ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Meeting: GAC and GNSO Council
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

MODERATOR

Welcome to the GAC meeting with GNSO on Sunday 8th of March at 13:15 local time. 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 in the chat will be read aloud if put it in the proper form. Please remember to state your name and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation and please make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I'll now hand the floor over to Ian Sheldon, GAC Vice Chair. Thank you, over to you, Ian.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, my name's Ian Sheldon. I'm one of the current GAC vice chairs. I hope you've all had a good lunch break and are ready for a fantastic discussion with the GNSO. Before we kick off, perhaps

we can do a quick round of introductions and then we can get into it. So, where do I start, perhaps with you, Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hello, everyone. I'm Susan Payne, I'm the GNSO Chair for the current year and very much appreciate being here. We always appreciate joining our GAC colleagues for this session, so thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hello, everyone, I'm Jen Chung, I am the GNSO council vice chair and I'm also the lead on the DNS Abuse mitigation.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hello, I'm Ashley Heineman, representing the Registrar Stakeholder Group and I don't have any other important titles. I'm going to talk about Urgent Requests and the accreditation, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hello, I'm Sebastien Ducos and I am the GNSO's liaison to the GAC, and we have two participants today who should be joining us online. We have Sam Demetriou who will take the topic of RDRS and we have Bruna dos Santos who will be taking the topic of human rights.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Perhaps we can get started. Next slide, please. There we go, DNS Abuse. Great, good to go.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Right, straight into the best topic, right? DNS Abuse mitigation. So, GNSO council and I guess broader GNSO, we thank GAC for providing your experts and your members, participants, alternates and also, I know there's a lot of observers from the GAC membership as well, we really welcome this high-interest topic.

We've had two Working Group meetings yesterday, first of an administrative nature and then also one to really look at consensus building given our group size, it's really good to have a baseline understanding of how we can get to the PDP work efficiently and effectively.

Paul McGrady is the chair-elect for this PDP and council has a consent agenda motion before us on Wednesday to formally approve this. GAC will have already received the early input invitation. This is a request to input on the charter and of course we invite and we know that there has been a small group or a Working Group that's been established in the GAC to particularly work on this so we really appreciate that as well.

So, the early input request to this, I believe the deadline is the 20th of March so we really look forward to receiving this input from GAC. Again, this topic is really high interest, I know all of us here in this room of course wider also ICANN community has been really

putting eyes on this as a community-wide expectation that this associated domain checks, PDP will be very focused and it will be efficient to produce implementable recommendations on an effective timeline.

So yesterday, during the first session of this Working Group, we had eyes on a preliminary look at what the timeline could look like, again this is up to the Working Group to work out. It is going to be then sent to council for adoption as well so we do welcome all the inputs and comments and suggestions that we could look to doing this work constructively, efficiently and produce implementable results.

Of course, the current work plan has the initial report to be published April of 2027. Of course, depending on work and Working Group progress deliberations the work could be finished earlier, there is a lot of will goodwill around the table in the room and of course across the community to actively try to beat this timeline and of course once this timeline is confirmed as I mentioned council will be approving this work plan.

There's been some questions we received yesterday and also, I guess in some discussions previously about PDP 2 and again in the motion that the council adopted late last year when we were starting this work, we will be deciding on the appropriate timing of course pending resources and the progress of the very first PDP so again, watch this space.

There's also been some suggestion earlier in our working sessions in the council that we can already take a quick look at what the charter for PDP 2 would look like so of course, there's also a will to make the work effective, make the work efficient but of course, this really depends on the progress, the resources that are available. And then finally just again, the issue report is drafted in a manner that allows council to continue to take further measures to mitigate DNS Abuse.

We are not forgetting all of the priority topics that different SO/ACs, SGs and Cs have indicated to us so nothing has been dropped into a black hole. We certainly take all of these inputs and priorities very seriously and we're also discussing a methodology within council to see how we can prioritize our work and certainly, I'm sorry, I'm talking way too fast. I need to remember there is translation.

We've been discussing a methodology for prioritizing our work and DNS Abuse mitigation is definitely taken into consideration once this methodology is agreed upon.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Jen. I think I think you've answered likely a lot of the questions that I had on the previous initial slide. Would there be questions from my GAC colleagues at this juncture? Nigel, please.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE Thank you, Ian. Nigel Cassimire from the CTU and welcome back, Ashley. Jen, you mentioned like about a one-year time frame. Was

this one of the narrowly focused PDPs that we were hoping to be able to expedite in like a six-month period?

JENNIFER CHUNG

This is Jen, for the record. Answering your question thank you, Nigel, for the question. I think there is a lot of will around the community to look at a focused PDP and I think the associated domain checks PDP if you look at the charters particularly at the charter questions, you will find it actually very focused on really a singular topic.

I think when we were looking at the initial draft of the work plan you can take it as this looking at it in a very conservative view. This will be the limit of the timeline. The only as our chair elect Paul McGrady talked about yesterday, the only way the timeline can go is backwards so it can only be shortened and not lengthened.

So, if we are able to get to the work and look at the charter questions in an efficient, effective manner, and of course doing everything that is necessary to come to these recommendations including all the checks on for example, the human rights impact assessment, the public policy framework and also the data protection impacts as well. I think there is no obstruction to us looking at actively beating this timeline.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE

And just for a quick follow-up and would there be need for additional resources from ICANN for example to help shorten it?

