Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 21 May 2026

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 21 May 2026 at 05:00 UTC: https://tinyurl.com/5hy4zjwe
(Wednesday) 22:00 Los Angeles; (Thursday) 01:00 Washington DC; 06:00 London; 07:00 Paris; 08:00 Moscow; 15:00 Melbourne

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Anne Aikman Scalese
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng (joined after vote), Ashley Heineman(absent), 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 (apology, proxy to Tapani Tarvainen), Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, Benjamin Akinmoyeje (absent)
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:
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations
Julie Hedlund - Policy Development Support Director (GNSO) (apology)
Caitlin Tubergen - Director, Policy Development Support (GNSO) (apology)
Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)
Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)
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) (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 11 March 2026 were posted on 29 March 2026.
Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 16 April 2026 were posted on 30 April 2026.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, updated her SOI that she has been appointed Chair of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) for the IGF.

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, reminded all Councilors that they all should review the Projects List and Action Item List prior to each meeting as it is not covered in depth on the call.

Item 3: COUNCIL VOTE - Board Un-Adoption Process in Updated GGP and PDP Manuals
3.1 - Presentation of Motion (Jennifer Chung, GNSO Council Vice-Chair)
3.2 - Council Vote (voting threshold: simple majority of each house)
3.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, introduced the topic and gave background for the vote on the updated PDP and GGP Manuals. She emphasized that this process has been designed to be very rare and only used in exceptional circumstances.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, made a general comment on the public comment process and she suggested going through in detail how the comments were addressed and tracking changes into how their comments were incorporated into the final product.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, agreed and pointed to the redline edits and encouraged comments to be captured in an open manner.

Steve Chan, ICANN org, generally the Public Comment summary analysis is one aspect where the comments are discussed and captured. More directly, the impacts of the comments were captured in a presentation to the Council in Mumbai that staff made for the additional edits from the Public Comments for extra transparency.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, indicated that the IPC will be voting no and had a comment to be read into the record.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, read the resolved clauses and moved to a vote.

Vote Results: no abstention, two objections, three absences and the motion passes.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, read the IPC statement on their no vote into the record.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, thanked Damon for the IPC statement and a query if there was a response to the IPC comment. Council has taken note of the IPC statement and that these changes in the updates of the PDP and GGP manual, does not preclude any further action from SG/C individually or Council taking steps it deems necessary in any particular case.

Action Items:

- GNSO Support Staff publish the updated manuals in the appropriate places on the ICANN website [COMPLETED]

Item 4: COUNCIL DISCUSSION - Council Process for Forwarding an issue to the SPIRT
4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Council Chair)
4.2 - Council Discussion
4.3 - Next Steps

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, introduced the topic and summarized her email sent to Council list on the topic of SPIRT. She thanked Councilors, especially Farzi, Anne, and Lawrence who engaged on this topic on list. The purpose of SPIRT is to ensure that the 2026 new gTLD round operates effectively. Council leadership determined that this was too early for a vote and this aligned with the SPIRT leadership, so the purpose of the current discussion is to seek a more general guidance on Council on how Council plans to forward issues to the SPIRT. She went through the following slides. She summarized the proposed path from leadership to refer items to the SPIRT through a formal vote. This is how things go from the Council to the SPIRT, this discussion does not circumvent the SPIRT Charter, just the expectation on how Council will deal with it when it forwards something on.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, gave a purely hypothetical example for clarity: If an issue were to come up next week and it was clearly impacting the information that an applicant had to submit during the application window for the Next Round, which is only open until August. That would seem to be a case where Council and subsequently SPIRT and org would have to vote outside of a normal meeting. Because the normal process of having a discussion in June, vote in July, would not meet that timeline. In sum, the idea is to have a vote at Council level when something is referred to the SPIRT.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, asked for clarification on what exactly the Council will be voting on in this process.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, responded that it does not seem necessary for SPIRT to refer something to Council for a vote in order to send back to them. We are therefore considering how Council will refer something to the SPIRT, where it has been brought before Council, for example brought by a constituency, then Council will decide whether or not to send it to the SPIRT, but not asking them to do something specific. It is simply triggering the SPIRT to work on that particular issue, since SPIRT cannot refer things to itself.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, is comfortable with this to have a group raise something to Council and then Council can vote to send it to SPIRT. She then inquired what will happen with issues that they want to submit.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, said that would be a process to go through a stakeholder group, and we should try to keep sufficient flexibility to ensure the issue gets escalated and addressed. SPIRT should not be able to refer issues to itself.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, praised Lawrence for his work as SPIRT liaison. She engaged so much on the list as she was Council liaison to the SPIRT Charter drafting team. She stated that leadership is correct that it was anticipated at the time of the charter drafting, when an issue arose not specifically by org, Board, or Council, then the SG/C should raise the issue at Council and that is consistent with the charter, depending on the issue. When Council does refer an issue to the SPIRT, whether Council wants to see the proposed solution back again could be addressed at the time of the vote and part of the authorization to SPIRT. If it is not complicated, Council can say that at the time of the vote that SPIRT and org can handle it. This will probably not be a frequent process and it can be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, echoed her appreciation of Lawrence's liaison role, it was a complex issue and it has allowed us to have a good conversation about this topic today.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, gave context to the issue that at its first meeting SPIRT identified a gap in the SPIRT process to bring issues to the attention of Council with the hope of getting a referral to look at the issue, review it extensively, and come up with a solution. When an issue comes to SPIRT it first has to determine what type of issue it is. If it is a Type 3 issue (policy) it will refer that back to the Council as SPIRT remit is not in the policy sphere. The creation of an internal process where SPIRT needed issues referred to it by Council oftentimes could not wait multiple months to come to Council attention. SPIRT proposed an expedited process on a case-by-case basis, which is now being discussed. The process then would be any member of the community could go through an SG/C to raise an item to the Council and then expeditiously refer it to SPIRT to look into. There are parts of the SPIRT charter that are clear that it often does not need to come back to Council and just collaborate with org if it is an implementation issue. Ultimately, the Council should not micromanage the SPIRT process.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, voiced her support for the proposal as sensible. She added it is necessary, even though it would be used rarely, because the SPIRT membership is open, so there could potentially be members of SPIRT who are not a part of any SG/C. So there has to be some mechanism by which a member of SPIRT can raise issues and then it is for SPIRT to determine whether or not that this something that needs to be referred to Council. Potentially org could take it up and goes through that way. She emphasized that there still needs to be something like this for any member of SPIRT to raise something, and there are already processes built in the SPIRT charter for how to handle these things. She added that Council should not add another layer for what it thinks should happen to the referral as this would create confusion. We should use the SPIRT Charter as much as possible. It is clear that some are concerned with Type 3 issues, but it is up to SPIRT and org in particular to determine the type that the issue falls under. For example, if org says the issue could be fixed within current policy recommendations, then it would no longer be a Type 3 issue. She emphasized that the SPIRT process needs to be allowed to happen before Council takes an interventionist approach.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, clarified that this is only about how Council will refer something to SPIRT. Council is not looking to add any layers to or change the SPIRT charter as that process is set.

Vivek Goyal, BC, urged all Councilors to give a heads up to their respective groups if the time comes to make a decision that a timely response to any SPIRT inquiry will likely be needed.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, this will likely be on a case-by-case basis and often there will be a real time sensitivity. She summarized that there was general support for referral by vote and leadership team will work with staff to coordinate with Lawrence to get that message to the SPIRT. More discussion will happen on this issue and if the process is not working as expected, nothing prevents change.

Action Item: Leadership team to convey message to the SPIRT via Council liaison Lawrence that there was general support for referral to the SPIRT by a vote of the Council.

Item 5: Council Discussion - GNSO Mechanism for Work Prioritization
5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Jennifer Chung, GNSO Council Vice-Chair)
5.2 - Council Discussion
5.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, gave an overview of the topic referencing both the SPS and referenced the updated prioritization document and the briefing document. She then went through the slides for the ADR and prioritization discussing the range of potential models explored. No single model is perfect, but sought agreement on a hybrid approach.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, Sought agreement on hybrid approach to score, rank then discuss for the pilot for criteria. The priority is that it should move the work forward. It should be easy to administer and flexible to aid the Council. She outlined the options in the slides. The hybrid approach of looking at this multi-criteria scoring model and a ranked-discussion model, if there is agreement to pilot this, then Leadership could propose some criteria for it. She pointed to the green text in this document, for the proposed 5 criteria for Councilors to agree to.

Tapani Tarvainen, NCSG, discussed his proposed mathematical model and mentioned that his proposal works quite well with this hybrid model as long as there is continuous review and adjustment and that is most important. He enquired about a timeline for this mutli-criteria proposal.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, clarified the question that Tapani's model 0 was his suggested way forward, and this was a foundation for the hybrid model that has been developed. As a pilot that multi criteria model is a starting point for Council discussion and leadership will be looking at how to operationalize it.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, commented that the document sounded a bit academic, but wanted to focus on the five characteristics, asking if there needs to be work on these criteria. She was used to the quadrant system for urgent/important urgent/not important etc. Those exercises involve the quadrant look. In terms of next steps will the criteria development be based on these options?

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, this was prepared as a sample in January for the SPS, but in case any Councilors have comments, they can be further operationalized with the criteria. Leadership wanted to consider if these were correct going forward. If there are concerns it should be flagged.
Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, when something is both urgent and important, it should be addressed by Council even if it is complex it should rise to the top.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, acknowledged that Anne made a useful point for the quadrant approach that was mentioned. We should consider this on the scoring, so that some criteria are potentially weighted higher than others.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, echoed agreement for the multi criteria scoring model for a richer discussion. She noted her support for the combined report. Councilors should take this with open minds to make tweaks as we progress through the pilot.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, mentioned the criteria discussed and asked if there is an explanation, discussion, etc. Specifically, defining importance is an explanation that could be demanded by the community, or that the community has ignored the issue, but it is important. To explain the score throughout the discussion of these issues.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, envisioned the hybrid approach, with numerical scoring then the qualitative part with the discussion, so that is accurate.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, we appreciate different groups have differing priorities and will assign different importances for things. The simple scoring is not optimal, it does not allow us a starting point from which to understand what groups are saying and why. It can provoke discussion to understand why groups assign certain scores.

Vivek Goyal, BC, asked if the next step is to agree on these criteria. He did not want the ranking process to become another policy process and not become a project in itself.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, indeed whatever is chosen should be working for Council and not against. The next step is how to operationalize this pilot going forward.

Peter Akinremi, GNSO Vice-Chair, the proposed path makes sense and we generally agree with that and looking at the criteria should be a definition of importance, urgency, and demand, that gives an understanding of what that means, so it is not out of context.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, it is good to start with a trial to see how this works out. If there is a ranked voting, there is a gaming system and encourages more extreme positive/negative votes. It could remove the middle ground for a pet project to be ranked high, etc. There are certain issues for how this could turn out in practice, it is something as a trial that there should be no presumption of the initially chosen path. It should be the case that after the trial there should be an affirmative vote to keep it like that and not an affirmative vote to change it.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, these are important highlights and there are of course weaknesses. With this hybrid approach and pilot, it is simply a starting point for discussion and should mitigate gaming as much as possible. This is something that should work for Council and if it does not work, it will not be difficult to change.

<u>Action Item:</u> Leadership and Staff to share with the Council how to operationalize the prioritization pilot going forward.

Item 6: Any other business
6.1 - ICANN86 Planning

- GNSO Prep Week Webinar - 28 May at 13:00 UTC
- GNSO Council members will be panelists and expected to join, unless apologies given in advance. Questions will be taken from GNSO Council only.

John Emery, ICANN org, reminded Councilors of the upcoming Prep webinar that is required for all to attend. It is an opportunity to hear updates from and ask questions of current PDP Chairs, Michael Bauland and Paul McGrady.

6.2 - DNS Abuse PDP2 Charter Drafting

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, it was noted during the Mumbai meeting that there was interest to start looking at the PDP 2 charter drafting and have staff take an initial look. There is already a draft charter in the Final Issue Report, but there could perhaps be revisions based on lessons learned from PDP 1. This is an initial review of PDP 2 including topics about membership structure, etc. Once staff has updated the charter, it will be brought to Council for discussion. This is just a heads up that work is underway in the background.

Action Item: Staff to begin revising draft of DNSAM PDP 2 Charter with lessons learned from PDP 1.

6.3 - RSP Issue Consideration for Potential Change Request

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, mentioned that this item is aligned with the previous SPIRT discussion that relates to RSPs and is something the RySG has flagged that it may need SPIRT to work on.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, gave a brief overview of a technical topic for Councilors to understand the issue. In the draft version of the base registry agreement that was, put out for public comment, there was a requirement that all registry operators would only use EPP extensions that are registered with the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA). So, these are the extensible provisioning protocol extensions that registries use. There is a registry that exists… the word registry is going to come up a lot here, and I apologize that it's confusing. There is a registry that exists within IANA, and there is a very specific process where new EPP extensions, proposed EPP extensions, can be approved for inclusion in this INA registry. In certain cases, registries use EPP extensions that are not included in that database. That's something that has existed in the ecosystem historically. But there was a proposed requirement that would say registry operators can only use those EPP extensions that are included in the INA registry.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, highlighted that a number of folks from the registry stakeholder group who were reviewing the base RA requirements and providing some feedback to ICANN org alongside, and in conjunction with the Public Comment that went out for the base registry agreement. They flagged that this requirement was pretty problematic, and that has to do with the specific process by which the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) evaluates and approves EPP extensions to be included into that IAN registry. After that background, added that this concern was raised with ICANN, and the outcome was that ICANN agreed to remove the requirement from the base RA. So now, everything that she just described is somewhat moot, because it's no longer a requirement in the base registry agreement.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, the issue now that the RySG would like the SPIRT to consider is that, despite the removal from the requirements of the base registry agreement. There remain some requirements under the technical questions and the registry system testing that back-end registry service providers have to go through that pertain to this requirement. So, to set the scene again, there are some technical questions to evaluate registry service providers that require the applicants to attest that they will only use the EPP extensions that are registered in the IANA registry. That requirement is similarly tested during the registry system testing. There is no longer a requirement for the registry operator to only use those extensions, but the RSP testing and the questionnaire retains the requirement for back-end registries to make the assertion that they are only using the extensions that are registered in the INA registry. So there's a misalignment between what's tested and what's required during testing, and what's actually in the registry agreement. So therefore, the registry stakeholder group is requesting that Spirit and ICANN org consider revising the testing criteria, so that would require a revision to the Registry Service Provider Handbook that lists out the questions, the registry questions that have to be evaluated, as well as the registry system testing that tests against this criteria. And specifically, RySG are proposing making the attestation that you will not use EPP extensions that are not in the IANA registry, making that optional. So that it would go back and apply, potentially, to those registry service providers that have already completed the testing and that they should not be held to a standard that was being removed.

Vivek Goyal, BC, asked would the base registry agreement supersede once the registry operator signs the agreement with the registry?

Sam Demetriou, RySG, replied that is exactly the issue that is trying to be resolved as there is a gray area for how long the attestations, once the RA is the ruling document. What are the consequences of saying one thing during registry system testing versus that requirement not existing once the RA is the ruling document, so that is the discrepancy to harmonize the two requirements.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, asked a question about ICANN org's point of view on this issue. She inquired if ICANN needs to present to Council their proposed solution.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, cannot state ICANN's point of view. This is one of the key items of discussion between ICANN org and SPIRT. If and when this gets taken up by the SPIRT.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, responded that Council might want to see the proposed solution if it's assigned to SPIRT. In speaking to Jeff, he did not know why ICANN org thought it needed to be raised at the Council level and did not necessarily agree with that. But ICANN org thought it was important to hear from Council, that is why she felt it important to hear from ICANN org.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, no objection to hearing ICANN org's view on this.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, thanked Sam for laying out the issue and he answered Anne's question. This is one issue that needs to be determined before the application round closes on the 12th of August. If the Council moves this to the SPIRT, the SPIRT will definitely interface with ICANN org and these questions will likely get answered and will have insight on the thinking of ICANN prior to the SPIRT determination. He reiterated that it is his role as liaison to bring issues of concern to Council and before SPIRT makes a determination Council can provide some sort of guidance and test the process discussed earlier in the call. He encouraged that Council work speedily so that SPIRT can look into this issue before 12th of August close date.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, agreed that this should be resolved prior to the conclusion of the application round because that is when the next wave of back-end registry service provider evaluations will close out.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, took off her chair hat. There were comments on whether Council needs org's input before it decides to pass this to the SPIRT, and she did not believe that is the case. The point here is, does the Council think, having heard from RySG, that there is something that potentially needs a change and therefore we should ask SPIRT to look at it. SPIRT cannot refer things to itself and cannot have looked at it or engaged with ICANN org discussions as it is not within its remit yet until Council asks them to work on it. Council does not need to hear what ICANN org thinks before we decide if we ask the SPIRT to work on it. This is time sensitive and the June Council meeting is coming up in Seville and Council should strive to reach a formal agreement to pass that on to the SPIRT.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, needing to hear from ICANN org is not before it is referred to the SPIRT, she is more interested in hearing from org on their analysis and proposed solution. In contrast to the ASP qualification issue which was raise by org itself and was dealt with in accordance with the Charter. Council does not need to hear from ICANN org prior to assigning it to SPIRT, but she is interested to hear from org as to why it thought it needed to be raised by the RySG with Council.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, responded that the clarification was helpful as it pertains to the question of when Council makes a decision whether it should be referred to SPIRT. The registry stakeholder group would appreciate it if this is something that could be resolved at the June meeting in Seville so that it can go to the SPIRT to commence the process.

<u>Action Item:</u> Councilors to review the issue brought by RySG to determine by vote in June if Council should pass this issue to the SPIRT group to look into this issue.

6.4 - Leadership Team Update on Call with Kurtis Lindqvist, ICANN CEO

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, gave an overview of the conversation with Kurtis and Russ Weinstein. The prep week webinar on the participant code of conduct, which Russ followed up on with an email on the mailing list. From Council side, they raised delays on GNSO policy recommendations being adopted by the Board, in particular RrSG letter signed on by other groups giving them a heads up that the letter was coming. Kurtis flagged the scorecards that Org has started producing to be more transparent about where things have got in the process, but was open to further discussions to speed up Board and org processes.

Another possible "delay" concern which was raised was on the topic of IGO names as, once the IRT has concluded its work, the missing piece of the puzzle is the notification system that org is meant to be building. Nothing had been heard on this topic since Puerto Rico, and that tends to create a perception that nothing was going on, but Russ confirmed that this notification system has been developed and is sitting ready to be rolled out when the IRT on curative rights concludes. So this is more of a transparency and communication issue, and a positive outcome from the discussion.

6.5 - ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct regarding Statements of Interest

Nacho Amadoz, RySG, noted that the RySG has been working on a document to establish a procedure for the enforcement of the Code of Conduct and it could be a good addition to the GNSO material, to be reviewed once it is ready. It will be circulated when completed as a lot of thought has gone into this and Council would benefit from reading it as there are references about how the process needs to be escalated to Council and looking at Annex 1 of the community enforcement guidance.

6.6 - Topic Leads for Discussions with the GAC

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, there have been various issues on which the GAC has been looking for the GNSO to participate in some of their discussions and topic leads have been invited to liaise with GAC leads on the content of these sessions. In particular the 15-day timeline for verification of registrants by registrars, the GAC want to see that timeline reduced. GAC also wants a discussion on the possibility of org to allow applicant support applicants to become their own RSP. On the 15-day topic, Ashley and Jen will be discussing it with the GAC topic leads. On the applicant support issue, while various groups have an interest in this, the platform GAC is requesting is largely a matter for org to consider. The RySG has been asked if they want to give any insights on the RSP issue. For the ICANN86 sessions, GAC is really driving these and has items in its agenda.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, commented on GAC's letter on the 15-day validation. GAC is asking for a contractual amendment and want a trilateral meeting with Council and the Board. That goes against the ethos of how the multistakeholder model works. NCSG is considering sending a letter to the GAC to tell them if they want policy change then it has to go through a PDP not through contractual amendments.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted that the letter received talked about an informational session before ICANN86 and then a trilateral at ICANN86 and the timing has been moved so that the ICANN 86 discussion is more informational. This issue was included in the DNS Abuse Issues Report for example and it may just be a conversation about how policy might be developed on this. If there is a trilateral it would be after ICANN86.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, requested on the agenda for trilateral to get a clarification from the Board by what they mean when they asked ICANN org to advance the authentication process via a proof of concept in relation to these law enforcement email addresses. She requested this go on the agenda. As the PSWG has made some progress on this but did not get a follow on from it and Council needs to know how far ICANN org will go in publishing email addresses of LEAs.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, the trilateral proposed by GAC was specifically about the 15-day verification issue, if it does happen it will be after ICANN86. There is likely some need for clarification on the Urgent Request point. The leadership team will take that away and think how to use the opportunity in Seville to try and get more clarity, perhaps the SO/AC roundtable with Board and org would be helpful here.

Justine Chew, ALAC Liaison, requested the GNSO Council's support to include ALAC in the trilateral, to turn it into a multi-party dialogue rather than retaining it as a trilateral, whenever it might take place. She agreed with Farzi that this should be a multistakeholder discussion.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, acknowledged her comment. She stated that this proposal came from the GAC and if it happens, it will be after Seville.

Action Items:

- Re: Urgent Requests: To get clarification from the Board as to the meaning of their request to advance the authentication process via a proof of concept in relation to law enforcement email addresses

- Request from ALAC to be included in the proposed future trilateral with GAC, Council, and Board making it a dialogue rather than a trilateral

Meeting Adjourned at 07:02 UTC.