

MINUTES OF MEETING

ICANN80 Policy Forum, 10-13 June 2024

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP	2
1.1. Opening Plenary Session	3
2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	4
2.1. New gTLD Program Next Round	4
2.2. WHOIS and Data Protection Policy (incl. Accuracy)	5
2.3. DNS Abuse Mitigation	7
3. GAC Operational Matters	9
3.1. GAC Strategic Planning	9
4. GAC WORKING GROUPS	10
4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	10
4.2. GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)	10
5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	12
5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board	12
5.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)	18
5.3. Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	21
6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS	22
6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session	22
Attachment 1 - ICANN80 Hybrid Policy Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST	25
Attachment 2 - ICANN80 Action Points Compilation	27

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

90 GAC Members and 9 Observers attended the meeting.

GAC membership currently stands at 183 Member States and Territories, and 39 Observer Organizations. A list of ICANN80 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in [Attachment 1 - ICANN80 Hybrid Policy Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST](#).

The ICANN80 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website at: <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann80-kigali-communicue>.

Presentations used by speakers during the meeting and supporting briefings prepared for the GAC can be accessed from the GAC website at: <https://gac.icann.org/agendas/icann80-hybrid-meeting-agenda>.

Full transcripts for each meeting session are to be made available from the [ICANN80 Public Meeting website](#), via the relevant agenda items on the GAC's website agenda page listed above.

1.1. Opening Plenary Session

The GAC Chair, Nicolao Caballero, opened the GAC public meeting at ICANN80 by welcoming in-person and virtual attendees to the meeting. He acknowledged the spirit of the Rwandan people, briefly reflected on the significance of the High-Level Government Meeting (HLGM) held the previous day in Kigali and thanked the host Rwandan government for its planning and implementation of the meeting – specifically recognizing the dedicated effort of the Rwandan representative to the GAC and ICANN staff for their contributions to the program. He noted a number of significant geopolitical and DNS activities on the radar of GAC members at ICANN80 including, the next round of new gTLDs, the WSIS+20, the Coalition for Digital Africa and GAC priority issues including DNS abuse mitigation, WHOIS and data transparency, and the importance of balancing considerations of transparency and privacy.

Meeting attendees then observed one minute of silence to remember and honor the victims as well as the survivors of the 1994 genocide.

The Chair ceded the floor to Mr. Charles Gahungu, the Rwandan government representative to the GAC. He welcomed attendees to the GAC Meeting. He provided a brief overview of the HLGM that transpired the previous day and noted that ongoing attention to the HLGM issues from governments and ICANN would lead to more digital inclusion around the world and contribute to the expansion of meaningful Internet connectivity in Africa.

The GAC Chair then provided an overview of GAC meeting agenda highlights for the next four days and gave GAC Support staff the opportunity to provide an overview of the logistical aspect of the meeting for both in-person and remote attendees.

Subsequently, the committee conducted its traditional Tour de Table – giving all delegates (attending in person and virtually) the opportunity to identify themselves and their affiliations and to offer brief remarks on topics of their choosing. Upon the conclusion of the Tour de Table, the GAC Chair thanked everyone and adjourned the session.

2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

2.1. New gTLD Program Next Round

The GAC discussed recent developments pertaining to the new gTLD program next round, and specifically focused on timely items requiring GAC attention and input including the Applicant Support Program, specifically an update on the Applicant Support Program Handbook and a status update on the Implementation Review Team (IRT).

GAC Vice-Chair, Nigel Hickson, introduced the session by reviewing the new structure of the **GAC new gTLD program next round Topic Lead Team**. This structure was created to tackle various topics pertaining to new gTLDs and handle the volume of upcoming GAC input required in the various streams. As such, a call for volunteers was opened and the team is now composed of 7 GAC representatives, including the UK, Chinese Taipei, UPU, Colombia, Canada and the US. The GAC Topic Lead Team is not a deciding group, but helps coordinate GAC efforts on new gTLDs, prepare GAC sessions at ICANN meetings and coordinate any necessary drafting. GAC members interested in following new gTLDs more broadly continue to be encouraged to join the GAC new gTLD mailing list which allows members to follow new gTLD matters.

On **Applicant Support**, GAC topic leads reviewed the purpose of the Applicant Support Program (ASP) in allowing applicants from underserved regions to apply for new gTLDs. The GAC once again underscored the importance of targeting underserved regions, since these regions are less aware of ICANN's work and don't have the same amount of outreach as other areas of the world. The GAC has emphasized that outreach and promotion of the ASP needs to focus on underserved regions in the global context and according to GAC's definition of underserved regions, encouraging ICANN to reach out to areas where engagement isn't as strong through ICANN's programs. As such, the GAC sees the program as a chance for ICANN to be innovative and ambitious, showcasing its mission and global diversification of the new gTLD application program. GAC topic leads reviewed GAC advice issued at ICANN79, reiterating the GAC's request for consideration to substantially reducing or eliminating ongoing ICANN fees for applicants from underserved communities, and looks forward to a Board response on this matter. Additionally, GAC topic leads outlined GAC work undertaken since ICANN79 through the GAC's ASP Small Team encouraging interested GAC members to join this small team.

ICANN org presented an update on the ASP Funding Plan including a budget estimate and ASP budget assumptions, on the ASP Outreach and Engagement Plans, as a follow up to the pre-ICANN80 webinar on the ASP Handbook. This also included an engaging question and answer session. GAC members continued to underscore the importance of focusing on underserved regions, in particular due to finite resources being allocated to this program, whereas the current Outreach and Engagement Plan foresees ICANN engagement with the broader community. GAC members noted that for the ASP resources should be prioritized and dedicated to engagement with underserved regions, where the focus of the program stems from, and that on the ground engagement is key. GAC members raised concerns about the 45 maximum application number for the ASP program, and specifically on the notion of priority being given to applicants on a first come

first served basis, noting that underserved populations may struggle to apply as quickly as other regions and will be penalized for this. Finally, GAC members reiterated the importance of the ASP and that it is an opportunity to be innovative and ambitious and thanked ICANN staff for the work conducted to date for this important initiative since it's a key opportunity to demonstrate the strength of ICANN's mission.

On the **Implementation Review Team (IRT)**, the GAC representative on the IRT and ICANN org presented recent developments pertaining to this effort, and its three sub-tracks (Applicant Support Program, Registry Service Provider Evaluation and Registry System Testing). ICANN org reviewed the timeline for the path to the next and future rounds of new gTLDs, noting that the current date for the opening of the application window is anticipated as April 2026. An initial public comment proceeding was launched for the first part of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB), and the GAC representative on the IRT reviewed input submitted. GAC members were reminded that the entire AGB will go through a final round of Public Comment prior to the launch of the Next Round.

