

GAC Final Prep Call For Discussions at ICANN86

Monday, 1 June 2026
13:00 UTC (60 mins)

Session Goals (GAC Chair)

- Review and Confirm GAC Topics, Questions and Messages to ICANN Board
- Review ICANN86 GAC Session Agendas
- AOB
 - Board Informational Session with the GAC [Leadership]



Joint Meeting scheduled for Tuesday 9 June at 16:30 Local Time (60 mins)

1. Introductions
2. Review of GAC Topics/Questions
(to be shared with Board in advance of meeting)
3. AOB
4. Closing

Any Additional GAC Topics?



ICANN86 Capacity Development Sessions (1&2)

Monday, 8 June 2026

Session 1: 2026 New gTLD Program: Application Process, Evaluations, and Community Input

(11:45-13:15, UTC+2)

- Informal capacity development session with ICANN org's Next Round Team focused on key aspects of the 2026 New gTLD Program application process, evaluations, and community input mechanisms
- Includes a practical overview of the GAC's role in Public Comments, Early Warnings, GAC Consensus Advice, objections, and appeals
- Interactive format with brief presentations followed by open Q&A
- Live polls and other engagement activities to support hands-on capacity building and discussion among GAC members

Session 2: GAC Readiness for the 2026 New gTLD Program: Practical Perspectives and Exchanges

(14:45-16:00, UTC+2)

This session will be fully exercise-based and led by GAC Topic Leads.

- Breakout session format, using flip charts, to enable members to engage in smaller group discussions focused on practical exchanges and experiences related to the 2026 New gTLD Program
- Session organized around a series of thematic discussion areas, including:
 - Early Warnings (15 mins)
 - GAC Advice (15 mins)
 - National approaches to organizing work related to the next round (15 mins)
- Groups report back to plenary to share observations and lessons learned (15 mins)

Key GAC Policy Topic: Registration Data Issues

Agenda Item 6: Tuesday 9 June at 11:45-12:30 (UTC+2) for 45 mins.

Session Objective is to discuss:

- Next steps regarding the **development of law enforcement requestor authentication mechanisms** to ensure that the agreed-upon 24h timeline for response to Urgent Request for disclosure of registration can become enforceable.
- **Modification of the GNSO policy recommendations** for a System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD) in the newly launched GNSO SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team in which David Bedard (Canada) and Owen Fletcher (US) are representing the GAC
 - A Full-day of meetings of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team is planned on “Zero Day” (Sunday 7 June)
- Updates on progress of the **implementation of the Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation** (PPSAI) GNSO Policy Recommendations

Key GAC Policy Topic: Accuracy of Registration Data

Agenda Item 6.a: Tuesday 9 June at 12:30-13:15 (UTC+2) for 45 mins.

- On 11 May, the [GAC Chair requested the convening of trilateral dialogue](#) between the GAC, the ICANN Board and the GNSO to address domain registration data accuracy, and specifically:
 - to address the gap between a domain's registration and the point at which a registrar may validate the registrant's contact information (also referred to as the *"15-day timeline for registrars to validate and verify registrants contact information"* in the ICANN85 Communiqué.)
- GAC Topics Leads and GAC Leadership determined that the trilateral dialogue approach, which was successful in achieving progress on Urgent Request, could usefully be applied this important policy issue.
- While a pre-ICANN86 GAC Webinar was envisioned to prepare for this trilateral dialogue, the GNSO Council, in its [response](#) (26 May) requested that an informational session be held instead during ICANN86, and the trilateral dialogue be postponed to after ICANN86.
- GAC Topics Leads are currently discussing the structure of this ICANN86 informational session, with their GNSO counterparts.

Key GAC Policy Topic: Next Round of New gTLDs

Agenda Item 7: Tuesday 9 June at 14:45-16:00 (UTC+2) for 75 mins.

Session Objective:

GAC discussion on matters pertaining to the next round of new gTLDs. GAC members will discuss materials and review priority items, focusing on opportunities for GAC input including GAC Advice, GAC Early Warnings and application reviews.