JENNIFER CHUNG I cannot speak for staff support right now, but they have at every stage before this PDP and even during this kickoff indicated that they will be putting every resource available to allow community to do this work effectively.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Jen. Thank you, Nigel. I have Gemma from the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Ian. Gemma Carolillo, from the European Commission and thank you so much for addressing the questions and that we had proposed as GAC.

I wanted to first say that we are very happy to see that this policy development process is set for a very good start. The GAC is very involved in this process there is a number of colleagues as you rightly pointed out that are participating already since the inception phase in this policy development process.

But I would like to echo what my colleague, Nigel, just mentioned saying that we were a bit surprised to see the timeline that was proposed. I now better understand that this is set as a maximum timeline. However, considering that this topic was chosen first because it's very consensuated in the community and sort of a low-hanging fruit and considering that all parts of the communities

needs to plan for resources for this policy development process we would really like to hope that the timeline could be reviewed.

Of course, this should be realistic we are not going to say PDP is going to finish in one month. However, even for resource planning purposes to see that the final report is expected after Public Comments in September 2027 this seems to be a bit of a very conservative timeline considering the topic and the commitment that has been shown by all parts of the communities.

So, the question was whether you would consider together with ICANN Org to revisit the timeline. And then the second question would be it's very interesting to hear that you are developing a methodology to see how to assess further topics of importance on DNS Abuse that were part of the issue report. And we would be keen on learning more about also a timeline for addressing this further topic as part of the methodology that has been developed. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thank you very much, Gemma, for your questions.

JENNIFER CHUNG I think that again there has been a lot of discussion during our first administrative meeting that we'll be looking at all resources available in terms of both Working Group call cadence and the amount of work and homework that the Working Group participants will be undertaking particularly looking at effective

asynchronous work. I think there will be a lot of that involved with working through the associated domain checks PDP.

For the second part the methodology. I think this is kind of a broader picture of what the GNSO Council is trying to do our prioritization methodology for looking at work coming down the pipeline for the council. So, it's not only narrowly focused on DNS Abuse mitigation which of course is a priority topic for council and of course the wider community as well particularly with GAC.

I think once we get to that point, it will be quite good for us to run this exercise and I'm speaking not on behalf of the council right now because we need to have this discussion first. We haven't had a full discussion on how this prioritization mechanism will look like, but I absolutely expect that when we do have something like this that we will be looking at the DNS Abuse topics as well when that time comes. I hope this is a good enough answer for now. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

I think it's probably just worth also mentioning for those who maybe haven't seen it in the schedule, but obviously we're here as the GNSO Council but the different stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO do also do their own work and the contracted party side of the GNSO in particular has a Working Group, they do regular outreaches and indeed their outreach session the first this time slot on Wednesday, they are doing a community update where one of the topics of particular focus will

be on domain generating algorithms that was the kind of priority three item that was identified in the recent issues report.

So, that might be of interest to either attend if you're free or listen to a recording subsequently and I should probably also mention the registrar stakeholder group on just after that session will are also doing their own session on DNS Abuse investigations.

That again, may be of real interest on some of the more practical things and it's one of those opportunities to have some examples and sort of for the group to kind of in an interactive mechanism sort of see what they would you know what their assessment would be on particular scenarios. There was a similar session in I think it was Prague, and it was quite fun and very well received. So, I hope some of you will be able to attend one or both of those sessions if of interest. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON I think they sound like fantastic sessions perhaps we can get the specific circulated in the chat. So, GAC knows specifically where to go and when because I would encourage attendance at that if we can. India, please.

SUSHIL PAL Thank you. I'm Sushil from India. Thank you for bringing us on this. I mean the present PDP bits, you know, would follow its own process like many of the PDPs of the ICANN, so that will be, I mean,

any impact of the PDP process would be maybe a year later only, right?

And I would not want to underline the importance of DNS Abuse, but there are a few things, you know, which the issue report on the DNS Abuse also which has also brought out, right? I would not focus on many others because a few of them may require a separate PDP, we would not want to kind of take up with a GNSO for another PDP process and however there are certain issues which have been brought out which might have very material impact when it comes to DNS Abuse.

For example, the reduction of the time frame for the verification of the registrant, right? Registrant data. If the registration can be done concurrent, if the verification of the registrant data can be done concurrent with the activation of the domain, I think that would be very quick and the issue report has also clearly brought out as to how, I mean, malicious actors, you know, create havoc, you know, within a daytime and they don't even bother for any validation.

That would be one big step forward which we can have and it will have a very immediate impact on the DNS Abuse. How do we do that? If GNSO can help us, guide us, that would be something very tangible outcome which we can have from the ICANN meeting.

The other would be about the addressing the transparency in the reporting mechanism, right? I mean, we had mentioned this in the last GAC meeting as well that there is no centralized mechanism for

reporting of DNS Abuse, number one, so we have no visibility as to what is the extent of DNS Abuse by various registrants with various registrars and neither since there is any mandatory reporting.

If such a mechanism, I mean, having us, it's a pretty simple thing for a small company, even a smallest company has a normal dashboard, you know, about its key parameters. I believe ICANN and GNSO would be having DNS Abuse as a key parameter for performance if such a centralized mechanism can be created and maybe it can be mandated that everybody has mandatory reporting, can be done for reporting of DNS Abuse. That itself will go a long way, because then community can decide as to where I should register, where I should not.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, India, for bringing those issues up. Again, I encourage all of us to take a look again at the final issue report. Right now, of course, we have kind of fast-tracked the first two PDPs, the first one having started and the second one when we look at the charter and when council then approves the start, it will happen.