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 domain name registration data, informally known as WHOIS, in light of the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services (28 March 2007) which it was recalled reflect the importance of this data for numerous parties and various legitimate purposes.

Presenters provided an overview of the continuing multi-phase efforts undertaken to define a new registration data policy framework which would include requirements consistent with applicable data protection law, as well as a final access system to non-public registration data for lawful and legitimate purposes. Since May 2018 and the adoption of a Temporary Specification, the ICANN Community has been actively involved in policy work in several phases. All three phases of policy development work have concluded. Implementation of policy recommendations is ongoing for EPDP Phase 1 (policy foundations), and remains to be started for EPDP Phase 2A (differentiation between legal and natural persons). EPDP Phase 2 (registration data access system) has moved into a pilot phase with the launch of the Registration Data Request Services (RDRS), in light of concerns with the feasibility and costs of the originally proposed System for Standardized Access and Disclosure (SSAD). Consideration of future policy development regarding the accuracy of registration data (Accuracy Scoping effort) is still paused.

Regarding the issue of **Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data** in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation, it was recalled that the ICANN Board had approved policy recommendations as part of EPDP Phase 1, and that interested stakeholders could not agree, subsequently, as part of implementation of these recommendations, on an appropriate timeline for responses to such requests. The GAC has argued that responses in such circumstances should be as soon as possible and no later than 24 hours, while ICANN Contracted Parties have sought to be given up to 3-business days for such responses.

In light of this situation, the ICANN Board determined that it was necessary to revisit the relevant policy recommendation (EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 18). The ICANN79 Communiqué, the GAC advised the ICANN Board to act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on Urgent Requests. The ICANN Board subsequently decided to defer action on this advice and initiated a consultation with the GNSO Council to determine the next step in this unprecedented procedural situation. It was highlighted that the ICANN Board believes responding to such imminent threats should be done in minutes or hours rather than days, but that this requires the ability to authenticate self-identified emergency responders and that no cross-border system for such authentication exists.

The GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) was reported to be currently investigating existing tools and mechanisms among law enforcement organizations that could serve the needs of such authentication. In the meantime, it was proposed that such exploration of solutions for authentication of law enforcement requestors should not delay the reconsideration of the initial policy recommendation.

A GAC participant questioned the appropriateness of the speed at which this matter is being considered given the seriousness of the harm involved and wondered if there were ways to increase priority at the Board level and expedite resolution. Another GAC member sought to understand what process exists for handling Urgent Requests at the moment. It was clarified that no specific process is in place, that the RDRS was determined by the ICANN Board not to be appropriate for such requests given its constraints, and that the GAC PSWG is currently exploring potential avenues going forward.

Regarding the **Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)**, a co-chair of the GAC PSWG recalled that ICANN launched this pilot service as a free global one-stop-shop to request access to non-public gTLD registration data, and which is expected to change the current state of accessibility of this data in a context where contact information of parties responsible for registrations of most gTLD domain names is unavailable publicly (redacted for privacy). Two GAC representatives are currently involved in the work of the RDRS Stranding Committee tasked to review the usage data and identify opportunities for improvements of the service. Several findings from the data collected by the RDRS over its first 6 months were discussed during the session:

- 2/3 of requests initiated with the RDRS cannot be handled because either the relevant registrar is not participating, or the domain belongs to a ccTLD, suggesting strong demand for higher participation of gTLD registrars (88 registrars participate currently, representing 57% of the gTLD domain space) as well as inclusion of ccTLD domains in the RDRS.
- Of the requests that could be handled by the RDRS, 50% are not actually completed and submitted, possibly because of user friction in the user interface.
- Of all requests initiated within the RDRS, about 3% have been subject to approval (registration data disclosed to the requestors).

While interested stakeholders continue to seek to improve the RDRS and its usefulness for requestors, it was recalled that awareness of the RDRS among all its potential users should be, and could possibly be greatly increased by leveraging the current output of domain data lookup tools as the GAC recommended in its ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué. It was proposed that GNSO policy, as referenced in the ICANN Board's response to the GAC, would likely not deliver results in due time

and that Registries and Registrars could voluntarily effect such changes now, without requiring ICANN's permission.

A GAC Member recalled that until WHOIS records become accurate, the RDRS will not meet the needs of requestors, and therefore called onto ICANN and the GNSO to quickly conclude work on the accuracy of registration data.

Regarding **Privacy and Proxy Services** used in domain registration data, it was recalled that these should be distinguished from the redaction of actual contract information in registration data. This is because when such services are in use, registrars usually insert the contact information of their affiliated service in lieu of that of the actual registrant. Thus, when responding to requests for disclosure of registrant information (that of the underlying customer's data), most often, the response given is that this information is already public (in fact that of the Privacy/Proxy service). This was taken to illustrate the complexities with which to contend when seeking to create an effective system for access and disclosure of registration data.

It was recalled that the ICANN Board approved policy recommendations for the accreditation of Privacy/Proxy Service in 2015 and that a new Implementation Review Team (PPSAI IRT) has been assembled (following the suspension of the first IRT's work in in 2018) and was set to convene for the first time during ICANN80.

2.3. DNS Abuse Mitigation

The GAC held a session focused on trends and perspectives on DNS Abuse in Africa and to consider what impacts the new obligations for Contracted Parties to disrupt/mitigate DNS abuse in gTLDs may have in the region. Speakers from national regulatory agencies, cybersecurity authorities and ccTLD operators in the Africa region shared the view that, given the increasing reliance and dependency of emerging African economies on Internet infrastructure, and in light of the observed growth of the number of domains in the region, DNS Abuse will likely become a growing challenge and priority.

Speakers shared different examples of Abuse, in particular phishing cases involving the financial sector, and illustrated several challenges African stakeholders face in dealing with Abuse. Detecting and recognizing Abuse in order to put appropriate mitigation in place was identified as a challenge, both in capacity and awareness, and which is expected to grow with the increased sophistication brought about by new technologies, and Artificial Intelligence in particular. Efforts in several countries to raise awareness and build capacity among stakeholders involved in the operation or use of DNS infrastructure were referenced. Another challenge is getting instances of Abuse reported to enable relevant authorities and TLD operators to appropriately measure and inform on the scale of the threat, as well as to take measures to protect and control national assets. Rwanda's Cybersecurity Agency exemplifies the type of actions that are taken to coordinate national efforts and ensure that private and public institutions can be resilient in the face of cyber threats, including through establishing minimum cybersecurity standards in key sectors of governments and industry,

as well as legal frameworks for data protection and privacy, which are seen as key to ensuring personal privacy in a context of cybersecurity.

