
MINUTES OF MEETING
ICANN83 Policy Forum, 09-12 June 2025

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP	2
1.1. Opening Plenary Session	2
2. PUBLIC POLICY AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES	3
2.1. New gTLDs Next Round	3
2.2. WHOIS and Registration Data Issues	7
2.3. DNS Abuse	9
3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS	12
3.1. GAC Strategic Planning	12
3.2. GAC Operating Matters	12
3.3. GAC Capacity Development	13
4. GAC WORKING GROUPS	14
4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)	14
5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	14
5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board	14
5.2. Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)	22
5.3 Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	24
5.4 Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)	25
5.5 Meeting with SIDN Labs	26
5.4 Meeting with the Address Supporting Organization (ASO)	26
6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS	28
6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session	28
Attachment 1 - ICANN83 Community Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST	30
Attachment 2 - ICANN83 Action Points Compilation	32

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE & MEMBERSHIP

80 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 ICANN83 GAC meeting Member and Observer attendees is provided in [Attachment 1 - ICANN83 Hybrid Policy Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST](#).

The ICANN83 GAC Communiqué is published on the GAC website at: <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann83-prague-communique>.

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/icann83-prague-agenda>.

Full transcripts for each meeting session are to be made available from the [ICANN83 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 ICANN83 Policy Forum. He highlighted particular aspects of the meeting week agenda and shared logistical information to help all attendees participate effectively during the meeting week. He was joined by the Czech republic's representative to the GAC who offered opening welcome remarks.

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 a second attendance-taking pilot effort that support staff was employing for this meeting that is intended to test a more rigorous attendance recording methodology for remote participants using the committee's future new election balloting infrastructure. Staff will evaluate the results of the effort after ICANN83 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 attending in-person and virtually introduced themselves.

GAC members also reviewed the Communiqué drafting schedule and process for ICANN83. 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 ICANN83.

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 an update on the Registry Agreement (RA), followed by presentations on the Implementation Review Team (IRT), the Applicant Support Program (ASP), outreach and engagement activities, and a focused discussion on GAC-specific mechanisms and obligations in the New gTLD round. The session would conclude with an open floor for questions and interventions.

Karla Hakansson (ICANN Org) provided an update on the **Next Round Base Registry Agreement** and informed attendees that a draft of the RA was released for public comment on June 4, 2025. Karla emphasized the importance of reviewing this foundational document, particularly for newer GAC members unfamiliar with RA mechanics, and announced two upcoming educational sessions:

- A foundational session on June 17, 2025, to cover the basics of the Registry Agreement (Registry Agreement 101).
- A follow-up session to be scheduled later, focusing on substantive differences between the existing and proposed RA for the next round.

The session would conclude with an open floor for questions and interventions. These sessions aim to help GAC members build familiarity with the RA's critical components ahead of formal policy review.

On the **Implementation Review Team**, Rida Tahir (Canada), the GAC-appointed representative to the IRT, provided a summary of the team's work to date. She noted that the IRT was formed in May 2023 and has since engaged in intensive, detailed work over two years to implement recommendations from the Final Report of the Subsequent Procedures (SubPro) Policy Development Process.

Rida confirmed that the full draft of the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) was published on May 30, 2025, and is open for public comment until July 23, 2025. This marks the fourth and final round of public comment for the AGB, and she emphasized that while this is not a forum for altering policy recommendations, it is a vital opportunity to ensure the document accurately implements community-agreed recommendations. She encouraged GAC members to provide feedback with a focus on clarity, consistency, and policy alignment.

Following Rida, Lars Hoffman from ICANN Org provided additional context and recognized the contributions of the late Nigel Hickson (UK), who had been an active and dedicated participant in 52 IRT meetings. Lars presented statistical highlights: the IRT had held over 170 meetings and had 123 members participating across several workstreams, including those on Applicant Support and Geographic Names. Lars emphasized the scope and complexity of the draft AGB, which currently totals 395 pages, including extensive annexes. While acknowledging the document's length, he stressed that the team has worked to make it as readable and accessible as possible.

He reaffirmed that the timeline for launching the next round remains consistent:

- The AGB public comment period closes on **July 23, 2025**.
- From August to October, ICANN Org will review, categorize, and address public comments.
- The final AGB is expected to be adopted by the ICANN Board no later than **December 2025**.
- The next round is scheduled to open in **April 2026**.
- Translations of the AGB in all ICANN languages will be published by **February 2026**.

Tracy Hackshaw (UPU) provided a GAC perspective on the **Applicant Support Program (ASP)**, noting that the program's success is closely tied to effective outreach and geographic diversity. He reminded attendees of a compromise reached with the ICANN Board after ICANN80, which stipulates that after the first 20 qualifying applications, ICANN Org will reassess outreach strategies based on geographic distribution and may adjust communication efforts accordingly.

However, Tracy expressed concern that the number of qualifying applications remains low, and a surge of last-minute applications toward the end of the submission window (closing in November 2025) could hinder the ability to make timely outreach adjustments.

Kristy Buckley, who leads the ASP from ICANN Org, provided a comprehensive update on the program's operational status. She reported that 44 applications have been initiated, one withdrawn, and four have progressed to Phase 2 (external evaluation). The majority of applications remain in early stages, and progress is contingent on applicants completing their submissions.

Kristy explained that ICANN is meeting its service-level expectations and that delays are primarily due to incomplete or pending applications. A five-question survey was distributed to applicants to identify obstacles, and follow-up reminders have been sent. Based on preliminary feedback, ICANN is preparing a tutorial webinar and other resources to assist applicants.

She presented a regional breakdown of ASP applications. For example, Africa has seven applications across four countries, and Asia-Pacific has the highest number of applications. Notably, the total number already exceeds the three applications received during the 2012 round, indicating broader awareness and interest.

Kristy added that ICANN has published a list of pro bono service providers and mentors on the ASP webpage and is working to make application data transferable between the ASP and gTLD systems to reduce redundancy for applicants.

Nigel Cassimire (CTU) inquired about the monthly reports mentioned in earlier consultations and the definition of the "20-application threshold." Kristy clarified that monthly updates are shared with the IRT and will soon be summarized in email briefs for broader dissemination. She confirmed that the 20-applicant threshold applies to qualified applicants, not just those who have applied.

Sushil Pal (India) requested detailed country-level applicant data and differentiation between commercial and non-commercial applicants. He noted that general statistics lack actionable value

for national outreach. He also asked if ICANN is actively contacting pending applicants. Kristy confirmed that regional GSE staff are informed of regional gaps and encouraged GAC members to contact their respective Regional Vice Presidents (RVPs). She also noted that entity-type data (e.g. nonprofit, Indigenous) is updated monthly on the ASP statistics page.

Marco Hogewoning (Netherlands) offered to assist in identifying and resolving national or regional obstacles that may be slowing applications. Kristy welcomed this offer and noted that ICANN would continue working with local stakeholders to amplify impact.

A written question from Colombia asked why the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region has comparatively fewer applications. Kristy responded that local interest is increasing, and noted a significant rise in website traffic from Brazil following ICANN's participation at the LACNIC event.

Kristy Buckley transitioned to present broader efforts around **applicant readiness** beyond the ASP. She explained that the goal is to ensure all audiences—applicants, ICANN Org, vendors, and community members—are prepared to participate effectively in the next round.

Resources under development include:

- Key Topic Overviews (1–2 page summaries of complex AGB topics)
- FAQs tailored for applicants and GAC members
- Webinars scheduled for early 2026
- Training modules for application systems and evaluation processes

She emphasized that while these materials are helpful, the AGB remains the authoritative source for all programmatic details.