And Susan, our chair, has also mentioned the DGA's topic is actually something that's been taken up by the contracted parties with the session already on some information. Now, I mentioned earlier that none of the priority topics that are included in the issue report that was looked at by the small team will be dropped.

These will not be going into a black hole. We will look at them again. It might be in the form of full council, it might be in the form of another iteration of the council's small team on DNS Abuse to look at how we can organize this work.

Again, this is going to be contingent on how well, how effective this first PDP starts and I hope very optimistically, this can be a blueprint on how we get to implementable recommendations on an effective timeline.

I know this is a very generic answer to your two specific questions, but because those will be topics that will be tackled, when we look at a real tightly scoped charter, I cannot answer you with solutions right now. This will be something that might require a policy development process, which will be in the future.

So again, I would urge us to remind ourselves in the final issue report, all of the priority topics are not dropped. It will then, of course, inform us how well this first PDP does. It could be a blueprint on how we do the subsequent DNS Abuse topics. Hopefully that's helpful at this point.

SUSHIL PAL You know, we're talking about specific actions, right? I think the concerns on DNS Abuse have been, it's been, I've been participating in ACAN for almost three years now. I haven't come across a specific action which has led to the reduction in the

domain abuse. Not one. We have been discussing on and on and everybody is fully aware.

People, you talk to anyone, I think everybody's on board, yes, this should be done. How? That's a challenge, right? The first one regarding reducing the verification, that's going to have a very tangible impact and we don't think it should require a PDP, since the contracted parties are already and can be handled through the amendment in the contract, since the contracted parties are, you know, one of the stakeholders in GNSO, would you be open to talking to the contracted parties for amendment in the contracts, so that it can have expedited actions?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you, this is Ashley, representing registrars and the registrar stakeholder group, and I just wanted to note that in terms of a centralized reporting, that function already exists, not through ICANN, through NetBeacon, so I encourage you to --

SUSHIL PAL Sorry, to interrupt NetBeacon is a sample report, right? It is not a comprehensive report of all domain abuse from all registrars, and it's one ad hoc report. It's not a systemic thing for domain abuse in the ICANN. We are looking for a systemic issues and systemic actions in ICANN for DNS abuse, if it's a priority in ICANN. We cannot institute one NetBeacon and maybe five years later another

NetBeacon to come out with the report. I think if that's the approach, then I think I addressed my question. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: I can see Graeme is in the room, if you'd like to comment.

GRAEME BUNTON: Sure, briefly, thank you, Ian. My name is Graeme Bunton. I'm the executive director of the NetBeacon Institute. I don't want to get into a back-and-forth or details about what NetBeacon, you know, what we do at this moment, but just to say that NetBeacon Reporter is a conduit for abuse reporting, it is open for anybody to use, it reports abuse to all gTLD registrars as well as participating ccTLD registries, and it has an API, and it's free to use, and so anybody can do that programmatically at scale. So, we accept abuse reports for many people all day, every day, to the tune of some 20,000 abuse reports a month, and so happy to talk more about that offline.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. Yeah, we do have a couple more topics we need to get through this meeting. I think it's a fantastic discussion, and I think one that's, it's very evident the GAC continues to monitor this space very, very closely, and I would just reiterate that the GAC and GNSO can continue to talk, even outside of these bilateral engagements, and I'd very much encourage more of that engagement intersessionally and in and around this conversation.

So perhaps we can continue it after this discussion, and we can work through some more of those issues. I saw one other hand, but it's popped down again. Would you like to… very quick, thank you.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you. Susan Chalmers, for the United States. Just wanted to thank the GNSO for its work on DNS Abuse. We've kicked off this PDP during this meeting, and we really do support the idea of this being a potentially a blueprint for further PDPs in the future that are narrowly targeted and efficient. So just to express thanks, and we're looking forward to engaging going forward.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Perhaps we can move to our next agenda item, RDRS and SSAD. Unless you'd like to, perhaps I'll kick off and then we can hand over. Great, okay. So, the GAC work on the RDRS policy alignment analysis. The GAC provided a comment submission generally supporting the proposed amendments to the RDRS and noting its expectation that efforts will be taken to achieve these outcomes swiftly if updates are needed to the relevant policy recommendations.

The GAC also notes the large degree of alignment between the concepts in the RDRS policy alignment analysis, the RDRS standing committee final report, and past position stated by both the GAC and the Board. What steps will the GNSO Council take to

expeditiously advance work towards the outcomes in the RDRS policy alignment analysis? Over to you, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks so much, Ian. I just want to make sure my audio is coming through, okay?

IAN SHELDON Yes, it's clear.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Great, thank you. So, to the GAC's question, I am happy to report that the GNSO Council has made some progress specifically in the area of discussing the next steps on the original policy recommendations around the standardized system for access and disclosure. That's EPDP phase 2 and it's something that was also included in the RDRS standing committee's final report.

