

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 9 July 2026

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 09 July 2026 at 13:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/22a3433s>

06:00 Los Angeles; 09:00 Washington DC; 14:00 London; 15:00 Paris; 16:00 Moscow; 23:00 Melbourne

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Volker Greimann

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 (apology, proxy to Susan Mohr), Damon Ashcraft (apology, proxy to Susan Payne), Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos (apology, proxy to Julf Helsingius), Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, 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: Paul McGrady DNSAM PDP 1 Chair

ICANN Staff:

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

Caitlin Tubergen - Senior Director, GNSO Policy Development Support(GNSO)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)

Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)

John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Andrew Chen - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO) (apology)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO) (apology)

Devan Reed - Policy Operations Senior Coordinator (GNSO/Programs and Operations) (apology)

[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 21 May 2026 were posted on 05 June 2026. [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Extraordinary Council Meeting on 07 June 2026 were posted on 23 June 2026. [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 10 June 2026 were posted on 23 June 2026.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, updated his SOI, with the RrSG Vice Chair for policy role to start after the AGM.

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](#).

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, Council's directive to SPIRT was communicated to them and sent an inquiry to ICANN org and they have let the SPIRT know that there is further work to be done on the RSP issue and SPIRT has meetings scheduled for July for ICANN org's response.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- GNSO Review of GAC Communiqué

Peter Akinremi, GNSO Vice-Chair, introduced the topic and acknowledged the addition to the Small Team document from Anne Aikman-Scalese was integrated. He then moved to a vote on the following [resolution](#).

All Councilors present voted in favor of the motion.

[Vote Results](#)

Action Items:

- GNSO Council Chair to communicate the GNSO Council Review of ICANN86 GAC Communiqué Issues of Importance to the ICANN Board; [COMPLETED]
- The GNSO Council requests GNSO Liaison to the GAC to inform the GAC of the communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. [COMPLETED as GAC-Staff was on letter sent above]

Item 4: Council Discussion - DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP1 Update

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

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, went through the following [slides](#) updating the Council on the background, progress, and updates of DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, queried about policy effectiveness and demonstrating compliance. In terms of assessing the policy's effectiveness as there are multiple abuse PDPs going on, she wanted to flag that with multiple PDPs, how to distinguish what is effective between the PDPs.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, raised the topic of policy effectiveness if qualitative indicators are not considered.

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, continued through the following [slides](#).

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, added that Council should consider when a PDP considers something out of scope, Council should see if it is out of scope. It could need further discussion if it is out of scope or could be attended to in a more holistic way.

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, reiterated that what happens after an ADC, including mitigation and registrant recourse mechanisms, were out of scope for this PDP.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, flagged that some parking lot items were in the issues report and recourse has been discussed more generally so it could be broader than DNS Abuse. This is added data to give color to the issues report.

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, continued through the following [slides](#) and gave an overview of the upcoming steps working toward ICANN87. He then opened the floor for questions from Councilors.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, thanked Paul for his leadership of the Working Group.

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, thanked ICANN staff and the representatives in the Working Group of the PDP.

Item 5: Council Discussion - DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP2 Draft Charter Update

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

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, went through the following [slides](#) noting the circulated draft charter of PDP2 to Council. She explained that the challenge with the term "API," it being somewhat limiting in the context of the scale, volume, and speed of DNS Abuse. In the future if there is a different way to do registrations by volume and at speed, "API" would be too narrow. The draft charter questions should not force the Working Group into a particular model or method of registration. It is about access to domain name registrations at scale. She also highlighted that DNS Abuse PDP2 will have policy effectiveness considerations as well. She also highlighted the updates to EOI for the Working Group Chair in the [slides](#). She requested feedback from Councilors.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, reiterated that this being the 2nd of a number of DNS Abuse PDPs, we should note the learnings from PDP 1, but wanted to ensure in the processes leading to the eventual PDP that there should be a balance. He noted that the BC will be reviewing this initial draft.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, reiterated that there is no issue with having a charter drafting team, there is more time here and requested that Councilors provide feedback before making the decision to

convene a charter drafting team.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, thanked the team for the initial draft and noted that she will take it back to ALAC. She asked if there is an indication of when PDP 2 may start.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, there is no additional information at this point in time. The lull is during the Public Comment period in September to talk through the charter drafting team if necessary.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, asked if it would be safe to say not earlier than Q1 of 2027.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, if there is agreement to do a charter drafting team there needs to be time to take this back to SG/C. Getting the ball rolling earlier is not a bad thing.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, no one is opposed to moving this forward. A lot of Councilors are also in DNSAM PDP 1; it could be overloading everyone. There is a lot of support for a charter drafting team.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, reiterated that PDP 1 Charter drafting was quite fast prior to the holiday break. From a staff perspective that even if there is a desire to set up a charter drafting team established, it seemed to make sense to have groups to review the draft charter first.

Vivek Goyal, BC, queried about the process for a charter drafting team.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, replied that if the Council determines it is needed, then it should be a tiered process and for the drafting team to be mindful of resource allocation. If the Charter is fit for purpose then there is not a need to establish a drafting team. But if the Council wants to ensure that there is a drafting team, it is the prerogative of Council.

Vivek Goyal, BC, requested that everyone go to their groups with the draft charter to kick off the process in the August meeting.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, queried about the August deadline for feedback.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, answered that rolling feedback is fine, there appears to be a demand for a call for volunteers for a charter drafting team. There is no hard deadline as the aim is to utilize the Public Comment lull in September.

Action Items:

- Staff to circulate PDP 2 Charter in a Google doc version for feedback from SG/C's
- Councilors to read through the PDP 2 Charter and come with feedback for the August Council meeting
- Staff to circulate a CfV for a charter drafting team for PDP 2

Item 6: Council Discussion - Initiation of Prioritization Exercise

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

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic and went through the [slides](#) and highlighted the

prioritization exercise with key dates on scoring and the test run of the process. She discussed the idea that trying to pull out all DNS Abuse PDPs was too complex for this test run exercise. On the assumption that DNS Abuse is prioritized, there will be a second run just on the abuse items. In sum, this is about prioritizing all the work based on what goes first in the queue.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, highlighted the [step-by-step guide](#) and the scoring template taking Councilors through the tabs. He noted that the template will be shared as an excel sheet for SG's/C's to conduct the exercise.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, noted that his query was answered by Steve.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted the 13 August deadline to get scoring in, it will all get shared and staff will consolidate the scoring from each group into one aggregate. The scoring will then spark a discussion amongst the Council.

Benjamin Akinmoyeje, NCSG, reacted to the idea of scoring or ranking and proposed calling it weighting. He further asked about the excel sheet online, or will it be offline?

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, answered that it will be worked on by each group offline, then sent to the Council mailing list. Then staff and leadership will aggregate the weighting. Then that will spark the discussion on why some things are more important than others.

Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG, noted that this may work well as there is not too much value on the aggregate scores as long as it is a starting point for discussion. Also it should be analyzed how much small differences in individual inputs will affect the total outcome, but for discussion and not determining a winner it will be pretty good.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, responded that it is not winning and losing projects, it is a starting point. For example, if everyone put the same item at the highest weighting then there may be less discussion about that item. She reiterated what Jen said that this is part of the process to give this a try as a framework for discussion to better understand each group's view on things. She ended by saying that Council should give it a try and hope that it is a benefit to move the prioritization work forward.

Action Items:

- Staff to distribute excel versions of the Prioritization scoring template to all for SG/C's to conduct exercise [Completed].
- Councilors to conduct prioritization exercise by 13 August 2026.

Item 7: Any other business

7.1 - Council Public Comment on the IGO-INGO Curative Rights IRT

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, flagged that this is open for Public Comment. Typically Council would defer to the SG/C's for their own Public Comment, but this is an opportunity to see if this warrants a Council comment.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, noted that typically Council would not comment, but Council has submitted advice to the IRT, but the end result is ultimately acceptable. Silence is fine, but if Council wants to comment with the end result it could be a short comment, that Council advice was submitted, but the IRT took a

different path, but that is okay.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, this is one that can be left with groups to see if there are no issues with the IRT direction, then the GNSO comment may be preferable. She suggested that Damon circulate at a high level a summary of what Council recommended and the direction the IRT took, that would be helpful.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, agreed to get that to Council next week.

Action Items:

- Damon to explain what Council said and what the direction the group has taken [COMPLETED]
- Councilors to review issue if they agree to a Council Public Comment

7.2 - Council Public Comment on Review of Reviews Draft Paper

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, cited that the Review of Reviews have put out their draft recommendations for [Public Comment](#). She asked if there were any Councilors who feel that the entire Council should be putting in a comment at the GNSO level, or would it be preferable to leave it to the SG/C level? Some of the co-chairs have noted that a comment from Council would be welcome, but for there to be a GNSO-level comment it would require that everyone agree and coalesce around elements that are non-controversial and welcomed by the entire Council. She added this was to put it on the radar of people, but advised them to take it to their groups. She flagged that the Review of Reviews CCG will host two [interactive sessions](#) on Tuesday, 14 July at 06:00-07:30 UTC and 18:00-19:30 UTC. Registration details are available in the [announcement](#). She noted that there is an early deadline of 4 August for Public Comment.

7.3 - SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team Liaison to the new Input Group for Law Enforcement Agency Authentication Mechanisms

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted that this input group looking at LEA authentication is going to support the development of a proof of concept for authentication for law enforcement. This would utilize the RDRS or its successor system and ICANN org has asked for a liaison from the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team. The input group is intended to provide input on the workflow design, the technical requirements, authentication processes for a proof of concept. It's not a policy body, it's not developing policy recommendations, but its role is very much operational and to provide that operational and technical input. There was a call for volunteers for that group that went out a couple of weeks ago. It's intended to start meeting sometime in July, and to meet probably every 3 or so weeks right through till about February 2027. But because obviously we have our own SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team that's currently working on, revising the policy recommendations, and they will also include policy recommendations relating to authentication, so there will be a relationship between the two groups. Consequently ICANN org asked for a liaison from the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team, so she asked for a volunteer.

Gaurav Vedi, NCA CPH, volunteered.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, thanked Gurav and noted that his position as being in the SSAD SRT and a Councilor are precisely what the requests for someone to serve as a liaison to that group were.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, raised the issue that she does not think this group is operational. If you look at their mandate, there are some things that go into the territory of policy. She warned that Council should be wary of ICANN being creative in coming up with these groups and going over the head of Council and not doing policy through the Council. IN the Reg data policy in section Section 3.9 authenticated requester means a law enforcement requestor that is authenticated through an authentication mechanism implemented pursuant to ICANN consensus policy. That is being worked on at the SSAD SRT, but she thinks that some of these issues go into the territory of policy.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, responded that it is worth keeping an eye on. It is clear that the SSAD SRT is where policy-making sits currently with the GNSO, but the issue is that SSAD fell apart because of operational considerations. So maybe with hindsight, this group is trying to address the concerns that were had previously where the policy recommendations could not be operationalized. She also noted that the group is open to all and encouraged Farzi to volunteer for it to keep an eye to ensure it stays in its lane.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, thanked Gaurav again for volunteering and moved to adjourn the meeting.

Action Items:

- Gaurav Vedi has volunteered to be the SSAD SRT Liaison to the LEA Authentication Input Group [COMPLETED and ICANN org Staff notified of name/email]

Meeting adjourned at 14:43 UTC