Bob Ochieng, ICANN org, presented statistics and strategy updates pertaining to **outreach and engagement**. In 2024, ICANN conducted 24 outreach events globally, and as of mid-2025, nearly the same number had been completed, signaling growing momentum. He highlighted recent events in Nigeria and Tanzania, noting the value of national-level workshops hosted in collaboration with GAC members. He encouraged other countries to consider co-hosting local events with ICANN staff.

Bob showcased resources available online, including multilingual outreach toolkits, blog posts, and use cases illustrating real-world applications of new gTLDs. He emphasized that materials are meant to be community-facing, easily downloadable, and reproducible for local outreach efforts.

ICANN continues to brief foundations and development banks and invited GAC members to assist with introductions. A recurring monthly update to the IRT covers all outreach efforts in detail and is followed by summary reports for stakeholders.

Ashwin Sasongko (Indonesia) asked whether ICANN supports regional events financially and whether ASP guidance includes lessons learned from the 2012 round. Bob confirmed that ICANN offers limited sponsorships and recommended routing requests through RVPs. Kristy noted that ASP

guidance now includes practical advice, string selection caution, and pro bono support to avoid pitfalls of the previous round.

Guo Feng (China) urged the GAC to hold structured discussions on potential consensus advice and emphasized the importance of member capacity building. He also called for post-session coordination to prepare for String Confirmation Day.

Elisa Busetto and Lars Hoffman (ICANN org) summarized the tools available to the GAC during the next round:

- **GAC Consensus Advice:** Formal statements that can block or conditionally advance applications.
- **Early Warnings:** Issued by individual governments to flag potential public policy issues.
- **Application Comments:** Open for 90 days following string publication.
- **Singular/Plural Notifications:** Allow governments to identify confusingly similar strings.
- **Formal Objections and Appeals:** ICANN will offer governments up to \$50,000 in funding per case, covering filing fees and legal support.

Lars further clarified the role of Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs) as a means for applicants to address public policy concerns flagged by the GAC.

Susan Chalmers (USA) raised a concern that excessive expansion of the DNS could exacerbate issues like phishing and spam. While recognizing the value of geoTLDs and IDNs, she urged the GAC to consider appropriate limitations on expansion in the public interest.

Jorge Cancio (Switzerland) closed the session by encouraging members to volunteer for upcoming GAC efforts related to String Confirmation Day, consensus advice preparation, and application reviews. He reiterated that preparation must begin now and called on members to reach out to the GAC support team.

Action Point(s):

- **GAC Members** to review the draft Applicant Guidebook (AGB) to determine if it aligns with SubPro PDP WG Recommendations and submit a public comment prior to 23 July 2025.
- **GAC Members** to participate in the ICANN org RA training session to better understand the contractual framework for new gTLDs (17 June 2025).
- **GAC Members** to begin preparing for active participation in GAC Early Warnings and Advice Planning for the next round of new gTLDs. GAC members to develop a process for GAC Early Warnings.
- **GAC Members** to volunteer to join the GAC's internal coordination team to help organize GAC work on application review, cons/ensus advice drafting, and objection tracking.

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, as reflected in the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services (28 March 2007) which refer to the numerous parties and various legitimate purposes that this data serves.

Presenters provided an overview of the continuing multi-phase efforts undertaken at ICANN 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 continue to be discussed. Implementation remains to be started for EPDP Phase 2A (differentiation between legal and natural persons). EPDP Phase 2 (registration data access system) has led to 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 such considerations have resumed for the accreditation of Privacy and Proxy services (PPSAI IRT).

The GAC Chair highlighted that 7 years have passed since the initiation of this multi-phase process of expedited policy development, with limited outcomes to date. He stressed that the amount of time this work has been taking is difficult to understand for newcomers and governmental authorities who may question the efficiency of this process.

Regarding **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 requestors and that no cross-border system for such authentication exists. Consistent with the October 2024 GAC proposal to the ICANN Board that two tracks of work be conducted in parallel, before ICANN82, 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). This group is reporting encouraging progress on both a short and long term authentication mechanism. In the meantime, since ICANN82, ICANN org has reconvened the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review Team (IRT) to determine an appropriate timeline for response to Urgent Requests. This group is currently discussing ICANN org’s proposal for a 24h time frame to respond to authenticated Urgent Requests, on which there are divergent views in the IRT.

Regarding the **Registration Data Request Services (RDRS)**, it was recalled that this service serves as a pilot program for the original EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations for a Standardized System for Access and Disclosure of registration data (SSAD), the consideration of which have been paused given the potential cost and complexity of implementation. The RDRS GNSO Standing Committee was formed to analyze the data and experience gathered during this pilot program. It is currently drafting a report which is expected to recommend modifications of the original SSAD recommendations based on the experience acquired with the RDRS.

The GNSO Council is expected to consider these recommendations and launch a policy process which would eventually deliver new policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for the establishment of the future system for access and disclosure of registration data.

Before ICANN84 in October 2025, the GAC will have the opportunity to provide input on the RDRS Standing Committee report that is expected in August 2025. It was proposed that on this occasion, the GAC may wish to revisit previous input it had provided in the EPDP Phase 2 process, including a GAC Minority Statement¹ which laid out a series of public policy concerns with the SSAD recommendations, and a letter to the GNSO² regarding ICANN’s implementation assumptions that were made regarding accreditation of governmental entities, in its Operational Design Assessment³.

Regarding the **Accuracy of Registration Data**, it was recalled that work has stalled since the pause of the Accuracy Scoping Team in 2022. A GNSO Small Team on Accuracy has been formed to assess community input on threshold questions that were circulated earlier this year.

Preliminarily, the Small Team has suggested, as a potential way forward: investigating shortening the timeline for registrars to perform registration data validation and verification from the current 15 day limit; education of registrants to encourage submission of accurate information; work to ensure registration data records show when a domain is suspended due to inaccurate data.

Final recommendations from the Small Team are expected in the coming weeks. During ICANN83, the ICANN Board suggested to the GAC that due to challenges with addressing accuracy directly, the accuracy could be addressed indirectly through possible policy development on separate issues.

¹ See <https://gac.icann.org/statement/public/gac-minority-statement-epdp-phase2-24aug20.pdf>

² See [GAC Chair correspondence to the GNSO Council Chair](#) (15 December 2021)

³ See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/ssad-oda-25jan22-en.pdf>

2.3. DNS Abuse

GAC Topics Leads on DNS Abuse recalled the importance of DNS Abuse Mitigation which is a priority issue for the GAC. It was also recalled that since ICANN81, the GAC has been briefed on the implementation of the recent DNS Abuse amendments by Contracted Parties, their enforcement by ICANN Contractual compliance and new research on malicious registrations in the so-called INFERMAL study.

Prior to ICANN83, the GAC hosted a webinar which welcomed industry experts and Contracted Parties representatives to discuss next steps the ICANN community can take to further elevate actions taken to prevent and mitigate DNS Abuse, and in particular specific topics that could be candidate for future policy development, including as a result of the ongoing deliberation of a reconvened GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse.

This ICANN83 GAC plenary session provided further briefing of the Committee on the DNS Abuse landscape with presentations from a representative of the host country's ccTLD as well as cybersecurity researchers, and continued the GAC's discussion of avenues for further progress in DNS Abuse mitigation policy at ICANN.

A speaker from CZ.NIC, the Czech ccTLD and also national Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) of the Czech Republic, presented their **response to a phishing campaign leveraging .cz domains**. This campaign was eventually fended off through a combination of monitoring and proactive measures of the ccTLD Registry Operator which included monitoring of domain registrations, monitoring the evolution of content served via suspicious domain names, and predicting future domain registrations in this campaign in order to prevent them. In response to a GAC Member's question regarding coordination with financial institutions whose customers were targeted in the phishing campaigns, the speaker spoke of challenges as well as opportunities.

