

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**ICANN82 Community Forum, 08-13 March 2025**

<b>1. MEETING ATTENDANCE &amp; MEMBERSHIP</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1. Opening Plenary Session	3
<b>2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. New gTLDs Next Round	4
2.2. WHOIS and Registration Data Issues	7
2.3. DNS Abuse Mitigation	10
2.4. WSIS+20	13
<b>3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. GAC Strategic Planning	15
3.2. GAC Operating Matters	15
3.3. GAC Open Microphone Session	17
<b>4. GAC WORKING GROUPS</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	19
4.2. GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)	19
<b>5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board	22
5.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)	29
5.3. Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	31
5.4. Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	32
5.5. Meeting with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)	34
5.6. Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH)	35
5.7. Meeting with the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)	36
<b>6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS</b>	<b>37</b>
6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session	37
<b>Attachment 1 - ICANN82 Hybrid Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Attachment 1 - ICANN82 Hybrid Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Attachment 2 - ICANN82 Action Points Compilation</b>	<b>40</b>

## 1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

93 GAC Members and 9 Observers attended the meeting.

GAC membership currently stands at 184 Member States and Territories, and 40 Observer Organizations. A list of ICANN82 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in [Attachment 1 - ICANN82 Hybrid Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST](#).

The ICANN82 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website at:  
<https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann82-seattle-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/icann82-hybrid-meeting-agenda>.

Full transcripts for each meeting session are to be made available from the [ICANN82 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 officially welcomed in-person and remote attendees to the ICANN82 Community Forum. He highlighted particular aspects of the meeting week agenda and shared logistical information to help all attendees participate effectively during the meeting week.

The Chair also highlighted a number of substantive and operational matters that the committee is currently addressing and identified a number of work efforts that will attract committee attention in the coming months.

GAC Support staff offered an overview of the meeting logistics and accepted standards of behavior at the meeting. Staff alerted the attendees to an attendance-taking pilot effort that support staff was employing for this meeting that is intended to test a more rigorous attendance recording methodology using the committee's election balloting infrastructure to encourage both in-person and virtual attendees to confirm their participation during the meeting week. Staff will evaluate the results of the effort after ICANN82 to see if lessons-learned can help improve the efficiency of collecting attendance information and dissemination after the meeting.

The committee engaged in the traditional "tour de table" ceremony during which all GAC delegates attended in-person and virtually introduced themselves.

GAC members also reviewed the Communiqué drafting schedule and process for ICANN82. The process has progressively evolved in the past several years and attendees were familiarized with how some of those recent innovations would be encompassed for ICANN82.

## 2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

### 2.1. New gTLDs Next Round

The GAC held a plenary session on the new gTLD program next round, and specifically focused on priority topics including the Applicant Support Program, a status update on the Implementation Review Team (IRT), GAC priority topics from the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) and ICANN org updates and discussion.

GAC Vice-Chair, Nigel Hickson, introduced the session by noting the considerable amount of work being conducted within the ICANN community in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs, notably within the IRT. Nigel Hickson reiterated that the IRT is the vehicle for translating all the work on the policies and agreements of various community groups on the new gTLD program into the Applicant Guidebook (AGB).

On **the Implementation Review Team (IRT)**, the GAC alternate on the IRT and ICANN org presented recent developments pertaining to this effort. 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. The fourth public comment proceeding opened in February 2025 and is set to close in April 2025, to determine whether the AGB language aligns with the approved policy recommendations within the SubPro PDP WG Final Report. This is the last public comment proceeding for a specific part of the AGB in preparation for the entire AGB to be released for public comment. 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, and this is anticipated to be submitted for public comment in May 2025. The AGB is anticipated to be published in December 2025, in preparation for the launch of the next round in April 2026. ICANN org noted that the AGB is expected to be more comprehensive than the 2012 version, which may translate into a longer document, but should ultimately provide clearer details on processes set up, transparency and accountability on the forefront of the next round. The AGB will be translated into the ICANN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish).

On the **Applicant Support Program (ASP)**, ICANN org provided a status update on recent developments in particular on the application statistics and geographic distribution of current applications and the overall timeline on the ASP. ICANN org mentioned that a Sub-Track of the IRT has been meeting (ASP-IRT) and recently covered applicant readiness materials, capacity development, new gTLDs in your language, pro bono service providers update and continuous monitoring and evaluation.

On the **ASP application statistics**, ICANN org noted that data is updated monthly on the 19th of the month since the program launched on the 19th of November 2024. At the time of this presentation the following statistics were flagged:

- Drafted: 17 applications started but not yet submitted organization information
- Initiated: 13 applications that submitted organization information
- Submitted: 1 application have submitted application information for evaluation

- Conditionally approved: 0 applications approved by the Support Applicant Review Panel and pending deposit
- Fully Approved: 0 application receiving final approval after deposit has been received.

A regional breakdown was presented, flagging that the majority of applications are currently from the APAC (9) and North American (9) regions, followed by Africa (3) and Europe (1) and Latin America (1).

GAC members asked ICANN org to provide further information on what is planned to help applications get through the pipeline. ICANN org noted that efforts have been made to reach out to applicants who have drafted applications via applicant counselor to share ASP applicant materials available online and translated in other languages, in case this would help the application process. ICANN org's global support team has also been answering questions received by applicants, and proactive communication is ongoing to ensure applicants make their way through the application process. ICANN org expects that the volume of applications will significantly increase closer to the end of the application window, and is proactively preparing for this.

ICANN org provided an update on the **ASP Capacity Development Program**, outlining the framework developed to provide applicants with a variety of tools and resources to better understand the ASP. The purpose of this development program is to also help inform the broader gTLD applicant efforts recognizing that a lot of applicants may need assistance or information to better understand how to prepare a gTLD application, while maintaining business confidentiality.

ICANN org encouraged GAC members to continue to familiarize themselves with the [Next Round Champions Toolkit](#) since it is a tool which GAC members could use for outreach information in their communities and networks. Additionally applicants have access to an Applicant Counselor, and self directed learning content, ICANN learn training curated into a syllabus as well as knowledge articles and access to frequently asked questions. Topical sessions are also anticipated to discuss complex or higher interest topics so prospective applicants can learn more about these issues, through webinars where experts from the industry or community will be brought in to dissect these issues.

A snapshot of the Applicant Counselor Role was provided by ICANN org, following interest from GAC members. This person is already available and received escalating questions through the ICANN org global support team. This role is to provide guidance to ASP potential applicants, applicants in progress and supported applicants through touch-points, publications and communications.

Finally, ICANN org provided a status update on the **ASP Continuous Monitoring and Evaluation**, which was specifically included as a recommendation from the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) for ASP. The GGP indeed recommended tracking metrics including click-throughs, inquiries, registrations to get more information as well as surveying ASP applicants including those who ultimately chose not to apply (Guidance Rec. 1 of the [GGP Final Report](#)). In support of this effort, ICANN org procured a researcher, developed a draft evaluation framework, and will provide programmatic data for analysis. This continuous monitoring and evaluation will also provide insights into supported applicants' journey throughout the ASP and gTLD application lifecycle.

Finally, GAC topic leads provided additional updates on **topics of interest** to the GAC including Early Warnings and GAC Advice, Application fees, New gTLD Program: Next Round Privacy Policy, Legal Compliance Check and Public Interest Commitments (PICs) and Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs). GAC members expressed interest in topical briefings to explain issues of interest to governments, such as GAC Advice and Early Warnings, to prepare governments for the next round and digest materials from the AGB.

A GAC member expressed concerns with the New gTLD Program: Next Round Privacy Policy, noting that in the document one can find a description of how ICANN collects and uses personal information that is provided by or collected by individuals in relation to the next round of the new gTLD. The document also contains references to European legislation pertaining to the protection of private data, this is the GDPR, but as the policy did not mention the need to consider norms and legislation from other countries, there isn't a general statement about the need to use the proper legislation from other jurisdictions. As such, a GAC member expressed concerns noting this approach can be considered selective, and that it may run against the principles of equality in protecting privacy data of applicants coming from various different countries.

GAC members will continue to discuss these matters intersessionally, in particular to identify ways of informing GAC members on the AGB and prepare for the next round of new gTLDs.

**Action Point(s):**

- **GAC Support** to work with the ICANN org new gTLD team to compile briefing materials on topics of interest to governments including GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice.

## 2.2. WHOIS and Registration Data Issues

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 for EPDP Phase 1 (policy foundations) has partially completed, without provisions regarding Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data which remain to be addressed. Implementation 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, while they have resumed for the accreditation of Privacy and Proxy services (PPSAI IRT).

An update on developments related to the **Registration Data Request Services (RDRS)** highlighted comments made by the ICANN Board regarding the future of the service, in recent meetings with the GAC and the GNSO's RDRS Standing Committee, including that: a lot has been learned from the RDRS Pilot to date, and it is not clear that there is much more to be learned during the rest of the pilot program's duration; the RDRS is a useful tool that should continue to be up and running; several improvements are needed such as participation by all registrars, integration of affiliated privacy/proxy services into the system, development of requestor authentication mechanisms where appropriate, in particular for law enforcement; and allowing voluntary participation by ccTLDs. It is expected that these changes will be informed by policy that is either already available (including EPDP Phase 2 SSAD policy recommendations) or that may need to be developed.

