

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 11 June 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday, 11 June 2025 at 11:45 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/2zjh8rfh>
04:45 Los Angeles; 07:45 Washington DC; 12:45 London; 13:45 Paris; 14:45 Moscow; 21:45 Melbourne

List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Greg DiBiase, Prudence Malinki
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Desiree Zeljka Miloshevic Evans
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts (in case of connectivity issues, proxy to Vivek Goyal), Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Tomsin Samme-Nlar, Peter Akinremi (in case of connectivity issues, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Manju Chen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Paul McGrady
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :
Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison
Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests:

Kurt Pritz (Board Readiness Small Team, Chair)

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apology)
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations
Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO) (apology)
Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support (apology)
Caitlin Tubergen - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO)
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)
John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)
Devan Reed – Policy Operations Coordinator (GNSO)

[Zoom Recording](#)

Transcript

Item 1: Administrative Matters

1.1 - Roll Call

1.2 - Updates to Statements of Interest

1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda

1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures: [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 10 April 2025 were posted on 24 April 2025.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 15 May 2025 were posted on 02 June 2025.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, updated his SOI that he will be serving on the state bar of Arizona.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, announced that she has been elected to the ALAC for another two years.

Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List

2.1 - Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics, to include review of [Projects List](#) and [Action Item List](#).

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, announced GNSO accomplishments between ICANN82 and now. Including TPR PDP sent to the Board, LD PDP moving ahead of schedule, a vote on the aspirational statement, voted on leadership for SCCI, and kicked off Small Teams on DNS Abuse and Registration Data Accuracy.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- Deferral of Whois Implementation Advisory Group work

Nacho Amadoz, GNSO Vice-Chair, introduced the topic and moved to a vote.

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote Results](#)

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Prioritization of Upcoming Work

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the following [prioritization document](#) for Council discussion.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, added that typically there is a maximum of 2-3 simultaneous PDPs at a time due to community bandwidth and staff bandwidth. With more efficient and narrowly scoped PDPs it may be possible to go from 2-3 to 3-4 simultaneously. Council should start thinking about this to be ready when the DNS abuse and accuracy small teams deliver their reports.

Jen Chung, RYSG, suggested adding a column on resourcing needs. She also added that since we have two small teams those would be presumed to be a top priority. Furthermore suggested that then there would only be 1 or 2 spots open, so it could be beneficial to see if any of these could be knocked out quickly given resourcing constraints.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that this is a preliminary and evolving document.

Susan Payne, IPC, RPMs Phase 2 is extremely important and is on board with the need to re-charter that. RPMs deferred for six months and deferred the launch of a Council drafting team for that time as well, so that can be parked for some time. Preliminary IPC feedback was that DNS Abuse and Accuracy were a priority. Additionally, RDRS, but it remains to be seen what the report we are awaiting seems important.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, emphasized Susan's last point on waiting for the report to determine if there is policy needed or not.

Vivek Goyal, BC, gave the BC perspective that DNS Abuse and Accuracy were a priority given the amount of interest and sessions on this.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, suggested the bottom of the page being at the gTLDs round and the transfers as it goes through its implementation phase.

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, challenged the justification for DNS Abuse because there is a concrete request from the community to start a PDP. She added WSIS+20 is not as connected to the conversation as it should be.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, suggested starting with DNS abuse because the small team currently looks at narrowly tailored PDPs that likely produce outcomes quickly to have a constant stream to the outside world and make a real difference. Personally, he suggested looking at bulk registrations and suggested the Small Team sending something to Council prior to the report. He also emphasized the EU regulations and the regulatory pause in the EU and that can potentially influence the appetite for the EU as well. He also added in the informal session of how law enforcement can contact CPs at the global level should be at the top of our attention.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, suggested bringing the last topic up in our wrap up.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, suggested the next rounds should be done prior to the closure of the current round. If we could get this work done narrowly, we could move to the steady state that the Board talked about. In addition to not wanting to default to another round, there are good reasons for trademark folks, once it is in a steady state it can be a priority. This should be urgent in that it gets rid of the auction issue with rounds as related to legal issues. This could create predictability in the community and it is red hot on fire priority.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, if it is something potentially simple, that could impact priority.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, from a chair perspective RPMs Phase 2 has been committed to by Council.

