
ICANN85 | Prep Week – Policy Implementation: What’s New and What’s Next
Monday, February 23, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:00 PM IST

MICHAEL KARAKASH

Hello and welcome to the ICANN85 Prep Week Session On Policy Implementation, What's New and What's Next. Today is Monday the 23rd of February and the time is 20:30 UTC. My name is Michael Karakash and I will be acting as the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. Also, please state your name clearly for the record before speaking.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in the Q&A pod will be read aloud at the time set aside for question and answer at the end of the program. Questions written in the chat will be considered part of the chat and may not be read out loud for the record.

Interpretation for the session will include English, Spanish, and French. Please click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. With that, I will

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.

turn the floor over to my colleague, Karen Lentz, the VP of Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Michael. And hello, everyone. Welcome to the session. Can we go to the next slide, Jen? So, I will start with introductions of who we are and what we do. My name is Karen Lentz. I have the honor of working with a very talented team called Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs. We are part of ICANN's Global Domains and Strategy Function, led by Theresa Swinehart. And our focus is on supporting the community with good research and analysis to inform decision making, as well as we have responsibility for implementing many of the recommendations that come from ICANN's multi-stakeholder processes.

So, I'll introduce some of our speakers today. Michael Karakash, you heard from, is running the remote participation. Jason Kean and Antonietta Mangiacotti will talk about some of the policy implementation work in progress. Jessica Villaseñor will talk about the Continuous Improvement Program. And Alice Jansen will give a little bit of an update on reviews. There was a very good session that just finished before this.

We can go to the next slide. You'll see our other team members who are behind the scenes. So, you may hear from them with questions or they're working behind the scenes on getting the prep ready.

Next slide. So, I will start with highlighting a few sessions as we are going into the ICANN85 Community Forum. The first two sessions there are meetings that we are having with Implementation Review Teams. So these IRTs, as we call them, are groups of volunteers that help us work out implementation details for many of the policy recommendations that come from the community.

So, the two groups that are meeting then that you'll hear more about in these sessions. The first is on intergovernmental organization and international non-governmental organization curative rights. There are some policy recommendations on an arbitral process that are underway. And there is also, you see the second bullet there, PPSAI stands for Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues. These are some recommendations that we're working with that relate to Privacy and Proxy services for domain name registrations and the associated data. So, those sessions are both open for those who would like to join in person or remotely during the Mumbai meeting.

There's also a Review of Reviews cross-community group session on Thursday in Mumbai. I really encourage participation in that. It's a very important stream of work that is important to ICANN's continued thriving.

And then on Tuesday, there's a session on policy from Idea to Implementation. This is one of our favorite subjects here at PRSP. And this is focused kind of on the process, more on how we work

than on a specific piece of policy work. So, those are some sessions to highlight for ICANN85.

You also see on the slide a few of the resources that we've prepared specifically for this meeting. And we will come back to those a little bit later in the session. Next slide. So, here's our agenda. We will have the updates on policy implementation and reviews related work and then come back to me for some other looking ahead items and Q&A at the end.

We've tried something a little bit different on the updates. So, looking to give a little more description and context on the policy implementation and the other work, particularly in the form of describing the challenges and successes. Each project brings its own set of requirements and circumstances. And so, you'll hear a lot about visibility during this session as we think about how to provide more color on the saying that a project is on track or is moved in terms of the timeline.

Here's the work that has been going on between updates or that may not be visible. The reason we are focusing on challenges is not to be negative about what some of the difficult aspects are, but to be able to celebrate and note for the most part we've been able to manage and solve many of these challenges or are in the process of doing so, and then to be able to share what progress is being made on many of these projects.

So with that, I'm going to go into the next section, and Jason Kean will kick that off. Thank you.

JASON KEAN

Great. Thank you, Karen. Welcome, everyone. We're going to start with a brief update on Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Issues, also known, as Karen said, as PPSAI. Brief history here. This work dates back to October 2013 when the Council initiated a PDP to make recommendations for consistency across Privacy and Proxy services.

Along the way, a Working Group developed recommendations which were adopted by the work was then put on hold for a little bit due to related work related to GDPR. It was restarted in 2024 with an IRT coming back together, and that brings us to the current status of work. That IRT worked to answer some threshold questions and requested some guidance from the GNSO Council.

The Council provided additional implementation guidance to the IRT in November 2025. ICANN Org reconvened that IRT on the 8th of January 2026, and aligned on an implementation plan that's consistent with the GNSO Council guidance. This IRT is currently working with ICANN Org on an alignment of the flow of requirements for potential consensus policy, what that would look like for Privacy and Proxy services.