A GAC member agreed with the assessment that there is nothing more to learn from the RDRS pilot program, and agreed that it should be extended to allow for the urgent implementation of the changes identified, which would be expected to effect and improve the metrics collected as part of the pilot. While there is no defined timeline for the implementation of improvement of the RDRS, it is expected that the ICANN Board may need to consider the RDRS Standing Committee Report (currently being drafted) before proceeding, and that policy considerations is likely to be another dependency regarding certain of the changes foreseen for the RDRS. Regarding registrar participation, a GAC Member suggested that incentives be considered to maximize participation without having to go through a GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP). Lowering the requirements

for developing new business processes to participate in RDRS was suggested as a potentially effective incentive.

Another GAC Member stressed that these changes should have been implemented from the beginning for the RDRS pilot to be adequate, and called for the service to move towards greater integration and automation, inclusive of WHOIS lookups and APIs. As it relates to Privacy/Proxy services, the GAC Member insisted that implementation work in the PPSAI be accelerated to ensure appropriate accountability of these stakeholders and the effectiveness of RDRS.

A GAC Member shared a national perspective on the challenges of balancing the legitimate interests of both law enforcement agencies in requesting registration data and commercial actors in protecting personal data of their customers. In this context, it was proposed that an effective RDRS would serve the interests of both parties, meeting the needs of law enforcement as well as the privacy rights of registrants. This GAC member also sees participation of ccTLDs in RDRS as a necessity given that certain ccTLDs operate like gTLDs as open-registration TLDs and suggested that the GAC forms a position on this matter, leveraging close connections between GAC members and their national ccTLD operators.

Regarding ccTLD practices, a European GAC Member shared that its national ccTLD operator had recently forbidden the use of privacy/proxy services in registration data as it deemed the European data protection framework to be sufficient to safeguard privacy needs of registrants and therefore judged privacy/proxy services as serving no useful purpose anymore. This GAC Member encouraged other ccTLDs to adopt similar restrictions.

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 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, following a correspondence from the GAC, that it was necessary to revisit the relevant policy recommendation (EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 18). In the ICANN79 GAC San Juan 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. In October 2024, the GAC proposed to the ICANN Board that two tracks of work could go in parallel. On the one hand, an “authentication track” could explore possible mechanisms to authenticate law enforcement requesters, while in parallel, a “policy track” would work to determine an appropriate timeline to respond to Urgent Requests, assuming an authentication mechanism is in place. The GAC’s proposal was discussed before ICANN81, during a first trilateral call between ICANN Board, GNSO Council and GAC (4 November 2024), in a subsequent GNSO Council letter to the GAC Chair (15 January 2025), and in a second trilateral call (12 February 2025).



Regarding the GAC's proposed Authentication Track, the PSWG Co-Chairs have initiated the formation of Practitioners Group with representatives from several "umbrella" law enforcement organizations (including INTERPOL, Europol and the US FBI) and from several stakeholder groups in the GNSO (RrSG, RySG, NCSG, BC). An initial meeting was held before ICANN82. This group is expected to meet every two weeks after ICANN82 and to report on its progress on a regular basis. As it relates to the GAC's proposed Policy Track, the GAC understands there is agreement to resume EPDP Phase 1 IRT discussions to determine an appropriate timeline for response to Urgent Requests and expects the IRT to reconvene shortly, with participation from GAC representatives.

A GAC Member suggested that the GAC continue to pursue a strict response timeline of 24 hours maximum, including in its discussions with the ICANN Board, noting that the frustration of governments in discussions such as these feed multilateral conversations on the governance of the Internet. Another GAC Member stressed the importance for a reconvened IRT process (on the policy track) to come up with the necessary timeline and safeguard provisions and deliver, in a timely manner, a proposal that meets the needs of governments, suggesting that this is a matter of credibility and accountability for those involved.

Regarding **Accuracy of Registration Data**, a reminder of the background was provided before the current status of ongoing efforts were discussed. It was recalled that in 2020 the GAC had commented that work on this issue should not be deferred, that registration data should be accurate for the purposes for which it is processed and that inaccurate registration data would defeat the purpose of a disclosure system such as the SSAD.

From a procedural perspective, the GAC was reminded that the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team was formed in 2021 as an initial step for possible policy development, but has now been paused for several years in connection with concerns about the impossibility to access registration data for purposes of analyzing its accuracy. In October 2024, the ICANN Board stated that despite the conclusion of negotiations of a Data Processing Specification (DPS) between ICANN org and the Contracted Parties, the DPS will not grant ICANN access to nonpublic registration to enable wide-scale accuracy studies.

During ICANN81, the GNSO Council indicated to the GAC that existing proposals would not provide enough data to move the accuracy work forward and that it had initiated a consultation of ICANN org and ICANN stakeholder groups on a set of regulatory and "threshold" questions with a view to provide a foundation for the GNSO Council to decide on next steps. In response to the GNSO's regulatory questions, ICANN org discussed legislative efforts and their impact on registration data accuracy obligations. In response to the GNSO's "threshold" questions several GNSO stakeholder groups and Advisory Committees provided their input, including the GAC, which stressed, recalling the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué, that:

- Inaccurate domain registration data can inhibit the activities of stakeholders in areas such as law enforcement, cybersecurity, investigations to enforce intellectual property rights, and domain name registration management.
- The initial objective of working on this challenge should be to assess whether the current practices are effective to ensure accuracy of registration data.
- This information can then inform GAC and ICANN community discussions about whether any policy development or other steps should be taken to increase the level of accuracy.

- The GAC welcomes any ideas that may overcome limitations on data processing to enable an assessment of how much gTLD registration data is operationally and syntactically accurate.

A GAC Member suggested that the GAC considers recommending the adoption of global practices evidenced in the ccTLD space as it relates to accuracy of registration data and associated verification mechanisms, including periodic auditing, which should be mandated from registrars.

### 2.3. DNS Abuse Mitigation

GAC Topic Leads on DNS Abuse recalled the elevated level of priority given to DNS Abuse mitigation by the Committee and reminded participants of the recently adopted amendments of the registries and registrars contracts with ICANN, which require those Contracted Parties to respond to reports of DNS Abuse and take appropriate action to mitigate or otherwise disrupt the abuse, as defined as the use of domain names or the DNS to perpetuate malware, botnets, phishing, pharming and spam.

As per a program of GAC discussions of these matters proposed since ICANN81 and set to continue into ICANN83, the GAC has received briefings regarding what can be done and what is being done within ICANN, in particular as it relates to contractual compliance enforcement and the expected impact of the new contractual amendments. Looking forward to ICANN83, it is expected that the GAC will consider ongoing and possible efforts within the Boarder DNS and Internet ecosystem. In the meantime, during the ICANN82 plenary session, GAC Topic leads reviewed the results of a GAC survey conducted to understand GAC Members practices and priorities regarding DNS Abuse, their appreciation of ICANN's and Contracted Parties' performance regarding the mitigation of DNS Abuse, and their expectations as to work to be conducted in the GAC in the near future. The session then turned to updates on activities and reporting from the ICANN Contractual Compliance function, on recent developments related to the analysis of DNS Abuse by the Office of the CTO of ICANN (OCTO), and on discussion of these developments by community representatives.

A **GAC survey on DNS Abuse** was conducted between 14 January and 7 February 2025 consistent with GAC Strategic Objective #4 on DNS Abuse which foresaw a “[...] survey [of] GAC Members and Observers to better understand how to address concerns and meet expectations of governments”. The survey received 21 responses which confirmed that DNS Abuse is a priority for GAC Members, that the work of ICANN org and of the ICANN community on DNS abuse is appreciated and that the GAC has a role to play in furthering ICANN's work on DNS Abuse. The survey illustrated differences among GAC Members in terms of the definition used to address issues related to online harms and abuse of the DNS, in terms of monitoring and data collection related to such activities, in terms of approaches to address them (legislative initiatives, policy and collaborative frameworks, best practices ...) and in terms of the scope of collaboration with relevant parties in the Internet community. Survey respondents believe that ICANN org's efforts are very commendable, but that progress is slow and tht efforts could be more effective, hence calling on ICANN org and the new CEO to be even more ambitious. Regarding Contracted Parties, respondents recognize their significant efforts but highlight inconsistencies across registries and registrars, some of which are deemed to continue doing the “bare minimum”, and opportunities for improvement to achieve industry-wide progress. While deemed a significant step forward, the amendment of the Registry and Registrar

Agreements are deemed too recent for their effectiveness to be assessed, and still flawed with gaps such as the absence of proactive measures, the need for more stringent accuracy requirements, and the necessity to include domain name resellers in the scope of the contractual obligations. Going forward, following the adoption of the contract amendments and in preparation for the next round of New gTLDs, survey respondents expect the GAC to focus on monitoring the implementation of the amendments; to consider targeted policy development; to strengthen collaboration within and outside ICANN; to develop guidelines on how to address DNS Abuse; to share best practices across communities, including with ccTLDs; and to continue to considering the evolution of the threat landscape, in particular in connection with emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence and Quantum Computing.

ICANN Contractual Compliance reported on their **enforcement of the new contract amendment** since their entry into force on 5 April 2024. As of early December 2024, 204 investigations resulted in the suspension of over 2,900 malicious domain names and the disabling of 365 phishing websites. As of 5 March 2025, ICANN compliance reported 46 ongoing investigations concerning over 5,400 malicious domains, with 89% of cases involving phishing. One Registry Operator and two Registrars were issued Notices of Breach<sup>1</sup> following their failure to comply with the DNS Abuse requirements and for exhausting ICANN's informal resolution procedure without resolution. The distribution of complaints received by ICANN regarding the DNS Abuse amendments was discussed on a regional basis as well as the nature of the complainant.