That warrants priority. From a registrar perspective they are open to work on DNS abuse and they are actively working on it already. There is less of a priority on accuracy. If others think accuracy should go forward it should be on contactability for a potential path to consensus as opposed to other topics raised in the surveys. Finally, depending on PSRs that registration policy is working well and does not need to be reviewed at the same urgency as others.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, asked whether the output of Council of DNS abuse is multiple PDPs, how does that affect prioritization?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that it could be done sequentially being one ongoing PDP at a time.

Manju Chen, NCSG, noted that SCCI was pronounced wrong in Greg's opening remarks. She noted NCSG priority that there is a reservation in pressuring DNS abuse as the first priority. NCSG has been advocating for the issue of hijacked domains and there is no complaint mechanism for registrants for other areas. If this can be included in DNS Abuse PDP, with multiple phases, timing, scoped, then NCSG would be willing to join DNS Abuse as a priority. Registrant and human rights are a priority for DNS Abuse and that is NCSG's position.

Thomas Rickert, CSG ISP, responded to Tomslin's point that we should start thinking about it. The phased approach would save us time in the process steps and since we have the same set of people, we can elegantly do the Charter drafting to do things sequentially to see what goes quickly while other parts may take longer.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, asked a question about urgent requests from law enforcement. There has been progress in the consultations in short-term and long-term efforts, there might be some kind of report or action that might be required from Council. Are we looking at this particular phase of work?

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, this is ongoing work in the IRT and is already undertaken by Council. This is a list of work that we could potentially take on in a new way, this is a priority and there are themes of authentication in a few policy areas.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, there is a coalescing on the topic of DNS Abuse that can evolve. Jen and Paul suggested nailing down resource requirements to get more granular

Item 5: COUNCIL UPDATE - Update from Board Readiness Small Team (15 minutes) | item start time: 14:30 CEST

- 5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Kurt Pritz, Small Team Lead)
- 5.2 - Council Discussion
- 5.3 - Next Steps

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead, presented the following [slides](#), updating Council on the Small Team progress including a proposed schedule for the Board Readiness Small Team to finish its work.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, asked if there are additional Board member interviews. Also if there is a discussion of a Council liaison to the Board on this topic?

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead, there will be more Board member interviews in the case of SubPro.

Susan Payne, IPC, for the second question, it is not something that has been discussed yet, but it could be useful.

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead, suggested making this a topic for the next meeting.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, suggested in the chat: "A Seb, but for the Board instead of the GAC."

Desiree Miloshevic, CPH NCA, queried about the Board rejections and recommendations and how the group went about determining which ones to place in the interview.

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead, responded that the group chose to interview people on Reg Data Phase 1 and 2 as well as SubPro. For phase 1 there were only 2 rejections, but for SubPro it was a little more difficult. For that in the questions, they grouped the rejections, one group was the wording was off, another was they violated the bylaws, and others about cost. These were grouped and tailored the questions in a way to allow the interviewee to pick ones they are passionate about. Essentially the team provided a framework to bring up the topics the interviewee wanted to discuss.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, asked if there would be a checklist? What would the output be?

Kurt Pritz, Board Readiness Small Team Lead, responded that it would likely be recommendations and perhaps augmenting how the charter is written. Or if we are anticipating GAC advice in that area then the PDP might get into more detail in that area it could be a tool to rely on when addressing GAC or ALAC advice.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, suggested something for SPS for Council to discuss based on these recommendations.

Jen Chung, RYSG, agreed that this is something Council will use especially with more focused PDPs. This will be useful to look at and to determine how best to implement these lessons in PDP charters going forward.

