
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and GAC
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

GÜLTEN TEPE

Welcome to the GAC meeting with the ICANN Board session on Tuesday, March 10th at 03:00 PM 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 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'll be speaking, in case you are speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. I'll now hand the floor over to GAC Chair Nicolas Caballero. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Gülten, and welcome to the ICANN Board. We have David Lawrence to my left right here, Jim Galvin, Amitabh Singhal, and Tripti Sinha who, by the way, is the Chair of the ICANN Board, Kurtis Lindqvist, CEO and good friend, by the way. We have very interesting conversations about rugby and many other things. We

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.

have Sajid Rahman, Greg DiBiase, and Wes Hardaker. Welcome, everyone. And of course, we have Chris Buckridge, Catherine Adeya, Patricio Poblete, and my good friend... you know, it happens.

So welcome, everyone. We have 60 minutes for this session. I want to make sure we have enough time for a Q&A session after we touch upon each one of the topics. We're going to be reviewing some GAC replies to Board questions. Right after that, we'll be reviewing the GAC topics and questions for the Board, and time permitting, as I said before, we'll have an hopefully interesting Q&A session.

So without further ado, let's move on to the next slide. This is just to provide an overview of the topics. I'm not going to read the whole thing because you have it right there. But this is, again, to provide some background. If we can move on to the next slide, please, Gülden.

We have Board questions to the GAC. I'm going to read the question very quickly. I am not going to read the whole thing again for the sake of time, but before I do so, let me just ask Tripti and Kurtis if they would like to give any opening remarks at this point before we dive into the details.

TRIPTI SINHA

Nico, thank you very much for the introductions and the warm welcome. We always look forward to this interaction, where we have candid conversations and, hopefully, moving towards

outcomes. I know we've got a heavy agenda in front of us, so, Kurtis?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

No. So back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, perfect. So again, for the sake of time, as you know, we have a packed agenda. The question from the Board to the GAC reads: "From your perspective, what is the top emerging trend that may impact ICANN that you think the Board should consider?" And the answer we provided—of course, you can raise your hands and you can say otherwise—but this is what we sent the Board as an answer.

"Among the broad array of important ICANN-related matters that governments have identified in the GAC's latest annual plan, 2025-2026, the GAC intends to serve as a forum to provide its members with information about WSIS+20 matters and the follow-up activities from that process, according to the GAC strategic objective number eight, so that GAC members can contribute as individual governments."

And there's a follow-up question from the GAC to the Board that reads: "Consistent with ICANN's strategic plan, how does ICANN Board or Org intend to contribute to the implementation of the WSIS+20 outcomes, considering the evolving geopolitical setting? What are specific priorities for ICANN and/or actions ICANN intends to undertake?"

AMITABH SINGHAL

I'll take that. Thank you for the question, Nico, and it is very pertinent in terms of our strategic plan. I think I'll answer this in two parts. One is in terms of the outcomes that were delivered as part of the WSIS+20 outcomes, and I think they were very positive, looking at how they endorsed the multi-stakeholder model and the permanency of the IGF was established. But basically, it means that we have a lot more work to do going ahead, and we have to contemplate and contribute towards the implementation of those outcomes which fall within our technical mandate.

So in particular, ICANN intends to continue to promote and advance the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance, provide neutral fact-based technical briefings to inform ongoing intergovernmental discussions at the United Nations on Internet-related public policy issues, support the Internet Governance Forum both substantively and financially, expand the deployment of internationalized domain names and internationalized email addresses, and promote universal acceptance. So ICANN will undertake this work in close cooperation with the other I* organizations and the broader multi-stakeholder community.