ICANN reported launching an audit on registry operators' compliance with the Registry Agreement, including the DNS Abuse mitigation requirements on 28 October 2024, with the selection of auditees based partly on ranking across internal and external reports related to DNS Abuse. A report with key finding and the list of auditees will be published once the audit is completed. It is expected that future routine audit of Registrar compliance will incorporate DNS Abuse mitigation requirements as well.

In response to the question of a GAC Member regarding the possibility of establishing a rating of registrars based on their performance in handling DNS Abuse, as seen and reported in compliance investigations, ICANN Compliance indicated that it is currently designing a proactive enforcement process which would leverage the data collected in terms of patterns and frequency of failures to comply by contracted parties. ICANN Compliance also listed the types of public reports it produces regarding audits<sup>2</sup> and regular enforcement<sup>3</sup> for interested GAC Members. A GAC Member shared reports from its law enforcement agencies that while the contract amendments have had a positive effect, some registrars are still not collaborating effectively, sometimes questioning the legitimacy of requestors despite their presenting adequate credentials. ICANN Compliance invited law enforcement agencies in these situations to submit a complaint<sup>4</sup> and assured that it would be investigated, irrespective of potential issues of jurisdiction.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.icann.org/compliance/notices>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/audits-2012-02-25-en>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/compliance-reporting-performance>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.icann.org/compliance/complaint>

A member of ICANN's OCTO presented **Domain Metrica**, a system that collects data on domain names, and makes that data searchable, usable, downloadable in as many formats, including via API, to as many different users as possible. Several use cases were presented as examples of how the service and the data can be used. One is to gather background information on an unknown domain name used in an email or a text message: Domain Metrica can provide information about the reputation of the domain, and potential abuse reported with it. ICANN's Domain Metrica is not a finished product. It is meant to evolve based on further research conducted by ICANN and feedback from the ICANN community. It is available for anybody to use at <https://domainmetrica.icann.org/> and more information about the platform is available<sup>5</sup>, including a recent webinar proposed to the ccNSO<sup>6</sup>.

ICANN OCTO's **INFERMAL study**, or Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains, a project funded by ICANN and conducted by a group working under Professor Maciej Korczyński at KOR Labs and University of Grenoble, aimed to examine registration policies and practices to identify patterns that might give an attacker a preference to a particular TLD-Registrar combination. The study considered parameters such as: pricing of registrations, discounts on bulk registrations and facilities to register domains in bulk, automation of registrations, acceptable payment methods (including crypto-currencies), free services associated with domain registrations (hosting, email, TLS certificates, etc), verification of contact details before purchase, registration restrictions (documentation requirement, local presence) and other verifications. The final report<sup>7</sup> was published in November 2024 and detailed results presented in a pre-ICANN82 webinar<sup>8</sup>. Among the findings of this study, it was highlighted that the strongest correlation with increased abuse were for registrars who offered free API-based registration, free DNS and hosting services and registration discounts. Conversely, registration restrictions and validation of email address and phone numbers were strongly correlated with decreased abuse. It was suggested that, in practice, attractiveness to attackers was likely dependent on a variety of factors and that deterring attacks through higher prices and other registration barriers would likely also affect legitimate registrants.

As part of a **panel discussion with speakers representing Contracted Parties, SSAC and DNS Abuse mitigation service providers**, community experts discussed the findings of the INFERMAL report. Graeme Bunton, Executive Director of the NetBeacon Institute stressed the importance of the conclusion of this report and the complexity of the problem. He offered that the 73 different features that were studied as potential factors in DNS Abuse are dials that registrars can adjust in the course of their operations and that interact and interrelate. He expressed surprise at the conclusion that mitigation speed does not correlate with less attractiveness to bad actors. Regarding actions the ICANN community could take on the basis of the report's conclusion, he suggested that to be successful and achieve meaningful progress, policy development would require a specific problem, and within that problem, a scope so narrow that the outcome would almost be pre-determined, while making sure

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.icann.org/octo-ssr/metrica-en>

<sup>6</sup> See DASC webinar on ICANN Domain Metrica (4 December 2024) at

<https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ccnsowkspc/pages/108402879/ccNSO+Webinars>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/inferential-analysis-maliciously-registered-domains-08nov24-en.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> More information is available at

<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/inferential-analysis-maliciously-registered-domains-infermal-2024-12-03-en>

that any solution is applicable across the ecosystem and is both technology and business model agnostic. Applied to the report's conclusion regarding APIs, he proposed that focus be placed on who is allowed to access such features as opposed to limits on volume of registrations.

Jeff Bedser, member of the SSAC leadership and CEO of CleaDNS, commended the study and stressed that its conclusions were findings, not recommendations, which confirmed industry suspicions on some aspects, as well as an economic reality: user will generally seek the cheapest and most accessible resource for whatever legitimate or malicious activity. Thus, he argued, given the gains expected by cybercriminals, raising costs of registrations would likely not deter further abuse, but would certainly undermine legitimate uses of domains. Instead, he suggested that more work be done on better detection and reporting of DNS Abuse (a phenomenon he argues is vastly under reported) to lead to faster mitigation.

## 2.4. WSIS+20

In its Strategic Plan 2024-2028, the GAC determined to work to ensure that governments, the ICANN Board, ICANN org and ICANN community participants are kept regularly apprised of developments and challenges in the Internet Governance (IG) ecosystem that impact the Internet's unique identifier systems. Following a successful pre-ICANN82 GAC webinar "Shaping the Digital Future: WSIS+20 Review and the Future of Internet Governance", during ICANN82, the GAC considered updates from participants in the webinar including relevant international organizations in the WSIS+20 process ahead of UN General Assembly discussions later in 2025, updates from developments within the ICANN Community and results of a survey of participants in the newly formed GAC Internet Governance (IG) group.

The **GAC IG group** was formed following the ICANN81 meeting and counted 48 GAC participants from 30 GAC Members States and Territories and 3 GAC Observer organizations, as of ICANN82. The objective of this group are to: facilitate the exchange information among interested GAC members on IG related news and updates; identify IG topics of priority that impact the Internet's unique identifier systems and agree on a series of activities to raise awareness among members; and to facilitate cross-community exchanges on IG related topics with other interested SO/ACs, as well as the engagement of GAC Members in community-wide IG related discussions.

**A GAC Webinar "Shaping the Digital Future: WSIS+20 Review and the Future of Internet Governance"** was held on 17 February 2025 and included speakers from UN DESA, UN ODET, UN CSTD, ITU, UNESCO, IGF MAG, Norway (as 2025 Host of IGF) and ICANN org. It discussed plans and expectations of relevant international organizations regarding the WSIS+20 Review process for the coming year, including the WSIS review milestones and key events, consultations and updates on the process modalities, next steps of the GDC implementation, IGF 2025 expectations, and the interplay between the different IG processes. Recording and materials were published on the GAC website<sup>9</sup>, and also shared on ICANN WSIS+20 Outreach Network and with other SO/ACs. Feedback provided by GAC attendees in a post-webinar survey was very positive: the programme was found to be very informative, well organized, comprehensive, and helpful; speakers were deemed excellent

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://gac.icann.org/sessions/shaping-the-digital-future-wsis-20-review-and-the-future-of-internet-governance>

and highly qualified, from all key bodies. In terms of outcomes, for survey respondents, the webinar provided an excellent overview/foundation on all the organizations, processes, policy issues and perspectives involved in the WSIS+20 Review, with important and authoritative information on the preparatory process, the upcoming milestones, and a great contextualization of ongoing developments, opportunities and challenges. GAC participants who attended the webinar took note of: the complexity of the WSIS+20 Review process; the reality of concerns on outcomes of the Review Process ; the importance of understanding how all these organizations work together; the key areas of interest for various parts of governments; and the importance of multistakeholderism, and the role of governments and the technical community in it.

During the session, speakers from the **Government Engagement Team of ICANN org** provided an update on their work to date and plans going forward to ensure that ICANN's experience in Internet Governance is appropriately represented in the WSIS+20 Review Process, as well as work ongoing in the ICANN Community to ensure that all interested stakeholders are aware of developments and opportunities to contribute to the process.

Going forward, GAC participants in the GAC IG group suggested that **further work** be done to continue tracking of developments, notable positions emerging, and identifying opportunities for involvement regarding WSIS+20, GDC Implementation, and the IGF. Several themes were suggested for future discussion of the GAC IG Group, including: Governments/delegations' current thinking; How to improve and advance the multistakeholder model; What ICANN priorities should be for IGF and the WSIS+20 High Level Event; How ICANN fits into the IG Landscape; and Digital Future and AI, emerging technologies and cybersecurity.

### **3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS**

#### **3.1. GAC Strategic Planning**

Recalling the endorsement of the GAC Strategic Plan 2024-2028 and the corresponding Annual Plan 2024/2025 in the GAC Kigali Communiqué, the GAC reviewed the approach chosen to develop these plans: the GAC Leadership, in collaboration with GAC Topic Leads and GAC Working Group chairs, proposed a set of long terms objectives (Strategic Objectives laid out in the GAC Strategic Plan) for each of which Expected Outcomes were defined in the first GAC Annual Plan 2024/2025 to guide the regular work of of the committee. It was also intended that completion of action items derived from annual expected outcomes would inform their attainability, which would in turn inform achievability of Strategic Objectives. In the coming months, leading to ICANN83, the committee will develop and consider the next GAC Annual Plan for the period 2025/2026 for potential endorsement in the Prague Communiqué. This will be an opportunity for the GAC to define new Expected Outcomes, buliding on the work and progress achieved to date.

