

GAC Advice – ICANN79 San Juan Communiqué: Board Action (05 May 2024)

GAC Advice Item	Advice Text	Board Understanding Following Board-GAC Call	Board Response
<p>§1.a.i Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. To ensure the Applicant Support Program (ASP) focuses on facilitating global diversification of the new gTLD application program, bearing in mind historical community calls for a ‘remedial round’, recalling ICANN77 GAC advice.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>The GAC stresses that facilitating global diversification is essential to the success of the ASP, and refers the Board to the GAC definition of underserved regions.</p>	<p>The Board understands the GAC’s emphasis on the Applicant Support Program in facilitating global diversification, in line with the SubPro Final Report outputs. The Board also notes that, more broadly, the primary purposes of new gTLDs—to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the Domain Name System (DNS)--are reflected in Affirmation 1.3. In addition to Applicant Support, making the DNS more accessible for communities globally by implementing Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs), raising their awareness, and enabling their utility by promoting their universal acceptance, also contribute to global diversification of the new gTLD program. The Board understands that there are communication efforts underway to raise awareness of IDNs and Universal Acceptance, in advance of a forthcoming communication and engagement plan for Applicant Support.</p> <p>The Board believes it is aligned with the GAC in recognizing that Applicant Support is key to facilitating global diversification in new gTLD applicants.</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and agrees with the GAC regarding the importance of the Applicant Support Program for promoting diversity in new gTLD applications, in service to Affirmation 1.3. The Board also notes other complementary initiatives such as raising awareness of Internationalized Domain Names and Universal Acceptance.</p>
<p>§1.a.ii Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. To publish a comprehensive ASP communications and outreach strategy and associated implementation plan for review and comment by the community with itemized costs, detailed scope and clear metrics of success identified, to complement the overview of the broader communications plan for the next round of new gTLDs included in the Implementation Plan. This ASP communications and outreach strategy must include details on building awareness of Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names and should leverage community connections to ensure underserved regions are reached.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>The GAC is of the view that global communications and outreach are essential to encourage organizations in underserved regions to apply through the ASP. Highlighting the economic benefits of operating a gTLD is particularly pertinent to helping organizations understand the merits of applying.</p>	<p>The Board understands that the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) for Applicant Support issued a guidance recommendation related to “Communications and Outreach/Awareness.” This included implementation guidance, indicators of success, and metrics to measure success. The GGP’s guidance recommendations are still pending Board consideration but the Board hopes to wrap up its deliberations on those recommendations in short order. The Board understands that ICANN org staff is aware of and has taken the GGP guidance recommendations into consideration as it continues to plan for implementation, so that if and when the recommendations are adopted by the Board in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws (Annex A-2) these can be implemented.</p> <p>In addition, the Board is closely following the ongoing campaign to create awareness of IDNs and UA as a first phase of work leading into the Next Round Communications and Outreach strategy. The Board anticipates that org will build upon that work to craft a holistic communications and outreach plan and that the upcoming ICANN80 meeting in Kigali presents an opportunity to discuss the Communications Planning document ICANN org plans to share by late May 2024. The Board encourages the GAC along with other</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and acknowledges the importance of a robust and comprehensive communication and outreach plan for Applicant support, building off of the work underway for Internationalized Domain Names and Universal Acceptance. The Board instructs ICANN org to share the plan, once completed, with the SubPro Implementation Review Team (IRT) and ensure that the GAC will be made aware either via the GAC IRT members or via ICANN’s GAC support staff.</p>

