
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC
Monday, October 27, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

GULTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC meeting with ICANN Board on Monday, 27th of October at 15:00 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper form in the Zoom chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include all six UN languages and Portuguese. If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and please remember to state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking in case speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. With that, I'll now hand the floor over to GAC Chair, Nicolas Caballero. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Gulten. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, depending on if you're online or which part of the world, as we always do during ICANN meetings. And a very warm welcome to our esteemed colleagues from the ICANN Board. Of course, it's a pleasure to have you with us for this session. We're looking forward to a productive

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

and collaborative conversation to make the most of our 60-minute, one-hour together. We have planned to briefly touch on a few key topics that are top of mind for the GAC, and these include our shared efforts on DNS abuse mitigation, the ongoing work around registration data, and we're going to get right into the details a little bit later, the governance of the RIRs, or Regional Internet Registries, as well as preparations for the next round of new gTLDs. And finally, the important review of reviews. You might have heard the very interesting conversations and discussions that happened no more than 20 minutes ago. So we're eager to hear your insights and perspectives on these areas, so thank you again for joining us. Without further ado, let's begin. Next slide, please. There we go. Thank you. So this is a question that the Board kindly sent to the GAC. I'm not going to read the question. It's a little bit long, but for that and ... Oh, I'm so sorry. You're right. I forgot to introduce the Board itself. We have Kurtis Lindquist to my right. I'm so sorry about that. You're right. I have the vice chairs on this side of the table Netherlands, Australia, and Switzerland. Thank you so much, and thank you for reminding me, Kurtis. I'm a terrible ... Anyways, and we have Tripti Sinha, the chair of the Board. We have Becky, and we're going to talk about Becky's departure, or planned departure, or for sure a little bit later. We have James Galvin, and the rest of the Board members, Patricio, Chris, Greg, Sajid, and of course, Amitabh Singhal. And I'm not seeing the rest of the Board here. There's Chris just walking by, and Miriam over there, and Sarah's probably somewhere else. So, there we go. So, welcome again. Sorry about that, and thank you for reminding me, Kurtis,

certainly. So, without further ado, let's dive in. And the question the Board had for the GAC reads, what does the GAC believe should be the Board's and the ICANN organization's policy priorities in 2026, taking into consideration the new five-year strategic plan, the WSIS+20 review, and the recently launched cross-community group on the review of reviews? So, we have five topics. On the first one, on DNS abuse mitigation, the GAC speaker will be Susan Chalmers from the USA. On the second one, RDRS and domain name registration data, I will give the floor to the European Commission, and after that, we'll talk about governance of RIRs, and the speaker will be Marco Hogewoning from the Netherlands. On next round of new gTLDs, and along with applicant support and GAC readiness and so on and so forth, the speaker will be Canada, and then finally, on review of reviews, I'll give the floor to our former GAC chair, Manal Ismail from Egypt. So, without further ado, Susan, I don't know if you would like to go ahead at this point. The floor is yours.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers for the United States, and along with my counterparts from the European Commission and Japan, one of the topic co-leads on DNS abuse for the GAC. Together, the topic co-leads developed input for the strategic objective. I would describe it as being two-fold. The first is advancing policy work at ICANN on DNS abuse, and the board will be familiar with our efforts towards that, in particular, our ICANN 83 advice in Prague. The second component of the strategic objective is to build up

resources for GAC representatives to be able to understand the topic better. That's all I have to say.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, USA. I have the European Commission next. Please go ahead, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo for the European Commission. And together with a group of countries, we are topic leads in the area of domain name registration data, the USA, Canada, and we have a number of other colleagues from the GAC participating to this work stream. This is a topic which has been on the agenda of the GAC for many years, and frequent in the interaction with the board. So this comes as no surprise that we still believe this is a priority for the year ahead, not only because there are some parts of the policies that still need to be addressed, but there are long-term objectives. And these are, for example, linked to the fact of having a reliable and stable accessible system to access registration data, to introduce requests, being the RDRS or successor system. We want to complete the policy on registration data which is pending the urgent request file since some time now. So this is an important piece of the puzzle to have a comprehensive policy. And we are consistently supporting the need for increasing the accuracy of domain name registration data, not as a mean in

itself, but as a tool that should lead to increased resilience of the DNS overall.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, European Commission. On governance of RIRs, I'll give the floor to my distinguished colleague from the Netherlands, Marco. The floor is yours.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. Good morning, good evening, wherever you are. I think ICP2 is a very foundational document regarding the second N, as Hans Petter called it this morning in his speech. So the GAC has been very actively engaging with the ASO in reviewing that and then working on the revised governance document. Looking forward and from the interactions between the GAC and the ASO, there appears to be some urgency on both sides to get this finished. So with regards to the question put forward, I think what the GAC is looking and hoping for is that once the board is presented with the final draft, that we're looking at a fast process to come to a decision and then further on subsequently also to work with the board and ICANN Org in implementing this in an expedited fashion. The document closes a few important loopholes and gaps. So I think that from this perspective, it would be the priority for 2026 to really get a revised governance process and associated reviews into place as soon as possible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Netherlands. Canada is going to walk us through the issue of next round new gTLDs. David, the floor is yours.