So what we have decided over the course of the last few months, including during our strategic policy session and our meeting in February in discussion with some of the members of the ICANN Board, is that the council will be accepting and following the RDRS standing committee's recommendation to suggest or request that the ICANN Board not adopt those original SSAD policy recommendations. And what this will allow us to do is open up a path to develop supplemental recommendations.

This is a process that is captured in the ICANN bylaws and it's also similar to a path that was used when the board did not adopt certain policy recommendations from the New gTLD subsequent procedures policy development group that going back about a year or two. So, what this would do is it would allow the council to issue some type of supplemental recommendations for the original SSAD policy recommendations.

And while the council hasn't reached a final agreement on exactly how it will engage in that process, we have preliminarily agreed that we will involve some subject matter experts from the broader ICANN community, but that we will keep this process very focused on just looking at the SSAD recommendations. We won't be opening up a brand-new policy development process.

We also will be looking to the RDRS standing committee's final report for the blueprint on how to consider those initial policy recommendations, because that group did put a lot of effort into making recommendations to whether the initial policy recommendations should be modified or kept as is.

I should also note one thing that all of the policy recommendations, we are looking to treat them as a complete package. So, we will be asking the Board to not adopt the entire group so that we can consider them all again as a kind of unified whole.

The last thing I'll note is that while this process is going on, we, the RDRS will continue to operate at substantially as it has been operating up to this point in time. So, we're looking forward to

initiating this after we have some dialogue with the Board. This process is all outlined as well in a letter that our GNSO council chair recently sent to the chair of the ICANN board.

If anyone wants to review that, you can see sort of the plan laid out in writing there. But it is our expectation that since we are not opening new policy development here, and we are using the RDRS standing committee's final report as a basis of work, we're hoping that we'll be able to conclude this process in a matter of months as opposed to stretching this timeline potentially over a year.

So that is a quick overview of where we've gotten in the time since the last ICANN meeting. And I'd be happy to take any questions or engage in any further discussion on this.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Are there any questions for Sam? I do admit I have not seen that letter. So, I think I'll go back and check my inbox to see if it's hidden. But if it's not, I'll be seeking it out and having a closer look at it. I have one hand from India, please.

SUSHIL PAL It's not a question, just a comment on this, since we're going for a supplemental recommendation. And we have come a long way, I mean, in the RDRS pilot as well, although the RDRS pilot as such has not been up to the mark because of the voluntary participation of the registrars, which actually undermines again, the integrity of

the system. And therefore, we consider reliability of the empirical data, whatever we get on the RDRS platform.

So, we believe that if the supplemental recommendations are being triggered, then it would be worthwhile to examine if the policy can address the mandatory participation of the registrars in this, in this platform. Because without the universal participation, I think this will always remain a fragmented thing. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Would you like to respond? We've got a queue for me as well.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Sure. Thanks, Ian. I'll be very brief. Thank you very much for the comments. And like I said, the all of the original recommendations for the standardized system for access and disclosure are going to be considered as a package. And so, I believe that is one aspect that will come up in those future discussions. So, appreciate the input on that.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. U.S., Owen.

OWEN FLETCHER Thank you. This is Owen Fletcher, United States GAC alternate. Thank you, Sam, for the information you just shared. We support the procedural path for the board to send the SSAD policy of recommendations back to the GNSO so they can be revised to align

with recent work, such as the RDRS standing committee final report, as you mentioned, and ICANN's policy alignment analysis regarding the RDRS.

We would urge ICANN and the GNSO to proceed quickly with next steps and to develop timelines for achieving the various components of the vision the Board's presented for the future of the RDRS. We look forward to monitoring the work as it goes on. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Appreciate that, Owen. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Great. Thank you. And I have one more hand in the room from somebody I don't recognize, but perhaps it's somebody in the GNSO side. Volker, the floor is yours.

VOLKER GREIMANN Yes, thank you. Volker Greiman, Registrar's representative on the GNSO. I would like to just highlight one minor issue with the current RDRS and how it has been implemented. It is currently a very cumbersome system to operate in, meaning that we are a registrar just to provide the background that has participated in the RDRS for over a year and has pulled out after a while for the reason that in the time that it takes us to answer one RDRS disclosure

request, we can action five direct RDRS or disclosure requests that come to us directly.

It is simply not worth our time to go via the RDRS to answer those requests when we can do that much faster ourselves in our own operated systems. And a lot of registrars that we can talk to see the same issue. If the RDRS can be streamlined in a way that it is operatively easy to manage and to handle, then we would gladly rejoin. But currently, as it stands, it's just operationally not effective. And that is why we pulled out.

SUSAN PAYNE

Just to add to that, obviously Volker knows well and Sebastien was the chair of that RDRS standing committee. I mean, the recommendations report from that standing committee, in addition to doing incredibly detailed work on going through each of the SSAD policy recommendations and suggesting what a possible path might be for consideration of this new supplemental recommendation effort. But that group did also look at a number of improvements that they recommended to the RDRS to address some of these operational and user experience issues. So, we do obviously hope that those will get picked up as well.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

If I may, does Sebastien Ducos, stepping away from my role as liaison, but indeed I did chair that group for two years, to address Volker's comment and both your comment on the Indian side,

developing a system that is going to slow the process down for the operators makes no sense. But at the same time, having 20 different systems collecting their own data is not a good model to standardize and be able to monitor.

