**Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting Part 1 – 21 October 2026**

GNSO Council meeting on 21 October 2026 at 13:15 WITA (05:15 UTC): https://tinyurl.com/4xcdbtw6 (Tuesday) 22:15 Los Angeles; (Wednesday) 01:15 Washington DC; 06:15 London; 07:15 Paris; 08:15 Moscow; 16:15 Melbourne

**Attendance**

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 issues, proxy to Tapani Tarvainen), Benjamin Akinmoyeje, Tapani Tarvainen
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson
GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:
Greg Shatan: ALAC Liaison
Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC
Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests: Samantha Eisner, ICANN org

ICANN Staff:
Steve Chan – Vice President, Policy Development Support & GNSO Relations
Caitlin Tubergen - Senior Director, GNSO Policy Development Support (apology)
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)

Zoom Recording
Transcript

**Item 1: Administrative Matters (5 minutes) | item start time: 13:15 WITA**
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 13 August 2026 were posted on 27 August 2026
Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting on 10 September 2026 were posted on 24 September 2026

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** welcomed everyone and asked if anyone had an amendment to the agenda

**Vivek Goyal, BC,** withdrew his candidacy for GNSO Chair, thanked NCPH, but had a long discussion from leadership and one of the possible outcomes could be delayed, so it was decided that he will withdraw his candidacy. He requested any of his votes go to Sam.

**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,** noted there are some IRT updates later on in the agenda, but asked if there were any other updates.

**Item 3: Consent Agenda**
Reappointment of the GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** previously discussed reconfirming Sebastien Ducos during the 13 August and 10 September Council meeting. On 30 September he submitted his report to the Council over the past two years.

Vote Results

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org,** with no abstention or objection the motion passes.

Action Items: The GNSO Council leadership team will inform the GAC leadership team accordingly, and will coordinate with Sebastien Ducos as well as the GAC leadership team and GAC Secretariat on next steps and the continued successful implementation of this role.

**Item 4: COUNCIL VOTE - Latin Script Diacritics Policy Development Process (LD PDP) Final Report**
4.1 - Introduction of Topic (Christian Dawson, GNSO Liaison to the LD PDP WG)
4.2 - Council Vote (voting threshold: supermajority)
4.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** introduced the topic and noted that the PDP was initiated in November 2024 and delivered its Final Report to Council on 31 August 2026, ahead of schedule. She recalled the briefings provided to Council by the Working Group Chair during the September Council meeting and the ICANN87 preparatory webinar.

**Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH,** noted that the Final Report contains 57 final outputs: 45 policy recommendations and 12 implementation guidance. He thanked the Working Group leadership, members, liaisons, ICANN org support staff, and Board liaisons for completing the work in a relatively short period and opened the floor for final questions before the vote.
**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** commended the Working Group and queried when a separate IDN-related issue previously raised by Tapani might return to Council for consideration. She noted that the issue was outside the scope of the LD PDP but should not be lost.

**Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH,** responded that he had discussed the issue and would continue working with the relevant parties and staff on an appropriate path for bringing it forward without delaying action on the LD PDP Final Report. He read the resolved clauses and moved to a vote.

Vote Results

**Terri Agnew, ICANN org,** announced that the motion passed with 100% support in both the Contracted Parties House and Non-Contracted Parties House.

Action Items:

- GNSO Secretariat to convey the approval of all 57 final outputs and recommend to the ICANN Board adopt the 45 policy recommendations contained within the LD PDP WG's Final Report.
- Per the ICANN Bylaws, Council Liaison to the LD PDP WG to submit a Recommendations Report to the GNSO Council for approval and delivery to the Board.
- Staff to prepare a Board issued Public Comment immediately after the Council's delivery of the Recommendation Report to the Board.
- Should the final recommendations be adopted by the ICANN Board, the GNSO Council requests that ICANN org convene an Implementation Review Team (IRT) to assist ICANN org in developing the implementation details for the LD PDP final recommendations to ensure that the resultant implementation conforms to the intent of the approved recommendations.

**Item 5: Council Update - Celebrating Accomplishments since ICANN86**
5.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Chair)
5.2 - Council Discussion
5.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** shared the following slides highlighting key accomplishments since ICANN86. She noted the completion and Council approval of the Latin Script Diacritics PDP Final Report and

thanked the Working Group, leadership, Council liaison, Board and org liaisons, and support staff for reaching that milestone ahead of schedule.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** also highlighted the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 Initial Report, which opened for Public Comment in August ahead of its project plan. She noted that the Public Comment period had closed, the Working Group was reviewing the input during ICANN87, and the project remained on track to deliver its Final Report before the May 2027 deadline. She emphasized the importance of recognizing community volunteerism and significant policy milestones.