Two representatives from the cybersecurity research firm **Interisle Consulting Group presented data on the significance and continued threat of phishing attacks**, and shared insights they have gained in terms of what type of measures can effectively address these threats. Taking European ccTLDs practices as an example, the presenters argued that better verification of registrant contact information, and identify verification can be effective in reducing the incidence of domain abuse. Among other anti-abuse measures, it was suggested that automated systems can effectively be used to recognize suspicious and conspicuous patterns that are hallmarks of abusive registrations.

The NetBeacon Institute recalled the proposals it recently made to the ICANN community for **potential topics of narrowly focused policy development efforts**, including:

- Creating an obligation, upon confirmation of a malicious registration, to check domains associated with the same account/registrant and to take appropriate action
- Adding friction that limits the abuse of APIs enabling bulk registration
- Requiring registrants who offer subdomains to 3rd parties to have an abuse contact and to take appropriate action against abuse conducted with these subdomains
- Ensuring that registrants have a path to challenge enforcement actions with registrars or registries when believed to be taken in error

- Creating an ICANN-operated facility that verifies and disseminates information to disrupt Botnet and Domain Generation Algorithms (DGAs) to allow addressing these threats at scale, across the TLD ecosystem.

In addition to these proposals, GAC Topics leads shared with the GAC a series of **other proposals that are being discussed by Contracted Parties** including:

- New requirements for Registrars to inspect other domains in a customer account, or attached to the same registrant information, when they are investigating an actionable DNS Abuse report
- Improve the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) to ensure that registrars that offer an API/Reseller program have the necessary contractual means to impose DNS Abuse mitigation requirements on their resellers
- Creating an operational framework to provide all gTLD registry operators with a verified list of botnet generated domain names to prompt proactive action at scale
- Promoting the existing Best Practices for reporting phishing, so that it reaches a critical mass of abuse reporters

Recalling previous GAC statements in the Hamburg Communiqué and in the Seattle Communiqué, GAC Topic Leads reaffirmed the **importance for the GAC to seek appropriate ICANN policy to address DNS Abuse**, including preventing the abuse of bulk registration services, and promoting proactive measures to prevent the registration of malicious domain names through monitoring of registrations behavior and identity verification requirements. GAC Topic Leads also proposed that obligations on Contracted Parties to report on their DNS Abuse mitigation actions would enhance visibility and understanding of DNS Abuse.

In the meantime, it was recalled that the recently **reconvened GNSO Small Team on DNS Abuse**, which is tasked to evaluate DNS Abuse mitigation efforts to date and to determine whether further GNSO policy work is needed, is expected to produce initial findings by September 2025.

Several GAC Members noted and welcomed the momentum that is building in the community for policy work on DNS Abuse, and recalled the long standing GAC position that new DNS Abuse mitigation measures should be in place before the next round of New gTLDs. It was suggested that as part of the GAC Advice to the ICANN Board being considered regarding targeted narrowly scoped PDP, the GAC identifies priority topics for future policy development. Among these topics, it was proposed that the monitoring of domain registration data and behavior, restrictions on bulk registrations and transparency obligations be prioritized. Several Members called on the GAC in its discussion with the GNSO and the ICANN Board to not let perfection stand in the way of progress and to seek to narrow down the scope of policy topics to be considered moving forward. A GAC Member stressed that it is very important, particularly at this time, for the multistakeholder community of ICANN to work together and deliver policy outcomes.

Regarding restrictions on the use of bulk registrations services, a GAC Member wondered whether restricting the maximum number of domains registered at one time has been considered. A panelist

suggested that the introduction of friction in the use of these services is likely to be more effective than setting limits.

One GAC Member expressed interest in understanding whether the ISO/IEC 27001 Standard related to Information security, cybersecurity and privacy protection is sufficient and effective as it relates to addressing DNS Abuse. Another GAC Member suggested that the root cause of DNS Abuse lies in the anonymity and lack of accountability that allows abusive domain registrants to provide inaccurate identity and contact information at the time of registration.

3. GAC OPERATIONAL MATTERS

3.1. GAC Strategic Planning

The GAC Leadership reported on its ongoing work with GAC Topic Leads to develop the next GAC Annual Plan 2025/2026 and reviewed expected updates to some of the GAC Strategic Objectives and various Expected Outcomes. The new distribution of “caretaker” roles for the next annual cycle among GAC Chair, Vice-Chairs and Topic Leads was also presented.

It is expected that the next GAC Annual Plan will be proposed for endorsement by the GAC during ICANN84. GAC Topic Leads and the GAC Leadership plan to circulate a Draft of the next Annual Plan for GAC Review and Input by September 2025, which would enable finalization of the plan for consideration prior to ICANN84.

3.2. GAC Operating Matters

Pursuant to GAC Operating Principle 53, GAC Members finalized revisions to the GAC Operating Principles regarding the timing of annual committee leadership elections and the terms of the GAC Chair and the GAC Vice Chairs that had originally been discussed and agreed to during ICANN82.

After a review of the Operating Principle 53 process by the GAC Chair, GAC members in attendance agreed by raising of hands to revise GAC Operating Principle 31 to adjust the committee’s annual election cycle to conclude during the second meeting of the calendar year. Comments were made reinforcing the value of this timeline to assure smooth onboarding of the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board role. This revision will enable leadership transitions to take place at the end of the ICANN Annual General Meeting when the ICANN Board and other ICANN communities also begin their leadership terms. GAC Members in attendance also agreed (by raising hands) to revise GAC Operating Principle 21 to adjust the term limit of the GAC Chair to three consecutive terms of two years and the term limits of the GAC Vice-Chairs to two consecutive terms of two years.

GAC Support staff shared an overview of the impact of the election schedule/timing changes and described the impact on current and near-future terms for both the GAC Chair and GAC Vice Chair positions.

Impact on Current GAC Chair Term

- Two-year term began at conclusion of ICANN82 (March 2025)
- Alignment with next AGM will require current term to end in October 2026 rather than March 2027
- 2026 Election Nominations begin at end of ICANN85 (March 2026) and election concludes at ICANN86 (June 2026)
- Current GAC Chair term ends at conclusion of ICANN87 (October 2026) - 4 months early

Impact on Next GAC Chair Term

- Regular/Full Two-year term begins at end of ICANN87 (October 2026)

- Nomination period begins at end of ICANN85 (March 2026) and election concludes at ICANN86 (June 2026)
- Begins two-year term at end of ICANN87 (October 2026 - in alignment with AGM) and serves until end of ICANN93 (October 2028)

Impact on Current GAC Vice Chair Terms

- One-year terms began at conclusion of ICANN82 (March 2025)
- No impact - terms still conclude at end of ICANN85 (March 2026)

Impact on Vice Chairs Elected at ICANN84

- 2025 Election Nominations begin at end of ICANN83 (June 2025) and election concludes at ICANN 84 (October 2025)
- Vice Chairs elected at ICANN84 will serve shorter terms to align with new AGM confluence
- Vice Chairs elected at ICANN84 (shortened two-year term) will begin term at end of ICANN85 (March 2026) and will serve shorter term until conclusion of ICANN90 (October 2027) - 4 months early

Some GAC Members expressed concern about the impact of the changes on the balance of the leadership team going forward. It was agreed for the committee to review and assess after future elections that the GAC leadership teams achieve a good balance of new and experienced members to assure consistency and historical knowledge.