DAVID BEDARD

Thanks Nico, thank you chair. So as we look ahead to the new round, the GAC is interested in the application of insights from past experiences to help shape a more inclusive and resilient domain name system. Our priorities include fostering a competitive environment that enhances user trust and expands choice. We also aim to bridge gaps by encouraging participation from under-represented regions through the applicant support program and supporting the growth of internationalized domain names. Ensuring robust safeguards for DNS security and stability remains essential, especially as it relates to global public interest implications like DNS abuse and geographic names. As we approach the release of the applicant guidebook, we look forward to its thoughtful implementation and remain available to work together constructively with the board and the wider ICANN community.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Canada. And finally, for the ICANN review of reviews or ROR, a new acronym, Manal Ismail former GAC chair, is going to take the floor. All yours, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL

Thank you very much, Nico, and thanks to the board. So the GAC is very much interested in the output of the review of reviews. We are conscious of the aggressive deadline time frame that we have, and I hope the GAC looks forward to the cross-community group accomplishing its final report in due time. We have two representatives on the group and also co-chairing the work of the group and look forward to its output. Worth noting that this feeds directly into the first strategic objective of the GAC in relation to role of governments within ICANN. So I leave it at this and we look forward to the outcome from the group.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Manal. So this is where we are. I don't know if you would like to give any feedback before we move on, Tripti or Kurtis or Vicky. Please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA

So first, thank you very much, Nico, for inviting us to this meeting. As you know, the board always looks forward to our exchange at this meeting. So in terms of your feedback to our question, what I'm delighted to say is that we're very much aligned. As you know, DNS abuse mitigation, as well as features of registration data, its accuracy and urgent requests is also front of mind for us and very much at place. We're very aligned there. Recently, regional internet registries with the revision of ICP2 has come to the front burner. I'm

delighted that the governments are taking an equal interest and engagement in it and we are quite focused on that. The next round, as you know, is barely six months away. And as I said earlier this morning, we are quite very engaged in ensuring that we extend a hand to applicants in areas that require more support and ensuring that this new program is available around the world to different regions. And review reviews, again, Manal being one of the coaches shows the GAC's engagement here. So we're delighted and it is part of our process to continue to evolve in our own effort at continuous improvement. So we are very much aligned here and I see that our priorities don't differ in this regard. So thank you very much for your input.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much. Tripti, Kurtis, is there anything you would like to say? Or Becky, rest assured I'll give you the floor with enough time to talk about anything. Next slide please, Gulten. So this is a quick overview of the GAC topics. The first one being the ICANN Code of Conduct, GAC strategic planning, registration data, request service, RDRS, urgent requests, and ICANN review of reviews, as I said before. Next slide please, Gulten. So on the ICANN Code of Conduct I'll very quickly read this and then I'll give you the floor to you, Becky, or to Tripti, or to Kurtis, or to whoever you tell me to give the floor to. The GAC shares its appreciation with the board for adopting last month the new ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest, or the code, the timely adoption of the new code prior to the end of 2025 strongly

signals ICANN's commitment to a culture of honesty, transparency, preparedness, and accountability. GAC members are interested to see how quickly the new code can be integrated into various community processes. And for that, I assume I'll give the floor to you, Tripti? Please go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA

So again, thank you for the question. As you know, this is a very important topic to the board, and as we've witnessed, it's been an equally important topic for the GAC. So the recent approval of the Community Participation Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest was a critical and important milestone for us. It was developed in response to community requests and shaped through extensive consultation, and we'd like to thank the GAC for your support on this initiative throughout the community's discussions. We are firmly, we firmly believe in transparency and accountability of our community and ourselves. We think it was important to provide this clarity for participants and to demonstrate the integrity of ICANN.

So the new code strengthens the requirements that ICANN community members disclose, that they disclose their interests and affiliations when participating on committees and working groups and other ICANN-related activities as we craft policy together and to ensure that we know where the participants are coming from and what their backgrounds are, so we have a better understanding of their positions. It sets clearer, more consistent

guidelines for what participants should disclose, such as clients, employers, affiliations, and other relevant interests.

