**GNSO COUNCIL REVIEW OF ==ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE== CONTAINED IN THE ICANN82 GAC COMMUNIQUE'**

| Topic | Details | To which group(s) is the GAC text directed? | Does the issue of importance concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[1] of the GNSO (yes/no) | How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO? | Does the GNSO want to provide additional feedback to the Board, the GAC, and/or another group? Please specify the response, target audience, and suggested method of communication or engagement (for example via this template, correspondence, and/or dialogue). |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data 2** | The GAC appreciates its shared understanding with the Board and GNSO Council that the existing Registration Data Policy Implementation Review Team (IRT) is the best venue to discuss the response timeline for authenticated Urgent Requests.<br><br>The GAC supports the PSWG's establishment of a Practitioners Group to advance its technical work | no particular group | yes | Council discussed this issue in Seattle and agreed to ask ICANN Org to reconvene the IRT. A letter to this effect was sent dated 27 March 2025. | The GNSO Council recognizes that the GAC's Public Safety Working (PSWG) is currently leading the work to explore a mechanism to authenticate law enforcement. The GNSO Council would appreciate it if the PSWG could provide regular updates regarding this effort.<br><br>The GNSO Council reiterates that any policy issues that arise in the future regarding the |

---

[1] As per the ICANN Bylaws: 'There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | toward authentication solutions, which is focused initially on authenticating law enforcement requestors. | | | | authentication mechanism will have to be dealt with using the existing procedure, i.e., the GNSO's policy development process. |
| **Registration Data Request Service (RDRS)** | The GAC recommends taking steps to make RDRS participation mandatory for all gTLD registrars.<br><br>The system's ability to address requests for data underlying privacy and proxy registrations should be improved. The RDRS should incorporate APIs to better facilitate RDRS usage by requestors and registrars and to make it ready to incorporate future authentication solutions for law enforcement requestors. | ICANN Org, ICANN Board | yes | The RDRS SC is reviewing the list of suggested improvements for RDRS and is currently drafting its final findings report/Council report where it will provide conclusions based on the metrics and data reviewed. | The RDRS SC aims to deliver its Final Report in the lead up to ICANN83. |

| Accuracy of Registration Data | The GAC notes that the GNSO is considering possible next steps on this issue based on responses received to its recent threshold questions, including a submission from the GAC. | ICANN Org, GNSO Council | yes | Following its deliberations at ICANN82 the Council agreed to start a small team on this issue to closely review the results of the registration data accuracy input assignment and provide a recommendation to the Council on next steps, and the small team has begun its call for volunteers. | |

| DNS Abuse | The GAC finds the INFERMAL report especially insightful as it contains findings that may further support the need for a targeted Policy Development Process on DNS Abuse, something that was among the options for further work mentioned in the ICANN81 Communiqué. The GAC supports engaging in discussions with the GNSO Small Group on DNS Abuse and other community members to determine whether any policy development building on the findings would be advisable.<br>In particular, the GAC considers it important to look further into the topic of bulk registrations of domain names as one of the most correlated drivers to DNS Abuse, according to the INFERMAL report. | GNSO Council | Yes | Following its deliberations at ICANN82 the GNSO Council agreed to reconvene the DNS Abuse Small Team via a new assignment form with the scope to include consideration of:<br><br>1) the insights provided by ICANN Org (Compliance) and the INFERMAL study;<br><br>2) the previous Small Team recommendations and implementation; and<br><br>3) list potential next steps on what other work (policy, further research, etc.) might be needed to address DNS abuse.<br><br>A call for volunteers has been issued. | As the small team considers the multiple data points, and studies and ascertains the next steps, we will keep the GAC members informed and seek their feedback.<br><br>We are as committed as the GAC in moving forward on the DNS abuse issue with concrete steps. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|