One of those recommendations was to say, if you don't participate, at least connect with us in terms of result, in terms of reporting, so that we can centralize a report and have at the end an RDRS that has a full vision, a full picture of the situation, and being able to report on abuse like that, rather than slowing every registrar down, particularly the ones that have, as Volker has, developed their own system in order to gain in efficiencies and be able to handle the traffic there. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Sushil?

SUSHIL PAL Thank you for clarification. I think we have been saying since the beginning that the RDRS was a sub-optimal pilot for the SSAD. This is what we've been saying for the past two, three years. But since we moved with consensus, so here we are. And I totally have my full sympathies with the registrar, I think, with regard to the operational challenges which they're having with the RDRS.

And it's a pretty sub-optimal pilot for the SSAD. It doesn't answer a single question of any of the 18 problem statements of SSAD, I think. So, let's look back and ponder as to what we have achieved

through this three-year pilot. It will be interesting, although we are extending it for two more years. And I'm completely with you. I think we just need a centralized mechanism.

You call it RDRS, you call it SSAD, you have it through hub-and-spoke system, you have it all reporting. But let's have a complete reporting, that's all, through whichever mechanism, through a decentralized model, through API exchange or through a centralized portal. But it should have complete reporting from all the registrars, that's all. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE I think if I'm understanding correctly, what I mean when I hear your comment is going to is the point that you want this system to be used by all. So, that kind of mandatory element is important because use by some and, you know, voluntary adoption is sub-optimal.

IAN SHELDON Any other questions or hands? I see there was one question in the chat, which I think has been answered. Great. Anything else before we move on to the next agenda item? I see none. Great.

Urgent Requests. So, the GAC would like to thank the GNSO for its recent report on the timeline for Urgent Requests for lawful disclosure of non-public registration data. As expressed, both within the implementation review team, IRT, and in the GAC's Public Comment submission, the GAC supports the current

compromised text, which foresees a 24-hour timeline with a possible extension of up to 72 hours in exceptional circumstances, force majeure.

The GAC looks forward to finalization of the Urgent Request policy language. The GAC remains concerned about the ongoing uncertainty regarding whether the authentication mechanism for law enforcement would require new policy development. At ICANN84, the Board said it saw a path to integrating authentication mechanisms without further policy development.

In addition, as the GAC has communicated previously, the GAC does not believe new policy development is needed. As the GNSO is aware, the PSWG's work to establish the authentication mechanism is ongoing and progressing well, with active participation from contractor parties and other ICANN community members. Great. Over to you, Ash.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you. Ashley Heineman, again. So, first of all, I just wanted to, you know, thank the GAC and law enforcement in particular for all the work that they are doing on authentication. And with that, just wanted to note that we have heard on a number of occasions now on the subject of jurisdiction that there is an understanding within the GAC and law enforcement that ultimately, when it comes to jurisdiction, that is something that registrars will have to keep in mind when reviewing requests coming through this system.

And if there's any other thoughts or questions with respect to jurisdiction, would love to share those, that discussion with you here today, if possible. So, we also have had conversations with respect to how to proceed, in particular with the Urgent Request recommendation. And there tends to be general agreement happening within the council that that timeline associated with Urgent Request should be published so we can move forward with that.

When it comes to dealing with the subject of authentication and the system that's still under development, ICANN staff provided some useful potential options for how best to proceed when it comes to policy. And the way it's understood is that one option is to deal with it in implementation, which is apparently the option that the GAC prefers.

There are other options, including dealing with, if the SSAD recommendations are non-adopted, unadopted, sorry I'm going to get, I got it wrong, I said it went, gets unadopted and this will go back to council and there will be an attempt to develop supplemental recommendations, that this could also be an opportunity to deal with any potential supplemental policy recommendations associated with authentication.

And a third is to deal with a yet-to-be-tested process by which to deal with recommendations that have been adopted but basically go back and deal with it in that manner, which could be

burdensome and not entirely clear since this would be the first time such a process would be utilized.

I think at this point where the council is leaning but has not made a decision is to again publish the timeline for Urgent Requests and to use that second option of basically, if necessary, making some supplemental adjustments in light of the accreditation system being developed and that that would be done in short order as opposed to developing a whole new policy development process or other process.

So, this could potentially address both the concerns for need for additional policy work but not doing so in a manner that would take a great amount of time. But that being said, we really would like to know from the GAC and law enforcement with respect to what the current status is of the accreditation systems development and I understand that that is something that we can have additional details shared with us today, perhaps by Mr. Gabe Andrews.

GABRIEL ANDREWS Hi, this is Gabriel Andrews, U.S. Government and also speaking now in my capacity as co-chair of the Public Safety Working Group. We've been having regular conversations now for some time and collaboration between various law enforcement agencies and ICANN Org staff to develop authentication mechanisms that can be

used to authenticate the identities of law enforcement requesters as they make RDRS requests.

I wonder before I proceed if there are the graphics I've provided that might be incorporated into the slide deck already just to check. I don't know who's piloting the deck but if they do exist it be helpful to show them and if not maybe give me some wave. Negative? Okay, standing by. I'll continue to talk then while that's being obtained.

So, just at a high level, we're talking about authentication and I just need to stress this. We're not talking about authorization and the difference is that you're talking about proving that the person that you're talking to is who they say they are. You're not talking about what rights or permissions you're going to give them. Totally different.