The code is now in effect, and an org is working with the community, particularly with the SOAC leaders, to see how we can properly support its implementation. The organization also put out a call to action to community members prior to this meeting to review the code and also to make any updates to your statements of interest that align with this new code. And the code is new, and as with all new things, we will work together as a community to apply it in practice. And over time, we hope that we will continue to develop additional tools and resources to support it and also include training for community leaders and other participants and have a unified statement of interest. And we're also committed to revisit this code on a periodic basis, so we will look at it in two years and see if we need to in any way true up the code. So with that, Nico, back to you. Do you have any questions?

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you for that, Tripti. I was going to ask my distinguished colleagues, if there are questions, please bear in mind we don't have that much time, so I kindly ask you to be concise, precise, and straight to the point. I have Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico, and thank you, Tripti, Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. So first of all, let me congratulate you for really a

swift progress on this question. It's a good example of how this community can move forward in a speedy way, and looking forward to seeing periodic reviews and data on how the code is applied, how effective it is, and to prepare also the review you just mentioned in two years' time.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. I don't see any other hand. So next slide, please, Gulten. So as regarding the second topic, which is the GAC strategic planning I'll give you some background during ICANN 84. The GAC, we intend to confirm our 25-26 annual plan covering nine key topic areas of interest to governments, and I'll read this statement very quickly, and my apologies to the interpreters in this case. But so beginning last year, the GAC has devoted resources to developing, implementing, and updating strategic and annual plans to bolster the committee's proactive stance in ICANN deliberations, increase the committee's readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness to provide timely and effective advice and policy input, and to assist readiness Thank you very much for joining us today. I'm very pleased to be here to assist in communicating the GAC's priorities throughout the multistakeholder community. Among the GAC's expected outcomes for calendar year 26, the committee is looking to establish a periodic informal exchange format between the GAC leadership and the relevant board committee for a regular assessment of ICANN's performance in

terms of openness, inclusiveness, transparency, and accountability in the spirit of the multistakeholder approach. DNS abuse mitigation will be a committee priority for 2026, with GAC members devoting substantial time and attention to the GNSO PDP regarding that matter. It is also a high priority for the GAC to ensure the continued operation of the RDRS and make participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars. For the next year, among nearly 60 expected outcomes, believe it or not, but there are 60 expected outcomes, the GAC is also committed to readying its membership for the role in the next round of new gTLDs, devoting in turn substantial resources for capacity development of all committee participants with appreciation to ICANN staff for its support in this area, and toward implementing the new ICANN continuous improvements program framework. I'll stop here in order to see if we have reactions from the board, and for that, let me know if I should give the floor to Jim, Becky, Kurtis, or to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA

I'll start and then turn it over to my colleagues. So first, we ourselves recently concluded our own strategic planning process, so we appreciate the significant time and effort that the GAC has spent in updating its strategies and its annual plan. So we look forward to engaging with the GAC as it assesses ICANN's commitment to its multi-stakeholder governance model, and of course the concomitant values of openness, inclusiveness, transparency, and accountability. So being clear with the board and the rest of the community about your key priorities and desired

outcomes is very helpful towards consensus building as we craft policy and do work together and move the work of ICANN forward. The priority topics mentioned with the GAC are, as I said earlier, very well aligned with our priority items for the board, and we welcome continued collaboration to ensure a common understanding. Becky, would you like to add?

BECKY BURR

The only thing I will add is that the reference in here to periodic informal exchanges between GAC leadership and the relevant board committees is extremely welcome. I think that we've demonstrated in our more informal, more engaged communications over time that talking, discussion, is the way to move the ball forward collectively and collegially. We are, as Tripti said earlier, very much aligned in terms of priorities, so I'm not speaking for myself as a committee chair, but I'm willing to bet that the ICANN board's committee chairs will welcome those discussions.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. The floor is open. Comments or questions at this point before we move on? I don't see any hand online. one hand from Switzerland. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Maybe as caretaker of the GAC strategic objective number one, where this

periodic exchange is placed, I'm looking forward to exchanging with you and looking into how we can implement this in the most informal and flexible fashion possible so that we have that dialogue on an ongoing basis. Thank you, and thanks also for welcoming this initiative and this idea. Thank you, Becky.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Switzerland. The floor is still open. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, Gulten, next slide, please. Thank you. So, the third topic is registration data request service, and there's some background. I won't read the whole thing, but basically the GAC and the board have aligned on a number of objectives for the future of the RDRS, including continuing RDRS operation past its pilot period, making RDRS participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars. That's something to be discussed, of course. Better facilitating requests through RDRS for the data underlying registrations made with a privacy or proxy service, a very important detail, and creating APIs for both registrars and requesters, and also considering options to enable voluntary participation by ccTLD operators. So, I'll stop there in order to see if we have some feedback from the board at this point. Should I give the floor to Becky? Becky, all yours.