The caretaker of each GAC Strategic Objective provided the Committee with an update on progress on each of the Expected Outcomes defined in the GAC Annual Plan 2024/2025, as detailed in the slides available on the GAC Website. It was indicated that the caretaking responsibility for Strategic Objective #9 on Internet Numbering Resources would be transferred to the incoming GAC Vice-Chair from the Netherlands.

A GAC Member suggested that Expected Outcomes be defined in terms that support their being completed, noting that most of them were marked as “On Track” as opposed to “Completed”. Another GAC Member, noting the significant scope of work included in the GAC plans, invited the workload to be spread more widely among GAC Members, in the spirit of efficiency and effectiveness in the GAC. In the absence of further distribution of the workload, it was suggested that the GAC may need to consider prioritizing its work and/or reducing its scope in order to augment the desired impact on priority policy areas.

In terms of objectives and outcomes, a GAC Member suggested that consideration of ccTLD practices and innovations be included in the work related to Strategic Objective #4 (DNS Abuse), #5 (Domain Registration Data), #6 (Universal Acceptance) and #7 (New Technology). Another GAC Members proposed that the GAC consider developing documentation on policy issues that could be used by GAC Members for dissemination in their governments.

#### **3.2. GAC Operating Matters**

The GAC Chair opened the session by introducing leading members of the ICANN2025 Nominating Committee (NomCom). The NomCom leaders explained to the GAC that they have ten open ICANN organizational positions that they are looking to fill this calendar year. Of those positions, three are for ICANN Board, one is for PTI, three are for the At Large Advisory Committee, two are for the Generic names Supporting Organization, and one is for the Country Code names Supporting

Organization. They asked GAC Members to go back to their individual geographical regions, identify any suitable candidates, and to refer them up to apply for ICANN for the positions.

It was noted that NomCom applications would be accepted up through 28 March and that more information could be obtained about the positions and the NomCom's work at the website [nomcom.icann.org](http://nomcom.icann.org).

The GAC Chair then moved to the discussion of potential changes to the GAC Operating Principles and asked staff to provide a summary of the proposals he had made during the GAC's ICANN82 meeting and subsequent additional proposals from GAC Members based on intersessional committee discussions and email threads.

It was explained that after intersessional committee discussion among and between members that there were two general proposals for the committee to consider at ICANN82. One proposal would adjust the timing of the GAC Annual Leadership elections. A second proposal would extend the number and length of terms for the GAC Chair and Vice Chairs.

It was explained that the proposal to change the timing for the annual GAC Leadership election cycle seemed to have coalesced around a proposal to move the conclusion of the leadership elections to the second committee meeting of the calendar year – rather than the third meeting of the year. This change would enable the GAC Chair and Vice Chairs to begin their office terms immediately after the Annual General Meeting of ICANN and enable a smoother on-boarding for the GAC Chair to their non-voting liaison role on the ICANN Board. Staff reviewed potential language modifications to GAC Operating Principle #31 that would be necessary to achieve this change. GAC members in attendance cast their votes by a show of hands and approved this proposed change unanimously.

Discussion of the number and length of Chair and Vice Chair terms was broad ranging. Attendees reviewed a variety of eight (8) options for retaining or changing the length of terms for both the Chair and Vice Chair positions. Attendees decided to assess the pros and cons of potential changes for each position separately and explored potential language modifications to GAC Operating Principle # 27 that would be needed to effectuate any changes agreed to by the committee.

Regarding potential new terms for the GAC Chair, the attendees determined by a nearly unanimous show-of-hands vote (33 for and 1 against) to update the terms of the GAC Chair from two consecutive two-year terms to three consecutive two-year terms (Option #4 discussed during the session). Then, regarding potential new terms for the GAC Vice Chairs, the attendees determined by a unanimous show-of-hands vote to update the terms of the GAC Vice Chairs from two consecutive one-year terms to two consecutive two-year terms.

Support staff reviewed the language of Operating Principle #53 to clarify the process steps for finalizing the decisions made during the session. It was explained that subsequent to the decisions made during this session that the three decisions would be subject to a 60-day consultation period after which a final decision would be made by in-person attendees during a GAC session taking place at ICANN83.



If approved during ICANN83, any new leadership terms and their lengths would begin to apply to the leaders elected during the 2025 election cycle. Any process changes needed to implement the new terms and the updated annual election timing would be applied via a transition period clarified by the GAC Operating Principles Evolution Working Group and would likely result in a shortening of the current GAC Chair's term and the terms of any vice chairs selected during the 2025 election.

The GAC Chair thanked all the attendees for a productive session and adjourned the group for the day.

### **3.3. GAC Open Microphone Session**

GAC members conducted a second iteration of the Open Mic session format originally attempted a year ago in Puerto Rico at ICANN79. The session format is designed to help the committee expand its collaboration, information, and communications channels within the ICANN multistakeholder community.

The GAC Chair welcomed everyone to the Open Mic session. He noted that the session was proposed as an opportunity for all ICANN community members to share their views with the GAC about any DNS issues that were or should be of interest to them and governments in ICANN. He shared that community members had been invited to sign-up for speaking slots during the session, but all comments would be welcomed. He noted that the GAC would be in "listening mode" during the session, and that GAC members were welcomed to speak or comment on any topics raised if they wished.

A representative from the GNSO's Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) opened the queue regarding DNS Abuse related matters, noting the set of requests from the CSG to the community in form of proposed amendments to the Registry Agreement (RA) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) that would successfully combat abuse. A second community statement shared by a remorse presenter and read by the GAC Chair, noted the openness the GAC has adopted to conduct all its public sessions in an open manner. Concerns were shared by the commenter that other community groups - particularly ICANN contracted parties - were holding more and more closed sessions and that this was concerning. A third commenter - also remote, asked whether the GAC would consider specific conditions under which a new gTLD application seeking a geographical name - whether on or not on the ISO 3166 list - would be acceptable to the GAC. The GAC Chair acknowledged the questions but no GAC attendee commented on the intercession. A fourth speaker asked governments to support a human rights assessment process that some community members are currently working to develop - particularly in the area of children's rights. It was acknowledged by a GAC member that this impact work was ongoing in the community. Other commenters shared views or drew the committee's attention to efforts or concerns regarding technical and capacity development support and opportunities among GAC members in the Asia-Pacific region, the sovereign rights of governments to manage their own ccTLDs, and concerns from some GAC Members about ICANN's scheduling of public meetings in conflict with holidays and religious festivals

important to various cultures around the world - particularly the upcoming Prague Meeting (ICANN83) in early June.

GAC Members expressed appreciation to all the speakers for sharing their views and the GAC Chair noted the committee's interest in holding similar formatted sessions during future public meetings.

## **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. In the week prior to ICANN82, the PSWG met with multiple ICANN stakeholder groups to discuss topics of mutual interest.

The PSWG participated in briefing the GAC during the session on developments concerning WHOIS and Registration Data Issues, which highlighted several aspects of the PSWG's ongoing work. Key takeaways involving PSWG workstreams included potential improvements to the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) and continued progress on work related to "Urgent Requests" for disclosure of registration data.

The PSWG appreciated the various presentations and discussions on the findings concerning the Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL) Final Report which provided valuable input for progressing the work on addressing DNS Abuse.

### **4.2. GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG)**

The GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) held two (2) capacity development sessions at ICANN82 which focused on topics of interest to GAC members related to the next round of new gLTDs.

The first session was an opportunity for GAC members to familiarize themselves with the concept and practices of the GeoTLD space, particularly with the leading up to the next round. GAC members were encouraged to communicate internally and with ICANN on the legal situation of registered and new applications of GeoTLDs, and to consult the Applicant Guidebook language on the protections and the rules regarding territories.

The second session was a follow-up of the pre-session webinar on the Next Round Champions Toolkit lead by ICANN org, and designed for GAC members to learn how to effectively use the toolkit and provide feedback to ICANN on their user experience.

Most of this session was dedicated to language breakout groups, where GAC members navigated and explored the toolkit. A set of opening questions were made available to the different groups to start off their discussion:

1. What is your sense of interest from potential applicants in your respective countries?
2. What questions are you getting internally or externally?
3. What information or resources might be helpful for GAC members to have or to pass along to prospective applicants?
4. How can the GAC / Governments support Outreach / Connections to funding institutions?

The French language group reported that the geographic top-level domains (TLDs) would be the applications that would most likely be of interest in their respective countries. They cited that the questions they were getting were about various challenges, primarily about the expense, the fees, and the complexity of filing an application.

In terms of resources that would be helpful, the group shared that an option could be to develop a summary of the Applicant Guidebook, such as a high-level description of the approach to help promote the program. Finally, in response to the support and engagement aspect, the group talked about efforts of non ASP applicants to speak to consultants and experts in the community, and encourage conversations with any town, company or person that might be thinking of applying.

The Chinese language group shared views on the potential interest from Brand and Geo TLDs, and discussed the high costs that Registry Service Providers (RSPs) could impose on applicants by increasing the application fee.