So those are the plans that we have. Now in terms of ICANN's geopolitical issues, we know that since the formation of ICANN in 1998, the environment has never been stable. It's always been static. It's always been volatile. The sands keep shifting. However, ICANN has always maintained constructive dialogue with different

stakeholder groups, including governments, on the importance and efficiency of the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance, and we will continue to monitor the geopolitical developments and engage as necessary in support of ICANN's mission and the model of Internet governance. Thank you, and I am happy to discuss further on this.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Amitabh. Let me open the floor for comments or questions from the floor or online, and I see a hand from Switzerland. Please go ahead, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you. Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Hope you hear me okay. And again, apologies for not being there. I really miss seeing you in person. On this question, as we discussed yesterday in different places, the consensus we achieved in New York is really fragile and conditional. It is conditional on the WSIS framework and especially also the IGF, which now has a permanent mandate, that they deliver. And it's very important that ICANN continue to contribute to these efforts.

I take note, and I welcome very much that you will continue to support the global IGF, which is very important. A question, or maybe a thought I would like to put to yourselves is that you have been piloting the grant program for auction proceeds, and quite some money has gone to initiatives to support the multi-

stakeholder approach. And I was wondering whether it is time, really, to make this work, to consider also a strategic approach to use those auction proceeds to support the global IGF and also the national and regional IGFs. Maybe more of a strategic way of looking at this instead of a more ad hoc way of looking at it, which maybe was part of the pilot. So, I just wanted to share that with you and see whether you have any reactions. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Jorge, this is Tripti. Thank you very much for your comment. One, we're very sorry you're not here with us; we miss you. I watched the panel that we had on WSIS the other day, and I couldn't agree with you more. It is all very fragile, but nevertheless, we're delighted with the outcome. And we've been thinking deeply about this, and I'm going to turn it over to Kurtis, who will share some items with you. Go ahead, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you, Tripti. So, no, thank you, and I completely agree with everything that's said, that we need to make sure that the support for the permanent IGF is still there and we are committed to continue the support. We're one of the larger contributors of funds, and we will continue to contribute that. We also contribute to some of the regional IGF, but that wasn't part of Jorge's question.

We are committed to still work, both through the funding we provide and also the work that we do in organizing sessions and

supporting the IGF in general. I will take note of your suggestion, Jorge, of a more strategic funding, and we can bring that back to the Board. But I just want to reassure you that we will continue to fund it and support the IGF as we have up until now. And the same goes for the wider value of the multi-stakeholder model and making sure that we can continue to support the outcomes of the WSIS document. That's what we're doing with ICANN's engagement themes, with our staff, and the role that we play in that ecosystem, so absolutely.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Kurtis. Thank you, Switzerland, for the question. Any other comment or question in this regard before we move on to the second topic?

GIACOMO MAZZONE

I think that a part of the funding that, of course, is very important and very appreciated, would be also important because we are going into a new phase of the IGF that wants to be more implementational, let's say, on the goals that the world wants to pursue. I think that would be very good if you can align the activities that you are doing with the IGF activities. For instance, what you do with the program with Africa, et cetera, are all things that can be very synergetic with what we are doing within the IGF too.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I agree. I mean, I think we share that view. I think it's also—I mean, we don't know what a permanent IGF is exactly going to look like, but yes, I mean, in principle, I agree with you. I think we should do that, and we continue to work closely with the secretariat and what that looks like. Thank you very much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

I see no hands, so let's move on to the second topic. And before we do that, let me apologize to my good friend Byron Holland. Bear in mind I need to remember about 184 names and countries and everything. We have 19 new GAC members, so my apologies again, Byron.

So this is the next Board question to the GAC, and the question reads: "How is your group participating in the review of reviews cross-community group, and what are your thoughts on how the proposals to date are evolving to be more fit for purpose and sustainable?" And I will kindly ask my good friend from Australia, also Vice Chair Ian, to help me out with GAC's feedback.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Nico. Two members of the CCG are from the GAC, one of which is co-chairing. The GAC welcomes the CCG's outreach and inclusiveness efforts, allowing active participation by observers and outreaching to members of past review teams, and welcomes the approach to maintain successes of past reviews, build on work of ATRT3, and be forward looking for sustainability.