BECKY BURR

Thanks, and I'm going to apologize in advance. This is that we are in a very complex state of affairs here. We have policy related to the temporary specification, the SSAD that has not been adopted by

the board. That's in play. We have the RDRS Standing Committee's final report, and taking all of those things together and in recognition that we're at the end of the two-year pilot for RDRS, the board will, intends to adopt a resolution on Thursday asking ICANN to continue operating the RDRS for two years, for up to two years, until December 2027, while the community completes related policy work on the SSAD recommendations, and by the community, by the way, it's not just the community, it's the board as well.

Concurrent with the resolution, the board is going to publish an RDRS policy alignment analysis for public comment. We had been calling that a gap analysis, but we really thought a better way to think about it is because we are looking at policy recommendations to think about this as how we align the various policy elements that are in the water table, so to speak. That analysis, which is going to be published for public comment, is going to explore path forwards in a couple of areas. First of all, we have an existing policy recommendation as part of the EPDP policy recommendation that all registrars be required to participate in a registration data access request system, and so as we have discussed many times, the board supports that community recommendation and we know that we are aligned with the GAC in supporting that community recommendation, so part of the path is how we get from where we are with the SSAD recommendations to an RDRS policy that mandates the inclusion of registrars, that implements the previous community recommendation. Also, we want to understand the

path forward for a requirement for registrars with affiliated privacy and proxy services to also respond to RDRS requests for underlying data as part of the system. We are interested in understanding how we can get to better integration for registrar systems and requester systems at the request portal in order to cut down overhead and duplication of efforts, both for registrars and for requesters. Inclusion of some service level agreements, including service level agreements related to urgent requests, the accreditation system for law enforcement, and options, operational options for ccTLDs to participate on a voluntary basis.

It's important to know that the GNSO Standing Committee's findings, which are out there, make several recommendations that align with this path forward, so we think that there's a lot of overlap and we just have to identify the path that gets us from where we are today to where we want to be. Some of that may involve new policy, but others of it, and we hope, much of it will involve the process that we have worked through with the GNSO Council to modify policy recommendations related to the SSAD. The resolution that you're going to see outlines the expectations for the continuing operation, offers a possible roadmap, notes where the possible actions aligned with the Standing Committee's recommendations, and we are looking forward to getting the community's input on that because that input will help us understand how the board and the GNSO Council consult on the pending consensus policy recommendations that are still outstanding for the board's consideration.

Because we have those outstanding recommendations, the Standing Committee advised the Council to recommend that the board reject the 18 SSAD recommendations as they were adopted in a package, not to take those off the table, but in order to initiate the supplemental recommendation process that we used very effectively in connection with the next round recommendations. We really did learn how to get from a recommendation that came from the community that the board could not accept in the form that it appeared. The Council worked with us closely to provide supplemental recommendations without having to go back through an initiated policy development program. So the intention is to amend the recommendations while using available mechanisms and incorporating lessons learned from the RDRS pilot. Boiling it down to its essentials, we hope that you will take a look at the alignment analysis when it's published at the end of the week and I'm sure that we will continue to have the GAC support and input as we work through the process of aligning the policy recommendations that we have with the community's policy recommendations, the Standing Committee's report, and the alignment that the GAC and the board have stated numerous times with respect to RDRS.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. I'll open the floor now for questions or comments on this topic and I have a hand from India. Please go ahead.