3.3. GAC Capacity Development

The ICANN83 GAC Capacity Development session focused on the New gTLD Program Next Round Applicant Guidebook and particularly on matters of GAC interest related to the applicant journey, community input, objections and appeals, contention resolution, and application evaluation. The very engaging and well attended session was instrumental in preparing for the productive GAC plenary discussions that followed on the next round of New gTLDs.

The GAC Leadership and Underserved Regions Working Group (USRWG) co-chairs will assess the [results](#) from the post session survey and will work with the USRWG to continue delivering capacity development opportunities for GAC Members.

4. GAC WORKING GROUPS

4.1. GAC Public Safety Working Group (PSWG)

The GAC Leadership reported on its ongoing work with GAC Topic Leads to develop the next GAC Annual Plan 2025/2026 and reviewed expected updates to some of the GAC Strategic Objectives and various Expected Outcomes.

A draft of the next GAC Annual Plan is expected to be shared after ICANN83 for GAC Members' consideration and input, with a view to endorse the plan during ICANN84.

5. CROSS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

5.1. Meeting with the ICANN Board

The GAC Chair welcomed attendees to this joint session and introduced the ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha, the ICANN CEO, Kurtis Lindqvist and other Board Members and GAC Vice Chairs. He explained that the GAC would review a series of topics and questions that had already been shared with the Board in preparation for the meeting - including ICANN Policy Development, Registration Data and Accuracy, Privacy and Proxy Accreditation, Community Statements of Interest, and then Deferral of the ATRT4 Review.

The Board Chair thanked the GAC for hosting this bilateral session. She noted that past joint sessions have always proven to be a very healthy dialogue between the two groups, and that some excellent outcomes have emerged from these discussions.

1. ICANN Policy Development

The GAC Chair referenced GAC background materials expressing that the ICANN new 5-year strategic plan (2026-2030) goes into effect at the beginning of next month (July 2025) with the recognition that ICANN should “enhance the agility and effectiveness of Policy Advice and Development” (see ICANN Strategic Goal 1.2). This appears to include “incorporat[ing] flexibility and agile methodologies into the policy and advice development and implementation life cycle” (see ICANN Strategy 1.2.4).

These are appropriate goals at a time when many ICANN community members (including governments) are expressing concern that ICANN policy development processes (PDPs) - even “expedited ones” - take too long. Recent community discussions (including within the GAC) have begun to stress the need for better-scoped, more-focused, timely and targeted policy efforts – with the intention to shorten the time that it takes to deliver results on policy development matters.

GAC members noted that they support the view that ICANN should improve the current approach to policy development and move expeditiously toward a framework of more focused and narrowly scoped PDPs designed to facilitate more effective decision making and practical outcomes on a faster timeline. With the impending expansion of the DNS following the next round of new gTLDs and a continuing community obligation to reinforce efforts to combat DNS Abuse at all levels, this

“step-change” would ideally be initiated as soon as possible.

Consistent with the new ICANN Strategic Plan, the GAC Chair asked, how can the Board and ICANN CEO prompt this type of “step-change” in the organization’s approach to make policy development more efficient and effective - without contemplating a wholesale change in the ICANN policy development process itself? And, how can the GAC assist in this effort?

Board Members shared that the Board appreciates the GAC's interest in improving ICANN policy development processes and views the matter as very important. It was indicated that the Board shares the hopes expressed in previous GAC sessions that new policies could be developed within months rather than years. It was acknowledged that ICANN Objective 1.2 in the next five year Strategic Plan is about enhancing the agility and effectiveness of the policy and device development and that a number of objectives have been identified for heightened attention. Some of the areas where the Board sees potential improvement include clear definitions of the scope of each PDP, making policy developments faster and making it easier for new volunteers to contribute. It was noted that the GNSO Council is already moving towards narrowly scoped policy development programs. The current Latin script Diacritics PDP was noted as one PDP that is actually ahead of schedule - partly as a consequence of the small and clearly defined scope of the process. Board Members welcomed further discussion with the GAC and with the entire community on this strategic objective and emphasized that the GNSO Council is the best place to drive this process. It was suggested that the GAC would directly encourage the GNSO Council to continue or refine their efforts to create narrowly scoped PDPs in the future.

While GAC Members acknowledged that a narrowly scoped charter would be a step in the right direction towards a narrowly scoped PDP, it was noted that the committee is looking for something a bit more proactive, perhaps dealing with how the PDPs themselves are managed and conducted. The concept of a “step change” was re-emphasized, and GAC members encouraged the Board and GNSO Council to consider other ideas as well that are in their hands, including devoting more resources to secretariat support for the different PDPs. It was also posited that very clear deadlines and timelines could help drive community discussions to closure rather than open-ended timelines that seem to be moved time and again. The community efforts regarding the IANA transition and the ICANN Workstream 2 (Accountability) were cited as examples where substantial matters were resolved in as soon as 18 months, compared with more recent experiences where PDPs seem to have taken two, three, four, and five years - then followed by an IRT to implement it.

GAC members also noted the importance of PDP participants having meaningful participation opportunities in the context of PDPs - in terms not only of allowing people to express themselves, but also to make sure that participants present views that are representative of the communities they belong to. Board members were advised that the GAC makes efforts to prepare for PDPs by consulting with the group before going to PDP meetings, but some GAC members are concerned that this does seem to happen among other community groups.

Board members added to the discussion by explaining how Board involvement in PDPs has evolved over time. It was shared that in general, the Board has been more proactive in naming Board liaisons

who are actively involved in the process, who are checking in on PDP efforts to ensure that the Board is fully up to speed on what is going on so that issue spotting and topic flagging can be done at the Board level on important issues. It was hoped that those efforts can continue to be regularly practiced.

Board members also agreed that group management skills exhibited by strong and well-trained PDP Chairs and co-chairs were vital to maintaining consistent PDSP efforts. The Board has looked carefully at ICANN's ability to provide enhanced training to PDP leaders. Additional issues related to consistent attendance and the scheduling of PDP calls at times when all of the group can be in attendance were also noted as presenting some challenges in ICANN's global environment.

It was also noted by attendees that it was important that PDPs generate recommendations that are "implementable". It was noted that in some instances, PDP recommendations have been generated that, though well-intentioned, turned out to be somewhat impractical - which has further elongated the overall process and exacerbated the work of any subsequent Implementation Review Teams (IRT).

The Board Vice chair echoed the GAC's desire for a "step-change" approach. It was noted that the new ICANN strategic plan anticipates that there will be a significant, substantive improvement in the interactiveness and the confidence with which people develop policy within ICANN and that it seems the entire community is pointing in the right direction.

2. Registration Data and Accuracy

It was noted that in the ICANN82 (Seattle) Communiqué, the GAC had stated that "it would be helpful to receive more information about the current levels of compliance with existing requirements related to accuracy in ICANN's Registrar Accreditation Agreement." In its follow-up response via its scorecard document, the Board had noted, in turn, that it "welcome[d] more information from the GAC on what additional information it would find helpful in light of data processing limitations that exist under applicable data protection laws/regulations and the existing contractual requirements, as detailed in ICANN's Assessment of Registration Data Accuracy Scenarios report that was provided to the GNSO Council".

It was noted in GAC preparatory materials that discussion in the BGIG call on 7 April 2025 concluded that this topic warranted further discussion between Board and GAC to find clarity on what information the GAC appreciates and which can be delivered by ICANN within the limitations of applicable data protection laws/regulations.

GAC Question:

As shared prior to the meeting, the GAC asked, "can the ICANN Board provide suggestions regarding which additional data can be made available within the current limitations, or which (contractual) obstacles can potentially be removed in order to provide the GAC with a greater understanding of the current levels of compliance?"

