

## Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 13 November 2025

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 13 November 2025 at 13:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/33sjnctx>  
05:00 Los Angeles; 08:00 Washington DC; 13:00 London; 14:00 Paris; 16:00 Moscow; 00:00 Melbourne (Friday)

### List of attendees:

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Prudence Malinki

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav VEDI

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Osvaldo Novoa, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Taiwo Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers :

Justine Chew : ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests: none

### ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong - Vice President, Strategic Policy Management (apology)

Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations (apology)

Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO) (apology)

Berry Cobb - Senior Program Manager, Policy Development Support

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)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (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 18 September 2025 were posted on 02 October 2025. Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 29 October 2025 will be posted on 15 November 2025.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, stated that two consent agenda items related to the GAC communique and the Empowered Community representative were moved to the December meeting. The proposal for today is to move the consent agenda to the end of the meeting to honor Rubens Kuhl.

**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](#).

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, highlighted this for new Councilors to highlight changes to the project list and an opportunity for liaisons to flag anything of importance. Councilors are expected to review this on their own in advance of the meetings, and a more detailed overview of this during the SPS in January.

**Item 3: Consent Agenda (moved to the end of the Council meeting)**

- Motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl

**Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP - Interpretation of Intent for Select IGO/INGO PDP Recommendations**

4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Chair)

4.2 - Council Vote

4.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, introduced the topic. She gave a detailed history as the language has moved recently. She discussed the implications of this for the AGB and Next Round in the string similarity evaluation. The staff interpretation differed from that of the majority of the IRT. Council has discussed this in the September meeting, an extraordinary meeting, and some convergence around option 3 at the time, then option 4 emerged during the Council meeting at ICANN84 where Council was unable to vote on it. She continued to outline the amended version that is currently before us.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, noted that while the suggestions to restructure the [motion](#) may have improved the wording, it was not a friendly amendment at this point in time as groups did not have time to discuss it.

**Prudence Malinki, RrSG**, confirmed that following ICANN84 the registrars discussed this topic further to confirm that they will be abstaining from the topic, and she would circulate their rationale after today's call. She read the following registrar [statement](#)

**Osvaldo Novoa, CSG ISP**, noted his constituency has decided to support motion #4, but they do not think this is correct. They recognize that the PDP has been followed, but this is not the right approach for protecting IGO names.

**Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org**, noted procedural concern as a result of a Councilor proposing an amendment that is not friendly. She noted if Justine withdraws her motion then we can move to voting. She shared the relevant portion of the GNSO operating procedures: “3.3.3.2(3) If the amendment is not accepted as friendly by either the proposer or seconder, the Council shall first vote on whether to accept the proposed amendment. The proposal shall be incorporated into the motion only if the vote passes by a simple majority of both Houses represented on the GNSO Council.”

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, would Lawrence also need to withdraw?

**Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison**, replied that she was trying to be helpful and based on Susan’s reply that it is not accepted as friendly, she is happy to withdraw.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC**, supports the fact that Council can move on without the edits from Justine. Based on what staff highlighted he is of the view that procedurally we might also need to formally withdraw the previous motions to move to a vote on the current option. He is happy to withdraw.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, Council will vote on motion 4 and then withdraw the other motions after the vote. Having heard from both Lawrence and Anne, it seems both would be supportive of that, which they confirmed.

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org**, queried whether part G of the motion should remain or be removed.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, replied that part G was accepted as friendly by both Susan and Nacho.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, read the [resolved clauses](#) and moved to a vote.

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org**, the motion passes.

#### [Vote Results](#)

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, stated that now motions 2 and 3 are withdrawn.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG**, asked an unrelated procedural question. Can the Board decide that there is not enough policy on an issue, and can the Board request an issue report from the Council? Can any AC or Board ask the Council for an issue report?

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, replied that, yes, the Board can request an issue report from Council. Caitlin Tubergen shared the relevant provision in the GNSO Operating Procedures/PDP Manual.

### **Item 5: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Final Issue Report on a Policy Development Process for DNS Abuse**

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, shared the following [slides](#).

**Feodora Hamza, ICANN org**, continued with the [slides](#) to discuss the Preliminary Issue Report recommendations. She highlighted the areas of agreement for the Final Issue Report and proposed two separate PDPs staggered and not parallel. She highlighted the changes in the draft charter questions as they are not substantive, but demonstrated that the community input would be integrated.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC**, queried about the estimated timeframe between the start of PDP 1 and PDP 2 as he was concerned about efficiency.

**Feodora Hamza, ICANN org**, responded that during ICANN84 sessions there were comments that this should be completed within 12 months. That could have been related to one PDP or two PDPs together. However, it is unknown currently what membership and the membership model will look like, and there still remains to be seen input from Council to provide a working plan. That is why there are no dates yet as it is difficult to give an estimate at this time. There also may be some overlap in membership between the two, which is why they are not run in parallel, but there may be some point towards the end where they can be connected.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC**, asked if both will be done within 12 months.