ICANN Org and the IRT will review the policy after it drafts it through the following sequential modules, working on definitions for the

consensus policy, the consensus policy language itself, and then also what disclosure would look like potentially in terms of frameworks.

The estimated completion for this work is quarter 3, 2027, so looking far ahead into the future. Although we're projecting a state, noting that timing and implementation are a collective goal, we discussed this with the IRT, we agreed on it. However, there's a lot of work that needs to be done in developing this, discussions with the community, and including a Public Comment proceeding on the consensus policy, which we're looking to have published in December as our current target.

So, current challenges, navigating changes to law, policy, and industry practices since the PDP Working Group first developed the recommendations. I mentioned earlier that they were initially envisioned in 2013, so a lot has changed, a lot of work has been done, and that was part of the threshold question and the work that the IRT had done, discussions with council.

In parallel to this, work on RDRS is expected and is continuing along the way, as well as advanced, and I'll mention this in a second, outstanding elements of the registration data policy, namely Urgent Request and disclosure. So, the Privacy Proxy IRT is going to work to align on this as much as possible, but consistent with council guidance, not to delay this work or wait for anything in any way. So, those are the challenges to date.

Successes, continued IRT commitment, and ongoing productive dialogue. There are a lot of IRT members that were involved initially in the first round, going back, I'm not going to date anybody, but almost 10 years. So, that's really helpful to move this forward for that historical knowledge, both within the IRT and ICANN org as well. And we wanted to give kudos to the rapid turnaround from the council regarding the threshold question responses.

Those were delivered in August. A Small Team worked on them pretty quickly that was socialized within the council, and then that official guidance was provided following ICANN84. So, kudos to everyone involved. We know it's been a long haul, but we do appreciate everyone's continued participation in this work. So, that's a brief overview of Privacy Proxy services.

I believe we'll go to the -- oh, there's one thing I wanted to drop in the chat really quick for everyone, and that is, if you'd like to follow along -- oh, Jessica already did it. Great, perfect. Thank you, Jessica. So, if you want to follow the work or have any questions -- want to look at the documentation, that historical information is there, and you can follow along as well. So, thank you for that, Jessica.

Next slide, please. Okay, moving on to Registration Data Policy from EPDP Phase 1. One outstanding issue from the implementation of this work was Urgent Requests, which anyone that has been following this knows that following a series of

trilateral discussions at ICANN82 amongst the GNSO Council, the GAC, and the ICANN Board, two work tracks were established.

One with ICANN Org working with the EPDP Temp Spec IRT to determine an appropriate timeline for Urgent Requests for lawful disclosure. This is EPDP Phase 1 Recommendation 18. So, that was the one track, and the second track happening in parallel was work from the GAC's Public Safety Working Group to undertake the development of the authentication mechanism for requesters. So essentially, once the timeline is in place, the hope is that the requester will have been authenticated, so that kind of streamlines the process for anyone receiving the request. So, just wanted to note those two separate work tracks.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Jason, I'm going to interrupt. Can you just slow down for the interpreters, please?

JASON KEAN

Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Jessica. So, the ICANN Org had been working with the IRT over the past year on this work, and I will make it through this slide, and I believe we have questions at the end to work through some of this material, and we will be able to jump back as well. So, I do appreciate that. Thank you. So the IRT has been working for a year to develop this language. This language was published for Public Comment in October. That proceeding

closed in December, and a report on the input received was published in January of 2026.

The results of this proceeding are currently being shared with the Council, the Board, and GAC to inform the discussion on next steps. And, of course, the next steps of this are for the Board, the GAC, and the Council to align on the remaining steps for Urgent Requests, given the current landscape and the input received, and procedurally, considerations of how to move forward with this work, given the two different work tracks and the state of each.

The estimated completion with these discussions would ideally be by the end of quarter one of this year. So, this work is actively going. Again, the report was just published. So we're looking to facilitate these conversations, which we currently are, and moving forward, especially by ICANN85. Challenges for this work. Similar to Privacy Proxy, extended community discussions to reach resolutions on this, especially with open issues. So that also includes balancing a wide range of community views. This open issue has been going on with the IRT. There was a lot of active discussion for a year, and then a lot of input was received during the Public Comment proceeding as well.

Successes. Again, kudos. Ongoing productive dialogue and strong engagement from key stakeholders, which includes governments, law enforcement, registries, registrars. So, all that participation is really helping shepherd and move this work forward and is greatly

appreciated. I do want to drop in the chat for everybody so they can follow as well.