As far as the African TLD ecosystem is concerned, it was noted that it is currently in an early growth stage in light of its limited share of domains: there are 4 million domain names registered across all African TLDs, compared to over 350 million across all TLDs worldwide. The African Top Level Domains Organization (AfTLD) indicated that the current focus in the African TLD ecosystem is ensuring that the recent trends of automation of domain registration (now 90% of African ccTLDs) and increased operation of those TLDs from within the African continent (now 85% of ccTLDs) are sustained. This is expected to support greater control over the prevention and mitigation of DNS Abuse, as ccTLD operators and relevant national authorities realize the importance of their stewardship in managing their ccTLD for the benefit of their country, in a manner that does not adversely affect the global Internet ecosystem. The legal action taken against Freenom, who used to serve as the Registry operators for several African ccTLD was discussed to illustrate this potential.

All African ccTLD operators consulted in an AfTLD desk survey recognize that DNS Abuse is a major concern, and report increasing exposure to it (75% of respondents) mostly in the form of spam, phishing, and botnets, to a lesser extent. Taking into account the trickle effects of ICANN's requirements for accredited TLD registrars on the African registrar ecosystem, in terms of elevating the standards of operations, AfTLD expects that the recent DNS Abuse contract amendments for gTLD registries and registrars will likely have a positive impact on the mitigation of DNS Abuse in the region.

There remains challenges to tackle, however, such as the uptake of ICANN accreditation among African registrars, and the building of awareness and mitigation capacities commensurate with the growing importance of digital infrastructure and ecosystems in Africa. Panelists unanimously urged collaboration among national and regional stakeholders, including ccTLD operators, to address these challenges.

GAC Topic Leads on DNS Abuse reminded the GAC of the continued attention that should be given to addressing the threat of DNS Abuse, particularly in light of the upcoming round of New gTLDs. As it relates to ICANN's new contractual amendments, it was recalled that the GAC suggested more work should be done in the area through proactive monitoring and enhanced transparency of reporting of DNS Abuse, policy development to provide clarity on key terms of the amendments, and the need to address DNS Abuse inside and outside of ICANN.

It is expected that the GAC will resume discussion on these matters at the next ICANN meeting in Istanbul.

3. GAC Operational Matters

3.1. GAC Strategic Planning

Building on a process initiated in December 2023 by the GAC Chair and Vice-Chairs, considering the GAC plenary discussion during ICANN79 in San Juan, and several consultations of the GAC Membership intersessionally, the GAC considered the endorsement of its 4-year GAC Strategic Plan (2024-2028) and the corresponding 2024/2025 GAC Annual Plan.

The ICANN80 Plenary Session focussed on reviewing the GAC Annual Plan for the 2024/2025 time frame following the circulation of a draft to the GAC on 17 May for review until 29 May. Subsequently, GAC Members input was discussed in a conference call scheduled prior to ICANN80 on Thursday, 30 May at 13:00 UTC, consistent with a timeline discussed with the GAC since ICANN79.

GAC Vice-Chairs and GAC Topic Leads presented the Expected Outcomes in 2024/2025 in the 9 strategic areas included in the GAC Strategic Plan. GAC Members expressed support for the proposed Annual Plan and expressed gratitude for its development. Several GAC Members offered suggestions going forward including considering tracking the implementation of the Annual Plan with a scorecard, and inviting governments to consider their own action plans as it relates to matters of importance to governments at ICANN.

Regarding Strategic Objective #7 “Impact of New Technology on Internet Unique Identifier Systems”, and specifically as it relates to Artificial Intelligence (AI), a GAC Member expressed support for the GAC to discuss the use and impact of AI with a focus on the remit of ICANN, and that the GAC should first assess whether, and if so, to what extent AI has implications for governance of the Internet's unique identifier systems. Another GAC member proposed that ICANN's Office of the Chief Technology Officer (CTO) provide its expertise to the GAC on technology matters.

GAC Members discussed refinements of some of the expected outcome under Strategic Objective #7 Internet Governance and Strategic Objective #8 Internet Number Resources for completeness and clarity.

The GAC concluded the session in agreement to move to endorse both the GAC Annual Plan 2024-2028 and the GAC Annual Plan 2024/2025 in the Kigali Communiqué. Several participants expressed their appreciation for the collective work achieved among GAC Leaders, GAC Topic Leads, GAC Members and GAC Support Staff to deliver the first ever GAC strategic planning documents.

4. GAC WORKING GROUPS

4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)

The GAC PSWG continued its work to advocate for improved measures to combat DNS Abuse and promote lawful, effective access to domain name registration data.

The PSWG participated in a session to brief the GAC on WHOIS and Data Protection Policy developments that included the topics of:

Ongoing discussions pertaining to “Urgent Request” scenarios for the request of registration data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation;

A review of usage data generated by the first 6 months of the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), the PSWG’s ongoing work in the GNSO Standing Committee assigned to review such data, and suggestions for raising awareness of RDRS via use of existing WHOIS/RDAP systems; and
The relevance of the newly restarted Privacy/Proxy Accreditation Implementation Review Team with respect to the RDRS and successor systems.

Regarding DNS Abuse, the PSWG appreciated the perspectives provided by leaders from Africa during a panel convened by the GAC Topic Leads on DNS Abuse, which highlighted regional experiences in the shared global fight against technical abuse categories such as phishing, botnets, and spam.

Finally, in bilateral outreach the PSWG met with multiple stakeholder groups within the ICANN community, holding discussions on topics of shared interest in the week prior to ICANN80.

4.2. GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)

The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) held a Capacity Development and an African Engagement session on 11 June 2024. Being the first ICANN meeting in Africa in five years, this was an opportunity for session leads to tailor an agenda according to the needs of GAC members from the region.

The first session discussed the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority’s (IANA) role in the delegation and transfer of ccTLDs. Kim Davies (IANA/PTI) provided background on how country code top level domains (ccTLDs) are managed, the role of the managers within their communities and the relation with ICANN Org and IANA/PTI. Additionally, Kim provided information on the evaluation criteria for ccTLDs managers (string eligibility, incumbent consent, public interest, local presence, stability, operational competency), on the different forms of assessment for delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs, and finally on the evaluation and transfer processes.