Expected to Discuss:

- GAC Timeline for Input
- Follow up on Capacity Development Sessions
- How are governments preparing for the next round?

Key GAC Policy Topic: DNS Abuse

Agenda Item 11 and 11a: Wednesday 10 June at 11:45-13:15 (UTC+2) for 90 mins

Session Objective: Consistent with the proposed expected outcomes laid out in the GAC Annual Plan in this Strategic Area for the GAC, this session will aim to:

- Advance ICANN policy work on DNS Abuse before further delegation of new gTLDs
- Build the subject matter capacity of GAC members on DNS Abuse

Expected topics for discussion :

- **Host country presentation**
- Status of deliberations of the **PDP Working Group on Associated Domain Checks**
- **Discussion with various stakeholder groups** of various frictions points in ongoing deliberations.
- **Discussion of broader DNS Abuse issues and future work in the ICANN community,** with interested stakeholder groups.

ICANN86 GAC Operational Sessions

Agenda Item 4: Tuesday 9 June at 10:00-10:45 (UTC+2) for 45 mins

Review of Reviews

- Discussion of potential desired outcomes from the GAC's perspective, out of this cross community effort

Agenda Item 5: Tuesday 9 June at 10:45-11:15 (UTC+2) for 30 mins

GOPE WG Proposal

- GOPE WG update on proposed administrative revisions to the GAC Operating Principles,
- Discussion of next steps and procedural timeline under Principles 52–53, including possible initiation of the formal revision process at ICANN86.

ICANN86 GAC Operational Sessions (contd.)

Agenda Item 10: **Wednesday 10 June at 10:00-11:15 (UTC+2) for 75 mins**

GAC Leadership and Operations Update

Discussions on a range of topics, such as:

- **Review Progress on the Annual Plan** (including update on the 2026 Leadership retreat)
- **Discussion about the GAC's participation in the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom)**, including historical participation, current practices, key considerations, and possible next steps
- **Discussion a Proposed Approach on the Continuous Improvement Program (CIP)**
- **Review of a proposal for GAC Capacity Development Working Group**



- Board Informational Session with the GAC [leadership] (*see next slides*)

Board Informational Session with the GAC [leadership]

- Part of a series of **Information Sessions** that the Board holds with each SO/AC, to facilitate the Board's ongoing efforts to **strengthen cooperation, partnership, and engagement with the community** by deepening its understanding of the opportunities and challenges faced by the community.
- These **briefings** are **separate from, but complementary to**, the regular bilateral meetings that the Board also conducts with the GAC and other SOAC groups during the ICANN Meeting.
- They are structured as **90-minute briefings** (including time for Q&A) and, like the bilateral meetings, for transparency the session will also be open to the community who can listen in to the session (but not participate or ask questions).
- *Agenda (next slide)*



Board Informational Session with the GAC [leadership]

- I. **Introduction to the GAC** (5 mins)
- II. **GAC Annual Plan and Strategic Objectives** (20 mins)
 - A. Objective of the Annual Plan
 - B. Presentation on the Strategic Objectives and Expected Outcomes
- III. **GAC Leadership Retreat Outcomes** for Board Information (20 mins)
 - A. Strategic Engagement
 - 1. Earlier Engagement in PDPs
 - B. GAC Effectiveness
 - 1. Risks of Over-Reliance on Key Contributors
 - 2. Building Sustainable Capacity Development
 - 3. Regional Capacity Building Efforts
- IV. **How the GAC develops advice** (20 mins)
 - A. GAC Communique Development Process
 - B. GAC Role in ICANN - GAC ADvice/Issues of Importance
- V. **Questions/Closing Remarks** (10 mins)



Thank you!



