GNSO COUNCIL REVIEW OF ==ISSUES OF IMPORTANCE== CONTAINED IN THE ICANN78 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)	If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work? Please specify.	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).
2. Future Rounds **Latin Script Diacritics in New Generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs**	The GAC notes that a potential gap in policy has been identified on the use of diacritics characters in the Latin script. The GAC strongly supports a multilingual Internet free from barriers in existing policy and looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO Council on this issue, and to reviewing the anticipated	GNSO Council	Yes, relates to Subsequent Procedures			The GNSO Council action from the ICANN78 Council meeting is a request for staff to produce a study to inform the GNSO Council on the issue of diacritics in Latin Script and in particular as it relates to .québec. The study is not an Issue Report, which has a specific meaning and

---

[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.

	GNSO Council's Issue Report on this topic.					timetable as defined in the Policy Development Process Manual.
4. Urgent Requests for Disclosure of Registration Data	The GAC welcomes the Board's reaction to the letter sent on 23 August 2023 in which the GAC 7 asked the Board to reconsider the publication of the proposed Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs and expressed its public policy concerns on the appropriate timeline to respond to requests for registration data in select emergency circumstances, known as "Urgent Requests". The GAC supports 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 to speedily continue discussions on the former to achieve an outcome which is	Board, Org, Community	Yes	Relates to Implementation of EPDP Phase 1		The GNSO refers to the Final Report from the EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 18, specifically: "A separate timeline of [less than X business days] will considered for the response to 'Urgent' Reasonable Disclosure Requests, those Requests for which evidence is supplied to show an immediate need for disclosure [time frame to be finalized and criteria set for Urgent requests during implementation]." The GNSO Council notes that the IRT has decided to remove the wording on urgent requests in order to

	acceptable to all parties. The GAC reiterates that "the proposed outcome of up to three business (not calendar) days to respond to the narrowly defined category of "urgent" requests for domain name registration data does not serve its intended purpose" and that the use of "business" and not "calendar" days is particularly problematic in this respect as it can lead to significant delays and would vary across different jurisdictions, leading to uncertainty. The GAC also recalls that in April 2023 the ICANN org Implementation Project Team (IPT) carefully reviewed the public input received and concluded that there was "sufficient justification to revisit the policy language and to require a 24-hour response time for urgent requests." The GAC looks				allow the publication of the Policy, and has asked the GNSO Council to consider this further.

	forward to the early reopening of the discussions with the community, also based on the further input which is expected to be provided by the Security Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), with the objective of achieving "an outcome that better meets the public safety considerations posed by urgent requests". Because of the vital public safety interest implicated by Urgent Requests, the GAC emphasizes the need to commence and conclude this implementation work as soon as possible. Further, this work should include accreditation issues, among others.				
6. Transparency and GNSO Statements of Interest (SOI)	The GAC strongly supports transparency at ICANN and takes note of ongoing discussions within the GNSO and the work conducted by the GNSO		Yes	GNSO Operating Procedures	The GNSO's CCOICI recently issued its final recommendations report. During the GNSO Council meeting at ICANN78 the motion	Currently, individuals participating in GNSO Groups and policy activities are required to provide Statements of Interest (SOI) as

	Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI) on the Review of the Statement of Interest (SOI) Requirements. The GAC notes that the GNSO Council motion on this matter on 25 October 2023 was not adopted. The GAC expresses ongoing concerns, as noted in the GAC ICANN76 Communiqué, regarding a proposed exception in the SOI that might permit GNSO participants to refrain from disclosing the identity of the entities they represent in GNSO working groups. Section 3.1 of ICANN's Bylaws state that "ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness".				to adopt these recommendations did not pass. The GNSO Council will therefore consider next steps, in due course.	outlined in the Chapter 6 of GNSO Operating Procedures. In the current SOI requirements, there are provisions allowing for a GNSO participant to refrain from disclosing the identity of entities they represent, where professional ethical obligations prevent such disclosure. The CCOICI was tasked to review the existing SOIs requirements and recommend modifications if needed. The CCOICI's recommendations, therefore, did not propose a new exception, but rather proposed modifications to the current exception language, which was considered to be insufficient. The motion to adopt

	Transparent disclosure of interests represented in GNSO working groups is part of the basis of credibility and legitimacy of ICANN's multistakeholder model. The GAC looks forward to continued engagement with the GNSO, Board and community on this issue.					the CCOICI Report on SOI did not pass in the GNSO Council meeting on 25 October. As a result, no changes will be made at present to the current SOI requirements and the existing exception language, pending consideration on next steps.