Manju Chen, NCSG, responded that SCCI will review its PDP 3.0. This will be a golden nugget for implementing this in the review and will incorporate its recommendations.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, noted staff work and thanked the Small Team and noted the firm deadline for the report in the September GNSO Council meeting.

Item 6: COUNCIL UPDATE - Progress Update from Council Accuracy Small Team

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Paul McGrady, Small Team Lead)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, gave an overview on the purpose of Small Teams

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, noted in the chat that these small teams are open to observers.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, went through the following [slides](#) on the accuracy Small Team.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, noted that there are preliminary recommendations in the inbox of the Small Team. They are moving quickly because the community is moving quickly and Paul's term is done after Oman.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, queried about the first golden nugget if the timeframe was shortened for the timeframe for the registrant to be validated.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, noted the primary goal is shortening the time to reply to improve outcomes by reducing the timeframe not changing the process.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, registrar perspective there are some issues with this study and pushback on the preconceived notion that it should be shortened prior to looking into it. However, the more general effort of contactability is important work. This came up as a side note in a meeting with GAC. Gemma asked about current procedures and verification and data accuracy and the RrSG has produced really good documentation on what they do today.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, mentioned concerns NCSG has with the study. The recommendation to shorten the time will be discussed further, but it seems like a solid solution without violating privacy. From the first look, this appears to be good. A discussion in a what-if scenario of missed deadline for domain suspension.

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, thanked them for their input. Assured that the Small Team does not take the INFERMAL study as perfect. This is to facilitate discussion and can lead to PDPs etc. This is meant to be an input process not jumping to the end. A 70% reduction in malicious work by reducing the timeframe seemed like a good solution.

Item 7: COUNCIL UPDATE: Status Update from DNS Abuse Small Team

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Jennifer Chung, Small Team Lead)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, went through the following [slides](#) giving updates on the DNS Abuse Small Team. She also noted that the Small Team and the staff have been adding to the gaps related to DNS Abuse during the sessions at ICANN83 based on discussions here in Prague. She noted that the Small Team is

soliciting feedback on the gaps identified in the source documents. Then the analysis will be done on the SG/C's input, then a prioritization of those issues identified. This is an initial interpretation of issues not a final assessment. Aim is to organize the gaps and prioritization to identify issues into an issue report. This can feed into future PDP work. She discussed the process of structuring and clustering the issues and consolidating them.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, she noted the GAC discussion that tightly scoped PDPs. Asked Council for feedback if there are any gaps missing from the list to then cluster and prioritize this to look at it in a holistic way.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, queried about delivery of a final report from a Small Team and that use of terminology.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, this is the terminology used for Small Team final reports, but we may end up using different terminology to avoid confusion.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, highlighted the caveat of important gaps, there needs to be analysis as to whether there will be work for DNS abuse for reactive/proactive measures. These can have human rights impacts. Even if we identify the gaps, not all of them can be addressed. She also mentioned other SG/Cs to send us gaps and reports and sources so that there can be a comprehensive gap analysis.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, responded that they are continuing to look for sources.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, asked about a request for issue report: would they group all the gaps identified for a single issue report or would they be broken up into buckets for multiple issue reports.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, mentioned that it is up to the discretion of the Council, but it is better to have a single issue report. Then the work could be structured in a way that could be done in phased work, but could be done in a single issue report.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, having one issue report does not prevent us from structuring work going forward.