GAC members in attendance expanded on the topic noting that the GAC question does not happen in the vacuum. It was noted that GAC members have had discussions about accuracy with all constituencies and groups, with the GNSO, with the Board, and within the GAC for a long time. Further, as part of the last GAC Communiqué it was noted that it was important to first understand how the current requirements are being implemented by the contracted parties. GAC members expressed a desire to have an overview of the compliance processes for accuracy that are currently in place and also to hear from ICANN what perceived levels of compliance are being observed.

ICANN staff explained that from an auditing standpoint, contracted parties are asked detailed questions about the processes that they have in place to comply with the accuracy requirements. They are asked for examples and to demonstrate that they do, in fact, follow through, on implementing those processes. It was noted that under existing privacy rules, the ICANN organization does not have a legitimate basis to go on a “fishing expedition” and ask contracted parties to validate and verify, or demonstrate to ICANN that they validated and verified all of their registrants and provide the associated data with that. However, it was explained that whenever ICANN receives an accuracy complaint or when it otherwise conduct an audit, ICANN Compliance makes sure that the contracted party is compliant with all the requirements that are particularly relevant to the validation and verification requirements. It was recognized that additional off-line discussions might be necessary on this part of the topic.

GAC members expressed an additional concern about potential delays (as many as 15 days) between the registration and the time for the validation, because that period can be used by malicious actors even when they are never validated. Board members noted that this issue has been raised by others and that is probably one of the things that people are thinking about.

3. Privacy and Proxy Accreditation

GAC Question:

Among other possible enhancements, the Board and the GAC have both expressed interest in the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) better facilitating requests for registration data in cases involving privacy or proxy services. As shared prior to the meeting, the GAC asked, procedurally, what would be the most efficient way to pursue this possibility, since the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation IRT is proceeding in parallel but is not aimed at addressing questions about the RDRS?

Board members explained that ICANN has been looking at how implementation of the RDRS enhancements gives ICANN an opportunity to map out and potentially test an integrated approach for centralizing the process for submitting third party requests for both gTLD non-public registration data and data concerning gTLD registrants who use privacy and proxy services.

They shared that one of the key questions that has to be answered (and that ICANN is working on with the Implementation Review Team (IRT)) is whether and how the existing recommendations

from the Privacy and Proxy PDP and the EPDP phase 1, 2, can be aligned with subsequent work on the RDRS and also with the new registration data policy and other relevant procedures. It was explained that the initial scope of RDRS didn't include processing of requests for data from privacy and proxy service providers, and that the RDRS wasn't built specifically for that purpose. It was also noted that nothing currently prevents existing registrars with affiliated privacy and proxy services from processing such requests via RDRS, and ICANN knows of some who are doing so, including one large registrar which publicly stated that it is working on RDRS disclosure requests for domains where the underlying data is affiliated with their privacy and proxy services. No other participating registrars have publicly confirmed that they are considering this approach, but Board members think there may be others.

According to Board members, the next step in this area that ICANN Org is currently working on and analyzing, is how do we get from where we are now with all of the policy recommendations that are on the table to an enhanced RDRS that includes privacy and proxy service providers? It was noted that the Board has to determine whether this can be done through implementation, whether existing policy covers it, or whether new policy is needed. It was observed that a solution will probably come from some combination of all three of those things and the Board hopes that such a solution requires very little new policy to get there.

GAC Members asked what the timetable for the mentioned analysis might be. Board members advised that the analysis was still in its early stages and they could not provide a current timetable but offered to get an estimate and follow-up to share any timeline information.

4. Community Statements of Interest

GAC Members acknowledged the latest Public Comment Opportunity shared by ICANN org seeking comment on an updated version of the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. Some GAC members have noted additional language added to the document which addresses government representatives.

GAC Question:

The GAC Chair noted the committee's appreciation for the continuing progress on this matter by the Board and staff and looks forward to it being concluded by the end of this calendar year at the latest.

It was shared that GAC Members reviewing the new Statement of Interest (SOI) red-lined language have interpreted the new language not to put any additional obligations on GAC representatives beyond the present expectation outlined in the current SOI process. Do Board members and senior ICANN staff have the same interpretation?

The Board Chair emphasized that transparency is very important to the ICANN Board and to ICANN Org. She noted that the Board appreciates the GAC's attention to the new red line language. It was explained that the new red line language provides some more detailed examples of how ICANN participants are expected to declare their interests behind their participation in ICANN processes.

She said so long as individual GAC representatives are participating in ICANN processes on behalf of the GAC or on behalf of their governments, and not on behalf of any other entity or interests and are already in the practice of making these declarations (and it's very obvious in these meetings that GAC participants do make such declarations), then, those individuals should not anticipate any change in obligations. The new policy is intended to enhance the focus on full disclosure for ICANN's SOI processes. And also since this code of conduct has been enhanced, if the GAC sees the potential of refining its own processes and practices, if appropriate, it should please do so.

The GAC Chair clarified his understanding that the process as far as governments representatives are concerned remains very simple - that a simple statement identifying the government being represented would be sufficient and the Board Chair indicated assent - if that was indeed the nature of the representation in a particular ICANN process.

When asked by GAC members about the timing for concluding the updating of the Code of Conduct/SOI process, it was shared that the expectation is that following the public comment, it will be sent to the Board for approval. The process could potentially be concluded by the end of the September Board workshop - assuming that any public comments received can be processed within that time.

5. Deferral of the ATRT4 Review

GAC Members noted the intended deferral of the ATR4 review process, as well as the decisions adopted by the Board recently on other accountability mechanisms as explained in the 27 May letter from the Board Chair to the GAC Chair. In this regard, the GAC recalls the essential character of the ATRT reviews as mandated by the Bylaws and their central role for the well-functioning of ICANN's multistakeholder accountability, transparency, and governance.

GAC Question:

Accordingly, the GAC Members expressed concern about this further deferral and called on the Board to expedite the preparations for undertaking the Bylaws-mandated review process in consultation with the multistakeholder community, and to present a corresponding timeline as soon as possible.

Board Chair reflected that this is a very important topic that's being discussed across the community. It was noted that The Board is committed to the original goals for the ICANN organizational review ethos to hold the ICANN community accountable, transparent, and effective.

She explained the genesis of ICANN reviews and noted that the community has come together many times on specified timelines and schedules for conducting community and organizational reviews in good faith and in earnest and people very generously have given their time.

It was noted that last year (2024) the Board first deferred the ATRT4 effort by 12 months because recommendations which were an outcome of ATRT3 and had not been completely implemented. At

that time the Board chose to defer the ATRT4 by 12 months. Fast forwarding to the present time, it was noted that there were still some Challenges in the process of implementing review recommendations. It was explained that in Seattle earlier this year, the Board polled the community during bilateral Meetings and Board members met with all the different constituencies to ask them their thoughts regarding review and whether they were actually producing the expected outcomes. They assessed that the mechanics and the constructs and how the current review system had been put together were not delivering the outcomes and that it is perhaps time to evolve them.

It was explained that community feedback reflected that there were variants of opinions about how to approach these concerns and even the chairs and community members involved in the Pilot Holistic review effort shared that there was no consensus and there was ambiguity in the language of the review recommendations.

Amidst this complex situation, it was shared that the Board decided that it was a good time to see how ICANN could reimagine community needs and to reimagine the process by which reviews could be conducted - while ensuring effective outcomes regarding accountability, transparency, and effectiveness. Thus, back on May the 19th, the Board decided to defer ATRT4 again, and a community-driven dialogue has been initiated to determine how best to evolve the review system.