The Urgent Request summary report. So, you can take a look at the analysis of Public Comments received and kind of understand where this work is at. It provides a nice brief history as well to get you up to date and see what everyone is saying about this work. So, on that note, thank you again for listening and attending, and I will hand it over to Antonietta for the next slide.

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI

Thank you, Jason. Hi, everyone. My name is Antonietta Mangiacotti, and I will be providing an update on a few more implementation projects.

Next slide. Okay, on the implementation of the GNSO, IGO, and NGO Curative Rights Policy, the team here is spearheading the implementation of updates to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy and the Uniform Rapid Suspension System to improve access for intergovernmental organizations.

This work involves setting up the implementation review team, drafting advice policy language and guidance, and identifying and engaging potential vendors to administer a new arbitral pathway for handling UDRP and URS disputes involving IGOs. In terms of next steps, the goal is to publish a Public Comment on the updated UDRP and URS in the first quarter of 2026.

This project is expected to be completed by the second quarter of 2026. In terms of challenges, there was a newly identified policy interpretation question that required escalation to the GNSO Council for guidance, which delayed the originally planned Public Comment in the fourth quarter of 2025.

A key success, however, for this project has been strong collaboration between the IRT and ICANN staff, which allowed the team to reach rapid agreement on this interpretation issue, helping to minimize the impact of the overall project timeline.

On the implementation of the Rights Protection Mechanisms Phase 1 policy recommendations, the team here is working towards finalizing the proposed revisions to the trademark clearinghouse requirements, and is also in the process of implementing the remaining Phase 1 recommendations related to RPN data collection and establishing a compliance mechanism for any party in the URS process to file complaints about perceived non-compliance by URS providers.

In terms of progress, recommendations from two of the five implementation groups have already been implemented. The next step for this project includes publishing the revised trademark clearinghouse requirements and launching the new URS complaint process, both expected by the end of the first quarter of 2026. The project itself is expected to be completed by the second quarter of 2026.

On challenges for this project, the work is being impacted by internal resource constraints, as well as the need to manage overlaps with next round related work. However, there has been efficient collaboration between internal and external stakeholders, which has helped keep this project moving forward.

On the internationalized domain names expedited policy development process Phase 1, the team here is currently aligning the implementation with the IDN Phase 2 and planning consensus policy documentation for all relevant IDN recommendations. The next step is to draft consensus policy documentation for the recommendations. The team is working on this project, is targeting completion of this work by the second quarter of 2026.

In terms of challenges, this project is also being impacted by internal resource constraints. However, the team has successfully incorporated all Next Round related IDN PDP Phase 1 recommendations into the Applicant Guidebook, and there has also been efficient collaboration between internal and external stakeholders.

Now, I will pass it on to my colleague, Jessica Villaseñor, who will give an update on the Continuous Improvement Program. Thank you.

JESSICA VILLASEÑOR

Thanks, Antonietta. If we can go to the next slide, please. Great. And as Antonietta mentioned, we're now heading into the reviews

related work. I am Jessica Villaseñor, and I'll give a quick update on the Continuous Improvement Program implementation, or CIP.

As many of you, if you've been following this work, you know that the CIP is an evolution of organizational reviews into a community-led process. The CIP framework was published in July of last year, and it establishes a common approach for each SO, AC, and the NomCom to implement their own continuous improvement efforts.

Implementation is currently underway, with four groups having begun their CIP efforts, with progress being tracked on the CIP wiki. Since the publication of the framework, Org staff has been working with the community to socialize the framework to ensure all groups understand the process and expectations, and to support implementation efforts.

Each cycle of the CIP is expected to last no longer than three years, with this initial CIP cycle expected to conclude in Quarter 3 of 2028. As far as next steps, our team will continue to track implementation progress on the CIP wiki, and offer resources like templates, workshops, and research consultation to support the community in its implementation efforts.

And as mentioned, the successes of this project thus far, is that implementation has begun, and we're currently on schedule. So with that, I'll pass it over to my colleague, Alice Jansen.

ALICE JANSEN

Thank you, Jessica. Could I have the next slide, please? Thank you so much. So, my name is Alice Jansen, and one of the projects our team is helping support is the Review of Reviews. You may have attended the session right before this one, where the cross-community group offered an update on its progress.

So, the Review of Reviews cross-community group, and allow me to shorten that to CCG, was formed through a charter developed by the community leaders. This was in response to a resolution from the ICANN Board asking that the community engage in a dialogue on ICANN reviews to help design a system that is fit for purpose of enhancing ICANN accountability, transparency, and effectiveness.

The charter was approved by the Board in September 2025, and the Review CCG has been very busy ever since, meeting on a weekly basis. Its composition includes members from the community, Board, and Org, as well as expert advisors. There's also a large set of observers who actively participate in these discussions.