Tomslin Samme Nlar, GNSO Vice Chair, asked because of the community query as to whether there would be one or multiple PDPs that could come after this report. It looks like the Small Team recommendation feeds into an issue report and then after that process scoping work would be done to determine what comes after that.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, before the issue report there will be a prioritization. Then the issue report with the gaps identified might not be a PDP, so before/after would then give the recommendation to Council at the full Council level.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, said it will come to Council and these are potential options at our disposal.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, noted that the table in the slides should be socialized within the respective groups and she will do that with ALAC. The Small Team will also go through the exercise of prioritization and there will also be for ALAC as well. She suggested that it would be useful for everyone to get prioritization information from their groups to share with the Small Team.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, it is important for each group to do prioritization and she did not want to be prescriptive with the homework. She has asked the RySG to do this and she is glad that Justine in asking ALAC to do it as well.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, mentioned that the team is doing great and do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, shared that the end result of the Small Team is not the end and it is not policy recommendation that comes out, just areas for future work. There might be some items on the gap matrix that do not fit policy work. She was envisioning there might be topics discrete enough that they could potentially occur in sequence depending on staff and community bandwidth. She elaborated that they are envisioning the Small Team recommendation and then it would get kicked over to Council for the logistical work and chartering.

Jennifer Chung, RYSG, agreed that chartering will be tightly scoped.

Vivek Goyal, BC, agreed that the positive of sharing the gap matrix and seeking feedback is because there has been so much work done on DNS abuse in different pockets of the ICANN community. BC has been championing it and NCSG has been working on this as well, so it is logical to collate all of this to put it in a single space so nothing is left out. A single repository is a good idea to allow us to consider what steps come next.

Item 8: COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Update on Reviews

8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair)

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic on Board deferral of ATRT4 to start a dialogue on how to improve reviews. There was some concern about delaying this further and could be a violation of the bylaws, and whether ATRT4 as it cannot be dictated in advance. With a number of threads on this the SO/AC leaders met to discuss and deferred the bylaws mandated timeline and to amend the bylaws for a one time review of reviews with a specific timeline. This is all new information, but the ICANN community and ICANN org is looking for feedback. Big picture, is it worthwhile to take stock of reviews to make sure they are fit for purpose? If so, does the approach of a preliminary bylaw change that extends the deadline to start the reviews and authorizes a review of reviews a good approach?

Paul McGrady, NCPH NCA, discussed how he was happy to see the notion of an interim bylaw. The problem with these reviews is that by the time you have them and implement them, you have to start on the next one. The timing was off on these, so now we have a pile up on the freeway and he believes what the Board did was simply try to keep additional cars from piling up while they clear the blockage. A pause makes sense and a bylaws amendment would give the Board breathing room they need to fix the problem. This should be a community process rather than handed down and that makes sense as long as it is done with a sense of urgency. The takeaway here is not to panic and continue to work with the Board to get this done in a speedy but thoughtful way.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA, there are plenty of possible routes for addressing this, but ways to provide input on this the community needs to think through another bylaws amendment for the empowered

community to be on board for that. She is very happy that we could rectify this process by a bylaws amendment and she queried what the period would run for this.

Greg DiBiase, GNSO Chair, responded that this was preliminary.

Manju Chen, NCSG, NCSG raised that they tentatively supported the idea of review of reviews. Hesitant to see if there are new mechanisms to be developed for the review of reviews for more time and processes to use any existing mechanisms or tools like ATRT4. The ICANN community thinks that the more important issue leads us to this discussion of review of reviews that the community has been blamed for not moving fast enough and we have been discussing this for a while even with fast PDPs for implementation taking a long time. As SCCI chair we have been discussing the GNSO input process and the Council can play a vital role in this. GNSO may not have a unified opinion, but we should try to unify to send input to the Board.

Osvoldo Novoa, CSG ISP, every organization needs to review its processes and it is something that is lacking in ICANN and GNSO should have been done regularly to keep up to date with the environment. The GNSO review should have been done in 2021 and it has not been done and we have the holistic review of ATRT3 and we could not go ahead with the pilot holistic review. It is important for ICANN to realize its priorities and do its reviews as soon as possible.

Item 9: Any Other Business

9.1 - Open Mic

The following topics were raised at the open mic:

Jeff Neuman, pleads that the UDRP remains a high priority.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, addressed concerns overlooking the rights of users.

Meeting Adjourned at 15:39 Prague Local Time