GAC Advice Item	Advice Text	Board Understanding Following Board-GAC Call	Board Response
		stakeholders to help raise awareness of Universal Acceptance, IDNs, the Next Round of new gTLDs, and the Applicant Support Program.	
<p>§1.a.iii Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. To specify how the reported fund for the ASP will specifically be used to support applicants – whether through offsetting reduced application fees for applicants, funding additional means of support, or a mix of both – and undertake an assessment of the appropriate budget to support the program and the associated communications and outreach strategy in the context of inflation trends since the launch of the last ASP, which was funded with 2 million USD during the 2012 new gTLDs application round.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>Adequate funding will be essential for a successful ASP. The GAC is concerned that if the same amount is allocated to the ASP as that of the 2012 round it will not be sufficient to ensure that all successful applicants can benefit from the ASP, particularly in the context of inflation trends over the past decade. Moreover, the application fee will increase to approximately 240,600 USD - an increase of 30% from 185,000 USD. As such, funding for the ASP should be increased by a minimum of the same proportion.</p>	<p>The Board understands that during ICANN79 ICANN org staff indicated that the ASP Funding Plan will be shared with the Implementation Review Team in mid-April. The Board is aware of the array of community recommendations, guidance, and advice related to expanding the scope of support.</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and agrees with the GAC regarding the importance of a clear funding plan for the ASP. The Board anticipates that the ASP funding plan will include the aspects articulated in the GAC advice. The Board understands that ICANN org has continued planning efforts for expanding the scope of support, in line with the options previously presented to the GNSO Small Team Plus.</p>
<p>§1.a.iv Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. To develop a holistic approach to the ASP by strongly considering implementation of the ALAC’s ASP incubator proposal, recalling the GAC’s ICANN78 text.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>Discussions within the GAC throughout ICANN79 on the ASP, including a bilateral meeting with the ALAC, highlighted the importance of a holistic program that includes non-financial and financial support for applicants.</p>	<p>The Board understands that ICANN org has continued planning efforts for the expanded scope of support options presented to the GNSO Small Team Plus, taking into account the ideas generated by that group and recognizing that supplemental Recommendation 17.2 is still pending Board consideration. The Board is considering the ALAC proposal for an ASP incubator in the context of its deliberations on supplemental Recommendation 17.2. The Board expects that an expanded scope of applicant support options would be made available and the Board is in agreement that applicant support should extend beyond reducing the cost of applying for a new gTLD.</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice to develop a holistic approach to the ASP. The Board also notes the GAC’s reference to its proposal for an "ASP incubator" as noted in the Issues of Importance of the ICANN78 GAC Hamburg Communique. The full scope of support provided via the ASP will be determined by supplemental recommendation 17.2, which the GNSO Council has recently adopted (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/policy/2024/agenda/new-gtld-subpro-supplemental-recommendations-2apr24-en.pdf) and which the Board will consider at its May workshop.</p>
<p>§1.a.v Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p>	<p>The Board understands that a broad range of options for applicant support is being considered following similar recommendations from</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and is considering this option in light of the intent of Recommendation 17.2—expanding the scope of support.</p>

GAC Advice Item	Advice Text	Board Understanding Following Board-GAC Call	Board Response
	<p>i. To consider substantially reducing or eliminating ongoing ICANN registry fees for successful applicants for at least five years, and consider further flexibility thereafter according to applicant needs, recalling ICANN77 GAC advice.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>At ICANN77, the GAC advised that eliminating ongoing ICANN registry fees would help to ensure organizations that are successful in applying for applicant support receive support not only with their application, but are also supported during the period it takes to get a new top level domain up and running. ICANN’s Survey of Globally Recognized Procedures for Financial Assistance Programs supports this conclusion, highlighting that “supported applicants may have limited access to the financial resources necessary for long-term sustainability. To combat this issue, Providers of Financial Support can provide direct or indirect additional financial assistance post-award”. The survey cites guidance suggesting that capacity development is ‘patient work’ that “typically requires an investment of three to five years before meaningful improvements can be achieved”. This advice is intended to respond to the Board’s question asking that the GAC specify whether ‘eliminating ongoing ICANN registry fees’ was envisioned for a specific period of time.</p>	<p>several parts of the Community, including curtailing ongoing fees after delegation of a New gTLD.</p>	
<p>§1.a.vi Applicant Support Program (ASP)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. To explore the potential of leveraging (including contracting and financing the services of), a platform to which new gTLDs, supported through the ASP, could move to eventually operate their own back-end services, recalling ICANN77 GAC advice.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>A Backend Registry is the mandatory technical platform to operate a domain name extension. The backend registry allows accredited registrars to technically sell domain names for each top-level domain. Support therefore could be provided to foster the establishment of technical registry platforms to assist ASP applicants interested in running their own technical operations. This advice is intended to respond to the Board’s question asking for elaboration on the GAC’s ICANN77 advice for the Board to explore the potential to support the provision of back-end services for successful ASP applicants.</p>	<p>The Board understands that the GAC will provide written clarification of this advice based upon the discussion. The Board requests the GAC to clarify the kind of platform it is referring to, what it means by “leveraging” such a platform, and what role it sees for ICANN in the development and operation of such a platform.</p>	<p>The Board defers action on this advice until the GAC has an opportunity to provide written clarification in light of the Board’s questions and the discussion.</p>