The GAC will continue to participate in the CCG with special interest in how important reviews such as SSR and CCT will be accommodated in the refresh proposal, how the overall cadence and workload will look like after compiling all reviews on one timeline, and how the final proposal will be driven by a functional approach, taking care that each review has a distinct function and a clear added value. Be mindful of resources and communicate it in clear, plain language, enabling those unfamiliar with ICANN to understand how the review system works.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you very much, Australia. Next slide, please. We have some specific GAC feedback, which is that the GAC conducted a session regarding the CCG ROR last Sunday and was briefed on the CIP framework during a session on Saturday. In that regard, individual GAC members may or may not express views on this question. That's basically the GAC feedback.

But of course, the floor is open at this point in order to provide any other comments. And I have a hand from Egypt at this point. Egypt, go ahead. Manal, please go ahead. There seems to be some sort of issue with Manal's connection. So Egypt, if you don't mind, we'll move on and then I'll give you the floor, unless you want to say anything right now. Can you check your sound, please? Well, we're obviously having some connection issues. So I'll give you the floor later on, Manal, if you can hear me. Kurtis, Tripti, any reactions?

MANAL ISMAIL

Can you hear me now? I was unable to unmute. I'm sorry for that. Thank you very much, Nico, and thanks to the Board for the question. Just to note, in addition to what Ian said as well, that the GAC is still discussing the draft design proposal, also in light of the GAC uniqueness and the existing operating principles. But this was the essence of where we stand in the discussion.

And also, it would be interesting to also know how the Board itself feels about the proposals and how they are evolving to date, and whether you have any initial thoughts on a question that came up during the discussion regarding whether the Board should also undertake a continuous improvement program similar to other parts of the community. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Manal, thank you for the question. First, I'd like to thank you for taking a leadership role inside the working group. It shows the GAC's commitment towards putting together a review of reviews and a new model in place. We are very committed to accountability and transparency, as you know.

So, in terms of the Board undertaking a CIP, we're very open to it. I think every segment, every constituency within the ICANN ecosystem should look to improve itself, so we would certainly be very open to that discussion, to that topic, absolutely. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Tripti. Thank you, Egypt. So before we move on, let me make sure that we don't have any more comments or questions in this regard—CCG, the CIP, and so on and so forth. I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see hands online. Okay, let's move on. Next slide, please, Gülten.

So these are the GAC topics for the Board. As you can see, there are four important topics for us, the first one being the future GAC contributions to the NomCom, the second one registration data matters, the third one mandatory DNS abuse reporting by registries and registrars, and then root server governance. Next slide, please.

So on the first topic regarding the future contributions to the ICANN Nominating Committee, I will kindly ask my distinguished colleague from Australia to help me with the background. Please go ahead, Ian.

IAN SHELTON

Thanks, Nico. With the impending 2026 application round for new gTLDs and increases in the number of related ICANN policy implementation and operational priorities, the scope and pace of ICANN work seems to be increasing. Where does ICANN Board/Org stand regarding the consideration that future ICANN Board membership commitments may entail a very heavy workload in terms of time and meetings, around 50% of a full-time equivalent? Which may have an effect on the available pool of candidates, and hence on the diversity and balance of the board.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you for the question. The Board recognizes and appreciates that we have a lot of work on our plate, and it's very atypical of a nonprofit board, but frankly, if you look at our bylaws and what the Board is asked to do, from ratifying policies and numerous other things, that leads to a very heavy workload. This has been the case, and it does take quite a bit of commitment and dedication.

We regularly have this discussion and evaluate our workload, and we continue to strive to improve efficiencies in our operations. Manal just asked whether we would look into continuous improvement. We certainly will, and actually the Board Governance Committee inside the Board is tasked with looking at improvements inside the Board, and it is taking another deep look into board processes. And the BGC has actually formed a small group of board members to identify areas where improvements could be made and where efficiencies can be implemented for the Board overall.

The BGC is also looking at just the amount of travel and face-to-face workshops that we have to see if there are other ways and other efficiencies in that area that the Board can implement. And also, many years ago, some community and review-based recommendations suggested that, in light of the amount of work that the Board faces and in order to help ensure qualified candidates apply for the Board positions, ICANN should implement some form of compensation for board members. In response to

that, board members have been able to elect to receive compensation for their service for well over a decade.