The Arabic language group agreed that the Applicant Support Program offers an excellent opportunity for both financial and pro-bono support, but members of the group couldn't think of applicants or entities that might be interested and qualify for the program. Another point raised was the lack of a success story from a regional TLD in the last round, making the effort of raising awareness more challenging because they can't refer to a regional or local TLD as an ASCII or Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) format.

The Spanish language group discussed how to promote the program, the toolkit, and the ASP noting the need for more public and private partnerships to be informed about it. For instance, by using top-level domains as a digital public infrastructure that could be spearheaded by national or public authorities, to boost tourism, regions, as well as subnational or national identities. The group also discussed the potential driver for applying for top-level domains in the new round, while also noting the potential challenges for more traditional top-level domain business models where the TLD has to be self-financing.

Lastly, the English speaking group reported about the rising interest in geographic names and dot brands, noting that the interest seems to be more protective and defensive as opposed to being more proactive on how to promote them.

Regarding the third question, the group discussed the withdrawal of an application due to a contention set and an eventual refund, the various concerns about costs for applying, despite the ASP, as well as the role of GAC advice and what it means in relation to the Next Round.

In Seattle, the GAC focused on helping its members prepare for the next round of new gTLDs, with the aim for GAC members to understand how government representatives can exercise their rights and responsibilities.

The feedback received at ICANN82, will help the USRWG finalize the draft framework and substance of the capacity building approach for future ICANN Meetings.

## Registrant's Journey

The GAC Chair welcomed the Registrars Stakeholder Group to conduct a very active session on a registrant's journey, where GAC participants could follow the lifecycle of a domain registration and learn about various aspects a registrant may encounter.

## 5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

### 5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero, and the ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha, welcomed attendees to the meeting. The Board Chair expressed the Board's deep appreciation for the GAC's willingness to engage in regular communications intersessionally. She noted how those interactions and further collaboration with the GAC have enabled progress in moving the next round issued forward with the Board.

The GAC Chair reviewed the meeting agenda and topics planned for the session, including:

- I. The ICANN CEO Priorities
- II. Internet Coordination Policy – 2
- III. Next Round of New gTLDs (Applicant Support)
- IV. Registration Data –
  - a. Urgent Requests
  - b. Accuracy
- V. Any Other Business

He noted all the topics were in some way vital issues that impact the global Internet and expressed the GAC's appreciation for the Board's engagement in these discussions. He noted the committee's goal is to have an open and constructive dialogue to ensure ICANN's policies and actions align with the public interest.

#### I. ICANN CEO Priorities

GAC Question –

1. Noting that the ICANN CEO, Kurtis Lindqvist, has now been with ICANN for nearly three months and in light of the Board's question to the GAC/Community about potential CEO priorities at ICANN81 in Istanbul, can you please -

- (1) *share what overall impressions he has gleaned about the ICANN community, especially the GAC?*;
- (2) inform GAC Members about the initial CEO priorities you and the Board have agreed on; and
- (3) reveal what he thinks ICANN (the organization) should be focusing on - particularly with respect to the areas of:
  - a.) ICANN org transparency and accountability;
  - b.) ICANN org's efficient and effective delivery of its mission; and
  - c.) ICANN's engagement within the wider Internet Governance ecosystem, considering the present context of WSIS+20

The CEO thanked the GAC for its warm welcome and noted his presence on the Board-GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) call a few weeks ago. He advised that his first several months at ICANN

have very much been devoted to trying to understand the needs, views and thoughts of the community and stakeholders and staff. He noted that he and the new head of the Policy Development Support team have met with many of the groups in the community and they have gathered very valuable feedback to help build and form opinions. He noted the willingness of all the ICANN communities to work hard together to deliver policy -- of high quality and in a timely manner while also having an efficient and open dialogue. He noted that the GAC has a very important role in those discussions.

Regarding his priorities he recalled his initial conversations with the Board that he would use his first few months to listen and understand the community and stakeholders and their priorities and form his opinions. He stressed that he did not come into ICANN with a vision of what he wanted to accomplish but to focus on the best outcomes for the community and to develop goals and objectives in the support of the ICANN strategic plan.

He advised that he is presently formulating his priorities, establishing timelines and will be defining executive team CEO goals, objectives, key outcomes and metrics. He expects to have much of this work progressed by the next Board workshop in Hanoi (scheduled for May this year) so that plans will be solidly in place for the ICANN FY26 period.

Regarding ICANN operations, he noted that transparency and accountability is very much on the Board's mind -- particularly as it relates to the community's new 5-year strategic plan. He said he will look to achieve efficiencies and cost-effectiveness across the entire organization. Areas of focus will include staffing, resourcing and the tools (including IT systems) that are used to accomplish tasks and goals important to the ICANN community. He noted that determining how you drive efficiency and deliver in the most optimal way is an ongoing process.

With respect to internet governance, the CEO noted the staff believes that active engagement with the SO-AC leadership and other groups to exchange information will continue to be important and will enable support for the IGF and other institutions to continue.

GAC Members expressed appreciation that the CEO was approaching things very much in a listening mode and for trying to understand the SO/ACs. It was noted that the approach was in line with GAC interests.

GAC Members shared some of their views with the CEO on issues of importance to them. Referencing the recent community session regarding a proposed new Code of Ethics for ICANN, GAC members encouraged the CEO to quickly implement the new code when it is approved by the Board.

GAC members also noted that this was a key year in Internet governance with the prospect of ensuring that the UN General Assembly endorses the WSIS process and recognizes the value of multistakeholder processes. It was noted that ICANN has been successful in delivering on its mission. Moreover, ICANN's role in communicating this important matter was recognized and encouraged to continue. The CEO was also encouraged to see that ICANN continues to play a valuable coordinating role in internet governance activities and to even increase them.

In response, the CEO observed that the multistakeholder model has evolved from an original concept in the early days of WSIS to a now more mature model around which proponents can now point to actual tangible value that is being provided. He emphasized that the multi-stakeholder model and the open Internet have enabled the economic value creation, the innovation, and the services the world knows today. He emphasized to the GAC the need to remind others that the multistakeholder model has been a success at ICANN and in other IG contexts.

The CEO outlined some of ICANN's recent outreach and information efforts at the UN offices in Geneva and New York (last month). He noted that he also spoke with Smart Africa here in Seattle this week and that the ICANN staff has similar intergovernmental or other government initiatives in the works to engage with governments at a national level. He said it is very important (and also part of the strategy he has discussed with the Board) to go out and identify more of these organizational outreach opportunities.

## **II. Internet Coordination Policy – 2 (ICP-2)**

GAC Question -

2. The GAC has noted and welcomes the recent adoption of the implementation and assessment procedures for ICP-2 compliance. The question to the Board is: Can the Board or ICANN leadership provide an update on the next steps with regard to this document and the timelines envisioned for ICANN org to implement the procedures laid out in the implementation document?

The Board Chair reminded the GAC that the ICP-2 is a very important document that speaks to the creation of RIRs and has not been reviewed in many years and that this time is an opportune moment for the RIRs to come together and consult.

Board member Christian Kaufman was identified as the subject matter expert in this area. He explained that there are currently two separate ICP-2 related documents under consideration – one that addresses RIR compliance after it is established and another that outlines ICANN's responsibilities for investigating issues in case an RIR is non-compliant and then working together with the RIR to attempt to restore compliance.

He explained that the spirit of the original ICP-2 document has been retained, but that when people talk about the new ICP-2 document, they usually talk about a slightly different initiative which is about addressing other matters - including development of 24 guiding principles which have been the subject of public consultation and surveys of various parts of the community. Several more rounds of review are expected with a plan for a finalized document to be shared with the ICANN Board by the end of the calendar year.

Based on input to date, an updated version of the ICP-2 documentation is currently being prepared and is expected to be made available in May of this year. The May version of the document will be the subject of community webinars and another public consultation period. Depending on further feedback, in the September time frame, yet another review opportunity is expected (late in the year



is a big time for RIR meetings) with the hope that the entire process will be concluded, as planned, by the end of the calendar year at which time the ICANN Board will officially get the document to ratify it.

GAC Members shared that they are following the process with interest, and that the committee has already had interactions with the ASO. It was noted that GAC Members expect to review the various drafts as they come along.

It was clarified that any newly proposed implementation assessment procedures are presently based on the current draft version of the ICP-2 and if future iterations of the ICP-2 include significant changes then the recommended implementation and assessment procedures may change as well.

Finally, it was indicated that any future examinations of non-compliance would likely only be triggered by specific events reported to ICANN, rather than be any regular compliance checking cycle.

### **III. Next Round of New gTLDs – Applicant Support Program**

GAC Question –

3. The GAC welcomes the updates from ICANN org this meeting week on applications under the applicant support program. GAC members are concerned that while it appears there are almost 25 support applications in some form of preparation or submission, less than half come collectively from Asia Pacific, African and Latin America regions of the world. GAC members intend to work further with ICANN org to enhance outreach and promotion of next round application opportunities to developing regions and countries. In the meantime, can the Board confirm expectations that application fees already lowered to reflect an 85 percent fee reduction from the current 75 percent target?

Board member Alan Barret was identified as the subject matter expert in this area. He explained that the Applicant Support Program (ASP) is an important part of the Next Round New gTLD effort and that the Board appreciates the GAC's interest in the program. He noted the GAC's recent collaboration with ICANN staff to reach out to potential applicants. He explained that ICANN org provides monthly updates on the application process, and that would be where GAC members have seen the statistics of the number of active applications.