Background (GAC Chair)

1. GAC Bilateral Meetings with other community groups are an important and regular feature of ICANN Public Meetings.
2. These bilateral meetings offer important regular interaction points to preserve and expand useful GAC connections with the ICANN Board and other community groups. They provide useful venues to highlight and emphasize topics and issues that are likely to be addressed in the GAC Communiqué.
3. Recently, the GAC has employed a targeted “topical/Q&A” agenda approach for these meetings which necessitates GAC preparation, discussion and coordination prior to the individual sessions.
4. Today’s session is an opportunity to be informed of and confirm the topics and agendas for the GAC bilateral meeting at ICANN86.

GAC Meeting with ICANN Board at ICANN86

Agenda Item 8: Tuesday 9 June at 16:30-17:30 (UTC+2) for 60 mins

Draft Agenda items:

- Staff will collect GAC Member suggestions for topics to discuss with the Board
- Call for topics to be circulated

Next Steps:

- Staff will collect all GAC Member delegate inputs by EOD 26 May
- Chair/Vice Chairs will subsequently discuss, curate and transmit to the Board Support team by 29 May.
- Final GAC polishing during 1st June GAC bilateral prep call



Board - GAC Meeting - Topics Overview

1.



Board - GAC Meeting - GAC Topics/Questions for Board

Topic 1. The Unfinished Business of the Applicant Support Program (ASP)

Statement/Context:

The GAC has consistently advised (ICANN79, ICANN80) that the \$227,000 evaluation fee for new gTLDs remains prohibitive, even with an 85% fee waiver. ICANN's own Africa Regional Plan (FY26-30) prioritizes broadening participation, but the financial mechanism to achieve this remains inadequate.

Question:

Q1. In ICANN81, the GAC advised the Board to actively facilitate 'matchmaking' between potential applicants from underserved regions and development finance institutions. However, 18 months later, no such facility exists.

Given that the Africa Regional Plan (FY26-30) explicitly aims to 'grow African participation,' and that the ASP fee waiver still leaves a balance of approximately \$34,000—a sum that is prohibitive for a small business or university in Niamey or Port Moresby—what specific, measurable, and time-bound actions has the Board taken, or will it take, to establish a third-party funding or micro-financing mechanism for ASP applicants from LDCs, separate from the existing fee waiver?

Q2. With respect to the ASP funding increase for a fee reduction from 75% to 85%, can the Board kindly provide some transparency and details regarding the [ICANN Blog communication of 26 May 2026](#) re: "range of feedback received" and exactly how this impacted the Board's decision to "not to take further action on the proposal at this time"? Additionally, given [the very high likelihood of well over 50 qualified ASP applications \[newgTldprogram.icann.org\]](#), will the Board re-consider the proposal and take potential action at a subsequent date?

[Ref. <https://www.icann.org/en/blogs/details/chairs-blog-recap-of-the-may-board-workshop-26-05-2026-en>]

Reasoning:

It forces the Board to move from a *policy* answer (which they are comfortable with) to an *operational* or *financial* answer (which exposes the gap between strategy and reality).

Board - GAC Meeting - GAC Topics/Questions for Board

Topic 2. The Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) – From "Lift" to "Shove"

Statement/Context:

DNS abuse mitigation is a public policy priority. However, developing country regulators and law enforcement cannot effectively act on phishing or malware without timely access to registrant data. The current RDRS is voluntary for registrars. Papua New Guinea, on behalf of many developing nations, has clearly stated that mandatory participation and enforceable SLAs are "foundational requirements".

Question:

The GAC has endorsed six enhancements to the RDRS, including mandatory registrar participation and an API for automated access. The Board's roadmap acknowledges that consensus policy may take years.

For a Sahel country facing a cross-border phishing attack originating from a .com domain, waiting for a consensus policy is not a luxury we have.

Given the Board's authority to impose contractual obligations on registrars (via the RA and RAA) to protect the public interest, why has the Board not initiated a contractual amendment to mandate a 'Lightweight RDRS' with API access and 24-hour SLAs for verified law enforcement authorities from LDCs, while the GNSO deliberates the long-term policy?

Reasoning:

It frames the issue not as a technical policy debate, but as a public safety and sovereign equality issue. It tests whether the Board prioritizes GNSO process over the immediate security needs of vulnerable states.



