GAC Meeting with GNSO Council
Session 9

8 March 2026

DNS Abuse - GAC Talking Points

- The GAC has organized a small group on DNS abuse to support the Committee's engagement in the PDP. We are encouraged that this important work has begun during this meeting and reiterate our interest in seeing the work remain targeted and within its scope in order to achieve a timely outcome.

- The GAC would appreciate initial thoughts from the GNSO Council on the start of the PDP on Associated Domain Checks, perspectives, areas on which consensus will be easy to achieve and perspective challenges.

- Beyond the issues prioritized for the Policy Development Processes (notably Associated Domain Checks and unrestricted APIs), the final issue report on DNS abuse identifies a number of other areas requiring intervention (i.e., accuracy, proactive measures, transparency, and reporting). How is the GNSO intending to progress work on these issues?

- What is the status of the Implementation of the Recommendations from the Small Team on Accuracy? See clarification from the GNSO on how they are prioritizing the work on the verification timeline. Where is that falling on the priority queue?

DNS Abuse - GNSO Talking Points

Topic Lead: Jennifer Chung

- The Associated Domain Check (ADC) PDP to launch during ICANN85 in Mumbai

- The GNSO thanks the GAC for providing experts in the field. Paul McGrady is the preliminary Chair for the PDP, and membership roster is here.

- The Working Group should receive a kick-off email soon covering all important information for members to come prepared to the Kick Off meeting and the other working sessions at ICANN85. The Kick Off Email will cover the following topics:
  - Meeting cadence, ii. Kick Off meeting agenda, iii. Call for volunteer Vice Chair, iv. Reading/prep material, v. Relevant background material and working spaces

- The topic is of high interest and there is community-wide expectation that this ADC PDP will be focused and efficient and produce implementable recommendations on an effective timeline. The Work Plan is currently being developed and needs to be discussed with WG leadership and the WG during ICANN85. Once final, Council will confirm the Work Plan.

DNS Abuse - GNSO Talking Points

- During ICANN85, there will be four DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 working sessions, which will include the initiation of PDP 1, focusing on establishing the working group's foundations, confirming its work plan and timeline, introducing the charter questions, and hearing initial inputs from technical and subject-matter experts to inform its early deliberations. Working sessions 1 and 2 will take place on Saturday, 7 March. Sessions 3 and 4 will take place on Monday, 9 March.

- On PDP2: As noted in the motion- Council will decide the appropriate timing on PDP2 pending resources and progress of PDP1. Progress depends, amongst others, on the WG deliberations.

RDRS/SSAD - GAC Talking Points

- The GAC welcomed the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis. The GAC provided a comment submission generally supporting the proposed enhancements to the RDRS and noting its expectation that efforts will be taken to achieve these outcomes swiftly if updates are needed to the relevant policy recommendations.

- The GAC also notes the large degree of alignment between the concepts in the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis, the RDRS Standing Committee Final Report, and past positions stated by both the GAC and the Board.

- What steps will the GNSO Council take to expeditiously advance work toward the outcomes in the RDRS Policy Alignment Analysis?

RDRS/SSAD - GNSO Talking Points

Topic Lead: Samantha Demetriou

- Council discussed next steps during its SPS retreat in January ahead of the Board's January workshop. Council discussed this topic further with select Board members during its February meeting and aligned on an approach.

- In accordance with the Standing Committee recommendations, the Council is asking for the Board to non-adopt all the SSAD Recommendations as a package and send them back to Council.

- Non-adoption provides the Council with an opportunity to develop Supplemental Recommendations. While the Council is still discussing the details of how to develop those Supplemental Recommendations, there is preliminary agreement on the following:

  - A limited number of participants including Subject Matter Experts will develop the recommendations. Council will need to approve the recommendations.
  - The group will have limited Policy Development powers and will be chartered to review and amend existing SSAD Recommendations, based on the work that the RDRS Standing Committee conducted and included in its Final Report.
  - This will not be a brand new PDP. While timelines need to be established, including in dialogue with the Board, Council's hope is for the process to conclude in a matter of months.

RDRS/SSAD - GNSO Talking Points

- We understand the Board is in agreement with this approach and is working to pass a resolution to non-adopt the recommendations during the ICANN 85 meeting.

- The RDRS will continue to operate in the meantime at ICANN's cost.

Urgent Requests/LEA - GAC Talking Points

- The GAC would like to thank the GNSO for its recent report on the *Timeline for Urgent Requests for Lawful Disclosure of Non-Public Registration Data*. As expressed, both within the Implementation Review Team (IRT) and in the GAC's public comment submission, the GAC supports the current compromise text, which foresees a 24-hour timeline with a possible extension of up to 72 hours in exceptional circumstances (*force majeure*).

- The GAC looks forward to finalization of the urgent requests policy language.

- The GAC remains concerned about the ongoing uncertainty regarding whether the authentication mechanism for law enforcement would require new policy development.

- At ICANN84, the Board said it saw a path to integrating authentication mechanisms without further policy development. In addition, as the GAC has communicated previously, the GAC does not believe new policy development is needed.