So, this has been looked at in the past many years, and we continue to look at it. And, you know, we are fundamentally bound and obligated by our bylaws to do what we need to do, so we do have a heavy workload, but we do continue to look at where we can improve our efficiencies. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Tripti. Any further questions or comments in this regard? And I have Switzerland online. Please go ahead, Jorge.

JORGE CANCIO

Yes, thank you, Nico, and thank you, Tripti. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. This point has come to this conversation on the NomCom, but actually it is something that affects the GAC also very directly, and I guess, Nico, you can sing a song about this, about how many percentage of FTEs your chair and board role means.

We are having, very soon, new elections to our GAC chair role, and at least for some governments, I imagine that you cannot really compensate in terms of an allowance or whatever. It is really a question of time. Senior officials or mid-level officials will always find it very difficult to find somebody able to devote 50 or 60% or even more of his or her time to such a role. So, just wanted to raise awareness about this issue, because it's something that affects us

also directly, as we have a position in the board as well in the person of our GAC chair. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Jorge. Point taken, and that is certainly under consideration. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, Switzerland, and for sure I could talk for two hours about that, but this is not the moment. Moving on. Next slide, please, Gülten.

The second topic is registration data, RDRS basically, or an SSAD, System for Standardized Access Disclosure. And the statements are: "The GAC continues to share the board's vision for an enhanced and permanent RDRS, including mandatory participation for gTLD registrars, as addressed in the RDRS policy alignment analysis. The GAC urges ICANN to proceed quickly with next steps, and to develop timelines for achieving the various components of this vision." And the question is: "What steps will the board take to expeditiously advance work toward these outcomes?"

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you for the question. I'm going to turn this over to... you're going to go first, Wes? Okay, Wes, and then Greg.

WES HARDAKER

Yep, thank you very much. With respect to the Registration Data Request Service, the Board has a proposed resolution that it'll be voting on this coming Thursday. And the specific proposal is to not adopt all of the 18 SSAD recommendations. This is being done because it takes into account both the advice of the RDRS Standing Committee Findings Report and the GNSO's desire to have the recommendations accepted as a group.

This direction allows policy enhancements to be developed based on the lessons learned from the RDRS experiment and from feedback from the community since the recommendations were created. We also greatly appreciate the GAC's acknowledgement that this is the best path forward. By not adopting these recommendations as a package, it will trigger the process outlined in Annex A, Section 9 of the ICANN bylaws that allows the GNSO team to come back and make minor modifications before returning it to us.

Note that this is actually the same process that was previously exercised with the supplemental procedure recommendations, so this pathway has already been proven as a successful mechanism for continuing with that. I'm going to ask Greg if he wants to add anything to my statements.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Wes. Yeah, just some color to make sure we have all the acronyms aligned. The SSAD recommendations have been pending before the board. When considering those recommendations, the

Board started the RDRS, which was a trial to judge the effectiveness of a centralized disclosure system. So that trial is done; the RDRS went for two years. A working group has taken lessons learned from that RDRS trial and compiled a report on how to improve these pending SSAD recommendations.

So, basically, what we're saying is these SSAD recommendations that have been pending regarding a centralized system—we're sending them back to Council, saying, "Hey, there's some lessons learned from the RDRS. There's also some parallel policy that is noted in the RDRS alignment analysis. Come back to us with supplemental recommendations that build upon the original recommendations with lessons learned," and then the Board will vote on those.

And then a quick note on the mandatory nature. I think GAC noted that the RDRS, because it was not policy, it was not mandatory for contracted parties. However, when these SSAD recommendations come back to the Board, they will be consensus policy, and so if the Board votes to approve those recommendations, as per any consensus policy, they will be binding on registrars and registries.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Wes. Thank you, Greg, and we do agree that it is the best path forward. Of course, I stand to be corrected, and this is a chance for my distinguished GAC colleagues to do so. Okay, so let me stop

for a second in order to see if we have... Okay, so I have a hand from India. Please go ahead, Sushil.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you for clarifying. I think it would help if you could clarify as to in what timeframe we look for the process to be completed. Because, as I understand, it won't be a procedural reset again, right? And it's for long that we have been carrying on with this interim arrangement on a completely voluntary basis.