INDIA

Thank you, Chair, and thank you. Thanks to the ICANN board for raising this important topic. So during our BCIG call also, India has emphasized that accurate, authenticated, and accessible registration data by authenticated users are vital for ensuring DNS security, trust, and accountability. We support the evolution of the RDRS into a mandatory, which is mentioned in the second bullet, centralized, interoperable, and a permanent mechanism, which we have been raising it from ICANN 82 with the board, which all registrars should utilize to avoid fragmentation emanating from indigenous systems developed by them. This will enable timely and lawful access for verified requesters, including law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, given the challenges faced in implementing the SSAD, which was mentioned by Becky, the RDRS was introduced as an interim solution for registration data access. However, considering its performance and the recent enhancement made, and the significant investment of time and effort of the community, it is timely to evaluate the RDRS as a potential permanent mechanism for legitimate and authorized data access.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, India. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Chair. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. I would like to first offer as a consideration that we continue appreciating the fact that there is a strong alignment between the board and the GAC as regards as the final outcome to be achieved out of this process. The GAC has expressed these views in the recent public comment to the GNSO Standing Committee report. So this is something which is very positive. We see alignments of intent and we also look forward to see the resolution approved on Thursday. This has been very informative from your side, Becky, to provide all these new elements. There are two areas that I would like to touch upon. One concerns the extension of RDRS. We think it's very positive to further extend RDRS. We also would like to see this developing into a permanent tool. But in the meantime, we would really support the idea that technical improvements being made before we end up with the other second term of the RDRS, because we already had two years pilot, now we're going to have an extension. And improvements are needed for the user friendliness of the tool, but these are also needed as a way of supporting the community of registrars who are still sticking to that.

And we have spoken about it with the GNSO yesterday. We had feedback that some registrars believe they have better system than RDRS, that this would be lacking compatibility or interoperability with the RDRS, which is a type of argument which in 2025 we have a bit difficult to understand. We are pretty sure that the systems can be connected in a way that works well so that users have one

interface and on the other side it's managed the way which is the most appropriate for the registrar's community. So this is the second point. We believe the mandatory participation is key for the system to hold, because we have seen that with a voluntary system there has been a decrease of participation, both in terms of the registrars and the requesters consequently. So this is something which is important because the system needs to work and needs to be used for it to have a sense of being in place. The very last point concerns the voluntary participation of the ccTLD operators. This is an element that the GAC has supported for a long time. We understand this is the case also for the board and we have spoken about it with the ccTLD. So this is not the very first priority while we have a good system in place for ccTLDs, but we would like to recall that this is an important element to look at.

BECKY BURR

Thank you and indeed there is alignment between the GAC and the board on this issue, but there is also on the issue of mandatory participation of registrars in a data request system. We have an existing policy recommendation that registration by registrars be mandatory. So we don't view this as something new or extraordinary. We think that this comes out of the policy work that the community has already done and so I think we're all in harmony on that particular issue and I recognize the need to continue to make enhancements as we go along. I don't think anybody's contemplating leaving the system entirely as it is and not making tweaks that make sense. Obviously you're right. We have identified

APIs both for registrars and users to make access and use of the system easier as it is a critical piece of the work to be done. So I think on that and of course on voluntary participation by CCs, we're in alignment as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that. I'll give you the floor right away, Kurtis. Before that, I really think that a little detail to take into account is also accessing the source code and a good way forward was shown by Ireland by INEX, Eileen in terms of having the source code available for all interested participants. I understand it's GPL2. I'm not sure about the licensing system, but that's a good way for the same way Norway showed us the way back in June during the IGF and all the solutions they have in as FOSS free and open source software. I really think that's the way forward. But again, that's my opinion. I'm not speaking on behalf of the GAC, of course. It's just an idea. The floor is yours, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Thank you. Becky actually said what I was about to say that obviously the implementation or improvement will follow the policy, and as Becky said, we have identified, I think, several issues that we could work on to make this more usable, more manageable, but without knowing that this is the future and the future policy, then there's a little bit of a chicken leg, but we have that list identified, we have that work, but I think Becky covered it.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Kurtis. I have the USA next.

OWEN FLETCHER

Thank you. Hello, I'm Owen Fletcher, United States alternate GAC representative. On the bullet point about better facilitating requests through RDRS related to privacy proxy registrations, can you, I think we will be interested to see the details of what that looks like, and wondering just the nature of whether it'll be a requirement or optional or just what it might be. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

So what happens on that is going to come out of the analysis, the alignment analysis. There is ongoing work on privacy and proxy, privacy and proxies, but the question is whether we need policy specific to, and how the policies that come out of the S, the group of SSAD policies, how those affect participation by privacy and proxy. So that is something that we will be very interested to hear from the community on, because there are, there's the privacy and policy, privacy and proxy policy that has some implementation issues. There are the, or that is in implementation, and the, and then the SSAD recommendations that do address some privacy and proxy related issues. Meanwhile, there are registrars who are participating in the, in RDRS, and who are making data available from affiliated privacy and proxy providers. So we have a source of experience and information that should be very helpful as we go