- As the GNSO is aware, the PSWG's work to establish the authentication mechanism is ongoing and progressing well, with active participation from Contracted Parties and other ICANN community members.

Urgent Requests/LEA - GAC Talking Points

- The PSWG-convened Law Enforcement Authentication Practitioners' Group is open to interested participants. The intent of this group is to discuss the existing and/or aspirational Identity Provider mechanisms for law enforcement agencies to authenticate to ICANN operated services (such as RDRS).

- The GAC would appreciate the GNSO's perspective on this matter, particularly regarding whether there is a need for a follow-up trilateral discussion between the GNSO Council, the ICANN Board, and the GAC.

- The GAC also considers it important to establish clarity on how the law enforcement authentication mechanism could be operationalized, including the possibility of integrating it into the RDRS. The GAC would welcome the GNSO's views on how the RDRS or another system could support predictable and effective handling of law enforcement urgent requests.

- From the GNSO's perspective, what next steps would be most useful to advance the work on developing and implementing authentication mechanisms?

Urgent Requests/LEA - GNSO Talking Points

Topic Lead: Ashley Heineman

- The GNSO expects the GAC/PSWG to lead this discussion.

- The Practice Group had a question over Jurisdiction which still awaits an answer. (As the group's meeting's are not recorded we are still waiting on members present to provide the exact wording of the question.)

- We acknowledge the agreed need for discretion over this topic in public/on the mic and understand the limited disclosures PSWG will be able to offer on the topic. We nevertheless hope to be able to get enough of an understanding to be able to, for example, assess the anticipated Policy work to frame the outcomes.

HRIA - GAC Talking Points

- Articles 17 (extending to an individual's right not to be defrauded) and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (extending to copyright and trademark) and Security and Stability Commitments in the Bylaws need to be taken into account in any HRIA.

- HRIA's can be undertaken using the model developed for WGs and need not be outsourced.

- About the GNSO request to know what -as GAC- we are planning to do for HRIA, first we need to remember that there was a letter from GAC Leadership sent to GNSO leadership on 15 January 2026 that was asking GNSO to let us know what their specific procedures were adopted in order to comply with HRIA. Now we understand from these last exchanges that have been just shared with us, the reference document that GNSO indicates is: HRIA analysis for LD PDP. Now that we know what is the basis for discussion, we shall work on it and will provide a comprehensive reply, because the document needs to be adapted to GAC specific issues;

- In any case, GAC agreed model -as already by GAC leadership to GNSO leadership in previous occasions- consists in assessing HRIA only into the policy decision where GAC is asked to express its view, but not on the internal procedures of GAC.

HRIA - GAC Talking Points

- The next example of HRIA applied to ICANN policies will be the DNS abuse discussion, where the GAC is involved and where HRILWG will have a specific focus at the HR component of this policy and its implications.

- Based on current practices of the HRILWG and on the position agreed by the GAC leadership in 2024, there is no intention to apply HRIA to other activities of the GAC, such as the communiques or the non-policy-related discussions or decisions. Of course, in making HRIA GAC -with the assistance of HRILWG- will take in account article 17 and 27 of UDRH, and the core values of Security and Stability Commitment of the ICANN Bylaws; and could use as a guideline the HRIA Checklist prepared for LD PDP, for instance , after having gone through a more in deep evaluation of the document.

- So, in case of complicated issues where more rights enter into conflict, *GAC members consider bringing in relevant governmental expertise — such as data protection authorities or human rights experts — depending on the nature of the issue.* The opinion of external experts (not only governmental, but also International organizations or national or regional regulatory independent authorities expert in the matter) could be requested. HRILWG signals that the group is already regularly working with partners, such as UNESCO or Council of Europe, exactly to bring in its perspective this kind of contribution and expertise.

HRIA - GNSO Talking Points

- GNSO has developed and piloted a Human Rights checklist and analytical tool, most recently in the Latin Script Diacritics PDP, structured around three core questions followed by a focused human rights analysis. The PDP Working Group remains responsible for deciding how and when to use the tool, and each PDP will determine how the analysis is carried out in practice.

- GAC participation could focus on how it chooses to contribute relevant expertise when potential human rights impacts are identified. For example, if a policy raises questions around privacy, data protection, due process, or access to information, it could be helpful for GAC members to ensure that the appropriate expertise is present in the discussion — not only law-enforcement perspectives, but also input from data protection authorities, human rights specialists, or officials familiar with the impact of policies on domain name registrants and users.

HRIA - GNSO Talking Points

Topic Lead: Bruna dos Santos

- Early identification of issues and the presence of the right expertise can help PDP Working Groups use the checklist in a more informed and targeted way, while the PDP retains responsibility for designing how the tool is applied.

- To help define next steps, it would be useful to understand:
  - How does the GAC envision coordinating its input when human rights considerations are flagged through the checklist?
  - Would GAC members consider bringing in relevant governmental expertise — such as data protection authorities or human rights experts — depending on the nature of the issue?

- Reference : HRIA analysis for LD PDP.