WES HARDAKER

Yes, thank you very much for the question. Timeliness is, I think, fortunately agreed to by everybody I have talked to. Everybody understands that this is not something that can be dragged on for a long period of time. The GNSO Council has publicly stated in a number of forums that they hope this will be on the order of months. I don't have an exact timeline and date I can promise, because I haven't been given one. But from all of the discussions that Greg and I and others have had this week, it appears everybody is aligned that a very rapid turnaround would be beneficial to the community.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, thank you. And just to add, the Council is making supplemental recommendations. In other words, they're not starting from scratch. They're looking at the existing recommendations and tweaking or modifying those, as opposed to

coming up with new things out of whole cloth. So that's part of the reason we're optimistic this can be efficient.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg, Wes. Any other comment before we move on? And I have a hand from the USA. Please go ahead, Owen.

OWEN FLETCHER

Hi, this is Owen Fletcher, U.S. GAC alternate. Thank you for those updates. I was wondering if and how the board will follow along with the Council's progress as it works on developing those supplemental recommendations. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER

The Board has always had representatives sit with the standing committees and the councils when possible to follow along, and we'll get regular updates. Greg might be able to speak more to that than I can.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, I imagine there will be some type of team of counselors working on that. I would imagine that either a board member would be a formal liaison, or we'd be corresponding regularly with the Data Protection Caucus that is following this closely.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg. USA, are you okay with the answer? India, good to go? All right, so let's move on for the sake of time, and for topic 2B, I will kindly give the floor to Australia.

IAN SHELDON

The GAC looks forward to finalization of the urgent request policy language, including the timeline for contracted parties to respond to urgent requests within 24 hours in the absence of certain exceptional circumstances. When does the Board expect to adopt final policy language regarding the urgent requests timeline?

WES HARDAKER

Yes, I'll start. Thank you very much. Based on multiple discussions in the IRT and in the public comment feedback on the proposed language for the timeline for responding to the urgent request, the Board believes that Track 1, which updated the timeline language, is actually complete. In general, there is very broad public support for integrating authentication with the expedited timelines, but there has been a mix of feedback on whether the response timeline aligns with Recommendation 18, or whether additional policy work is needed.

There does appear to be general agreement within the community, within the GAC, and within the registrars that the authentication of law enforcement agencies is needed for supporting urgent requests. Board members and the GNSO Council have had a

productive conversation this week, and actually a week or two ago as well.

And thus, it appears that we're making significant progress on aligning the importance of authentication of law enforcement agencies when submitting urgent requests and on the timeliness of completing this work. Having said that, as I stated a minute ago, we don't have an exact timeline. I will state that, again, everybody that I have personally spoken with agrees that this is not something that can wait. And as the ICANN Board has discussed, along with the ICANN organization, how to properly work on multiple fronts at once so that we don't have one work item blocking another, if that hopefully makes some sense. Greg, do you have points you want to add?

GREG DIBIASE

No, just real quickly on the question, "When does the Board adopt the final policy language?" The Board has already adopted this recommendation. Staff is finalizing the 24-hour period, and the board is supporting that decision. So after ICANN, ICANN staff is going to move to publish the 24-hour language as soon as feasible.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg. Next slide, please, Gülten. Why don't we go through both of these two issues together, and then we can open the floor up? Slide 12, please, Gülten.

IAN SHELDON

The GAC supports the ongoing work of its Public Safety Working Group, PSWG, to develop law enforcement authentication mechanisms. The PSWG convened Law Enforcement Authentication Practitioners Group is open to interested participants. The intent of this group is to discuss the existing and/or aspirational identity provider mechanisms for law enforcement agencies to authenticate to ICANN-operated services, such as RDRS.