GAC Advice Item	Advice Text	Board Understanding Following Board-GAC Call	Board Response
<p>§2.a.i Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. To act expeditiously to establish a clear process and a timeline for the delivery of a policy on Urgent Requests for domain name registration data, to respond to the vital public safety interests related to such requests. Such a process must ensure appropriate participation of the community, including the GAC.</p> <p><u>RATIONALE:</u></p> <p>The GAC reiterates its public policy concerns on the lack of progress in establishing an appropriate timeline to respond to requests for registration data in select emergency circumstances, known as “Urgent Requests”, i.e., circumstances that that pose an imminent threat to life, of serious bodily injury, to critical infrastructure, or of child exploitation in cases where disclosure of the data is necessary in combatting or addressing this threat.</p> <p>The GAC recalls that the 2019 Phase 1 policy recommendations provided for a separate timeline for the response to <i>“‘Urgent’ Reasonable Disclosure Requests, those Requests for which evidence is supplied to show an immediate need for disclosure”</i>. The Implementation Review Team (IRT) developed narrow criteria for Urgent Requests and initially proposed an up to three-business day timeline to respond to such emergency requests. In public comments on the Draft Registration Data Consensus Policy, GAC and other stakeholder groups objected to the IRT’s proposed timeline to respond to “Urgent Requests” as not consistent with the obligation to respond to emergency situations and recommended that the IRT revisit the timeline. The ICANN org Implementation Project Team carefully reviewed the public input received and concluded that there was <i>“sufficient justification to revisit the policy language and to require a 24-hour response time for urgent requests.”</i> Regrettably, the IRT discussions could not reach a consensus and the latest proposal of three business days with two possible extensions was considered by the GAC as not meeting the purpose of providing a reasonable window to respond to emergency or urgent requests, as per the GAC correspondence with the Board of August 2023.</p> <p>Recalling the ICANN78 Communiqué, the GAC appreciates the initiative of the Board to separate the topic of Urgent Requests from the publication of the overarching Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs and welcomes the recent publication of the latter. Having discussed the issue with the Board during ICANN79, the GAC</p>	<p>The Board understands that the GAC is calling for policy work with respect to urgent requests for registration data, and that the GAC is interested in participating in such policy development.</p> <p>As noted in the Board’s letter to the GAC of 11 February 2024, the Board believes that consultation with the GNSO is required to agree on the way forward for this topic. The Board plans to initiate this conversation shortly, and believes this will allow the establishment of a plan and timeline for community work on this issue.</p> <p>The Board agrees with the GAC on the importance of additional work in this area. The Board appreciates the discussions it has had with the GAC to date on the needs for registrar authentication of law enforcement requests as part of determining a workable timeline. The Board expects that a mechanism to address this may need to be developed to work in tandem with the policy considerations, and believes the GAC’s involvement and support will be critical in this effort.</p>	<p>The Board defers action on this advice, noting that it plans to discuss the way forward on this issue with the GNSO Council. The Board acknowledges the importance of the issue and the GAC’s continued involvement in policy and operational discussions on this topic. While the Board’s role is not to drive policy development, the Board will strongly support the community’s continued efforts in this area.</p>

GAC Advice Item	Advice Text	Board Understanding Following Board-GAC Call	Board Response
	<p>understands that no process for addressing the matter of Urgent Requests has been established since the work was interrupted in August 2023. Against this background, the work initiated in 2019 should restart as soon as possible with the aim to achieve <i>“an outcome that better meets the public safety considerations posed by urgent requests”</i> and <i>“is fit for purpose”</i> as also recommended by the SSAC.</p>		