forward on that. Again, I think we've discussed numerous times that the value of RDRS, the value of having privacy and proxy data available through RDRS, and so I think we're in alignment on that. There's more to be determined based on public comments, and then an analysis when we hear back on the policy alignment analysis.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Becky, thank you USA for the question. The floor is still open. Any other comment or question before we move on? I don't see any hand. Next slide, please, Gulten. So this is topic four, urgent requests for disclosure of registration data. I'm not going to read the background, because as you can see, there's, and next slide, and thank you, and we'll get straight to the question on slide number 10. I'll just read the question. The GAC would like, sorry, the GAC would welcome the board's views on how to meet the terms of the prior trilateral agreement between the board, the GAC, and the GNSO, which included two parallel tracks as part of the implementation of consensus policy, so that this work could be concluded expeditiously, and that urgent requests, when their circumstances occur, can be submitted, authenticated, and responded to in a timely manner, consistent with the vital public safety interests involved, and I'll stop there in order to see some reaction. Becky, back to you.

BECKY BURR

Thank you. And again, this is another place where there are a lot of moving parts, so I will try to be clear. The requirements for handling urgent requests for non-public data, there was a recommendation as part of the SSAD recommendation, but it was not adopted, it was not included in the registration data policy due to an agreement among all of us that there was further discussion needed, and we've all had the calls to discuss a path forward, and the work, as agreed, is proceeding on two tracks with members of the GAC's public safety work, working group, discussing options for authentication, and exploring with ICANN how to implement RDRS, how to implement that in RDRS, the authentication piece, and ICANN Org is holding a series of meetings with the IRT for the registration data policy to discuss urgent request response timelines, assuming, as you have, that an authentication mechanism is in place, because we've all agreed that is a necessary precondition.

We've opened a public comment period on the proposed language regarding the timeline, and we're very much looking forward to those. The language that is open for public comment now defines an urgent request is a disc, as a disclosure request that's submitted by an authenticated requester and meets the circumstances of imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure, or of child exploitation, and that proposed language does, that provide the timeline associated with this limited categories of requests, and I know you all know about the timeline, because the

GAC's been participating very actively in that process, so we're making good progress along those lines.

We need, so there are a couple of things. I think we have a policy recommendation. We don't need new policy with respect to urgent requests, because we have a policy recommendation, and now we have the language that's out there for comment. The authentication mechanism wasn't part of the policy, but we think that there's a path forward to revise the recommendations related to disclosure requests in the EPDP Phase 2 regarding the temporary specification, and that could provide a clear enforcement path that the GAC is seeking, rather than initiating a new PDP process. We think that we can use this path to effectively address concerns by providing the enforcement of the timeline on authentication mechanisms through adjustments to EPDP Phase 2 recommendations. Now, there's a tweak, just to be clear. The RDRS right now is voluntary. We're talking about a mandatory policy with respect to urgent timelines, so those things need to be decoupled a little bit, but as I said, we don't think that, we think that we can get to an enforceable provision of responding to the urgent request timeline in response to an authenticated request without new policy. I know that you would like me to tell you exactly what the timeline would be. I can't tell you that, but I think we are agreed that we want to move as quickly as possible on this, but I hope that it helps to understand that we don't think that we have to have new policy again with respect to the urgent request enforcement.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Becky. I'll open the floor for comments or questions. Please bear in mind, please try to, please bear in mind that we only have ten more minutes, so be precise, concise, and straight to the point. European Commission, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Becky, for this presentation. As you from the board know and, of course, the GAC knows, being very engaged on this issue, we have, indeed, urgent requests on issues of importance and advice on multiple occasions, stressing how critical it was for the GAC to have this piece of policy out. We have actively engaged in the implementation review team. The PSWG has committed a lot of resources to ensure that we would work on the authentication system, which was a requirement raised by the board and the GNSO, which the GAC agreed to, so there was consensus on this. What the concerns we have raised and we have raised with the GNSO already, we are happy now to hear your reply now, was that the language that is being put forward for public comment would imply that new policy development would be needed for the authentication system to be enforced. We fully share the objective that any part of the policy needs to be fully enforced, but what we cannot see is that while we are going into the verifying details of the implementation, we need to have new policy on how we implement, because this risks to become not only an endless process, but also a precedent for the future. Because the

issue of authentication is not part of the policy recommendations, but has been considered as a critical element in order for the policy to be implementable in a way, in the correct way. So for what concerns, my understanding is that you are going to propose a review of the EPDP phase one recommendation number 18. I have no idea what this implies in terms of reopening of the discussion, but just at this point, a word of caution that we wouldn't want to reopen the whole policy. This is an outcome agreed by the community, so of course any modification should be surgical and compatible with what the community wishes. Thank you.