So the CCG's mandate is to conduct a fundamental evaluation of ICANN reviews as a whole system, including their implementation, and the deliverable is to propose a refreshed system of reviews. If you attended ICANN84 in person or virtually, you may recall that the CCG was very much in listening mode at the time, collecting input on successes and challenges of reviews and past reviews, as well as on a draft purpose statement that was put together for that discussion.

The CCG has now moved on to its second phase, which is focused on developing proposals. So, at ICANN85, the CCG will have an initial proposal, an outline for discussion. It will host a session on the Thursday of the ICANN week, so March the 12th, and will also be joining some of the community groups during their sessions to gather insights and perspectives on this outline.

In terms of next steps, the CCG will take stock of the suggestions and comments received and heard in Mumbai, as well as online, and will release a draft design for Public Comments. So, there will be a Public Comment coming out of the Mumbai meeting.

The Public Comment received on that draft design will then help shape the proposal that will be presented in the draft report soon after. The draft report, of course, will also be submitted for Public Comment prior to being finalized. The CCG expects to send its final report to the Board, along with the documentation of support from the community groups, in the third calendar of 2026, so that means in August. And this is what we have in terms of the work plan for now.

There are multiple ways that you can contribute to this dialogue. You can join a plenary meeting at ICANN85, either in person or virtually, but also you could consider becoming an observer, or sending your ideas to the input on review's email address. This is an address that the CCG uses as a channel to continuously get feedback on their work. Of course, there's no requirement for you to be familiar with the ICANN reviews, existing ICANN reviews.

Everyone is welcome to contribute to this important work. The CCG, I know, is very eager to hear your views on this initiative, and I will hand this virtual microphone back to Karen now for next steps. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Alice. Can we go to the next slide? Thank you. And the next slide. So, I wanted to follow up here with some comments on the topic of visibility, transparency, and reporting. This is something we've been thinking about quite a lot within our team, and cross-functionally as well. And so, what I wanted to do here is first highlight a number of resources that exist, and then talk a little bit about how we're thinking about how to evolve some of these for greater visibility.

So, first thing I will highlight is our Consensus Policy Implementation Framework webpage. This framework is what guides the processes for implementing policy recommendations that come from the GNSO. So that's all of the things that Jason and Antonietta talked about. So that page has all of our implementation resources, the framework itself, a number of other procedural documents, and it also links to each of the implementation projects in progress. And so, you'll find there the project schedule, the status, the wiki workspace, the mailing lists, all of the draft documents, all of those are available from the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework webpage.

Second thing I'll highlight here is the Quarterly Specific Reviews Implementation Report. This is something that we produce that is on behalf of all of the implementation work happening across the ICANN space. So, the last cycles of specific reviews produced a number of recommendations, and there are different parts of the community and organization that are responsible for those. And so, we compile the latest information and publish that each quarter. The latest one is linked there.

I'll also highlight our PRSP briefing. So, ahead of each ICANN meeting, we consolidate all of the information that we have on implementation of policy recommendations and review team recommendations and include also a description and links to other work in progress, including things that are planned that we have not started on yet.

We publish this for ahead of each meeting, and it has more detail of some of the things that have been mentioned in this session. And so, I encourage you to look at that. So, looking at the big picture, one of the things that we've noticed is the information is in several places, not just within our team, but across different parts of ICANN.

And so, we've spent a lot of time in this last Since ICANN84 thinking about how to make the work more visible. This is something that you'll hear more about going forward, but I'll show you a couple of things in the next couple of slides that are attempting to find

different views of how we depict work in progress. So, if we can go to the next slide.

So, this is a little bit hard to read, but one of the things we think about is how to show a composite picture of all of the recommendations and all of the work that's pending. So, these columns are showing the numbers of recommendations that are completed in progress or not started yet. And so, one of the things that we are juggling is how to represent a project as a whole versus per recommendation.

We tend to think of implementing a policy as it's either all or nothing. It's all done or none of it is done because the recommendations are so interconnected. But there are other cases like the rights protection or like the Urgent Request example where you have a specific recommendation that is pulled out and is on a different track. So, this is something that we're thinking about how to create views that capture both of those angles.

The next slide is on the review recommendations. And this is kind of depicting over time how we capture the number of recommendations that are in progress and when we can consider those complete. For example, with the Registration Directory Service or RDS-WHOIS 2 review, those implementations having been complete.

A number of other things that are still ongoing and have continued over a period of time. So, looking at numbers as well as the narrative because these recommendations are not a monolith. So,

some of them are quite comprehensive and some are fairly straightforward. So, being able to share different views from the high level versus the detail level is also something we're working on.