It was reported that the ccNSO leadership voluntarily took the lead in providing some suggested draft guidelines for next steps regarding community reviews and the ICANN CEO had a meeting with the SO/AC Chairs here in Prague to share and discuss those draft guidelines. It was explained that with the deferral of the ATRT4 effort, ICANN is not in compliance with the bylaws time requirements for the reviews as the ATRT4 has now been deferred again, however, the reviews have not been cancelled. The community has now been given time to work through the obvious issues with these reviews that arose in trying to follow the bylaws and questions regarding considerations of a more comprehensive holistic review of the ICANN community groups.

It was explained that a draft blueprint provided by the ccNSO Chair is framing the current community leader discussions and ICANN staff is now beginning to work with the SO/AC Chairs on next steps to establish a framework for moving forward. The Board will attach some timelines to this effort and it is hoped that this work will progress by the ICANN84 and ICANN85 public meetings.

GAC Members expressed appreciation for the Board Chair's update on these matters and said it was good to see that those discussions are ongoing, because these reviews (including ATRT4) are a central part of the accountability mechanisms to the larger ICANN Community. GAC Members noted their concern that there is a current situation where ICANN is now not exactly abiding by the Bylaws, so it is important that the Board take the responsibility to actively guide and steer the community into a timely process where we can get back to complying with the bylaws, Given current wider internet governance discussions that are ongoing, some governments want to be in a position where they can openly and clearly say that ICANN's accountability measures are being complied with. It was noted that if there is a delay in recommencing the reviews, it is important that there are very good reasons and that there is a timeline to get to closure so that the community does not have an open-ended process during which the bylaws are de facto suspended in their validity.

The Board Chair reiterated that the decision to defer the ATRT4 effort was not a decision to suspend any bylaws but was made with full accountability and transparency in order to assure that future reviews are even more effective. The Board saw no purpose in pursuing something when it was not producing the expected outcomes and they are very committed to the organization's accountability, transparency and effectiveness. Board members assured the GAC that they are putting some very tight timelines around the discussions with community leaders and the next steps to get the review system back on track.

Board members reiterated their desire for the community to come together and take some time to define a clear process going forward so that everyone can be back on schedules and effectively deliver on the ICANN review system mandates. All the work that's been done in these reviews historically has been excellent, first-class, highly committed, passionate work but the current review system needs to be basically reassessed and potentially reimaged. The Board welcomes that accountability and is looking forward to it.

6. Any Other Business

In the few minutes of remaining session time, GAC members raised a couple additional topics for discussion.

ICP-2

GAC members thanks the Board for identifying ICP-2 as a topic for engagement during prep week at ICANN82, and thanked the CEO and ICANN for the recent notice that was sent to AFRINIC calling for immediate action to ensure transparency and fairness in AFRINIC's upcoming board election process. It was noted that the ICANN letter was very timely, flagging two key issues of concern to many in the AFRINIC community. Full transparency is key at this critical time to help restore stability and trust to AFRINIC's governance. The GAC looks forward to being kept updated on further developments, including any response to ICANN's notice and to knowing potential next steps in that respect.

ICANN Strategic Planning

It was noted by Board members that ICANN and the community is just about to embark on the first year of the next five-year strategic plan, which is supplemented by annual organizational and financial plans. A central core of expectations for ICANN and the new ICANN CEO will be delivering on the strategic plan annually and over the five-year period. The document is a well-informed, community-accepted, community-contributed-to document that sets out where ICANN and the community want to go over the next five years. It was reflected that delivering against that strategic plan will be a great reflection of ICANN's future accountability.

7. Adjourn

Noting that the time for the session had run out, the GAC Chair thanked the Board and attendees and adjourned the session.

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

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) held a bilateral session to discuss issues of mutual interest. The main agenda focused on registration data accuracy, DNS abuse, the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), urgent disclosure requests, law enforcement authentication, and any other business.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, provided a structural overview of the Council's role and its recent achievements. He explained that the GNSO Council is composed of representatives from ICANN's stakeholder groups and is responsible for managing the policy development process from issue identification to recommendation submission. In the past year, the Council had completed significant work on the next round of new gTLDs as well as on the domain transfer policy. The Council's current focus has shifted to the topics of DNS abuse and registration data accuracy.

Paul McGrady (GNSO) then provided a substantive update on the work of the GNSO Council's small team on registration data accuracy. Formed shortly after ICANN82, the team was tasked with reviewing the input received on a set of threshold questions regarding accuracy, and with drafting recommendations for further action. The team had reviewed community submissions, along with external resources such as the INFERMAL study and input from the NIS2 Cooperation Group.

The first key finding was drawn from the INFERMAL study, which showed that when accuracy verification was performed earlier in the domain registration lifecycle—either prior to or immediately after registration—there was a 70% reduction in malicious domain registrations. The small team believed this to be a potentially actionable point. The second recommendation involved improving transparency by including a notation in the RDRS when a domain is suspended due to inaccurate data. This could benefit researchers and registrants alike by providing greater clarity. The third recommendation emphasized the need for better education for domain name registrants, both about the importance of maintaining accurate data and how that data is protected.

Paul McGrady noted that while there is broad agreement on the importance of accurate data, there remain fundamental disagreements in the community regarding the definition and scope of "accuracy." These range from debates about whether the existing Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) requirements are sufficient, to divergent views on whether identity verification should be included. The small team decided not to focus on these polarizing issues in the initial phase, choosing instead to advance work on areas where there was alignment. The GNSO Chair clarified that while the team is starting with consensus topics to expedite progress, areas of disagreement may still be addressed at a later stage, potentially through a formal policy development process.

Responding to a question from the GAC Chair about the anticipated timeline, Greg DiBiase stated that while no fixed deadlines could be offered, there was a concerted effort within the Council to

pursue narrowly scoped, efficiently managed policy work with an aspiration to deliver outcomes within one to two years.

Gemma Carolillo (European Commission) welcomed the update and reiterated the GAC's interest in the topic. She noted that a key difficulty in prior work was the lack of a common understanding of what constitutes "accuracy," including uncertainty over whether to assess compliance solely against WHOIS contactability standards or the broader RAA requirements. She asked whether the Council could obtain more comprehensive information on registrar compliance with the full set of accuracy obligations. Paul McGrady agreed that such data would be valuable and indicated that the Council would continue its work in parallel with any new insights provided by the Board or others.

The session then transitioned to DNS abuse. Rida Tahir (Canada) posed two questions on behalf of the GAC. First, she asked for an update on the work of the DNS Abuse Small Team and its expected timeline. Second, she sought the Council's views on the GAC's recommendation that policy work on DNS abuse be prioritized ahead of the next round of gTLD delegations. Jen Chung, who leads the DNS Abuse Small Team, responded by reviewing recent developments. She noted that DNS abuse had been identified as a policy priority since the Seattle meeting. While contractual amendments were introduced following prior small team work in 2022, the Council recently decided to revisit the topic now that the amendments had been in effect for over a year and compliance data was available. The team was assigned four tasks: to evaluate DNS abuse mitigation efforts across the community and industry; to review the 2022 recommendations; to assess the effectiveness of the new contractual provisions; and to analyze findings from recent studies, including the INFERMAL study and the NetBeacon white paper.

Jen Chung explained that the team had produced a draft matrix of identified gaps in current mitigation efforts. This matrix would serve to guide potential areas for an issue report and policy development. The GAC, through its topic leads and liaison Sebastien Ducos, was invited to provide feedback on this gap analysis. While the team was officially given six months to deliver its assignment, she emphasized the collective desire to expedite progress, particularly given broad community alignment on the importance of the topic. Regarding the GAC's second question, Jen Chung and Greg DiBiase both noted that while it was premature to commit to specific policy outcomes, the Council shared the goal of launching a narrowly scoped PDP that would have a high likelihood of success.