**Feodora Hamza, ICANN org**, replied no, that was an input received at the DNS abuse session. The aim is to deliver it in a timely manner as efficiently as possible, but cannot give a timeframe at this point in time.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG**, noted that efficiency is great, but at the same time we want to make sure that the policy does not have adverse effects on the Internet, end users, and registrants. So we should not sacrifice a good outcome for the sake of efficiency. We should also discuss fairness in tandem with efficiency.

**Feodora Hamza, ICANN org**, there are additional questions upcoming then we will have a Council discussion. She continued on the [slides](#) to raise the questions for Council discussion..

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, moderated discussion.

**Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting**, when it comes to the model for PDPs she is concerned about a representative model and the impact that may have on including new people and allowing them to participate. She expressed concerns that the representative model has the effect of excluding newcomers since they will not have the experience to be selected as a representative.

**Taiwo Peter Akinremi, GNSO Vice-Chair**, from prior experience how many charter questions are suitable for a timeline to get it finished in time. He asked how many charter questions are anticipated. Second, regarding the contactability and verification, will charter questions clarify that or will that be a discussion for the EPDP? And regarding the model that we want to adopt, what are the provisions for technical folks, where we need experts to understand the topic at a more technical level.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, noted that it is not an EPDP, but a PDP. The number of charter questions is not important, but it is about proper scoping. The general wish is to have focused and tightly scoped questions. Where technical experts are needed, by staggering the two PDPs would allow for experts to come in. During the community sessions, it is noted that different experts will likely be needed for each topic. It is hard to comment at this point in time.

**Prudence Malinki, RrSG**, commented that personally broader community engagement is great, but being mindful that registrars will be impacted by the outcome of these PDPs and registrars are not a monolith. Multiple registrars with different business models or structures and registrars will be impacted

differently. With regards to this consequence, the weighting needs to be done more to have as much representation as possible to address issues in real time for different registrars.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, please do bring this back to the registrars to look at the charter questions and scope for the final report and in anticipation share the [slides](#) with your respective groups.

**Sam Demetriou, RySG**, addressed the representative model issue. She understands the point of not closing this off to new participants. Being the representative on a PDP is not the only way to engage in a PDP. They can be observers, and it is incumbent on the various groups to keep their membership involved and make sure they are actually getting input from their membership and bringing it to the PDP. It is not about delegating to one person who is speaking from their own experience, they are responsible for taking the views of their membership, and this is worth keeping in mind. These two PDPs are not going to look the same. Both in terms of the charter questions and more importantly who should be involved. To Prudence's point the composition of a PDP will be different for API access than for associated domain checks. Council should be aware of this fact and be willing to have the models looking different between the two PDPs.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC**, concern of two PDPs making it longer than it needs to be for the sake of efficiency.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, in the public comments and community session they preferred two PDPs, they are looking to streamline and stagger to be efficient while not sacrificing the quality of the PDPs.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG**, suggested having an open PDP and then later close it down.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, responded that any charter change of a PDP in progress is discouraged unless there are exceptional circumstances.

**Hong-Fu Meng, RrSG**, streamlining touching 1 PDP at a time is a streamlined process to move things quickly. By doing things sequentially we can focus on the task at hand and not get bogged down in parallel PDPs. He restated that the ISG would still like to go forward with a PDP process.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair**, closed the discussion.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, requested input from groups to engage in conversation on the list as well prior to the next meeting. The earlier that these conversations can be had, the better.

#### **Item 6: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Registration Data Request Service (RDRS) Standing Committee Findings Report**

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Sebastien Ducos, RDRS Standing Committee Chair)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

**Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, went through the [slides](#) discussing the recommendations of the RDRS SC [Findings Report](#). He emphasized that the report is not policy, but recommendations with a small "r" that are advisory in nature to reflect the lessons from the pilot. While there were a lot of policy matters discussed, there were no policies built, changed, or modified. After an overview of the Public Comment he went through the recommendations in the [slides](#).

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG**, asked about the IRT asking the community the question of whether authentication of the requestor should be done through a policy. What is the plan to change the recommendations based on this? We also need to make sure that law enforcement can authenticate and then come to RDRS and cannot tell us to implement it. There is a practitioners group that met with the PSWG discussing processes and accountability mechanisms. We need to get clarity on those things and before it can be implemented in the RDRS.

**Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, answered that the recommendation is indeed open to other parties with authentication systems. Not everyone can do this as it has a cost, the law enforcement one will likely be integrated with, but other groups doing that will be evaluated on a case by case basis as integration has cost. This group is not a policy making group. Amongst the 18 recommendations on SSAD there were two recommendations on authentication, one general and one specific to law enforcement and governments. The successor group will have to look at it in a policy way. As for the group they have sent an email inviting Councilors to a meeting later this month.