BECKY BURR

And let me just say absolutely. The modification process is a process that we did work through several times with the GNSO Council in the context of the next round, and we think we know how to do that both surgically and efficiently from a time perspective.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, European Commission. I have India next.

INDIA

Thank you, Chair. Now we have the view that against further delays, which is caused by treating LEA authentication mechanism, which was also mentioned by the European Commission, should not be a separate policy process. As a GAC representative in the registration data policy implementation review team have already emphasized the authentication mechanism and was always intended to form

part of the implementation, but not as a consensus policy track. We also recommend that ICANN organization should act expeditiously to design and deploy an authentication tool for verified LEAs. Governments and GAC representative shall be consulted to provide validated list of authorized LEAs within their jurisdiction to ensure that only legitimate requesters seek information. Further, as mentioned, that the tool for urgent request should also be embedded within the RDRS tool itself. Otherwise, the concerned countries will be requesting 1,000 odd registrars for any misuse happening.

BECKY BURR

Thank you. And we agree that ultimately the urgent request should be embedded in a permanent this depends on all of the alignment, policy alignment work that comes out—A replacement for SSAD, however that comes out. It's just that the policy on urgent requests is in some ways distinct from RDRS. So we should be thinking of those as separate things.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Becky. And I see nodding in the room. Seeing no other hands online or in the room. Let's move on for the sake of time to the next topic, please, Gulten. Next slide. Which is I can review of reviews. This is very quick. How will the board participate in and monitor the recently started review of reviews to ensure that the effort is staying on track? Jim, go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, Chair. And lucky me, I get the easy question. I do think that first I should acknowledge that the board shares the GAC's interest in the priority success of the review of reviews. And toward that end, with my partner from the board, León Sánchez, we serve a unique role with Manal and Osvaldo Novoa from the GAC in being actual members of the review of reviews. This is unique because normally we would all only have observer roles in general. But we participate directly. So we all have that direct engagement and direct opportunity to obtain what we need to in order to maintain a status. And, of course, a thank you to Manal as serving as co-chair of the group, as she indicated earlier. In terms of our own internal logistics, you should just know that the board, we get updates every week from the CCG. Actually, since the group has started, we get updates on the reviews topic. We maintain it as an agenda item at our regular workshops, and we will for the coming year in order to watch all of this. And, of course, Leon and I have the opportunity to keep the board apprised of any issues as they may or may not arise as the path goes on. And obtain our own inputs and perspectives as needed from the rest of the board. And the board is engaged. We certainly, it was a topic at our agenda that we just had at this workshop this past weekend. And we had a relatively fulsome discussion about that, and we'll continue to do so.

USA

Thank you, Chair. The United States submitted this question for consideration because we are concerned by the breakdown of ICANN's system of reviews, which were put in place to ensure ICANN's accountability to the global Internet community nearly 10 years ago. That said, we really do appreciate Jim's response, and we look forward to monitoring the work going forward.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much. Indonesia.

ASHWIN

SASONGKO

SASTROSUBROTO

Thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia for the record. From the first topic until the last one, it seems that DNS abuse is very high on the agenda. Now, during the APAC meeting two days ago, last Saturday, I think, one of the topics that we discussed was the human resources development, capacity building to achieve higher quality operators so that we can handle the DNS abuse and other problems better. Now, ICANN Asia Pacific in Singapore basically proposed also the similar idea of how we can do a better capacity building. Here in the GAC, we have GAC capacity building, but I think it has to be enhanced to include the technical capacity building in many countries. That's number one. Secondly, perhaps with this tomorrow, it was announced that Mr. Ambassador Janis Karklins was appointed as what's called government relation. So I'm just thinking out of the box, perhaps if the DNS abuse and cybersecurity measure like that can also be included in the UNITU cybersecurity agenda and decided by the planning potential

meeting in ITU, and perhaps it will be better to achieve better cybersecurity. I met with the UNITU representative this morning, and perhaps I will talk with her also how to together, we all work together to have better activities against DNS abuse. Thank you.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

So on the capacity building, as ICANN Org, we do actually engage in quite a lot of, Capacity Building for various ccTLDs, registry registrars, DNS operators, and we run several programs and best practices like kindness, and we provide data tools for the community like domain metrika, and these are all helped as part of this capacity building and the trainings we do around the world. We will happily partner with other groups or countries to provide this further in their country for DNS operators, we have done this in many places, we will happily work with each of the regional offices ICANN has to further do this capacity development, and I think you're right that the more capacity building we do will help fight DNS abuse, I don't necessarily know that itself, DNS abuse is driven by a lot of other factors, but the more capacity building we can do, the harder it will come and the stronger the fight against it will be, and that's something we're very committed to and we already run several programs, I'm happy to continue working on this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, next slide please, Gulten. Let me go over time, two or three minutes, in order to see if we have any A or B at this point, and a hand from, please introduce yourself.