So the question to the Board: The Board indicated at ICANN84 that it saw a path for integrating consideration of authentication mechanisms into the registration data policy without further policy development. Can the board expand on the path it sees to accomplish this?

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, so the timeline is set. And from there, there's two pieces that need to be done. The actual language of Recommendation 18 does not reference authentication mechanisms. We're working with the GNSO Council to either provide a statement that that is implementation guidance, or a very narrow supplemental recommendation to add that language. So it may be policy to tweak the language, but we think it is very tightly scoped.

And then the next step is finalizing an authentication mechanism, which is a little more uncertain, but that is where all of our focus is turning. As Kurtis even mentioned in his opening speech, we're working closely with law enforcement and focused on bringing that

to resolution, which would bring this recommendation into operation.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you again, Greg. There's a hand from the European Commission. Gemma, please go ahead.

GEMMA CAROLILLO

Thank you very much, Nico. Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission. I just wanted to stress that we are very glad to see that the work on the timeline, the policy track on urgent requests, is considered concluded, and that this part concerning the timeline will be integrated into registration data policy. I think there's been a lot of work from the different parties involved—the GNSO, the board, the GAC, and including in the implementation review team—and the outcome is satisfactory.

The second part is that it is indeed very important that the policy be effective. Of course, it needs to be implementable, and since it has been identified a dependency with the authentication mechanism being in place, we are really looking forward to see this path. So, the eventual change in Recommendation 18 to accommodate for the authentication work and the actual conclusion of the work on the authentication systems, we are really looking forward to move this forward. So, thank you.

-
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Thank you, European Commission. You have no specific question, right, Gemma?
- GEMMA CAROLILLO No, thank you, Nico. I just wanted to highlight the importance. Sorry!
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Sure, sure, no problem. Thank you so much, Gemma. I have India next.
- SUSHIL PAL Thank you. I mean, just want to highlight that, although we'll have a decision on the 24-hour timeline soon, it will remain inactionable because we still don't have any mechanism on the authentication part formalized yet. So, I just want to highlight that. Greg clarified that it would be either through the implementation arrangement or through supplemental recommendations. Which would be faster?
- GREG DIBIASE The faster would be the GNSO sending a letter saying that they think this is an implementation detail, but we think the supplemental recommendation could be done alongside the other SSAD work to add that policy. That would be the slower route, but we still think it's very narrowly scoped and could be done efficiently.

SUSHIL PAL

So, my specific question is, are we looking at the supplemental recommendation of the SSAD as such within that, or are we taking it out and trying to expedite the process more as the implementation?

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, so I think the Council is leaning towards making that determination as part of their supplemental recommendations for SSAD.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg. Thank you, India, for the question. I have the US next.

SUSAN CHALMERS

Thank you, Chair. Susan Chalmers, the United States. The GAC has advocated for the 24-hour timeline for many months, and we welcome the news that the Board's confirmation that this will become the final policy. Thank you so much.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, US. Seeing no more hands, let's move on to the next slide. Sorry, I see a hand over there.

-
- UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER For cross-border requests, is Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty by LEAs a must?
- NICOLAS CABALLERO Could you please repeat the question?
- UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER For cross-border requests via law enforcement agencies, is MLAT treaty a must?
- WES HARDAKER Thank you. The difficulty in doing authentication of agencies is that authentication only tells you who the agency was. It is outside of purview to decide if that agent is authorized for the information. And that falls down to the jurisdictions that are regional. ICANN does not really have the ability to mandate cross-border responses, from my understanding. I'm not a lawyer; I'll state that. But the authorization decision is independent of the authentication piece, which is what we have been talking about mostly to date.
- GREG DIBIASE To be clear, I think there could be a cross-border request. There could be a cross-border urgent request, but then it would be on the party receiving the request to analyze, given their legal obligations, whether they can respond positively to the request.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg and Wes. Moving on to topic 2C, I'll very quickly read the background. "In light of continuing concerns that the current 15-day post-registration verification period is creating a potential security gap, this matter intersects both the registration data accuracy recommendations and ongoing DNS abuse policy work." So the question to the Board is, how is the board foreseeing to look into this important matter?