He explained that some of the applications in progress do not yet have geographic data associated with them, and that happens when someone begins creating an application but they have not yet finished submitting all the information. He shared that ICANN org has spent about 85 percent of their engagement efforts in trying to reach those regions of Africa, Latin America, Caribbean and Asia Pacific and the number of applicants received so far are much more than in a similar period in the 2012 round.

Regarding the potential discounts for supported applications, he explained that the final discount percentage to be applied will be dependent upon the number of approved applications received. There is a specific budget for the support, but the Board cannot yet guarantee what the specific discount per application will be. Less applicants will mean larger discounts, but more applicants might lead to lesser discounts. It remained possible that the Board could allocate a larger budget if there are more than 45 approved applications received.

GAC members encouraged the Board to give as much clarity and predictability as possible for potential next round applicants.

#### **IV. Registration Data**

##### *Urgent Requests for Disclosure*

GAC Question –

4. a) Following the recent second trilateral call between the GAC, the ICANN Board and the GNSO on this matter (12 February 2025), the GAC understands that there is agreement to proceed with resuming EPDP Phase 1 IRT discussions to define an appropriate timeline for response to Urgent Requests for disclosure of Registration Data in circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily harm, critical infrastructure, or child exploitation. In light of the ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué GAC Advice for the ICANN Board “To act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy” on this matter, *the GAC would appreciate confirmation of when the Board expects ICANN org will reconvene this Implementation Review Team.*

Board member Becky Burr was identified as the subject matter expert in this area. She shared that the two recent calls held among the Board, GAC and GNSO were quite productive and there was general agreement that progress in this area would now move forward on two tracks; (1) there will be continued work on the authentication matter for data requestors; and (2) that work on the timeline for responses to urgent requests can proceed on a second track. She confirmed the view that no new policy development process is needed, and that the parties working on the response timeline will proceed using the Implementation Review Team (IRT).

She said the Board is prepared to hold working sessions with the IRT to discuss and establish the response timeline, and that once the GNSO Council notifies the Board that they are ready to proceed along that track, the ICANN Org will be able to proceed to convene the IRT to kick off discussions and to develop next steps and a timeline for those steps. She surmised that once the approach is confirmed, the IRT will be able to convene fairly quickly.

GAC Members shared that the topic has been discussed extensively by the committee and there has been general appreciation for the trilateral calls with the Board and the GNSO. They observed that this progress shows that the parties have been able to find alternative productive inter-sessional ways to move forward on this issue which is very important for governments. It was noted that the GNSO meeting will be closely watched so that the IRT discussions can commence.

When asked by GAC Members about the concerns for resolving the timing of responding to urgent requests, the Board explained that it had not been happy with the prior response timeline recommendations offered by the community and that it was important to see both the timing and authentication issues move forward in parallel. The GAC was assured that the Board would not support a timeline of more than 15 days for responses to urgent requests for registration data. The Board noted the good work being done by the Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) and members of law enforcement who are developing a system that would enable registrars to quickly authenticate that they're dealing with an actual law enforcement agent.

With the parallel efforts of timing and authentication in place, the expectation is a final “very reliable system” for authenticating that a request is coming from law enforcement which will enable prompt registrar responses to any urgent request for registration data.

### Accuracy of Registration Data

GAC Question –

4. b) Since the suspension of the work of the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team in November 2022, the GAC has regularly stressed the importance of resuming work on accuracy as soon as possible. Recently, the GAC submitted its input to the GNSO Council’s questions aimed at “providing a foundation for deciding on the next steps” which the GAC expects will soon follow towards resuming the scoping of policy work on accuracy of domain name registration data. *The GAC is interested in hearing the ICANN Board’s current thinking on this matter.*

Board member Becky Burr was identified as the subject matter expert in this area. She recounted that the GNSO Council had suspended the work of the accuracy scoping team, given the challenges it was facing collecting data.

She said the Council seems divided on whether continued work via a small team approach or some other mechanism is the right way to proceed. She shared that the Council has surveyed various stakeholder groups, constituency structures and ICANN Org about the issue and is going to be collecting and going through the survey results. The goal is to come back to the GNSO to recommend next steps based on that feedback from the various responses.

The frustration of the community in moving forward on this issue was acknowledged, but it was explained that it is difficult to access any relevant data so it's very hard to evaluate the ways in which the registration data is or is not actionable. It was noted that in addition to the GNSO Council survey work, that contracted parties (registrars in particular) are having conversations about what other steps might be available to get a better handle on this data availability issue as well. The Board believes there is a commitment among ICANN’s contracted parties to look hard at the issue and see if the community can collectively come together to begin to answer the questions.

The Board emphasized that it believes the contracted parties have made a serious commitment to do the work, are acting in good faith and that the time being taken is not intended to stall or delay any actions. The Board will be watching very carefully for progress in this area.

## **V. Any Other Business (AOB)**

### Time Zone Scheduling

In the context of “How We Meet”, GAC Members reiterated concerns expressed in sessions earlier in the week that ICANN communities need to employ efforts to be more equitable regarding time zone scheduling for community meetings and discussions. The practical considerations in working through the challenges of scheduling were acknowledged, but it was also noted that an aspect of this challenge was embedded in the culture of the community.

The Board shared that they have heard from many different constituencies and people from different parts of the community regarding time zone issues and hoped that further input can help in this area.

### Public Meeting Scheduling

GAC Members brought up the issue of the ICANN83 meeting being scheduled at the same time of the feast of Eid al-Adha – a major religious holiday event in Muslim countries. It was expressed ICANN has lately been doing a great job on scheduling to avoid such conflicts and there is hope such concerns continue to be taken into consideration again in the future. Board members noted the concern has been expressed by others here in Seattle and they will do their best in the future to try to avoid these conflicts when possible.

### Registration Data Request Service (RDRS):

GAC Members also asked about the timeline regarding the RDRS. The Board informed the GAC that they are waiting for the RDRS report from the standing committee to be finalized, and that Board members have had a very good conversation regarding what should happen next and the need to move forward. Thus, the Board will be watching this matter very carefully and considering the way in which the move from the SSAD recommendations to a robust RDRS that addresses the needed issues can be accomplished. This will be starting as soon as the final report from the standing committee is delivered.

Having reached the end of the scheduled time for the meeting, the GAC Chair concluded the session with a final note of thanks to the Board and a final welcome to Mr. Lindqvist.

## 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 improved communications between the GAC and GNSO Council, New gTLD Program Next Round, WHOIS and Data Protection and Urgent Requests, Latin Script Diacritics and DNS Abuse.

Pertaining to the **improved communications between the GAC and GNSO Council**, the respective Points of Contact and Liaisons provided an update on improvements and changes the new POCs and Liaisons are instauring. Notably through enhanced direct communication between GNSO topic leads with their counterparts in the GAC, commencing from two topics: human rights and Internet Governance.

On **WHOIS and Data Accuracy**, the GNSO Council provided an update on a recent approach to address this issue, following questions being submitted to ICANN and the various SO/ACs. The GNSO Chair noted the feedback has now been received and will be discussed during the upcoming GNSO Council meeting in Seattle. During that meeting the GNSO Council will be talking about its plan to compile feedback received and on next steps to address this issue. The GNSO Chair noted a specific answer to GAC comments is not currently available but GAC input will be considered during next steps.

On the topic of the **Billing Contact** the GNSO Chair noted that a process is still under development, but that there is a slight ambiguity on the billing contact and the Registration Data policy which will also be addressed during the upcoming GNSO Council meeting. On **Urgent Requests**, the GNSO Chair recognized that a lot of work was conducted by both the GAC and GNSO to identify a way to restart this work. The GNSO Council noted its appreciation for the GAC's input and ideas on how to progress on this matter, especially noting the trilateral meeting between the GAC, GNSO and ICANN Board. The GNSO Council will also be discussing this topic at its meeting in Seattle, specifically about restarting an Implementation Review Team (IRT) to discuss the timeline for Urgent Requests and what other policy work may be needed to keep this topic moving forward.

A GAC member expressed understanding that the bulk of GAC questions on this topic will be addressed at the next GNSO Council meeting, but raised additional items for consideration. On data accuracy, GAC members reiterated the importance of this topic for the GAC and the GAC's continued contribution to the Scoping Team and asked for the work on accuracy to resume, and asked whether the pause of the work on accuracy is expiring or being prolonged? Additionally, regarding the GNSO Council's review of community input received, GAC members wondered how action would be taken on such diverse feedback.

The GNSO Chair responded that the GNSO Council will be reviewing the survey results and see where there may be alignment or divergence to identify what the next steps should be. On the Scoping Team, the GNSO Chair noted that the GNSO Council is not sure whether this continues to be the right path forward, and that a close look at the survey results will help identify what mechanism may make the most sense to advance this issue.

On **DNS Abuse**, the GAC took note of the recently released conclusions of the Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL) Study and the GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse. The GNSO Chair flagged that the Small Group on DNS Abuse has also been paused because the registrars and registries executed an amendment to improve the Registration Accreditation Agreement. As such, the GNSO Council paused its Small Group to allow ICANN org's Compliance Team sufficient time to gather metrics and feedback on how this did or did not change the DNS Abuse landscape. At the time of this discussion the GNSO Council received feedback from the Compliance team, as well as the INFERMAL study, and the GNSO Council is reviewing these items along with the original work of the DNS Abuse Small Team, with the mindset of restarting the Small Team's work.

