



86

POLICY
FORUM



ICANN Board/GAC Meeting

Tuesday, 9 June 2026

Session 8

Agenda

1. Introductions

1. GAC Topics/Questions for the Board

2. AOB

3. Closing

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 1: 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. 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.

Questions

1. 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 can be prohibitive for a small business or university—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 least developed countries (LDCs), separate from the existing fee waiver?
1. 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, will the Board re-consider the proposal and take potential action at a subsequent date?

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 2: gTLD Registration Data (page 1 of 3)

A. 15-Day Validation Period

Statement/Context

The GAC appreciates the swift progress made to organize an informational session with the GNSO during ICANN86. The GAC also takes note of its communication dated 11th May 2026 addressed to the Chair, ICANN Board and Chair, GNSO Council requesting to convene a trilateral meeting to address Domain Registration Data Accuracy during ICANN86 and to discuss Policy Prioritization in the longer term. Via communication dated 26th May 2026, the GNSO Council inter alia proposed to leverage the time proposed for this trilateral meeting at ICANN86 to hold an informational session as there was inadequate time to properly prepare for a webinar prior to ICANN86. The Council also expressed its willingness to participate in future dialogue between the GAC and the ICANN Board post ICANN86.

Question

The GAC would welcome the views of the ICANN Board regarding its willingness to participate in the trilateral call on this topic post-ICANN 86, and before ICANN87.

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 2: gTLD Registration Data (page 2 of 3)

B. Urgent Requests

Statement/Context:

With respect to implementation of the 24-hour response timeline for authenticated Urgent Requests for disclosure of registration data, and further to the ICANN85 Mumbai Communiqué Scorecard, the GAC notes that Board correspondence to the GNSO on May 13, 2026 stated that ICANN will "take the lead in advancing further work on the technical requirements for authentication and proof-of-concept testing with law enforcement agencies."

Question:

Can the Board provide an update on operationalization of the law enforcement authentication mechanism, more specifically regarding the possible "testing group or other transparent, multistakeholder effort" referenced by the Board to support preparation for use of these mechanisms by Contracted Parties and requestors?

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 2: gTLD Registration Data (page 3 of 3)

C. SSAD Supplemental Recommendations

Statement/Context:

The GAC has noted several elements as important for RDRS or a successor system for requesting access to gTLD non-public registration data, including mandatory participation of registrars, voluntary participation of ccTLDs, use of the mechanism to obtain underlying non-public registration data for privacy/proxy domains, and inclusion of service level agreements that require registrars to provide substantive responses to authenticated urgent requests within an agreed timeline and finalisation of authentication mechanism to facilitate response to urgent requests by LEAs.

Comment:

The GAC will be actively participating in the ongoing SSAD SRT through its nominated members and looks forward to working with the appointed Board liaisons to help advance this important work.

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 3: GAC engagement on the RIR Governance Document

Statement/Context

In its scorecard to the GAC's ICANN 85 Mumbai Communique and the following BGIG call held on 23rd April, 2026, the Board noted that “.....Per its Bylaws commitments, prior to Board action, the Board will notify the GAC if the proposed RIR Governance Document might impact any public policy concerns and will take into account any advice that might be timely presented.”

Question

The GAC would greatly appreciate clarification that adequate opportunity and sufficient time will be made available for the GAC to meaningfully consider and provide timely input or advice following any such notification by the Board concerning potential public policy implications of the proposed RIR Governance Document.

GAC Topics/Questions

Topic 4: Systemic Risks of Arbitrary, Non-Standardised DNS-Layer and Geo-Blocking by Private Service Providers and the Resulting Internet Fragmentation

Statement/Context:

There is a worrying trend of large-scale, arbitrary DNS/IP blocking by private providers driven by independent interpretations of sanctions. Lacking standardized protocols or accurate data, companies resort to "over-blocking." This has affected hundreds of thousands of legitimate users in government-controlled territories of Ukraine for over a decade and is now expanding globally.

This practice undermines ICANN's core principles of openness, transparency, and universal connectivity, accelerating Internet Fragmentation (Splinternet).

Questions:

1. Who within ICANN is analyzing the impact of private-sector over-blocking on global DNS stability?
2. How can ICANN facilitate a standardized protocol to prevent disproportionate over-blocking and provide remediation for legal users?
3. Which bodies (e.g., SSAC, OCTO, IETF) should be consulted to evaluate the systemic risks to the unified root of trust?
4. What steps will the Board take to bring private providers, geo-data registries, and governments together to ensure the DNS remains a neutral public good?

Thank you!