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks. So this is a potential topic that was identified by the accuracy scoping team on the GNSO Council. Some of the teams looking at data accuracy sometimes got caught up by a broad scope. They were looking at potential topics that could be tightly scoped and well-suited for possibly policy development work. So the small team recommended back to Council that potential work on accuracy and also DNS abuse—because in this circumstance they addressed both subjects—could potentially be taken up in future policy work.

So that was added to the DNS abuse issue report, which listed out a number of potential issues that the PDP could address. Ultimately, the PDP decided to go with the associated domain name check first and looking at bulk registrations after that. But this idea of a PDP is in the backlog, so to say. So it's in the issues report for the DNS abuse, and it can be taken up by the Council after this current work—after these current two PDPs on abuse progress.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Greg. Let me stop here again in order to see if we have reactions from the floor or online. Oh, and I have a hand from India. Sorry, I didn't see you. Go ahead, please.

SUSHIL PAL

Thank you, Greg, for clarifying. It moved on from one accuracy team to now to a DNS abuse team, right? That further shifts the timeline for achieving any result on this. But given the fact that it's pretty material, a small change in the contract can have a very significant impact in terms of the reduction in the DNS abuse, right? Even if we have a policy on the associated domain name or a subdomain name, but the data is not accurate, it doesn't help us, right?

Should it not be incumbent upon us to ensure the accuracy first and then look at the associated ones or a domain name ones? Yes, we did give advice to start the two process, but at that point in time, this was a separate matter altogether in the accuracy team. It was never in the DNS abuse team. Had this been there at that point in time, this would have been the first priority, or could have been the first priority.

So the bottom line is, even if you have all this process, if the data remains inaccurate, I think we are heading nowhere. It's like we have a 24-hour notice set, but we don't have an auth mechanism in place. Just to highlight the urgency, I request the Board to look at

any other possible mechanism in the larger interest of the community. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, and I think we understand that perspective. So it was in the issues report, along with the other two issues and, kind of to the point of—it seems like they could be combined, but at the same time, we wanted to keep the PDPs efficient and try not to conflate different issues. I definitely understand that they're close to the associated domain check, but I think that was some of the rationale at least by Council. But I think we understand the urgency of the issue and that this should remain a potential priority for Council to address.

SUSHIL PAL

Is the PDP the only option possible? Is there no other option possible?

GREG DIBIASE

So, it's part of the registrar agreement, so there is an option of amendment. Those are used sparingly and not in a top-down manner. This is a contract between ICANN and the registrars; that is another potential option. But again, that has been used sparingly traditionally. There was one a little while back for the abuse contract amendments. I would note in that situation, though, that it was an idea that the registrars brought forward, or the contracted

parties brought forward as a way to progress. So I think those are the two options that would be a PDP or a contract amendment.

SUSHIL PAL

Is the Board open to taking up the matter with the contracted party house to discuss the matter?

GREG DIBIASE

I don't think we've discussed that in detail yet.

TRIPTI SINHA

So, as just to add to what Greg was saying, since that would be a top-down approach, we would prefer that the suggestion come from the registrars themselves, and if we're hoping it gets to that point, absolutely, that's a path we could take. But we would prefer a more organic approach to that; otherwise, you begin to violate your model.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Tripti. Thank you, India. Any other question or comment in this regard? Seeing none and switching gears a little bit, we're going to be talking about mandatory DNS abuse reporting by registries and registrars. Ian, please, go ahead.

IAN SHELDON

Thanks, Nico. Will the ICANN Board consider establishing a mandatory uniform reporting framework requiring registries and

registrars to periodically report DNS abuse complaints received, actions taken, and resolution times to ICANN? And further explore the creation of a centralized ICANN-maintained reporting portal to ensure transparency, comparability of data, and improved enforcement of contractual obligations.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you for the question. Jim, where are you? Jim Galvin will take this. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN

Thank you, Tripti, and thank you to the GAC for the question. I think, first, it's important to acknowledge that we're pleased that DNS abuse and abuse mitigation and related topics remain a priority of the Board as well as the GAC, so we share that obligation and interest in wanting to move forward.

