



**Review our Expected Standards of Behavior when participating in ICANN Meetings.**

Go to:

<http://go.icann.org/expected-standards>

**Review the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy when participating in ICANN Meetings.**

Go to:

<http://go.icann.org/anti-harassment>



**Do you have a question or concern for the ICANN Ombudsman?**

Email [ombudsman@icann.org](mailto:ombudsman@icann.org) to set up a meeting.



# ICANN79 GAC Meeting with GNSO Council

6 March 2024

# Agenda

---

1. Introductions
2. Next Round of New gTLDs
  - a. Update on Small Team Plus Work
  - b. Latin Script Diacritics
  - c. Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (SPIRT)
3. GNSO Statements of Interest (SOIs) status and next steps
4. DNS Abuse
  - a. Potential post contractual amendments policy developments (including botnets and phishing)
  - b. Update on GNSO Council Small Team on DNS Abuse
5. WHOIS
  - a. Data accuracy/Data Processing Agreements between ICANN and Contracted Parties
6. AOB

## 2. New gTLD Program Next Round

---

### a. Update on Small Team Plus Work

The GAC welcomes an update from the GNSO Council on the Small Team Plus work in preparation for the New gTLD Program Next Round. Are there any specific points where a policy decision is pending that would affect the GAC?

### b. Status update on the work being done on Latin Script Diacritics in new gTLDs, including a tentative timeline for decisions and actions

Following the [GNSO's response](#) to the ICANN Board regarding the ICANN78 GAC Advice and issues of importance, the GAC wishes to request a status update on the work being done on Latin Script Diacritics in New gTLDs, including a tentative timeline for decisions and actions. Furthermore, while the “.quebec” TLD issue has become the de facto case study, the issue is much broader in that it identifies a substantial gap in policy that is counter to the narrative of supporting multilingual internet. French, Spanish, German, Italian, Portuguese, etc. languages could all face related issues in the future.

## 2. New gTLD Program Next Round

---

### c. **Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (SPIRT) Charter**

The GAC welcomes a GNSO Council's update on the SPIRT Charter Drafting Team, recognizing a meeting took place to date. The GAC finds this cross community work to be extremely important and is looking to appoint GAC representation to the SPIRT Charter Drafting Team as soon as possible. Could the GNSO Council provide an overview on the SPIRT Charter Drafting Team for GAC membership (e.g. timeline, output and approval process, expectations from members including cadence of meetings and time commitment)?

### 3. GNSO Statements of Interest Status and Next Steps

---

- ICANN's processes should be fair and transparent to ensure the trust and confidence of all stakeholders, including governments, in the multistakeholder system of Internet governance. The importance of transparency is enshrined in ICANN's Bylaws.
- In its ICANN76 and ICANN78 Communiqués, as an issue of importance, the GAC addressed the exception within the GNSO's Operating Procedures that permits participants to refrain from disclosing the individuals or entities that they represent at ICANN.
- These exceptions ignore globally established norms in policymaking, where representatives are required to disclose client identities when engaging in policymaking processes.
- The GAC firmly supports transparency at ICANN and, in its view, considers this exception in conflict with the ICANN Bylaws.
- The GAC hopes to see further opportunities to review this issue so community members can advocate for changes that promote greater transparency at ICANN.

## 4. DNS Abuse Mitigation

---

### a. Potential post contractual amendments policy developments on DNS Abuse, including botnets and phishing

The GAC was pleased to hear that the DNS Abuse amendments to the RA and RAA were approved by the Board and will become effective on April 5th.

In the GAC's [public comment](#) on the amendments, the GAC noted several potential areas for further work on DNS abuse, including, for example:

- Guidance on Key Terms in the Amendments, such as “appropriate,” “prompt,” “actionable,” and “reasonable;”
- Due Process Considerations, in the event that a registrant maintains that registrar/registry action taken pursuant to the new obligations was unwarranted; and/or
- Policy options designed to address registrants that are “repeat offenders” in the DNS abuse category, which could include identifying thresholds of abuse complaints at which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered, or positive incentives for registrars to achieve positive results in DNS abuse mitigation.

The GAC also understands that interest has been expressed in exploring different policy approaches for addressing maliciously-registered domains versus compromised domains.

Recognizing that some time must pass in order to observe the effect and impact of the new provisions, what are the thoughts of the GNSO on any prospective Policy Development Processes pertaining to DNS abuse which build upon the foundation created by the new contract obligations, and in advance of the next round of new gTLD applications?

How can GAC representatives participate in future discussions on potential policy work and PDPs on DNS Abuse issues?

## 4. DNS Abuse Mitigation

---

### **b. Update on GNSO Council Small Team on DNS Abuse**

Could the GNSO kindly provide an update on the Small Team on DNS Abuse? Is any further work envisioned?



## 5. WHOIS/Data Protection

---

### a. **Data accuracy/data processing agreements between ICANN and contracted parties**

The GAC would welcome a status update from the GNSO Council on where we stand on these issues, where the GAC has repeatedly stated its concern.

## 6. Any Other Business

---

- The GAC welcomes a GNSO Council Update on “urgent requests” and highlights the need to start work as soon as possible on this important issue. What is the timeline contemplated for this work?
- The GAC also welcomes an update on the status of Privacy Proxy Accreditation Implementation. When will work begin on assessing what policies remain fit for purpose in light of other policy developments related to GDPR? What is the timeline contemplated for this work?