VINCENT ROBERTS

Thank you very much, Vincent Roberts from Grenada. Mr. Chair, the GAC underserved regions working group expresses deep concern regarding the persistent and systematic visa challenges that continue to impede the participation of GAC members and community representatives from underserved and global majority regions. Complex and opaque visa processes, limited counselor access, and high rejection rates have repeatedly excluded qualified delegates from ICANN meetings, thereby undermining inclusivity and weakening confidence in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model.

Recalling the recommendations of the ICANN meeting strategy working group, which identify ease of visa access and entry as key criteria for meeting venue selection, the underserved working group observes that this principle has not been consistently applied. The resulting and recurring exclusion of participants from the very regions ICANN seeks to empower remains both predictable and preventable.

Moreover, the GAC underserved region working group notes that the Sao Paulo multi-stakeholder guidelines explicitly call on processes to be, and I quote, mindful of power asymmetries between diverse stakeholders and empower stakeholders by providing them with the necessary information, resources, and

skills to participate effectively, meaningfully, and sustainably. Transparency measures should aim for making policy processes known, accessible, comprehensible, and actionable, unquote. The systemic visa barriers we identify represent a clear breach of this guideline.

In this regard, the underserved region working group urges ICANN and the ICANN board to adopt concrete measures to ensure equitable participation, including embedding visa accessibility assessments into venue selection processes, establishing a dedicated visa facilitation mechanism, engaging host governments to provide simplified or expedited entry procedures, and publishing transparent data on visa-related participation challenges. Ensuring fair and inclusive access to ICANN meetings is essential to safeguarding ICANN's legitimacy as a true global and representative multi-stakeholder institution. Thank you very much.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Thank you. We obviously share the desire that as many community members as possible should be able to attend in person in ICANN meetings, and this is something we work with. The visa evaluation is part of our site selection, and ultimately, visa granting is, of course, a national sovereign issue. We have no influence. We do work with host countries. We have worked with the Irish foreign minister here for a meeting in Ireland. As you know, we had to relocate with quite short notice here, which also impacted the

timeline to generate some of the invitation letters. What we have done for this meeting is we have actually generated the visa statistics. We have shared that with SOAC leaders. I believe Nico got it as well, the GAC leadership. That's something we can continue to do. We have analyzed this, and we're happy to continue to do that analysis to see what we can do. We have provided a lot more support this time. We continue to evaluate how we can do more to support visa applicants, both from the funded travelers and also the general participation where possible. But as I said, ultimately, this, of course, resides with the host country. But the visa evaluation is part of the site selection. We do look at visa issues as part of many other facets of the venue selection.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much for that, Kurtis. Thank you, Granada. That's all we have time for. But let me just say that today is a bittersweet moment because as we joined Becky Burr for her last official meeting with us, not only Becky, but also my good friend, Chris Chapman, and my also good friend, Maarten Botterman. But let me refer to Becky because some other vice chairs are going to be referring to Chris and to Martin. Becky, you have been a phenomenal force shaping policies and building bridges with your sharp mind tireless work and incredible grace. I also mentioned something along these lines during our last BGIG call, if you recall. So we will miss you, we will miss your laser-like clarity, warmth, and guidance more than we can say, while we wish you the very best in your new adventures, hopefully not that far away from the ICANN

environment. We're holding you, to your promise to stick around, informally at least. So you take with you our deepest gratitude and a standing invitation to always pop in as you will always have a home here. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

And thank you, Nico, and I've been informed that Maarten Botterman unfortunately isn't here. He's dedicated, as always, somewhere in this building discussing universal acceptance. I'm sure somebody can pass it on, but I think we should recognize his very constructive, his very open and soft approach throughout the nine years, but also especially the three years from 2019, 2022, where we served as the board's chair and took us ICANN community through the rough pandemic and the fact that we have to switch to fully virtually coming together, and as we just heard, getting together is really important for ICANN, so we should recognize his nine years on the board and, of course, thank him for that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

Chris, the GAC thanks you for your service as vice chair and for your broader leadership across the ICANN community. You've consistently brought classic Australian eloquence, simplicity and clarity to the work, helping to lead many work efforts as well as champion broader APAC views. Looking forward to seeing you back in country.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]