With respect to reporting in particular, I think it's useful to point out that the Board is open, obviously. The community is already moving forward on abuse mitigation topics. There are, at least in the short term here, one DNS abuse PDP which is active and another one forthcoming.

The particular request that you're making here is actually on the list and included in the final issue report on DNS abuse mitigation. So certainly the Board is open to the community continuing to progress that topic and hopefully move it forward as one of the next things that it might get to, but we also expect the community will

continue to evolve its list of priorities in terms of how to address mitigation. So we'll be tracking this and paying attention and, you know, hopeful that all of this will move forward appropriately. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jim. And given the fact that we still have 11 minutes, as a matter of fact, any reactions from the floor? I don't see any hand online. Any reactions in the room? Okay, seeing none, let's move on to the next topic, please, Gülden, which is root server governance.

It was a placeholder for potential discussion today, but the idea was to seek the Board's views on deliverables and future steps as related to root server governance. I don't know, Tripti or Kurtis, if you would like to give your views on this?

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Nico, for the question. As you know, the Root Server Governance Working Group just submitted their model, their document, to us. And we have two Board liaisons, Christian Kaufmann and David Lawrence, to the working group. I'm going to turn it over to Christian.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Certainly. Thank you. So the root server governance system has been going on for a while now. It started with RSSAC037 as the first document, and then it got more specified with success criteria in RSSAC058. The question is actually quite timely because the GWG

just published the report a couple of weeks ago. And it's even more timely because in approximately 35 minutes, I think there's a session in another room about it where it gets presented, so if you have an interest, please have a look. The GWG chair will then present the report.

What the Board will do is consider the GWG report. We asked them to provide it, so of course that's what we will do. We also will have a look—because that came up last time—if the various stakeholder inputs were considered and what the reaction was to that. And then if we approve the report, then we would basically set it out for the next step. That would include the formation of a council, and then the council would come together to establish recommendations on the policies and standards necessary to establish the governance structure. So we are a little bit on a milestone here this week. And with that, I give it back to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you so much, CK. I have a hand from the Netherlands. Marco, please go ahead.

MARCO HOGEWONING

Yes, and thank you, Mr. Kaufmann, for your clear and concise explanation. I wonder, looking forward to the establishment of the council, whether the Board has any views on the timeframes in which they expect this to happen once you agree that the report is good.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

I guess that will now be a very vague answer. I think as soon as we have approved it, and if we go for it, then of course as quick as possible; then there is no reason to not form it. After we have figured that part out with the approval, then I think we will move on.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you again, CK. Thank you, Netherlands. Moving on, because I don't see any other hand online or in the room. And before we wrap up the session—and I can't believe that we actually had time to cover all the topics today. Gladly surprised.

So I just wanted to make sure that we have a very... actually, yeah, a seven-minute AOB mini-session. Is there anything you would like to add that was not included in the slides? Anything we forgot to mention? Anything you would like to ask at this point? The floor is open. I have the UPU.

TRACY HACKSHAW

Thank you. Tracy Hackshaw, UPU. We just wanted to note the Board's blog at the start of the meeting regarding the Applicant Support Program and that the GAC is discussing the matter and will revert with its observations on this. We thank you very much for acknowledging the expanded applicant pool and we hope this was a good sign for the future. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

No, thank you very much for your attention to that matter, and we look forward to your feedback.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Okay, thank you, UPU, once again. One last chance for a mini AOB session. I see no hands online. No hands in the room. Well, then we can wrap up. Thank you so much, Kurtis, Tripti, and the ICANN Board. Are you sure you don't have any other question? One last time. Thank you very much.

So we're wrapping up. Please be back in the room—this is for the GAC, of course—please be back in the room at 04:30 PM. Thank you very much. The session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]