What we've been exploring is two models of potential use and the first is to talk about using pre-existing or aspirational law enforcement portals which might then connect directly to the RDRS and the second mechanism that we've been exploring, well, actually I'm going to pause on the first now that we have the graphic. The use of law enforcement portals is is what we're getting consensus is really the real way to address this in an actual authentication mechanism.

I'm also going to talk about something in a second that was looked at as sort of a stopgap or short-term solution or mechanism that it doesn't have the same degree of robustness. So just to set the

table, we're talking about two but this is where most of the effort it seems to be most productive. The notion is that you have a law enforcement employee that can connect to an existing law enforcement portal that has a number of various services on it.

One such service could be ICANN's RDRS. They connect using their employee credentials. The portal will connect directly to the RDRS system. An authentication token will be passed and then from there everything proceeds as already does happen when RDRS requests are made. The end-user still has to fill out all the required information. If the RDRS changes over time and includes new questions, they still have to address them. But then when the request is then passed to the registrars or the data controllers, they will get not just the request as it exists today but they also get that authentication token passed.

They evaluate the request as normal. It's their decision as to whether to disclose or not. And if they do submit a response back, it goes directly to the law enforcement employee, likely via email as the way that the RDRS works now. The email field will be one of those fields that are validated in the token.

Now secondarily to this effort, because this is it's what we're viewing as the long-term, but it's taking some ongoing collaboration with ICANN Org staff and the Interpol folks that we're collaborating with and in the U.S. We will talk more about this in Tuesday's registration data session, by the way.

We'll go into more detail and Interpol will be part of that conversation and discuss their efforts to create their portal. I think there'll be a lot of interest from the GAC on that. But if we can flip to the next slide, we've also been exploring whether or not providing lists to ICANN of known law enforcement agencies and their associated domains that they use in their email addresses would be of value.

And the way that we had thought that this could work would be that if law enforcement agent logs into the RDRS, as they do now, and they select a request that is of the category of law enforcement, that potentially ICANN would then be in position to check, well, what email address are they logged into our system with, and does that match the known law enforcement domains?

This would be an additional data point that registrars might use in their evaluation as to whether to disclose information or not. But this isn't the same as true authentication, and so there are potentially some challenges.

I understand that currently ICANN Org staff are having conversations with registrar stakeholders to determine the utility of this as a model versus the other, and I think we might have updates from ICANN Org staff in the Tuesday session as well.

So, just wanted to provide this as sort of the general overview. It was suggested in our last practitioner call by some in the GNSO space that would be helpful to share these specific diagrams, and

so trying to do so now in the hopes that it is helpful. But of course, am available for additional questions offline. Over. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Are there any questions for Ashley or Gabe? Great, and Gabe, I assume that's an old hand you've got. Volker, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN Yes, Volker Greiman, RrSG stakeholder group. Just for Gabe, I think everything is better than nothing, and nothing is what we have currently. So, as registrars based in a certain jurisdiction, we do not know what kind of email addresses law enforcement and other jurisdictions may use.

Therefore, having any form of confirmed sender list is already a step forward over what we have currently. So, while that probably would not be sufficient in the long run, it would be the first step in a long way that we could go together.

IAN SHELDON Thank you. Gemma, please.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Ian. Gemma Carolillo again from the European Commission. Going back to what Ashley was presenting and also the question that was asked, I have three quick points.

The first one is that we are very happy to hear that also the GNSO expects the policy on the timeline to be finalized very soon.

This is a very encouraging message. We are going to relay the same message also to the ICANN Board, since this has been also at some point was a trilateral discussion. And also, I'm glad to hear that there is a sort of understanding that the authentication mechanism could potentially be treated as an implementation issue.

I just wanted to flag that there is an interest, I think from the GAC, to get more information or get involved in any way the GNSO retains pertinent in the supplemental recommendations work, because of course, this is a bigger bucket of issues pertaining as such. But you have mentioned that the supplemental recommendations are also one possible avenue to tackle the issue of the implementation for the authentication.

And then, so this is a question from my side. And then the third part, so I don't take the mic again, I will try to answer very quickly the question on the jurisdiction.

We have been discussing the jurisdiction on a few occasions in the implementation review team. And the line from the GAC has always been that we do appreciate jurisdiction is one of the issues that the contracted parties take into account when addressing a disclosure request. This is the same for regular requests and Urgent Requests. Jurisdiction is part of the picture. And that we believe that applicable jurisdiction should apply regardless of the type of requests, whether it's regular or urgent. And that the ICANN

registration data policy already caters for jurisdiction to be one of the elements for considerations.

So, beyond the difficulties for the GAC to go on a case-by-case basis over every jurisdiction and what could be the possible impact on Urgent Requests, we want to refer to the general rules that jurisdictions apply and consideration over jurisdictions are considered to be taken into account whether a disclosure is made or not. Thank you very much.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN Thank you very much, Gemma. I think we're aligned on everything that you just articulated. I do have a question about the question you posed though. You noted that the SSAD approach to dealing with supplemental recommendations is a potential avenue, but I didn't actually hear the question. So, if you could clarify that, that would be great.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you. I'm sorry if that was not clear. So, the question was, since the preparation of the supplemental recommendations is in the hands of the GNSO, of course, and all the preparatory work is done there. If you see any ways where the GAC could sink in with this process in order to see how the supplemental recommendations are prepared, eventually contribute, if this is appropriate, with regards specifically to issues that are especially critical, like the one on Urgent Requests. Thank you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Thank you, Gemma and Susan. Yes, I can answer that. I think the precise structure of the working group, for want of a better word, that we will use for this effort, I think it's still a matter for us to discuss. And we will, in fact, be having that discussion a bit later in the week.

