out in the survey prepared by the ccNSO.

Lastly, the ccNSO provided an update on the **ccPDP4 on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs)**, regarding the ccNSO IDN ccTLD string selection policy roadmap (from 2019 to 2022), principles and basic criteria selection for an IDN ccTLD string, de-selection of IDN ccTLDs, and the general applicability of ccTLD related policies. The ccNSO concluded the discussion noting that the adoption of IDN ccTLDs as compared to ccTLDs is quite low, nevertheless, the growth of IDN ccTLDs registered in the last couple of years reached more than 30%.

4.4.Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The GAC met with the ALAC regarding issues of common interest to governments and end-users.

Regarding the **Internet Fragmentation, the DNS and ICANN** ([ICANN75 Plenary](#) GAC proposal), the GAC topic lead presented the plenary session's agenda highlighting that there are various interpretations of Internet fragmentation and a lack of ability for people to access types of content because Internet fragmentation can happen at different levels. The plenary session will go over some of those different elements and where it occurs in the different levels as for instance, the potential for Internet fragmentation can be introduced inadvertently in a way governments, legislators or policymakers have not envisaged.

The ALAC topic lead added that At-Large strives to safeguard the interests of end-users and Internet fragmentation has a strong end-user component to it. The upcoming plenary session will be an attempt to contribute to the emergence of Internet fragmentation and to provide a space for an inclusive dialogue on the challenges it represents to the ICANN community and identify shared priorities. The ALAC highlighted that in the last decade, political tensions have impacted the Internet ecosystem and threatened its open and universal nature. The Internet is an extraordinary human achievement, and its fragmentation could be determinant not only for the technology but also for the democratic values.

The topic lead concluded that the open and universal Internet has shown remarkable resilience but wonders how long it can endure the ideological pressures and how the Internet fragmentation would impact the ICANN community and multistakeholder model.

On matters related to **Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs on Closed Generics** and the participation in the facilitated dialogue with the GNSO Council, the ALAC topics leads opened the discussion welcoming the opportunity to participate in the dialogue and highlighting the need to find a methodology to deal with the issue in a way that is appropriate and keeps in mind the interest of end-users. They noted that the GAC will need to elaborate and flesh out what public interest means from its Beijing Communique and ensure everyone understands what the concern is.

From the GAC side, the topic lead welcomed the thoughts shared by the ALAC, noting that the facilitated dialogue was still at an early stage and despite the different sensitivities, the GAC is looking forward to finding common solutions in the process. The GAC is considering the preparatory documentation prepared by ICANN org, which includes detailed information about past GAC positions, elaborated on the basis of the Beijing Communique, which continues to be the baseline for GAC positions.

With regard to **Local Cross-Community Cooperation**, the ALAC topic lead started the discussion noting that the multistakeholder approach starts at home. The cooperation between governments and At-Large Structures (ALSes) could take place at the national and regional Internet Governance Forums (IGFs), the upcoming International Telecommunication Union Plenipotentiary Conference (October 2022) but also through joint capacity building efforts. The GAC welcomed the suggestions made by the ALAC and looks forward to continuing having dialogues at the strategic, tactical and ground level. The GAC would like to see how checkpoints could be put in place to make sure both groups are working towards common strategic priorities.

5. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS

5.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session

During the final GAC session of the week, the GAC Chair led a discussion intended to Identify important ICANN75 Follow-Up Matters and key post-meeting dates for the committee.

Important post-meeting follow-up matters included:

- **Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs**
 - Operational Design Phase Continues
 - Closed Generics “Tria-logue”
 - Potential Future GAC Advice
 - GGP on Applicant Support
- **WHOIS and Data Protection** (incl. Accuracy)
 - WHOIS Disclosure System: short-term stakeholders engagement
 - GAC Comments
 - Registration Data Accuracy: Next Steps by GNSO Council
- **DNS Abuse Mitigation**
 - GNSO Council consideration of expected Small Team Report
 - PSWG engagement with stakeholder groups to identify common ground for contract improvements
 - SSAC Proposal for a Community Roadmap to be tracked
- **IGO Protections** List Change Process Update
- **Public Comment Opportunities:**
 - Pilot Holistic Review Draft Terms of Reference (20 October)
 - Proposed Amendments to the Base gTLD RA and RAA to Add RDAP Contract Obligations (24 October)
 - Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs (30 October)
 - Initial Report on the Second CSC Effectiveness Review (8 November)
 - Final Report from the EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs (upcoming)
- Identifying and pursuing **IDN and Universal Acceptance** matters
- GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group (**GOPE WG**) Review of Operating Principles
- Potential High Level Governmental Meeting Discussions (**HLGM**)

The GAC Chair adjourned the meeting, noting her desire to see everyone again at ICANN76 in Cancún, Mexico next March (2023).

#

Attachment 1 - ICANN75 Hybrid Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST

GAC Members (79)		
Argentina	Hong Kong, China	Paraguay
Armenia	Hungary	Portugal
Australia	India	Russian Federation
Azerbaijan	Indonesia	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Belgium	Islamic Republic of Iran	Senegal
Bermuda	Iraq	Serbia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Italy	Singapore
Botswana	Japan	Slovakia
Brazil	Kenya	Sweden
Brunei Darussalam	Korea, Republic of	Switzerland
Bulgaria	Latvia	São Tomé and Príncipe
Burundi	Lebanon	Sudan
Cambodia	Lithuania	Chinese Taipei
Canada	Luxembourg	Timor-Leste
Republic of Chad	Madagascar	Tokelau
China	Malaysia	Trinidad and Tobago
Congo, Democratic Republic of	Mali	Tunisia
Congo, Republic of	Mexico	Türkiye
Cook Islands	Morocco	Uganda
Côte d'Ivoire	Myanmar, Republic of the Union of	Ukraine
Croatia	Nepal	United Arab Emirates
Czech Republic	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Denmark	New Zealand	United States of America
Egypt	Nigeria	Uruguay
Eswatini	Niue	Zimbabwe
European Commission	Norway	

Germany	Oman	
---------	------	--

GAC Observers (7)	
Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization (CTO)	Organization of American States (OAS)
Council of Regional Organizations of the Pacific (CROP) ICT	Universal Postal Union
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
League of Arab States	

Attachment 2 - ICANN75 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
1	Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	GAC Support to schedule an intersessional GAC meeting to review GAC positions on closed generics in preparation for the GAC/GNSO Council dialogue.
2	Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs	GAC Members interested in matters pertaining to Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs are encouraged to reach out to GAC Support or GAC Topic Leads to join the GAC mailing list on this topic.