The discussion then turned to the Registration Data Request Service (RDRS), with Manal Ismail (Egypt) requesting an update on the status of the Standing Committee's report and an assessment of how RDRS aligns with the recommendations of the System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD).

Sebastien Ducos, Chair of the Standing Committee on RDRS, provided a detailed update. The Committee's four-chapter report—focusing on usage trends, technical improvements, operational lessons, and analysis of SSAD recommendations—was nearing completion. The final chapter, which evaluates SSAD in relation to RDRS, had taken longer than expected due to its complexity and potential policy implications. A public comment period is expected to run from mid-August to

mid-September. Sebastien Ducos clarified that while RDRS would remain operational, future policy work would likely be needed to determine how SSAD recommendations might be reinterpreted or adjusted to fit within an RDRS-compatible model. He acknowledged the significant investment—over \$2 million to date—in developing RDRS and stressed the importance of maintaining its functionality in the interim.

Gemma Carolillo (European Commission) expressed concern over the withdrawal of some major registrars from RDRS. She warned that this could diminish the system’s utility, particularly for law enforcement users. She also stressed that SSAD, as the product of a formal PDP, should take precedence in shaping the final outcome. Sebastien Ducos responded by noting that some registrars had opted out of the RDRS front-end while continuing to operate their own systems. Planned technical updates to RDRS would include the ability to redirect users to those systems. He urged caution around making RDRS mandatory while it remains under development and potentially subject to change.

In the final discussion segment, Rida Tahir (Canada) raised the issue of Urgent Disclosure Requests and requested an update from the GNSO on how this is being addressed in implementation. Thomas Rickert, GNSO liaison to the Implementation Review Team (IRT), noted that the original EPDP recommendations did not include a timeframe for responding to urgent requests. However, following input from the GAC, the Council had agreed that the matter should be addressed by the IRT. That group has since resumed its work and will meet during ICANN83. Thomas Rickert emphasized that the issue of law enforcement authentication was central to enabling timely responses, as contracted parties must be confident in the legitimacy of requestors before acting.

The GAC Chair thanked all GNSO Council representatives for their engagement and concluded the GAC’s joint session with the GNSO.

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 Applicant Support Program (ASP), and the public interest framework.

On the Applicant Support Program (ASP) and particularly on the question of equity in the next gTLD round, the ALAC shared concerns about having false negatives in the future, particularly with the applicant support program, by pulling in people who have not been involved, and applicants who should meet the intent of the policy but face difficulty. The ALAC noted its concern about outreach and the very low number of applications for the ASP.

From a GAC perspective, the committee shared ALAC’s concerns, and is trying to understand what are the obstacles in place for applicants, emphasizing on the need to ensure course correction for outreach and engagement.

Regarding the agenda item on the public interest framework and the advisory roles, the ALAC opened the discussion by introducing the global public interest (GPI) framework developed by the ICANN Board in consultation with the community to consider while developing PDPS. The ALAC shared some of the key findings from the [GPI framework pilot report](#) developed in October 2023, the global public interest framework was applied to two policy development processes (PDPs). For instance, 36% of the System for Standardized Access Disclosure's (SSAD PDP) 22 recommendations, and 78% of the Subsequent Procedures' 41 topics, carried GPI considerations. The ALAC sought GAC members' attention on future collaboration to ensure that global public interest is included in future discussions within ICANN. The GAC agreed that GPI is linked to ICANN's mission and anchored in its bylaws, and that the results of the pilot suggest that it's useful to have this framework in different contexts.

Both committees could apply the framework from a community perspective, to see it could fit within their work, provide feedback on the framework to the Board and to other parts of the community, and embed it in the relevant decision-making processes. For instance, by comparing the São Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines with PDP and other processes, in order to assess what is essential for having open and inclusive processes in ICANN.

The GAC and ALAC liaisons were requested to coordinate on future collaboration relative to the global public interest framework implementation.

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

The GAC met with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) as the first part of its security and stability session, for an update on matters related to domain registration data access, the SSAC Free and Open-Source Software Work Party, and the SSAC report on DNS Blocking.

On the topic of Domain Registration Data Access, the SSAC wants to ensure that any policies for gTLD registration data access are well-defined, robust, and serve the needs of the global Internet community in protecting against security threats. The SSAC believes that this could be done by creating an access system that follows a structured and expedited mechanism, so that legitimate requests, especially urgent requests, are handled in a prioritized and expedited manner, while ICANN org should continue sharing metrics on data requests that come in for domain registration data.

The Free and Open-Source Software (FOSS), is a software that has unique development and governance characteristics compared to proprietary software and can be freely used, shared, modified or studied. The SSAC is examining the role of this type of software within the global Domain Name System (DNS), to show the critical reliance on FOSS in the DNS and to equip policy makers with the knowledge to avoid policies and regulations that could unintentionally harm the FOSS ecosystem and therefore the DNS. By ICANN84, the SSAC wants to offer guidelines to policy makers and regulators on the use of FOSS. The GAC agreed to reconvene a meeting with the SSAC to present their findings in their report.

Lastly, on the SSAC report on DNS blocking, the SSAC provided an update due to the new DNS blocking instances taking place. DNS blocking is a technique that restricts access to domain names for security, content control, and legal and political reasons. The SSAC provided context on this issue noting the consequences of DNS blocking can cause collateral damage and over-blocking, is often ineffective, and can weaken security. To that effect, the SSAC developed its [SAC127 DNS blocking revisited](#), describing the technical means of DNS blocking and its effects, and presented its 3 recommendations to the GAC.

GAC Vice-Chair Marco Hogewoning thanked SSAC members for their interventions and closed the session with the SSAC.

5.5 Meeting with SIDNLabs

The GAC met with the SIDNLabs as part of its security and stability session, on post-quantum cryptography for Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC) and potential GAC actions.

Presenter Cristian Hesselman, introduced the topic on the expectations of quantum computers, noting the risks of quantum computers for DNSSEC could break cryptographic algorithms that DNSSEC is using to verify the authenticity and integrity of DNS responses. In other words, an adversary could re-sign DNS messages with a compromised key and pretend that the message was coming from an authentic source. As a result, users would end up on the wrong website or software components would end on the wrong site. Although experts believe this situation would not happen for another 10 or 15 years, Cristian emphasised that it was important to work on this issue now, since adding or replacing quantum algorithms in DNSSEC takes about 10 years.

Cristian Hesselman presented the three strategies that could be used to protect DNS against quantum computers, by replacing the existing crypto algorithms in the DNS with new ones, redesigning the DNSSEC system, and retiring or removing the DNSSEC. Noting that each of those approaches have different benefits and drawbacks.

Finally, Cristian suggested actions for the GAC to consider, such as working with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to explore how to align the post-quantum cryptography (PQC) algorithms that are being developed with the requirements of the DNS, incentivise the development of open-source software that would integrate PQC algorithms into the DNS infrastructure, stimulate deployment to incorporate PQC, and support research to further assess operational impact of PQC algorithms on the DNS and its operators, for the root zone for instance.

The GAC Chair closed the session, noting the support for a future regional capacity building for the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) region on issues related to open-source software for governments.

5.4 Meeting with the Address Supporting Organization (ASO)

The GAC met with the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) to follow-up on their May intersessional discussions on the Regional Internet Registries (RIR) Internet Coordination Policy 2 (ICP-2) review document for public comment.

The ASO introduced the ICP-2 noting that the document governs the recognition of new regional Internet registries and illustrates the process to recognise a new RIR. Since the document was enacted in 2001, the ASO is in the process of creating a new document, the RIR Governance Document, to update the procedures not only for recognizing new RIRs but to memorialise ongoing obligations and the potential for derecognition in the event an RIR continues to not comply with its ongoing obligations.