And we do have a plenary session on Thursday morning, 9 a.m., which would be open to all to come along and be interested to hear views from people. But as a more sort of a matter of more general principle, I think it's very much the case these days that just as when we are putting together a policy development process, this kind of similar effort, we would always be looking to inviting the GAC to participate, just as we also tend to now be inviting CEDA at large as well.

So, you know, just as when we conducted that similar supplemental recommendation effort on the SubPro recommendations, we did have, or certainly at least that was open to the GAC to send some subject matter experts if they wish to do so. This one I would absolutely envisage we would have the same type approach.

And in the same way as the Standing Committee, I hope I'm not wrong here, did have members from the GAC involved in that group as well. So, absolutely, we would very much appreciate GAC involvement in that.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you. I have one more hand in the queue. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you. My name is Lawrence, a GNSO council representing the business constituency. So, this question is to Gabe, actually. They shot them for Urgent Requests. We started that discussion about, I think, two years ago, and it was supposed to be a stopgap to the long, what I call it, the long method that integrates directly into RDRS. It seems today that our long-term plan is gradually catching up with the short-term one.

We have, as a part of the group that has been working on this, I know that you have collected emails. Those emails are already validated by law enforcement. The question is, is there anything the GNSO council can do to help fast-track this process such that the interim plan for which the email addresses are already collected can still get to actively play a role before we get to that long-term plan that integrates to RDRS? Short question is, how can we help?

GABRIEL ANDREWS: This is Gabriel Andrews again. So, first, thank you, and I think you are right in your assessment that we initially thought it would be a faster and easier short-term solution to provide those email domains.

It turns out that for various reasons; it's not been as easy to implement to make those available via ICANN as an intermediary as we first hoped it would be. So, it is important then that if we think that this is useful and helpful, that that message gets communicated to ICANN Org. They are still actively soliciting that input from the, especially the registrar constituency of those that are participating in the RDRS, so that messaging could be important.

I will note in the registration data session on Tuesday, there will be an ICANN Org member participating in this discussion, Elisa Ogopian. I will defer to her for ICANN's position on all of this, but I do recognize that they have a limited number of staff that can do the development work that we contemplate, and there are a number of important projects that they are expected to work on this calendar year, and so there is going to have to be some adjudication of what gets worked on when, but I am very, very grateful to the collaboration that we've had with their staff thus far, and view it as absolutely essential to going forward. Over.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you for your offer of help. I might move us along to the final agenda item, and leave a little bit of time for Seth to take the floor before we wrap up, and so Bruna was going to take this one. So, I might quickly run us through these slides and try not to skip the second of these.

So, Article 17, extending to an individual's right not to be defrauded, and 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, extending to copyright and trademark, and security and stability commitments in the bylaws need to be taken into account in any HRIA.

HRIAs can be undertaken using the model developed for Working Groups, and need not to be outsourced. About the GNSO request to know what, as GAC, we're planning to do for HRIA.

First, we need to remember that there was a letter from GAC leadership, which was sent to the GNSO leadership on the 15th of January this year, that was asking GNSO to let us know what their specific procedures were adopted in order to comply with HRIA.

Now, we understand from these last exchanges that have just been shared with us, the reference document that GNSO indicates is the one linked here. Now that we know what the basis for this discussion is, we shall work on it and provide a comprehensive reply, because the document needs to be adapted to GAC-specific issues.

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

The next example of HRIA applied to ICANN policies will be the DNS Abuse discussion, where the GAC is involved and where the

HRILWG, the Human Rights and International Law Working Group, will have a specific focus at the HR component of this policy and its implications.

Based on current practices of the HRILWG and on the position agreed by the GAC leadership in 2024, there is no intention to apply HRIA to other activities of the GAC, such as in the communiqué or the non-policy related discussions or decisions.

Of course, in making HRI a GAC, with the assistance of the HRIL Working Group, we'll take into account Article 17 and 27 of the UDRH and the core values of security and stability commitment in the ICANN by-laws and could use as guidance the HRI, a checklist prepared for the LDPDP, for instance, after having gone through a more in-depth evaluation of the document.

So, in case of complicated issues where more rights enter into the conflict, GAC members consider bringing in relevant governmental expertise, such as data protection authorities or Human Rights experts, depending on the nature of the issue.

The opinion of external experts, not only governmental but also international organizations or national or regional regulatory independent authority experts in the matter, could be requested.

So, the Working Group signals that the group is already regularly working with partners, such as UNESCO or the Council of Europe, exactly to bring in its perspective for this kind of contribution and expertise.

Next slide, please. Perhaps we'll hand over to Bruna for a reply. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, Ian. I hope my audio is coming through well. I think the main goal for us was really to bring this issue to the attention of the GAC and add this request of the added expertise into that, as you already highlighted that. But as we're heading into the DNS Abuse PDP, I do think that at the opening session for the PDP, we already had a great kind of heading or some sort of short announcements towards what will be the initial things we need to keep in mind, such as the global public interest and also concerns related to Human Rights.