A GAC member asked whether the GNSO Council is pursuing the idea of mini policy development processes on DNS Abuse, and whether this would potentially work for the issue of DNS Abuse.

The GNSO Chair noted that this will be discussed within the DNS Abuse Small Team, taking a look at recent developments and determining the efficacy of a potential PDP or another way to resolve abuse.

On **the New gTLD Program Next Round**, GNSO Council members expressed appreciation for the GAC's engagement within the policy development process and now within the Implementation Review Team (IRT). GNSO Council members noted that a new public comment proceeding opened for the fourth set of sections of the Applicant Guidebook, which is the final opportunity for input prior to the entire AGB being submitted for public comment (anticipated in May 2025). GNSO Council members noted that the Council's role in this process is that of the developer of the policies which are now in implementation mode by ICANN org and the IRT.

Pertaining to the **Latin Script Diacritics PDP**, GNSO Council Members thanked GAC members for their engagement on this topic and now in the PDP. In terms of an update, GNSO Council members flagged that this is just the beginning of the PDP's work, as the group had their first meeting the day before this session, so further updates will be given with regards to developments and changes. For members who aren't engaged in the PDP but would like to participate differently, there will be opportunities for public comments.

Under **any other business**, a GAC member noted that under improved communications for the future it would be helpful for the GAC and GNSO Council to align agenda topics so they can be discussed proactively, i.e. not needing to defer to future meetings occurring.

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

The GAC and At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest. The agenda focused on the topics of the INFERMAL report and the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)+20.

The ALAC Chair (Jonathan Zuck) provided an overview of the Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains (INFERMAL) Report (Nov 2024) noting that the report seems to aim at validating previously anecdotal claims regarding the prevalence of DNS abuse linked to factors such as cost, payment methods, and registration methods. The report does not offer solutions and instead, confirms how these factors influence certain rates of DNS abuse. Therefore, the ALAC is looking into pursuing a very narrowly focused conversation with the contracted party house on the issue of bulk registrations.

In response, pertaining to the GAC's position on DNS Abuse, at the time of the public comment on contract amendments and in light of the current exchange, the GAC has been inclined to give positive views to a very narrowly scoped policy development process to address remaining issues that may not have been addressed in the contract abuse amendments, including the importance of exploring proactive measures.

The GAC mentioned the recent discussions with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) noting that the use of application programming interface (API) is not the issue, but more the difficulty in putting a cutoff price after which domain names would not be registered for malicious purposes, and the wish to avoid market distortion with very high prices to buy domain names, since low prices incentivize abuse. Lastly, the GAC noted the importance of feedback from the registrars regarding their commercial practices.

On the WSIS+20 and next steps item, with the objective of having an open dialogue between both groups, the ALAC started the conversation about exploring how the end user community could be better informed on intergovernmental developments and how channels of communication could be improved between both committees.

The GAC presented on the committee's modalities for internet governance (IG) as part of its four-year strategic plan (2024-2028), designed to keep members apprised on the developments and challenges in the IG ecosystem impacting the Internet's unique identifier system, and flagged the recently formed GAC Internet Governance group (GAC IG group). The group was formed for GAC members to discuss the issue internally (e.g 17 February 2025 webinar on WSIS+20 review and the future of Internet Governance), but particularly to facilitate a cross-community exchange on IG related topics, such as with the At-Large community.

The GAC and ALAC agreed on collaborating intersessionally by the ICANN83 meeting, to leverage both committees' knowledge and engagement on this matter, with the caveat that the GAC does not establish or develop common positions on WSIS+20, since its function is to act as an advisory committee and take part in ICANN's empowered community.

#### 5.4. Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)

This bilateral meeting of the GAC and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) of ICANN focused on two topics: quantum computing and its impact on encryption, and particularly what this will mean for the DNS; as well as the findings of the recent ICANN study “Inferential Analysis of Maliciously Registered Domains” (INFERMAL).

Ram Mohan, Chair of the SSAC recalled the role and composition of his Advisory Committee of ICANN. He reminded GAC Members that SSAC provides technical advice on the security and stability of Internet identifiers, with a view to provide advice based on data and expert opinion. The SSAC’s objective in interacting with the GAC is to bridge the respective domain of expertise of both committees, that is technology and policy to ensure that SSAC recommendations are aligned with the public interest. The SSAC Chair encourages GAC Members to engage with the SSAC.

Russ Housley, an SSAC Member, discussed the expected **impact of quantum computing on encryption in the DNS, and DNSSEC in particular**. It was stressed that while the DNS protocol does not carry secrets, and is thus not concerned with the traditional “harvest now, decrypt later” possibilities potentially afforded by quantum computing, the DNS will need “post quantum” DNSSEC signatures that can’t be forged by quantum computing capabilities. However, the expected size of these signatures and of their related cryptographic public keys under various potential future encryption algorithms will not be compatible with UDP, the messaging protocol on which the DNS is based. In response to GAC Members' questions, it was proposed that this challenge may require transitioning DNS to a new transport protocol such as TCP or DNS over TLS. GAC Members and their governments were invited to consider this matter as a subject of ongoing research, and not yet a matter for infrastructure transition planning. The SSAC Chair offered the support of his Advisory Committee’s expertise as needed for the briefing of governments on these matters.

Jeff Bedser, a member of the SSAC Leadership team, reviewed the findings of the **INFERMAL study** conducted by ICANN’s Office of the CTO in collaboration with academic researchers. He cautioned that the INFERMAL report does not offer solutions to mitigate DNS Abuse, but rather sought to identify and evaluate various restrictions, incentives and measures that can influence which registrars malicious actors will choose to register domain names with which to conduct DNS Abuse. Among numerous factors, several were highlighted, including:

- **Lower Registration Fees and Discounts**: Each dollar reduction in registration fees corresponds to a 49% increase in malicious domains. Discounts on domain registrations are associated with a significant increase in malicious registrations.
- **Free Services**: The availability of free services, such as web hosting, drives an 88% surge in phishing activities.
- **Registration restrictions and verification practices**: implementing stringent restrictions can reduce abuse by 63% and proactive verification of registrant information, such as email and phone validation, significantly reduces malicious registrations.
- **API Access**: Registrars providing application programming interface (API) access for domain registration or account creation experience a 401% rise in malicious domains
- **Abuse Mitigation Timeframe**: The impact of mitigation times on reducing domain



abuse is minimal. Even brief uptimes can provide attackers with valuable credentials and financial gain.

- Concentration of Abuse: Malicious registrations are not uniformly distributed and tend to be concentrated in certain registrars and TLDs.

It was suggested that these findings are well understood in the industry, and that the study provides valuable data-driven validation of this understanding. Solutions however have remained elusive. For example, even at much higher registration prices, phishing attacks will remain profitable, and higher prices will deter legitimate use of domain names. As it relates to registration verification processes, Artificial Intelligence can be leveraged to generate digital identities that are credible enough to defeat verifications, and legitimate registrants can sell domains for abusive activity. Progress in the mitigation of DNS Abuse was proposed to lie in the acceleration of both detection and mitigation with the goal to reduce victimization.

Asked whether SSAC is planning to comment or advise on the findings of the INFERMAL Study, SSAC leaders indicated that their committee has not sought a consensus position and that consultations need to be initiated following a presentation received from ICANN's Office of the CTO.

One GAC Member shared the experience of their ccTLD which significantly reduced DNS Abuse with the implementation of registration verification and 2-factor authentication of registrants. Another GAC Member wondered whether technical standards could be considered to improve on detection of DNS Abuse. The SSAC chair suggested that education, data collection and the definition of best practices would likely be more effective. He also proposed that GAC and SSAC collaborate on relevant advice toward solutions that he expects will require a combination of governmental, policy and technical expertise.

In response to a GAC Member's plea for assistance from the GAC and SSAC in assisting small countries in implementing appropriate cybersecurity strategies, the SSAC Chair encouraged GAC Members to connect with SSAC and reaffirmed the willingness of SSAC experts to assist governments where possible.

## 5.5. Meeting with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)

The GAC and the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest such as the Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) on DNS abuse and the gTLD Applicant Support.

The NCSG Chair provided a short introduction noting that it is the space for civil society and non-commercial users in ICANN through the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), and which participates in the policy making for gTLDs.

Regarding the topic on the Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) on DNS abuse, the NCSG indicated that hasty takedown of domain names could have implications for freedom of speech and impact access to information, and how to protect registrants. The NCSG expressed its interest in developing nonbinding guidelines for how registrars and registries should follow a human rights impact assessment when mitigating DNS abuse. The GAC welcomed this initiative and expressed interest in joining the discussion as it is a complex topic and human rights are extremely important to governments.

On the topic of gTLD Applicant Support, the NCSG wanted to assess the GAC's understandability of the next round of new gTLDs and Applicant Support Program (ASP) rules and guiding materials. The NCSG noted that despite the outreach and engagement efforts regarding the Applicant Support Program do not seem to be enough to attract people and different entities. Secondly, the NCSG was concerned about the effectiveness of the financial assistance provided which might require full exemption in some cases, to achieve diversification. And thirdly, regarding the non-financial support (i.e business, technical and legal support), the NCSG questioned the clarity and transparency of the information for organizations with a very low level of knowledge about ICANN's procedures. The NCSG concluded that it is still trying to reach organizations that could be potential applicants for the program, taking into account their priorities.