The second session, the GAC Africa engagement, members had the opportunity to learn more about efforts within the region from Smart Africa and the Coalition for Digital Africa, who reported on their activities and Internet Governance projects in Africa.

The Coalition for Digital Africa presented on the areas of focus and key achievements, particularly reporting on the publication of the [2023 African Domain Name Industry study](#) commissioned by ICANN, with the objectives of highlighting the strengths and opportunities for Africa's DNS industry and establishing a Trial Observatory for ongoing monitoring of its status and growth.

Smart Africa reported on Internet Governance projects with the objectives of establishing a robust and inclusive framework for Internet governance in Africa, fostering collaboration among regional organizations, governments, and civil societies to address challenges and promote equitable representation and sustainable development in the digital era.

In light of the high engagement demonstrated by members, the USRWG will continue exploring new modalities to enhance capacity development initiatives through webinars and workshops, intersessionally and during ICANN meetings.

5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC Chair welcomed members of the ICANN Board to the session and noted that an array of important topics had been identified for the meeting discussion. The Board Chair thanked the GAC Chair and noted that the Board enjoys the exchanges that it regularly conducts with the GAC.

The GAC Chair identified the first agenda topic – **GNSO Statements of Interest** - and asked the Board if it could share the current state of thinking within the Board on transparency rules applicable to statements of interest (SOIs) (including the idea previously noted for a potential ICANN ethics code) throughout the multistakeholder community. Board members reflected that this is an important (and shared interest) topic for the Board and that the GAC’s continued interest and vigilance on the topic is appreciated. It was shared that the Board has asked ICANN org to draft an ethics policy that could be reviewed by the Board and brought to the community for discussion. GAC members welcomed this development and reiterated that transparency is fundamental to good governance – in addition to being enshrined in the ICANN Bylaws. When asked whether the Board had given ICANN org any parameters in developing a draft ethics policy, it was indicated that the Board and GAC are “on the same page” with respect to the expectation that it is important to know who is talking and whose views are being represented.

Next, the GAC Chair asked the Board if it could provide an update on its work regarding the consideration of the committee’s **ICANN77 advice on the resolution of contention sets**. GAC attendees were advised that the Board greatly appreciates the GAC's interest in this topic. Reference was made to the 3 June 2024 blog post by the Board Chair which addressed this matter.

It was acknowledged that the Board has received advice from both the GAC and the ALAC that ICANN should ban or disincentivize private auctions or other private means of resolution of contention sets. It was noted that the SubPro PDP suggests that joint ventures should be allowed as a means of resolving contention sets. Consequently, the Board is trying to balance these two views. It was shared that while the Board agrees that auctions should be disincentivized, even the joint venture approach may involve a transfer of funds or other items of value. Consequently, it was shared that the Board has engaged a consulting firm to advise on how the Board could identify possible ways/solutions for achieving as many of these competing options as possible. It was noted that a report from the consultants is linked in the 3 June blog post.

With respect to the GAC’s advice about “drawing lots” as a potential solution regarding the resolution of contending applications between commercial and noncommercial applicants, attendees were informed that the Board has been told that drawing lots would most likely be prohibited under U.S. law. Moreover, the Board sees difficulty in distinguishing between commercial and noncommercial applicants. Attendees were informed that the Board’s current thought is that it will probably not attempt to make those distinctions while still working to disincentivize private. It was noted that the Board continued to discuss this issue as recently as the Board workshop held a

few days just before the ICANN80 meeting and that a further report of those discussions would be shared in the coming weeks.

GAC members expressed their support to hear that the Board is actively discussing the ICANN77 advice and shared that they were looking forward to further reports of the Board workshop discussions. It was noted that the GAC will be having discussions with the GNSO and ALAC on this issue later in the week. It was noted that the GAC and ALAC are particularly concerned about how the 2012 round was conducted where the majority of contention sets were resolved through private auctions rather than going through ICANN as the auction of last resort.

Members noted that the linked consultant report was excellent and that the 3 June blog post offered a very fair summary of that paper. It was indicated that the GAC will want to look further at how to resolve this issue in a timely manner given the “IRT” process. It was noted that forming joint ventures as a requirement might be somewhat problematic and might result in the same sort of private negotiation found in the private auction scenario.

Board members were asked whether they have analyzed ways to reconcile the more colloquial definition that the GAC used in its advice on treating commercial and noncommercial applicants and to consider it not so much as a binary problem but in a more nuanced manner. It was noted that GAC wants to avoid the 2012 round results where the auction system favored applicants with large resources over other applicants whose applications might be as worthwhile but were not as heavily resourced as the commercial or the more commercial applications. Additionally, GAC members asked how a mutually acceptable solution could be reached if it seems the Board is not inclined to follow the GAC advice.

Board members agreed that the difficult question is not so much how to identify commercial from non-commercial applicants (that is a relatively clear legal distinction that can be made from filed legal forms). The challenge will be determining which is the more “beneficial application” and that is not as simple a concept as stating that a non-commercial applicant is always more beneficial. It was noted that there could be many types of commercial applications that would be very important to a particular community, and which could, perhaps, be more important than a non-commercial application. Board members emphasized that before any final Board decision can be made, the ICANN Bylaws require the initiation of a consultation with the GAC. Board members noted that they have an obligation to attempt to find a mutually acceptable solution with the GAC, and that if such a solution cannot be found, then Board rejection of the advice would need to be done by a super-majority vote.

The GAC chair raised the third agenda topic and asked the Board to provide an update on the latest developments and discussions about **public interest commitments and registry voluntary commitments (PICs and RVCs) in gTLDs**. Board Members expressed appreciation to the GAC for their prior contributions on this issue both intersessionally and during the community plenary session at ICANN79. It was reported that the Board has decided (during its pre-ICANN80 workshop) that it not accept into the contracts for new registry agreements any commitments that involve the restriction of content. In particular, from an ICANN perspective, it was the legal conclusion that the

ICANN Bylaws would likely not be permitted under law to enforce content restrictions. It was clarified that such an approach does not preclude registries from making commitments and creating outside processes to enforce those commitments, in that that registries or ICANN could possibly identify a third party that would evaluate certain conduct and make a determination as to whether the conduct was consistent or not consistent with a commitment that was made regarding content. It was explained that relevant U.S. legal case law precedents and legal analysis shared with the Board has led the Board to conclude that the organization would very likely not be permitted to enforce those commitments, and the seriousness consequence of having even one Independent Review Panel decision where a content related restriction was struck down can't be overstated as it could lead to a situation where all of the voluntary commitments related to content could be invalidated. Consequently, all of the previous commitments that have been made to the GAC could be invalidated and the Board does not want that to happen. Attendees were advised that the Board would not be able to share its legal advice but that the soon to be released Board resolution and materials would describe the analysis shared during this session.

During discussion of a variety of follow-up questions from GAC members a number of matters were clarified. It was clarified that some non-content registry operational mechanisms could be enforced by ICANN (e.g., limiting licensing of certain domains to certain registration categories, like banking). Additionally, it was explained that ICANN could enforce orders of courts under the jurisdiction of certain local/national laws. But it was reemphasized by Board members that these examples would not apply to any form of content regulation.

It was also clarified that the Board's current views would not impact any existing contracts based on public interest commitments and would also not affect the mandatory public interest commitments which "will go forward as well". The view could impact the way future applications are considered because if the GAC provided well founded recommendations that an application not proceed (unless certain mitigation steps were taken), and ICANN was unable to ensure that it could enforce those mitigation steps, then there would a question of whether the applicant could find some external enforcement mechanism that satisfied the GAC's concerns. Board Members emphasized that they take very seriously the obligation to enforce registry voluntary commitments that appear in ICANN contracts and they simply will not accept them if ICANN cannot enforce them. GAC Members agreed that further clarity for applicants on what constitutes content regulation, as well as the potential for alternative solutions to RVCs, was important to be shared in the Applicant Guidebook and/or a future Board resolution.

When asked, Board members provided some assurances that ICANN will be very clear about what kinds of Registry Voluntary Commitments will be accepted and not accepted and that applicants will be provided clarity on the matter and so that governments will understand the limits of ICANN's ability to mitigate GAC concerns about certain applications through contractual provisions. Such clarity may allow applicants to be creative about finding alternative mitigation methodologies or tools that they might be able to use to address GAC concerns about an application.

On a matter related to content, Board Members were asked if they are we satisfied that ICANN has adequate policies in place to deal with the preventing the misuse of domain names in the spread of

Child Sexual Abuse Materials (CSAM) and if not is there anything we can do to establish a policy to prevent the abuse of domain names in that regard? Board members indicated that it will be difficult for ICANN to ever be in a position to say it has adequate policies on CSAM as the issue presents “an endlessly changing challenge”, particularly with the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and AI CSAM at the global level.

Later in the joint session, the Board noted that there is some interesting and innovative work taking place within the contracted party community to really support global attention to CSAM, and to containing CSAM. For example, the Public Interest Registry (PIR) has partnered with the Internet Watch Foundation to sponsor free memberships for all registries and registrars to get domain hopping lists to identify lists of second level domains that hop from one top level to another with CSAM material. The subscription provides alerts about the presence of CSAM.

GAC Members also noted that in the previous round it took substantial time for some objections to applications to be finally resolved - in one case as long as five years. Board Members noted that lessons-learned from the previous round and more recent efforts to explore streamlining of the IRP process may help reduce some of those processing times. It was noted that previous IRP precedents will likely reduce these time frames in the next round. Additionally, it was noted that the Applicant Guidebook for the next round of applications will very much be a product of lessons learned in the last round and the hope is that there will be far fewer disputes and that an applicant for a contentious name will know going into the application process what the issues are, what the objections might be, where they are likely to succeed or not succeed in challenges.

The GAC Chair then turned to the fourth topic area noting that the Board previously advised the GAC that it was looking forward to analysis and feedback from the **Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) regarding the findings and recommendations presented within the name collision analysis project NCAP study two** and the proposed name collision risk assessment framework. Now that the SSAC's analysis has been published, the GAC Chair asked Board Members to share some initial reactions on whether the report met Board expectations.

Attendees were advised that the Board has only just received the SSAC recommendations and it is too soon to say anything particular about the analysis. It was noted that the first SSAC recommendation was to fully support the final report from the discussion group. The Board will be considering a review of the SSAC analysis before it shares any substantive reactions.

Moving on to topic five, the GAC Chair asked what steps are being taken by the Board to ensure the **security and resiliency of the DNS system** against emerging threats such as large scale cyber attacks, distributed denial of service DDOS and other threats.

Board members shared that DNS resiliency and security is a critical problem space being actively worked on by many organizations including ICANN, the IETF, law enforcement organizations and certification organizations. ICANN has strong ties to those organizations and works closely with them. It is a large and very important topic with many components that are reinforced by ICANN's

core mission and mandate to ensure the stable and secure operations of the Internet's unique identifier system - including the DNS.

It was explained that the IETF is responsible for the DNS protocol itself and that both organizations work closely together and there are multiple liaisons between the IETF and ICANN to ensure communication continues about all important developments. It was observed that three members of the current ICANN Board are long time participants in the IETF.

Attendees learned that DNSSEC has been widely deployed within ICANN's purview to ensure that DNS data is not tampered with and that ICANN is working to ensure that the DNSSEC protection mechanisms are updated over time. Within the IETF, the DNS protocol is constantly being updated to reflect new best practices and to ensure the DNS itself is resilient.

Board Members observed that ICANN has close relationships with many law enforcement agencies to deal with legal investigations and noted that the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) has been deployed to help mitigate the communication complexity associated with investigations of illegal activity.

It was noted that the DNS root is potentially the most resilient provisioned DNS service on the planet with 1800 instances deployed and no global failures since its inception. As an example, the recently published update to the protocol allows resolvers to use data longer than intended when the needed authoritative server is not reachable making the system more resilient. Board Members reported that ICANN staff have been actively engaged in this and other efforts as well.

In answering several questions from GAC Members, the Board clarified that DNSSEC adoption at the root and TLD level was actually very high with over 20 million signed domains – much used to secure e-mail. ICANN has undertaken publicity efforts as well as research projects to try and promote the further deployment of DNSSEC. It was noted that further uptake of the technology requires the industry at large to help but it is not in ICANN's purview to enforce that.

It was noted that the protocol itself needs to be carefully updated to handle quantum cryptography which requires a lot more data with the size of the keys. That is currently being studied within the ITP protocol, which is outside the purview of ICANN directly, but that ICANN's Office of the Chief technology Officer (OCTO) has the topic on its list of matters to study.

Attendees also learned that ICANN's OCTO has produced a paper describing name collision issues with alternate name spaces. It was noted that there have been several public announcements from companies that are taking advantage of some of these alternate technologies.

The GAC Chair then asked Board Members how ICANN could **address the potential economic impacts of new DNS technologies, such as Blockchain and alternative root systems** - from the point of view of the Board?

Board Members explained that from a technology perspective the Board and ICANN org are aware of developments in these areas and are making efforts to track them. It was noted that the current draft of ICANN's strategic plan for the next 5 years (to be discussed by the community later in the week) explicitly calls for the organization to pay attention to and be concerned about new technologies - tracking them, identifying them, and considering their impacts on the DNS.

Reference was made to ICP-3 (Internet Coordination Policy) that is posted on the ICANN web site. It was pointed out that ICP-3 is a policy that is often forgotten but it is an underpinning document for ICANN and its public interest mission and commitment to a single authoritative root. Consequently, it was explained, it is important to acknowledge and identify alternate technologies and the Board certainly takes that seriously. It was noted that ICP-3 is more than 20 years old, and so the Board is considering the appropriateness of potentially reviewing and updating that document - especially as alternate technologies become more prevalent, visible and available.

From an economic point of view, it was explained that the Board sees both risks and opportunities in the availability of new technologies. It really is too soon to tell whether these new technologies will present any significant economic impacts to the organization or whether the community needs to be directly concerned about them, but the Board is carefully paying attention to them as a regular part of its funding forecast process.

It was explained that new DNS technologies and also BlockChain domain names are creating new investment opportunities for people who are investing currently in the DNS market. Combined with slower growth in the DNS market, those developments are part of the Board's strategic and practical agenda but also on the Board's practical agenda because of potential impacts on funding.

Board Members explained that Internet users still need to be able to communicate using domain names that can be used anywhere around the world, and one of the issues with an alternate name space is that it's not globally unique any more if there are different system that is need to be consulted. It was explained that this is one of the reasons that both of the IETF and ICANN have published statements about the necessity for a globally unique single name space root. It was noted that there are many people in the industry actively discussing how conflicts can be avoided between multiple name spaces. Alternate name space technologies can fundamentally create user confusion especially if they use names that look like domain names but they are used differently in their system. To the extent that these other technologies become more common these "name collisions" will become an increasing problem.

It was noted that a fundamental tenet of the Internet is that people are expected to experiment and try new things, so it is important, generally, for the organization to identify new technologies, track them, pay attention to them, consider them. For right now, the GAC was told, that is the best that can be done.

Time for the session was running out and it was noted that further discussions of Applicant Support, the RDRS and balancing of stakeholder interests would need to be reserved for another conversation at a following meeting. Attendees agreed to spend a few extra minutes on the

concerns of governments regarding plans for the **Applicant Support Program** to be associated with the Next Round of new gTLDs. Board members shared that the Board has taken recent action and information will be shared very soon. It was indicated that the Board would accept the policy recommendations regarding applicant support and has approved a framework for the approach to applicant support that could also include the amount of funding both funding via application fees and funding from ICANN resources separately.

The GAC Chair thanked all attendees for their participation and closed the session.

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

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest. The main agenda focused on the High Level Government Meeting (HLGM), New gTLD Program Next Round, GNSO Statements of Interest and Transparency, WHOIS and Data Protection and Urgent Requests and Latin Script Diacritics.

Pertaining to the **High Level Government Meeting**, GAC Vice Chairs provided a review of the sessions held as part of the HLGM, noting a report would be published following the meeting with comprehensive information/details on the meeting and results.

GNSO Council members reviewed the matter of **GNSO Statements of Interest (SOIs)** noting that within the GNSO there is a divergence of opinions on this topic and that the ICANN board discussed a potential ethic's policy to address this. The GNSO Council hasn't yet discussed this but is keen to understand the Board's perspective and looks forward to the Board's input. GAC members noted that following GAC discussions with the Board it is the GAC's understanding that the Board is now planning to develop an ethic's code, and the GAC welcomes this process, while wondering how this would translate into practical rules or practical frameworks applicable to all discussions which take part in the ICANN community.

On the **New gTLD Program Next Round**, the GAC and GNSO discussed mutual areas of interest. The GNSO Council provided an update on the **Singular/Plural Issue** noting that the GNSO Council Small Team Plus is actively discussing this topic and reviewing the strawman. The Small Team Plus is reviewing what elements should be included in the strawman as review mechanism which would allow singulars and plurals to proceed in the event there was some contextual information that would indicate the likelihood of non-confidence fusion. GNSO Council members noted that the Small Team Plus is not tasked with restricting content, but is focusing on context as mandated by the ICANN Board and aiming to resolve this issue as soon as possible and submit a recommendation to the GNSO Council.

On the **Implementation Review Team**, GAC members noted their keenness to continue engaging actively in the IRT and asked the GNSO Council its views on the proposed \$92,000 Registry Service Provider (RSP) fee and how it could affect new entrants' ability to participate in the next application round for new gTLDs. GNSO Council members responded that the nature of the IRT is somewhat

challenging since once the GNSO Council has developed policy, adopted it and submitted it to the Board it then moves to being an ICANN staff responsibility to implement policy recommendations. As such, the GNSO Council has two liaisons to the IRT, to make sure the IRT runs smoothly and that there is no misalignment between what is being proposed in the implementation and what was noted in the recommendations. In regards to the question on the RSP fee, the GNSO Council is not aware of misalignment between the implementation and the intent of the recommendations, at least not currently. As far as the GNSO Council is aware this RSP fee is not a final fixed decision, but a proposal coming out of the IRT. The GNSO Council doesn't have a position on this matter since it hasn't been brought back to the Council as a concern where there is misalignment between the policy and the manner in which it is being implemented. GAC members and GNSO Council members discussed that this is an ongoing issue and that concerns were raised at the level of the fee particularly regarding the impact on those from underserved regions.

On **Resolution of Contention Sets**, the GAC noted its interest in hearing the GNSO Council's views on alternative systems to resolve contention sets (different to auctions) between commercial and non-commercial applications, as well as the possibility of effectively ruling out the use of "private auctions". GNSO Council members noted that the issue of private auctions was a hot topic during the SubPro PDP WG due to significant diverging views on the matter, which ultimately resulted in a lack of consensus within the PDP WG. As a result these recommendations were not adopted by the GNSO Council and weren't passed to the Board for consideration. The GNSO Council hasn't discussed this topic since and doesn't have a specific view on the matter, but understands that the Board is looking into this item. The GNSO Council is also awaiting further information from the ICANN Board and if there is an opportunity to provide input. GAC members noted that this is a matter which goes beyond the GAC, Board and GNSO Council but is a community issue which the community needs to address to find the best solution, as such the GAC would appreciate GNSO view - not necessarily GNSO Council ones, but views from the community to see how this could be resolved. GNSO Council members noted there isn't a position on this but they would take this back to discuss with the Council.

On **Public Interest Commitments/Registry Voluntary Commitments (PICs/RVCs)** the GAC noted this was an item to discuss as a fall back item based on discussions between the GAC and the Board, recalling that the Board is looking into this item to see how consistent they are with the ICANN Bylaws and whether the Bylaws should potentially be changed. GAC members updated the GNSO Council on the most recent GAC discussion with the Board on this item, noting that the GAC's understanding is that the Board is parting from the position of restricting or regulating content, which aligns with the Bylaws, while recognizing that there are pending questions to address. GAC members flagged that they would like to know what this would mean in practice, how predictability can be created both with the applicants and with the GAC to understand when an RVC is considered to restrict or regulate content. GAC members asked if the GNSO Council had any specific reactions to the direction the Board is taking and whether the Council agrees that some parameters or criteria would be needed for predictability purposes within the community. GNSO Council members responded that the Council hasn't looked at the most recent feedback from the Board yet but is aware of it and will consider how this may affect its work on new gTLD matters. Additionally, GNSO

Council members noted this topic may affect the underlying work of the Small Team Plus and that the Council looks forward to providing input when possible.

The GAC and GNSO Council moved to the next topic on the agenda and discussed **Latin Script Diacritics**, where the GNSO Council noted it is exploring approaches to develop a solution to allow for an ASCII and a Latin Diacritic version of a gTLD to be delegated and operated by the same registry operator. Initially the Council had looked into a possible solution leveraging one of the non-adopted SubPro recommendations to see if there was a potential solution there. However, GNSO Councilors noted some procedural problems with that approach so the GNSO Council voted in its May meeting to request a preliminary issue report on the subject to outline what the issues are, and to identify an approach to move forward. The Issue Report should be delivered by the end of June or possibly the beginning of July, followed by a 40 day public comment period.

On **WHOIS and Data Protection** the GAC and GNSO addressed multiple issues including Urgent Requests and Domain Registration Data Accuracy. On **Urgent Requests**, the GNSO noted it received a letter from the Board on 3 June 2024 which hasn't yet been discussed by the Council. In this letter, the Board highlighted concerns with this recommendation, firstly on the timeline to respond to urgent requests noting that data measured in business days did not seem fit for purpose. On the other hand, the Board noted that any requests would need to be authenticated to protect the data involved. At this time there is no method for authenticating law enforcement or emergency responders globally, and such authentication could take time. The GNSO Council is expected to review this letter, assess whether the Council agrees with the Board's concerns and determine the best course of action. GAC members including the European Commission and USA noted that they urge the GNSO Council to seek solutions as quickly as possible, while reiterating that the previously identified timeframe for responses to Urgent Requests is completely unacceptable for that category of circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation. On **Domain Registration Data Accuracy**, the GNSO Council provided some background information on the Accuracy Scoping Team formed within the GNSO, to assess what issues and possible policy work could be done on this topic. The scoping team had noted an issue that there wasn't enough registration data to use to assess the issue, as such the work was paused while a Data Protection Specification was negotiated between ICANN and the Contracted Parties. The specification is not complete yet, but GNSO Council members believe it is close. GNSO Council members noted they would provide further updates to the GAC on this matter at ICANN81.

Finally, the GNSO Council provided the GAC an update on **DNS Abuse Mitigation**, notably on the Contracted Party Summit held in April in Paris. An output document was shared with the GAC Chair on the work which was conducted as part of the summit, and noted that that kind of output documents is what the contracted parties are committed to working on, including continuing registration related efforts, continuing work at combating DNS Abuse, and providing an update on DNS Abuse reporting framework that will provide historical trends and insights and more data that can be used proactively. GNSO Council members noted that it has been 2 months since the new contractual amendments related to DNS Abuse have been in force, and the Council is considering when to assess what the next step on DNS Abuse mitigation should be. GNSO Council members thanked GAC members for taking part in the CPH Summit.

5.3 Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest. The agenda focused on the topics of New gTLDs contention resolution and the New gTLDs Applicant Support Program (ASP).

The ALAC introduced the topic of New gTLDs contention resolution noting the priority for both advisory committees to change the perception and emphasize on underserved communities, organizations and nonprofits. It noted that auctions should take place as part of the application process and the need to put a ban on private resolution.

Both committees provided input on the National Economic Research Associates (NERA) study commissioned by ICANN on addressing monetary means of private resolution, and how to disincentivize private auctions through various methods without totally banning them, such as joint ventures, which could be beneficial for a commercial and non-commercial applicant, whereas, in the case of two commercial applicants, would probably lead to a private resolution.

In light of the ICANN Board's recent resolution on the matter, announcing their "intent" to not follow the GAC advice on the question of commercial versus non-commercial applications, could leave an opportunity to the ALAC, GAC and other interested parties to continue discussions.

Both committees agreed to leverage their discussions, as a number of outstanding issues need to be resolved before the next round, and potentially develop joint advice.

On the Applicant Support Program (ASP), the ALAC noted the ASP and New gTLD Program are intrinsically linked, thus outreach and engagement have to be done for both. ALAC presented the aim for regional collaboration between regional At-Large Organizations and the Global Stakeholder Engagement team to build capacity and develop tailored material, particularly for underserved regions.

The GAC reiterated that this matter remains a key topic of interest, on ensuring that the applicant support program focuses on facilitating global diversification of the new gTLD application program. Particular points were discussed on whether applications should be handled differently than normal applications in terms of contention, on the importance of the evaluation of application, in the context of the applicant support program, would need to be based on merit and not on a first come first served basis; and lastly, on the need to strongly reduce application fees (85 to 75% reduction). Both committees agreed to continue collaborating and track progress until ICANN81.

6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS

6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session

The GAC Support staff summarized a number of follow-up committee action items resulting from ICANN79 meeting discussions, including the following identified topics: The GAC 2024 Leadership election cycle; ICANN80 follow-up work; key post-ICANN80 dates and lessons learned from the current gathering in Kigali, Rwanda.

Staff reported that the nomination period for the GAC 2024 leadership election will commence at the end of ICANN80. Staff will transmit an email announcing the opportunity for all GAC Members and Observers to nominate candidates for the GAC Chair and Vice Chair roles. A web page on the GAC web site has been created that identifies all the key process points and deadlines for the nomination period. Confirmed election candidates will be identified on that page in the order they are nominated. The nomination period will end on 25 September 2024.

A number of follow-up matters were identified for short term committee attention after ICANN80. Those matters included:

- ICANN81 Annual General Meeting Planning
- Reactions to the ICANN Board Resolution (2024.06.08.15) initiating a Board-GAC Bylaws Consultation Process on GAC Advice from the ICANN77 Communique regarding avoiding auctions between commercial and non-commercial applications for the same strings;
- Potential follow-up input from the GAC regarding the GNSO Council Motion to Request an Issue Report for Diacritics in Latin Script;
- Preparation of a Sign Language Feasibility Report by the GAC Human Rights and International Law Working group (HRILWG) that was triggered by the ICANN FY24 Additional Budget Request (ABR) Report; and
- Next steps in implementation of the new GAC Strategic and Annual Plans, with further actions expected by the GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group – including suggestions mentioned by the GAC Chair about updating the authorized term limits for future GAC Chairs and Vice Chairs, further community wide efforts intended to develop continuous improvement programming by all ICANN communities (including the GAC); and ongoing implementation of other recommendations for improvements approved in connection with the ICANN Work Stream 2 on community accountability.

The staff identified several key dates for GAC delegate attention between now and ICANN81 later this year. Those dates include:

- Publication of GAC ICANN80 Communique - 17 June 2024

- Travel Support Applications - due 21 June 2024
- ICANN80 GAC Minutes ~ July 2024
- Communiqué Clarifying Call with ICANN Board July/August (tbd)
- Call for Topics for ICANN81 (policy topics, WG updates, joint sessions) ~ due July/August 2024
- ICANN81 GAC Agenda Setting Calls (to review preliminary agenda) ~ September 2024
- GAC Leadership Nominations - due - 25 September; and
- ICANN81 Annual General Meeting - 09-14 November 2024; Istanbul, Türkiye

Attendees briefly discussed the planning and preparations for the GAC meeting as well as the previous HLGGM.

It was noted that during the Communiqué drafting effort that there were a number of newer issues raised that were not necessarily discussed and deliberated during the meeting. It was suggested that the Communiqué drafting actually helps attendees to focus their interest in certain issues and that it could prove useful to have those types of discussions intersessionally as well. It was also suggested that an intersessional webinar on the Communiqué itself might be warranted. The agenda could include history, articles, procedures, norms and how the document has evolved over time. It was noted that given the document's long history and evolution that it would be valuable for the committee to discuss "what we actually want from this document and why do we do it?"

Attendees also flagged that whole consideration of the recommendation 7 and the possible changes to the bylaws. Discussed last meeting whether consideration whether there needs to be a bylaw change as the auction program, auction proceeds program goes forward. We didn't go into details here but we well might have to do work on that in due course.

Interest was also expressed to consider a future public session or intersessional webinar about the UN IGF supporters association. It was shared that many GAC members have connections with that group and a broader discussion of the participation and contributions to the association might be in order.

As another matter of interest to delegates, it was noted that the ITU has a Working Group of the ITU Council on Internet Public Policy and there is currently a public consultation taking place on the developmental aspects to strengthen the Internet. It was observed that the consultation is open until 7 September 2024. The results of that consultation will be heard at the next Council Working Group in October which is open to all member states and stakeholders. There will also be a consultation on the role of public policy in promoting multilingualism on the Internet which includes reflecting on the work of ICANN and other bodies, promoting multilingualism such as international domain names.

Attendees offered appreciation to the whole team that implemented the HLGGM and shared feedback that their senior officials found the meeting to be valuable in helping them to understand ICANN's role and see the great work being done in the GAC. It was noted that several delegates had expressed interest in the HLGGM Chair's Report preparations. It was noted that the report has

traditionally not been delivered any sooner than at least a month - if not more - after the meeting. Attendees encouraged the meeting host and ICANN staff to expedite that effort as much as possible.

Attendees also reinforced the value of capacity development programming for GAC attendees and confirmed the desire to continue capacity building efforts during the ICANN81 meeting later this year. Some expressed the great value here at ICANN80 of giving the program a regional theme associated with the location where the meeting took place and encouraged future programming to consider this approach. Attendees were encouraged to share their ideas about prospective capacity building topics as soon as possible to expedite the preparation process for ICANN81.

GAC Members took the opportunity to share their appreciation for the support of the GAC Leadership and the excellent work of the ICANN meeting support, technical, scribes and interpretation teams. With his thanks, the GAC Chair adjourned the GAC ICANN80 meeting.

#

Attachment 1 - ICANN80 Hybrid Policy Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST

GAC Members (90)		
Antigua and Barbuda	Hong Kong, China	Russian Federation
Argentina	India	Rwanda
Armenia	Indonesia	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Australia	Islamic Republic of Iran	São Tomé and Príncipe
Austria	Ireland	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Bahrain	Italy	Singapore
Bangladesh	Jamaica	Slovakia
Belarus	Japan	Spain
Bermuda	Kenya	Sudan
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Korea, Republic of	Suriname, Republic of
Brazil	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Sweden
Burundi	Lebanon	Switzerland
Cambodia	Libya	Chinese Taipei
Canada	Principality of Liechtenstein	Timor-Leste
Republic of Chad	Luxembourg	Thailand
China	Malaysia	Tonga
Colombia	Malawi	Trinidad and Tobago
Congo, Democratic Republic of	Mali	Türkiye
Congo, Republic of	Mauritania	Uganda
Croatia	Mexico	United Arab Emirates
Czech Republic	Morocco	United Kingdom
Denmark	Mozambique	United States
Egypt	Republic of the Union of Myanmar	Uruguay
Eswatini	Netherlands	Vanuatu
European Commission	Niger	Viet Nam

Finland	Nigeria	Zimbabwe
Gabon	Niue	
The Gambia	Norway	
Georgia	Oman	
Germany	Pakistan	
Grenada	Papua New Guinea	
Guyana	Portugal	

GAC Observers (9)	
Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization (CTO)	Organization of American States (OAS)
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	Smart Africa
Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)	Universal Postal Union (UPU)
Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
League of Arab States	

Attachment 2 - ICANN80 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
No Action Points identified		