And it was important to put it in the map of the DNS Abuse PDP that things such as right to privacy, effects on freedom of expression and further issues will be part of this analysis. So, I think here the goal was really to have this as a compromise or as an ongoing conversation between both the GNSO and the GAC in the sense that we will continue to talk about these issues and whenever necessary, you can bring it up to us and highlight some more points or issues that the GAC is perceiving in these discussions.

And also, just to add, it might be I'm sure it is of your knowledge, but in the past meetings, we have been trying to run an HRIA on the GAC communiques whenever needed or whenever we have relevant policy decisions that we consider that might affect rights, might affect end users and so on. So, even though it's not part of

your ongoing efforts, it would be nice to get some sort of a feedback on these efforts whenever possible, but not really putting that on your agenda, but just saying this is an ongoing effort.

And so, she has been championing these topics within the GNSO council and it will be good to engage with you guys further on this. But I don't think I have anything else to add other than thank you guys for the compromise of bringing in experts.

I do think that's what we need at this point. And kind of diversify a little bit of the expert on the table when it comes to a lot of those PDP discussions, because we know it will go far beyond only a request, but we'll also add another point on this plethora of discussions on Human Rights in general. So, maybe I'll stop here. And if there are any questions or points, I can also take them.

IAN SHELDON Thank you, Bruna. Any questions? Great. Any other hands? I see none. Just checking the chat. Great. I think we're good to move on, which I think that brings us to AOB. So, before I open the floor, where are we?

SUSAN PAYNE Sorry, I saw a hand from Gemma, but she --

IAN SHELDON Oh, sorry, Gemma, did you want to take the floor?

GEMMA CAROLILLO It's an AOB, so I will be waiting.

IAN SHELDON Great, okay. Before I open the floor up, I might hand to Seb to make a quick announcement, and then we'll open it up, or would you like to do the other way?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS No, maybe after Gemma.

IAN SHELDON Okay, sure. The floor is yours, Gemma.

GEMMA CAROLILLO Thank you very much, Ian, and thank you for giving the opportunity. It's a quick AOB, and I know we do not have this topic on the agenda today, but we are having also discussion on Wednesday in the GAC, and there will be some representatives from the GNSO, so I wanted to raise it already now.

It's about the UDRP, or the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. We have seen that there has been the last report from WIPO on the review of the UDRP, and among the others, there is, I would say, a clear call for the GNSO to take leadership and decide what to do about some aspects of the report.

In particular, there was one point concerning the extension of the scope of the UDRP in relation to other topics that have been considered important from the communities, including the topic which is important for the European Union and others on geographical indications, but there were more issues in there.

So, my question is whether the GNSO has had already the opportunity to discuss this issue, and whether, because this has been directed to the GNSO for decision, and whether there could be any news on this subject. And of course, if it's not possible today, we would still welcome perhaps to have an update on Wednesday when we are going to welcome a GNSO representative. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON Any quick comments, please?

SUSAN PAYNE Thank you, Gemma. So, I think I have been invited to come to your session on Wednesday, and I may be a little bit late arriving because I think it comes straight after the GNSO councilor meeting with the ICANN Board. So, I will attend that session as soon as I am able to leave the Board session.

I would say that I probably will not be able to give you very concrete answers, well, in fact, I will not be able to give you very concrete answers on this. I think we've mentioned that we are going through an effort to work out how to prioritize the various items on the

GNSO's workload at the moment, and one of the items in the mix is the review of the UDRP.

So, we first have to agree what process we will use for determining how things rise to the highest level of priority, or how we order the work that we will do, and balancing this amongst other efforts like the additional work on the SSAD that we already are committed to, the second PDP on DNS Abuse that we are already committed to, and then also other work in those areas, such as on DNS Abuse. But the UDRP is one of the items in the mix on that, and that's about as much as I can say at the moment.

That question of whether or should the UDRP extend to other rights is clearly not something that the GNSO can answer, or at least the GNSO council can answer. That is a topic that would potentially be part of a PDP effort, and there would be discussion, and ultimately a consensus would be reached on whether or not that would happen. I hope that is sufficient for now, and I'm looking forward to that session on Wednesday.

IAN SHELDON Great, thank you. It sounds like a more substantive discussion to come. I think we're just about at the end of our session here. I see no further hands, so before we close, I'll hand to Sebastien to make a brief comment.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

Just a brief comment or reminder, Ian touched on it when we were having the DNS discussion. We've tried for the last year to make sure that your topic leads are in contact with our topic leads. We didn't really have, so far, formally topic leads, but for that reason, we designated them. Today, we were able to present four of those to represent the points of discussion.

I strongly encourage you, individually, to reach out, either to your liaison, Manal and Rita, if you need to get in contact with us, or to me, or through staff. We'll find somebody. Let's not wait for three times a year to have these meetings now, but continue the conversations also offline. Thank you.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you. Absolutely support that comment. I think a lot of us travel a very long way. Let's find some time to connect here on the ground and find some time intersessionally to keep the conversation going. If there are topic leads or points of contact that you need help getting in contact with, leadership's always open, the liaison points are always open, and I think let's make sure we continue to find those points of commonality and work together.

That brings us to the end of this session. Thank you very much. The GAC always enjoys and appreciates the time with the GNSO. I found this session to be incredibly productive and useful. Thank you again, and please join me in thanking our GNSO colleagues. Thank

you. We'll take a 30-minute break and be back here at 3. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]