## 5.6. Meeting with the Contracted Parties House (CPH)

GAC Members met with representatives of the Generic Names Supporting Organization's Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) and the Registrants Stakeholder Group (RrSG) to discuss the latest developments in areas where they have common or overlapping interest, including WSIS+20, Next Round of New gTLDs, Urgent Requests and Authentication Mechanisms and the INFERMAL study.

Regarding **WSIS+20** the CPH noted its support for the existing WSIS action lines and the continued support to the multistakeholder model which is foundational to an interoperable Internet. Individually, Registries and Registrars are very involved in various government preparatory proceeds, trying to offer technical perspectives.

GAC members highlighted the importance of the WSIS review and how it affects the whole Internet ecosystem, and that as such it is important for all parties to engage. GAC members further expressed their support to the technical community getting together with other parts of the community on this item, including civil society, academia, business sector because the stronger the coalition, the more harmonized positions can be developed.

Pertaining to the **Next Round of New gTLDs**, the CPH noted their availability to provide input to GAC members specifically on GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice on the process as it occurred in the last round, in preparation for the upcoming one. The CPH expressed their availability and offer to share learnings from the process in 2012, in case GAC members have questions.

On **Urgent Requests**, the CPH noted their availability for cross community work on this issue of how law enforcement can be authenticated for urgent requests, recognizing this is not necessarily a multi-stakeholder model approach but within the auspice of the ICANN community, leveraging relationships to work within ICANN to solve a problem.

GAC members underscored the importance of cross community collaboration due to the very serious nature of the topic at hand, i.e. serious life threatening situations when no policy recommendations are in place for urgent requests. The GAC remains available and eager to collaborate with the CPH expressing that joining progress can help this effort, notably on the authentication mechanism which has been a concern as well as the timeline.

Finally, on **the INFERMAL**, GAC members flagged interest on the results of the INFERMAL report. The CPH provided some input on the results of the report, noting that it is valuable when looking at taking in data to identify next steps for registries or registrars by impacting or curating an environment that may encourage or allow increased DNS Abuse. GAC members reacted to CPH comments noting that quick mitigation needs to be looked at and expended since for instance a few hours is sufficient for significant harm and DNS Abuse cannot simply be prevented. GAC members encouraged comprehensive feedback from the CPH regarding bulk registration to understand the CPH's perspectives and better inform research since the INFERMAL report is not the ultimate definitive conclusive report on maliciously registered registration can be built on.

The GAC Chair, and CPH leadership members shared appreciation for the opportunity to liaise on matters of interest to both parties, and the GAC Chair adjourned the meeting.

### **5.7. Meeting with the Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)**

The GAC and Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest. The agenda focused on an update about the Policy GAC Analysis (PGA) and a second part, was dedicated to an engagement session format about ccTLD models.

Pertaining to the ccNSO Policy Gap Analysis, the chair of the Working Group started by providing some background on the work produced noting that the PGA WG was formed to prepare an overview of policies and guidance related to ccTLDs, identify possible gaps in current policy, guidance and practices, as well advise the ccNSO Council whether to act, and if so how, on any gaps identified. As of January 2025, the overview document was finalised, and the second output, the WG's considerations around analyzing the gaps, concluded in March. Two ccNSO groups are recommended to look in depth at the IANA public records for ccTLDs (purpose, data accuracy and maintenance) and its role in disaster recovery for ccTLDs. The ccNSO Council will decide on the next steps in the coming months.

During the second part of the session, the chair of the ccNSO provided an introduction on the ccNSO membership and governance models, and subsequently explained the objective of the engagement activity, before GAC and ccNSO in-person participants gathered in smaller groups; aimed at helping GAC members learn about different ccTLD models and engage in smaller settings with ccNSO members, to encourage networking and foster the relationship between ccTLD operators and committee members.

GAC and ccNSO members had the opportunity to interact in smaller groups around two main topics, from an operational standpoint on the use of back-end providers and from a governance perspective, to learn more on the ccTLD governance models. Each topic had 4 meeting points, and members could rotate twice after 20 minutes.

Following the breakout time, mentimeter poll questions were shared with participants. The first question required to describe in one word the networking session, the second was for participants to provide feedback about the format and dialogue of the networking session, and the third question was to gauge future breakout session topics.

The GAC Chair closed the session and welcomed the ccNSO and GAC's initiative for the interactive session programming.

## 6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS

### 6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session

GAC Members found time for a final wrap-up session after the conclusion of the communiqué drafting effort. Attendees and support staff reviewed a number of follow-up work areas for the committee between ICANN82 and ICANN83 including - ICANN83 Policy Forum Planning (topic inputs, agenda setting calls, input on capacity development, etc.); the GAC 60-day consultation period on election timing and leadership term changes; follow-up on the Urgent Request “triad” negotiations with Board and GNSO - particularly in the context of IRT Implementation; and GAC Annual Planning - (2025-26) work.

Attendees also discussed key dates and deadlines to be observed between ICANN82 and ICANN83, including:

- Publication of GAC ICANN82 Communiqué - 17/18 March 2025;
- ICANN82 GAC Minutes ~ April 2025;
- Call for Topics for ICANN83 (policy topics, WG updates, joint sessions) ~ ASAP;
- ICANN83 GAC Agenda Setting Calls (to review preliminary agenda) ~ early April (3 April) 2025 (and potential #2); and
- ICANN83 Community Forum - 09-12 June 2025; Prague - Czech Republic

GAC Members once again extended their appreciation to the outgoing GAC Vice Chairs - Nigel Hickson (United Kingdom), Zeina Bou Hard (Lebanon) and WANG Lang (China). In his closing remarks to the committee, Mr. Hickson expressed the following, "it's obviously been a pleasure and an honor to be a GAC vice chair. I look back on it with immense enjoyment and I hope we've achieved something in the last two years. It's been a real collaborative effort. It's been a pleasure to work with Nico and my fellow vice chairs. I think the substance we've covered has been immensely important. Many people say to the corridors that it's so good that the GAC seems to be in tune, aware, and understanding of the processes that are going on. We might not always agree with them 100%, we might not agree with details, but I think we have shown that by being involved in all these community working groups and PDPs and everything else, that we're a full contributor to the whole ICANN process."

The GAC Chair adjourned the meeting with thanks to government participants, attendees, staff and interpreters.

# # #

**Attachment 1 - ICANN82 Hybrid Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST**

	<b>Registrations</b>	<b>Attended (in-person &amp; virtual)</b>	<b>Active Check-In Pilot</b>
<b>Member Delegations</b>	93	84	70
<b>Observer Delegations</b>	9	8	8
<b>Member Delegates</b>	142	121	90
<b>Observer Delegates</b>	13	12	9

**Attachment 1 - ICANN82 Hybrid Annual General Meeting - GAC ATTENDEES LIST**

<b>GAC Members (93)</b>		
European Commission	Government of Grenada	Government of Portugal
Government of Argentina	Government of Guatemala	Government of Qatar
Government of Armenia	Government of Haiti	Government of Romania
Government of Australia	Government of Hong Kong (China)	Government of Russian Federation
Government of Azerbaijan	Government of India	Government of Rwanda
Government of Bangladesh	Government of Indonesia	Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Government of Benin	Government of Ireland	Government of Sao Tome and Principe
Government of Bermuda	Government of Italy	Government of Senegal
Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Government of Jamaica	Government of Serbia
Government of Brazil	Government of Japan	Government of Singapore
Government of Burundi	Government of Kenya	Government of Slovakia
Government of Cabo Verde, Republic of	Government of Korea, Republic of	Government of South Africa
Government of Cambodia	Government of Kuwait	Government of Spain
Government of Canada	Government of Lebanon	Government of Suriname, Republic of
Government of Cayman Islands	Government of Libya	Government of Sweden
Government of Chad, Republic of	Government of Malaysia	Government of Switzerland

Government of China	Government of Mali	Government of Chinese Taipei
Government of Colombia	Government of Monaco	Government of Thailand
Government of Congo, Republic of	Government of Mongolia	Government of Timor-Leste
Government of Congo, the Democratic Republic of the	Government of Morocco	Government of Tonga
Government of Cote d'Ivoire	Government of Mozambique	Government of Trinidad and Tobago
Government of Croatia	Government of Myanmar, Republic of the Union of	Government of Tunisia
Government of Czech Republic	Government of Nauru	Government of Türkiye, Republic of
Government of Denmark	Government of Netherlands	Government of Uganda
Government of Dominican Republic	Government of Niger	Government of United Arab Emirates
Government of Egypt	Government of Nigeria	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government of Eswatini	Government of Niue	Government of United States
Government of Finland	Government of Norway	Government of Vanuatu
Government of France	Government of Pakistan	Government of Zimbabwe
Government of Gabon	Government of Papua New Guinea	
Government of Georgia	Government of Paraguay	
Government of Germany	Government of Philippines	

<b>GAC Observers (9)</b>	
African Parliamentary Network on Internet Governance (APNIG)	Universal Postal Union (UPU)
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	The World Bank
Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO)	World Broadcasting Unions (WBU)
League of Arab States	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
Smart Africa	

## Attachment 2 - ICANN82 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
1	New gTLDs Next Round	GAC Support to work with the ICANN org new gTLD team to compile briefing materials on topics of interest to governments including GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice.