

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting at ICANN86 Seville 10 June 2026

GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday, 10 June 2026 at 12:45 UTC (14:45 local time):

<https://tinyurl.com/3z6jz3jp> 05:45 Los Angeles; 08:45 Washington DC; 13:45 London; 14:45 Paris;
15:45 Moscow; 22:45 Melbourne

List of attendees:

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

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, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi (in case of connectivity issue, proxy to, Farzaneh Badii), 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 (absent)

Guests: none

ICANN Staff:

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

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

Caitlin Tubergen - Director, 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)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

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

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

[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 16 April 2026 were posted on 30 April 2026.

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

Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH, updated his SOI as “chief evangelist” of the CloudFest and NamesCon conferences.

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](#).

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- Motion to commemorate Arinola Akinyemi
- Motion to commemorate Alan Barrett

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted that the item would be moved to the end of the meeting.

Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - RSP Issue Consideration for Potential Change Request to SPIRT

4.1 - Presentation of Motion (Samantha Demetriou, GNSO Councilor)

4.2 - Council Vote (voting threshold: simple majority of each house)

4.3 - Next Steps

Sam Demetriou, RySG, gave background on the item from the RySG requesting that registry service providers be referred to the SPIRT. The RySG would like SPIRT to work with ICANN org to resolve this inconsistency. She referred to the minutes of the May Council meeting for additional details on the topic.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, read the [resolved clauses](#) and moved to a vote.

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, with no abstentions and no objections, the vote passes.

[Vote Results](#)

Action Items:

- Liaison to the SPIRT (Lawrence Olawale Roberts) to provide the confirmation of the Council that the issue has been referred to the SPIRT for discussion and alignment with ICANN org.
- Liaison to the SPIRT (Lawrence Olawale Roberts) to advise the Council of the proposed solution when finalized by ICANN Org in cooperation with the SPIRT.

Item 5: Council Discussion - Celebrating accomplishments between ICANN meetings

5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Council Chair)

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, went through the [slide](#) celebrating GNSO Accomplishments between

meetings.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, noted that the DNS Abuse PDP has gone very far and the spirit of good faith. She complimented all those involved and thanked them for their hard work.

Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH, it was acknowledged that the eyes of the community are on this and the swiftness is a goal and progressing.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, agreed with Anne and Christian and thanked the support staff.

Item 6: Council Discussion - Update on the Curative Rights Implementation Review Team

6.1 - Introduction of Topic (Damon Ashcraft, GNSO Council Liaison to the IRT on IGO-INGO Curative Rights)

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, gave an update on the timing of arbitration of the UDRP process and where the IRT got stuck is when should arbitration occur once the UDRP has begun. Because of the nature of NGOs they are not subject to court jurisdiction. There is a special arbitration procedure and the PDP was silent on when an arbitration could be filed at any point during the UDRP. In January the Council passed a resolution to harmonize that would allow NGOs to have arbitration at any point in time. IRT has accepted ICANN org's compromise, litigants during UDRP and if the NGO consents to it then it will go to arbitration. If not, then it will go to a decision. The issue being brought up these gTLD strings were delayed until the 2nd quarter of 2027 and there will be a Public Comment period that will open at the end of June. Jeff Neumann since the compromise was reached, the Council should put in a comment supporting it given that it does not align with the Council resolution.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, asked if one would start arbitration and then request consent?

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, answered that it is unclear at this time but logically, it would be more of a notice to consent to arbitration.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, asked if there were additional issues for the IRT.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, this is the last remaining issue and it will go out for Public Comment. Only ask of Council, it might be worth submitting a Council Public Comment to the effect of the Council support of the compromise even though it does not perfectly align with the

Vivek Goyal, BC, queried the details of arbitration and UDRP

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, answered that the UDRP decision is not binding and it could then move to arbitration subsequently starting from scratch.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted to add the topic to the July Council agenda to submit a Public Comment if it is open at this time.

Action Item: Staff to put this topic on the agenda for the July Council meeting to prepare Council to submit Public Comment on the topic.

Item 7: Board Approval of ICANN Fundamental Bylaws Amendments re: Customer Standing Committee and IANA Naming Function Review

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Caitlin Tubergen, GNSO Support Staff)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, introduced the topic and gave a detailed background in the [slides](#). She summarized that the Council has approved this, these are non-controversial, and there will need to be an electronic ballot in June.

Vivek Goyal, BC, queried that it has been discussed and agreed to by Council and it is just a vote.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, answered that these have been discussed on Council, before including back to 2023. And the CSC review from 3 to 5 years adopted the report from the Council and the Charter has been updated. She invited additional questions before a vote.

Vivek Goyal, BC, noted the timeline 2023 to 2026 is long.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted this is a fundamental bylaws change.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, noted that the groups had outputs and are being streamlined to fit together for fundamental bylaws change. It initially issued its report and it was adopted by the Council and she cannot speak to the timing.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted that leadership and staff could get back to Council on this topic.

Berry Cobb, ICANN org, shared the relevant IFRT2 Report [Board resolution](#) and added in the Board resolution kicking off the bylaws amendment process. The CSC report was delivered to the Board in 2023, but implementation involved ICANN Board work as seen [here](#).

Gaurav Vedi, NCA CPH, noted that he was on the committee for 5 years and he is glad to see these issues getting resolved. He is thankful to the community to get these issues resolved. The CSC is small with 4 members and a few liaisons and there were no alternates and there were constant challenges from that.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, queried about the process of 4.10 for e-ballot if it needs to be documented if staff could verify the process. She does not have a problem with it, but wanted to document it.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted that this is the discussion of the e-ballot voting prior to the July Council meeting.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, requested staff document compliance with 4.10.

Action Item: Staff to ensure compliance and document the process aligns with 4.10 of the operating procedures.

Item 8: Council Discussion - Prioritization of upcoming work

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

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, referenced the slides and noted the discussion on Council list about the prioritization topic and agreed to pursue a pilot and staff has operationalized the pilot program. She highlighted the [step-by-step guide](#) and went through the [slides](#) giving an overview of this process. She gave an example in the slides taking Councilors through the process and gave a timeline of this process.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, asked about “importance” as the ranking, should there be a score on the project list about voting or non-voting members.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, staff and leadership can take a closer look at this. She reiterated that it would be a shame to not have NOMCOM appointees involved in the process, but it is useful to have a discussion on this.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, asked about importance as a ranking feature and whether that would be a vote that extends from SG/C ranking or should it reflect (deletion) importance to the community. That which is not necessarily important to certain SG/Cs may be important for some in the wider community. How should we distinguish between SG/C importance and community importance when entering scores in the Prioritization form?

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, referenced [slide](#) 11 on the difference between importance and community demand. Noted that it could be better framed in ICANN’s mission and scope and then community demand can change even though something that is critical to ICANN’s mission, but SG/C might have a high score on something outside of that scope for example.

Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG, noted that this is a good looking proposal. His concern is that sometimes the math is surprising. It may not be as trustworthy. There are some obvious criteria for the size of input etc. Sometimes a group can have an outsized influence by supporting it in a surprising way. There is no good mathematical solution and proposes criteria for this pilot to play with it a bit to notice and fix some of these effects.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, proposed staff to provide a spreadsheet to stress test those for Tapani to play with and see how it works numerically.

Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH, thanked staff for moving this forward and noted his January skepticism on this. This is for the pilot period; it is a “vibe check” to better understand the ecosystem. The data will be valuable as we are all subject to our own blinders about what is important. This is important to note that community demand is one condition and not a popularity contest. Human rights should not be a popularity vote.

Vivek Goyal, BC, looked at the criteria and the complexity of something is based on a lot of factors. What is a benchmark for complexity, DNSAM PDP 1 would be a good example program to compare against to decide and rank.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, this pilot process is expected to give illustrative examples with wide ranking variation, it is meant to be a perspective from the SG/C, there should be some differences and that is valuable to bring out discussion.

Vivek Goyal, BC, noted that complexity and resources will be fixed. He requested a benchmark to work against. What is the complexity of DNS Abuse PDP 2?

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted the links [step-by-step guide](#). There is a link on step 2 where staff talked about resource allocation estimates.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, these are inherently subjective and the greatest numerical spread would allow for the most conversation. She added that staff will have good insight based on experience when it comes to complexity.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, added the vibe check issue. Note for Vivek the vibe check is to promote discussion. For one PDP it could be a low/high resource for different groups. She flagged again the [step-by-step guide](#) with a list of projects from January and they added a column for a level of effort and it still did not help with the prioritization. At some point Council needs to go for it, try it and see how it works, because it is especially helpful for the outside community to see how Council prioritizes.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, she never thought that prioritization was a good idea nor numerical ranking, it is a can of worms. She liked the idea of importance but the criterion is ambiguous, but noted that each group will answer based on group interest. She asked more about the pilot program.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, referenced the timeline on [slide 25](#).

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, asked which projects would be on it.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, referenced [slide 15](#) for the candidate projects. There will be another step for DNS Abuse.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, noted the pilot will become a real thing and is not likely to be stopped. She raised concerns about the process and the methods and the idea of going directly into a pilot. She wanted to raise concerns about this.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, agreed that this is the time to raise concerns about it. If Council decides that the pilot is not working out, then it will not continue.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, thinks this is a good start, even though he does not like everything about it. There is a lot of work to do and Council owes the community and the public an explanation of why Council does the things that it does and in what order. There should not be paralysis through analysis as it is never going to be perfect nor please everybody. He wanted to give it a shot.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, clarified this is a test run rather than a pilot. Then one could see if there is voting in the extreme could effect the overall outcome. He asked for clarification that this is a ranking. So, if there are 5 topics there are five votes and have to rank them to know by ranking of preference or could everything be the highest score.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, appreciated the suggestion of phrasing as a test run rather than a pilot. Clarified that it is not a ranking, where only one number can be used once and referenced [slide 19](#)

Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG, raised the point on the criteria to bring it closer to the GNSO mission. The first tier on the importance, whether it is important for the community. Is it the GNSO community? External requests? How to prioritize certain things in detriment to others. What will happen if it does not work? What will happen if this does not work?

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, answered during the test run that it will bring out all of these issues and would welcome improvements and clarity of the criteria. If this doesn't work, the Council will just keep doing what it is doing currently. It will be very hard looking at the Council to understand why certain things are prioritized. In the end the work is going to get done and this will make it better.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, added to what Jen said there is already a list of projects and the work has to get done. The task ahead is managing the PDP and the work needs to get done. Maybe this prioritization exercise could tell us that some projects should not be tackled by GNSO at all. When testing this mechanism are tweaks to the ranking and criteria etc. She would like to move toward an exercise on this on an annual basis for incorporating new suggestions for new types of work for a long-term road map that the community will work on. Not wanting to have a backlog and give a gift to future Councils.

Benjamin Akinmoyeje, NCSG, thought practically if there are already metrics to show when the pilot is successful or not working. How would this not affect the topics and how does it not compromise the value of the topics. There are various issues with pilots and the criteria they are looking at, so practically do we have that in place?

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, for this there is not an metrics of success as this is a test run. This is not just a numbers exercise, it is a qualitative exercise. It is to sequence and order the work for future Councils as well. Personally, she defines success as a test and finds that it helps with understanding the work coming down. The community can look at the GNSO work, these topics will be tackled now, and others will also be tackled down the road. It is more having the accountability and visibility to others looking at Council work. The Council is doing the work. The community is currently asking why the Council is doing this and not that? This is what success might look like.

Susan Mohr, CSG ISP, the numbers will likely be less relevant but the value is going to come down to the qualitative discussion, and the value that we're going to get out of this is that each of us are going to go back to our constituencies get an understanding of how we view the numbers and the criteria. We'll be able to come together as a group, talk about it as a group, and I think as a result of that, we'll be able to come up with a set of criteria, or a set of priorities, and having that long-term roadmap and a methodology for getting there is what's most important.

Peter Akinremi, GNSO Vice-Chair, thanked the leadership and staff for work on this. A lot of people are defining the pilot as a test run. Council needs to ensure that there is something to test the process. People are concerned about the process and the criteria or transparency of the criteria. The NCSG has been against this and should leave it at the ADR. He wanted to continue the conversation on transparency

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted she is hearing a willingness to try things out and adjust the criteria as needed and to suggest clarifications.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, is more concerned that there is not a process. This goes to the credibility of the Council and its ability to defend its decisions. It needs to be something and this is somewhere to start.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, summarized a general willingness to try and to improve the process as needed. The next steps according to the timeline, is for staff to prepare the material

Item 9: Any other business

9.1 ALAC liaison update (Justine Chew)

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, reminded the Council of her announcement at ICANN85, Mumbai that she would be stepping down to take her seat at the Board at ICANN87. She announced her replacement as Greg Shatten. He will be replacing her at a later date to be determined, but she noted this would be her last face-to-face meeting as a Councilor.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, thanked Justine for her announcement and said a proper thanks would be saved for later meetings as she will still be with us for some additional meetings. She thanked Greg for stepping up and added that he had big shoes to fill.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, thanked Justine for her incredible work. It has been a pleasure working with her, and glad she is moving on to bigger and better things at ICANN.

Action Items:

- Staff to circulate the prioritization mechanism spreadsheet as requested for GNSO Council to stress test the methods.
- Staff to prepare the prioritization exercise for use according to the timeline.

9.2 - Open Mic

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, opened the microphone to the wider community.

Paul McGrady, DNSAM PDP 1 Chair, on the prioritization exercises, he felt the GAC liaison also needs to do that as Council work can get thrown off when the GAC gets intense about something.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, thanked Paul given that Seb is the liaison to the GAC.

Sebastian Ducos, GNSO Liaison to the GAC, spoke to the GAC members yesterday and they discussed a new concept where they decide priorities, of which they may or may not agree. But the fact that we are doing work does not impede us from having discussions about other work.

Philip Corwin, ICANN Community, noted that he served on the Council a decade ago and the prioritization system make aware that he published an article on his personal views of UDRP reform. Consider UDRP prioritization might be something useful there.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, seconded ALAC liaison should also fill out the test run vibe check prioritization.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted ALAC liaison and ccNSO liaison.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, added that Seb liaises on Council's behalf for the GAC, the ccNSO and ALAC liaisons are slightly different roles. It is worth input from them in the discussion, but this is a GNSO work prioritization exercise. Personally, she thinks there is a distinction for the ccNSO liaison should not be involved in a scoring exercise for GNSO work.

Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH, shared the article that Phil talked about. The vibe check is not the UDRP and that was helpful and the type of insight he is looking for from the community.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, quick response about ccNSO/ALAC liaison would participate. The operating procedures the liaisons get to behave like a Councilor other than in voting and motions.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted that she has been corrected by Steve.

Greg Shatten, Future ALAC Liaison, introduced himself and weighed in that it would be useful for ALAC to participate in the prioritization process.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, raised the topic of remedies for registrants and NCSG wants to work with the community to build remedies that are not currently available. She is hopeful through prioritization that this can be brought to Council in the future.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted that this is an important topic and other parts of the community have been supportive. She noted that from DNSAM PDP 1 there would be a letter that Jen would bring to Council on topics that arose out of scope of the PDP to consider for future work and this was one of them.

Item 3: Consent Agenda (Moved here in the Agenda)

- Motion to commemorate Arinola Akinyemi
- Motion to commemorate Alan Barrett

Vivek Goyal, BC, read the [motion](#) in full commemorating Arinola Akinyemi and read the [resolved clauses](#).

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, read the [motion](#) in full commemorating Alan Barrett and the [resolved clauses](#).

[Vote Results](#)

Meeting Adjourned at 16:41 CEST