**Caitlin Tubergern, ICANN org**, as Seb noted the recommendation from the standing committee is in relation to the RDRS and the SSAD recommendations. The SSAD recommendation was about accrediting all users, and the committee noting the expense of that replied that it might not be needed. But they do recommend accrediting/authenticating law enforcement to start. That is in relation to RDRS and SSAD. The question that is out for public comment is related to recommendation 18 from phase 1, which is about disclosure of urgent requests more broadly. She clarified that the two issues are related but not the same. So for those interested in the updated registration data policy language it is currently out for public comment and there is language about urgent requests, and there is also a question about this authentication work that is happening and if that would be policy or considered implementation.

**Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison**, noted that Caitlin mentioned two open public comments that have opened recently. She asked about the RDRS request policy alignment analysis public comment that has been put out by the Board. She queried how they are related to the Standing Committee's recommendations and whether Council was going to respond to the ICANN Board's public comment call or whether that would be up to the individual SGs and Cs.

**Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, responded to the first part of her question that they are independent views on the same problem. The Board requested from staff from an operational point of view for a paper on the difference between the two.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, responded to the second part of Justine's question that it is to be determined whether Council should put in a comment on it. Many Councilors have not had time to read it and that she will be looking for views on whether Councilors believe Council as a whole should respond in addition to the respective groups and constituencies.

**Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, closed by noting there has been a consensus call on this report and it has been sent back to the standing committee and there is consensus, just shy of full consensus. That will be shared with the Council and he is happy to answer any questions.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, thanked Seb for his work on this. The next steps will be for Councilors to review and digest the report with their respective groups. She reminded everyone that the RDRS Standing report recommendations are not policy recommendations. This is input for ongoing discussions

not Council accepting them in and of themselves

## **Item 7: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - GNSO Liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Annual Report**

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Sebastien Ducos, GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, opened the floor for Seb to answer questions.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG**, queried in the chat: "I have one question, we asked GAC to respond to our human rights question in writing."

**Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, responded that yes he can follow up

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, queried about a closer relationship between GAC and Council topic leads, is that on track or are there any other concerns about getting that closer collaboration.

**Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC**, responded that at the end of the report it is noted that we can deepen that relationship. Right now we are presented to each other, one particular group on internet government with WSIS that was very interactive. The others were less interactive. Jen tried to have these discussions on DNS Abuse and the GAC is still reluctant to do that. Has not started work on other topics. But for DNS Abuse and Accuracy, these groups have met, but something to push again and he would like to continue pushing.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, thanked Seb for his work and his report and for shepherding the response to the GAC communique.

## **Item 8: Any Other Business**

8.1 - SPS Planning

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org**, told Councilors that ICANN travel has sent emails to all Councilors. Some were booked now, so please book immediately. Please reach out to Terri if you have any issues. All agenda items are a work in progress and it will be updated as information comes in.

8.2 - Next steps - Expiration Policies

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair**, expiration policies followed up on org presentation from ICANN84 and clarified that the expiration policies. There was a suggestion to proceed for a small group to review that PSR. What we think having reflected on this is that the next step will be for each of us to share the PSR with respective groups to see if there is any additional work needed on expiration policies. We want to have that input from Council members first of all. If there is policy work needed from the groups, then that could be added to the prioritization document.

## **Item 3: Consent Agenda**

- Motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** introduced the motion to commemorate Rubens Kuhl.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** seconded the motion by all the Council members. She went on to read the [motion](#) in full. Paused for a moment of silence. Then invited Council members to share any thoughts for Rubens and his family.

**Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG,** volunteered to translate into Portuguese to share with his previous team.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG,** highlighted Rubens' work for keeping the internet global and open. He truly believed in universal human values such as privacy. He worked with us to operationalize what he believed was good for people and their access to the Internet. His work contributed so much to the internet system as a whole beyond ICANN.

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org,** shared what a great human Rubens was. He was always taking time to engage with everyone and was never in a rush. He was a great human who will be dearly missed.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** did not know him well on Council, but worked with him closely on SubPro and she valued him for his quiet expertise and willingness to put the work in. If Rubens was looking at something then he would catch any issue. If he said something you should listen to him, he always had valuable input. He will be greatly missed and was a lovely human and a great member of this community.

**Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting,** cited his great work on name collision analysis. He would get the WGs issues to arise when it was time to get comments on the reports. On NCAP his analytical abilities were on display, so thank you rubens.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** moved to a vote.

The motion passed unanimously.

[Vote Results](#)

**Meeting Adjourned at 14:57UTC**