If we can go to the next slide. Okay, so we're about ready for questions. I will also highlight one of the efforts around visibility of work helping to try to consolidate some of this information. And you'll see a blog upcoming in the next week before ICANN85 that talks more about those efforts.

JESSICA PUCCIO

And there is a question in the Q&A pod. So, I guess I can read it to you or would Luc like to actually read it himself?

KAREN LENTZ

Go ahead, Jessica.

JESSICA PUCCIO

Okay, sorry. So, Luc said with respect to slide 12. So, actually, Jen, if you wouldn't mind scrolling back. And the proposed revisions to the TMCH requirements and URS update. Could you specify the nature of the resource constraints currently facing ICANN?

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Luc, for the question. So, this is really to identify things that we've had to manage over the last couple of periods on this implementation work. So for example, if someone leaves and we

need to spin up someone new to work on something, or a lot of this work is cross-functional. So it's not just our team that's working on it. We have technical, legal, compliance, many other resources that are working together on implementing a policy.

And so as one or more teams might get pulled into something else or go through changes, this is something that we've managed in terms of, you know, finding ways to continue to get the needed support that we need. And so, it's not that we have resource constraints and therefore nothing is happening. It's noting that these are some of the aspects that we've been juggling through the last period to keep the project going. Thanks.

JESSICA PUCCIO

There's actually, it doesn't read as a question, but there is a comment in the Q&A pod. Karen, I don't know. I'd just like to read that out loud.

KAREN LENTZ

Sure.

JESSICA PUCCIO

So, Sazan said, some registrars don't maintain transparency regarding abuse reports. Most of the false abuse reports are neither disclosed nor properly verified. I just wanted to acknowledge.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you.

JESSICA PUCCIO

And also -- sorry, go ahead.

KAREN LENTZ

Yeah. So, thank you for that question. I think I'm not the right person to comment. I think I'm not the right person to answer it. But if you would like to send an email or a note to our PRSP-contact email, which is in a later slide, if we can maybe go back to that slide, we can follow up to where that input needs to go.

I'll add that Anne had asked a question earlier on the Public Comment report on the Urgent Request draft language. And we did share the link to that report in the channel, or sorry, in the chat. And then Albert had a hand raised as well. And I think that has gone down. So, we are open for any other questions.

JESSICA PUCCIO

One thing that has come up on our sidebar was that this presentation deck will be uploaded to the schedule, to the ICANN85 schedule website just after this call. And I do believe recordings are posted within like a 24-hour period.

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you, Jessica. Yes, I see your hand up, Anne.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Yeah, thanks so much, Karen. And boy, I need to catch up on the public summary on Urgent Requests. There is a question I have about that, since we have time and you're available. In the summary on the Public Comment, I'm not sure if there was any sort of summary conclusion about whether a further policy process is required in order to define capital A, Authenticated, capital R, Requester.

And I know that the IRT had put that out as I believe a recommendation that a further policy process was required. And I think there was comment on both sides of that issue. If it's not too detailed, are you in a position to summarize what was actually said there? Because I couldn't find a clear answer in the Public Comment summary. Or is that a matter for the Board?

KAREN LENTZ

Thank you. Thank you, Anne. It's a really good question. And this was indeed one of the topics where feedback was specifically requested in the Public Comment proceeding. The reason we're not being too specific here on what's next in terms of an outcome is this two-track process was the result of a discussion among the GNSO Council, GAC, and the Board.

And so, I think we expect that those groups need to come together to make sure that everyone is aligned on the next steps. And where we are now is trying to get those conversations set up. And I believe there is one already pending for the GNSO Council at ICANN85. But to answer your question or to give a little bit more sense around

your question, we had the two tracks of the timeline language for responses to Urgent Requests, and then the second track being the work on authentication.

And so, we believe we largely have what we need on the first piece, and that we're turning our attention to the authentication mechanism and how those can be brought together. So, I think the intention is for the respective groups to agree and align on what the next steps need to look like, particularly given that there were mixed views on what is needed to bring those two together from a procedural standpoint.

JESSICA PUCCIO

And no other additional questions in the Q&A pod, Karen.

KAREN LENTZ

Okay, last call for questions. I will also thank everyone for attending. And please do use that PRSP contact email address if you do have questions or if you look at some of our resources and want to ask more about some details or how to be involved. We really welcome that. Alice, Jason, and I will be on the ground at ICANN85, and so please do also get in touch with us in real life. Thank you very much for attending and for those of you who commented and added questions, and we will talk to you all soon. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]