The ASO provided insight on the regional community engagement from the public consultation period that took place from 14th of April to 27th of May 2025. The ASO reviewed the feedback received, categorising what could be incorporated into the new document and keeping the more detailed feedback for a future implementation procedures document.

Other insightful comments that were deemed to be out of scope would be considered but not incorporated in the documents. Some of the comments received during the consultation were discussed, such as:

- Approval Thresholds: Different opinions on whether it should require unanimous approval of the existing RIRs to recognize a new RIR, or whether a different threshold should be used
- Initiation: Should ICANN be able to initiate a proposal to derecognize an RIR?
- Review/Appeal: Should there be a mechanism to review or appeal an adverse decision by ICANN?
- Continuity/Handoff Procedure: Concerns about whether RIRs will establish sufficiently reliable processes to ensure continuity if an RIR is in trouble or is derecognized
- Number of RIRs: Different opinions on how to determine the appropriate number of RIRs
- Details: Need for more detailed procedures or requirements (likely to be provided in a separate “Implementation Procedures” document)
- Audits: Desire for more frequent/detailed audit procedures to identify problems early
- Anti-Capture: Make sure that no single entity or group of affiliated entities can effectively control the RIR.

Some GAC members asked about the anticipated number of drafts of the document before the implementation, and noted that the different versions for review during the consultation process made it difficult to follow, and suggested developing a one-pager summary to indicate the changes made. The GAC also suggested looking into the São Paulo multistakeholder guidelines that provide some process steps on how to run an open, transparent and inclusive multistakeholder process.

In response, the ASO indicated that it anticipated for the second draft to be the final one. In terms of the draft documents for consultation, the ASO proposed developing a summary describing the changes that were made beyond the red lines and also developing a separate document that would

summarise some of the common and salient pieces of feedback received, including the course of action.

The GAC Chair thanked the ASO for their detailed explanations and concluded the session.

6. INTERNAL GAC MATTERS

6.1. GAC Wrap-Up Session

GAC Support staff identified a number of important committee matters that would necessitate follow-up after the public meeting in Prague, including:

- ICANN84 Annual General Meeting Planning (topic inputs, agenda setting calls, input on capacity development, etc.)
- Nomination Period for 2025 GAC Leadership (Vice Chairs) Election
- GAC Public Comment Opportunities:
 - [Updated ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning SOIs](#) - due 14 July
 - [Proposed Next Round Base gTLD Registry Agreement - Public Comment 1 of 2](#) - due 21 July
 - [Final Proceeding for Proposed Language for the Draft Next Round Applicant Guidebook \(AGB\)](#) - due 23 July
- Next GAC Annual Plan - feedback from committee before ICANN84

Regarding the upcoming 2025 GAC Vice Chairs nomination and balloting period, staff reported:

- GAC leadership elections process begins here at end of ICANN83 and concludes at ICANN84 (25-30 October 2025)
- Five (5) GAC Vice Chairs to be elected
- Three current Vice Chairs are eligible for re-election
- Nomination period from end of ICANN83 until [23:59 UTC on 10 September 2025 \(OP#33\)](#)
- More than five nominations for GAC Vice Chairs will activate a balloting period.
- Nominations should be made by email to gac-staff@icann.org with a copy to the GAC list
- Nominations (including self-nominations) are possible for all five vice chair positions
- Staff will send an email confirmation to the nominator that the nomination has been recorded
- If third-party nomination, staff will also verify that the nominee is willing to stand for election
- GAC website election page will track all nominations

GAC Support staff identified a number of key post-ICANN83 dates for committee awareness:

- Publication of GAC ICANN83 Communiqué - 16 June 2025
- ICANN83 GAC Minutes ~ July 2025
- Call for Topics for ICANN84 (policy topics, WG updates, joint sessions) ~ ASAP
- ICANN84 GAC Agenda Setting Calls (to review preliminary agenda) ~ mid-July 2025 (and

- potential #2 - mid - September)
- Nominations Close for Gac Vice Chair Election - 10 September
- ICANN84 Annual General Meeting, 25-30 October 2025, Muscat, Oman

Meeting Adjournment

The GAC Chair thanked the ICANN support team, interpreters, scribes and meeting technical teams for their excellent support of the meeting. He looked forward to seeing GAC Member and Observer representatives at the ICANN84 meeting schedule for Muscat, Oman in October 2025.

#

Attachment 1 - ICANN83 Hybrid Policy Forum - GAC ATTENDEES LIST

	Registrations	Attended (in-person & virtual)	Active Check-In Pilot
Member Delegations	90	80	59
Observer Delegations	10	9	4
Member Delegates	130	112	75
Observer Delegates	12	9	5

GAC Members (80)		
European Commission	Government of Guatemala	Government of Romania
Government of Argentina	Government of Haiti	Government of Russian Federation
Government of Armenia	Government of India	Government of Sao Tome and Principe
Government of Australia	Government of Indonesia	Government of Saudi Arabia
Government of Austria	Government of Ireland	Government of Serbia
Government of Azerbaijan	Government of Israel	Government of Singapore
Government of Bangladesh	Government of Italy	Government of Slovakia
Government of Belgium	Government of Jamaica	Government of Spain
Government of Benin	Government of Japan	Government of Suriname, Republic of
Government of Bermuda	Government of Korea, Republic of	Government of Sweden
Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Government of Kuwait	Government of Switzerland
Government of Brazil	Government of Lebanon	Government of Timor-Leste
Government of Burundi	Government of Libya	Government of Trinidad and Tobago
Government of Cabo Verde, Republic of	Government of Luxembourg	Government of Tunisia
Government of Cameroon	Government of Malaysia	Government of Türkiye, Republic of

Government of Canada	Government of Mauritania	Government of Uganda
Government of Chad, Republic of	Government of Morocco	Government of United Arab Emirates
Government of China	Government of Myanmar, Republic of the Union of	Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Government of Chinese Taipei	Government of Netherlands	Government of United States
Government of Colombia	Government of Niger	Government of Uruguay
Government of Congo, the Democratic Republic of the	Government of Nigeria	Government of Vanuatu
Government of Costa Rica	Government of Niue	Government of Yemen
Government of Croatia	Government of Norway	
Government of Czech Republic	Government of Oman	
Government of Denmark	Government of Pakistan	
Government of Egypt	Government of Papua New Guinea	
Government of Gabon	Government of Paraguay	
Government of Georgia	Government of Portugal	
Government of Germany	Government of Qatar	

GAC Observers (9)	
Caribbean Telecommunications Union (CTU)	Smart Africa
Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation (CTO)	Universal Postal Union (UPU)
League of Arab States	World Broadcasting Unions (WBU)
Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
Regional Technical Commission of Telecommunications (COMTELCA)	

Attachment 2 - ICANN83 Action Points Compilation

#	Subject Matter	Action Point
1	New gTLDs Next Round	GAC Members to review the draft Applicant Guidebook (AGB) to determine if it aligns with SubPro PDP WG Recommendations and submit a public comment prior to 23 July 2025
2	New gTLDs Next Round	GAC Members to participate in the ICANN org RA training session to better understand the contractual framework for new gTLDs (17 June 2025)
3	New gTLDs Next Round	GAC Members to begin preparing for active participation in GAC Early Warnings and Advice Planning for the next round of new gTLDs. GAC members to develop a process for GAC Early Warnings
4	New gTLDs Next Round	GAC Members to volunteer to join the GAC's internal coordination team to help organize GAC work on application review, consensus advice drafting, and objection tracking