**Item 6: Council Discussion - Update on the IGO-INGO 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

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** introduced the topic and noted that the IRT had continued its work since the previous Council update, including a Public Comment on proposed updates to the URS and UDRP to address IGO curative rights.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC,** reported that the IRT had received significant Public Comment input and had several issues to work through. He noted that the revised schedule targeted completion by the end of Q1 2027 so that IGO acronyms could be released later in 2027. While the IRT remained behind its original schedule, he considered the revised schedule achievable and encouraged interested Councilors to attend the IRT session at ICANN87.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** queried whether any particularly difficult issues appeared likely to take the IRT off track.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC,** responded that the Public Comment raised several substantive points that would require diligent consideration, but he did not currently consider the work to be off track.

**Item 7: Council Discussion - Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Policy IRT Update**
7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Ashley Heineman, GNSO Council Liaison to the IRT on PPSAI)
7.2 - Council Discussion
7.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** provided background on the PPSAI recommendations, noting that the Board approved the Working Group Final Report in 2016, implementation work was paused amid overlapping registration data work, and the IRT was reconvened in 2024. She noted that ICANN org shared Version 1 of the draft Consensus Policy with the IRT in August 2026.

**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** reported that the IRT resumed substantive discussion on 1 October after members had time to review the draft Consensus Policy. She described the ICANN87 IRT meeting as constructive but noted that differences remained regarding the implications of the draft policy and the Council guidance, particularly whether the accreditation framework should be limited to affiliated privacy/proxy service providers. ICANN org intends to develop Version 2 of the draft policy after ICANN87, and the IRT is continuing to work through the differing interpretations.

**Gaurav Vedi, NCA CPH,** asked whether the IRT had considered protections against unintended disclosure if an authorized service provider goes out of business, noting that the original PPSAI recommendations included protections for registrants and consumers.

**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** responded that the IRT had not yet reached a full discussion of that issue because it was focused on more immediate questions, but she would ensure the point was taken back to the group.

**Gaurav Vedi, NCA CPH,** also asked how the PPSAI work would account for related work on urgent disclosure requests and whether relevant recommendations from other registration data efforts would ultimately be reflected in the Consensus Policy.

**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** noted that the draft policy contains a disclosure framework and that many IRT participants are also involved in related registration data work. She said the IRT had not yet reached the stage of substantive discussion on all of those interactions.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG,** emphasized the importance of privacy and proxy services for vulnerable communities, underserved regions, people expressing opinions online, and users providing services that may be lawful in some jurisdictions but not others. She queried whether the policy would cover only accredited or affiliated providers.

**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** explained that the scope of the accreditation framework remains one of the central issues under discussion. Different views exist on whether unaffiliated providers should be included and what is operationally feasible for registrars that may not know which unaffiliated providers are being used.

**Damon Ashcraft, IPC,** queried whether the differing interpretations of the Council guidance might ultimately require the IRT to return to Council for further guidance.
**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** confirmed that this remained a possibility, although the IRT was continuing to work through the issue and had not yet made such a request.

**Item 8: Council Discussion - Accuracy Small Team Educational Material Review**
8.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Chair)
8.2 - Council Discussion
8.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** recalled that the Accuracy Small Team recommended developing clear, user-friendly educational materials for registrants explaining the importance of providing and maintaining accurate registration data, how personal data is processed and protected, and the potential consequences of inaccurate or unverified data. She noted that the RrSG had circulated revised draft materials on 18 August and asked Council to focus primarily on the content rather than presentation or formatting.

**Hong-Fu Meng, RrSG,** confirmed that the current review was focused on the substance of the educational materials. He noted that the eventual format could be determined after Council considered whether the content was appropriate.

**Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG,** raised several privacy-related concerns, including inconsistent terminology, the treatment of data minimization, the absence of information on data subject rights, and the need to address storage and the legal basis for collection. She offered to help develop additional language even though she was leaving Council.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC,** thanked the RrSG for condensing the information and sought clarification regarding the statements on suspension or cancellation. He queried whether a domain is suspended after 15 days because registration data is inaccurate or because the registrant has not completed verification and emphasized that the materials should accurately reflect the contractual requirement.

**Volker Greimann, RrSG,** clarified that the 15-day verification requirement derives from the 2013 RAA. He explained that after a registration, transfer, or material update to registration data, the registrar must suspend the domain if the registrant does not verify the relevant email address or telephone number within the required period. He noted that most registrars use email verification.

**Farzaneh Badii, NCSG,** noted that the educational materials reflected an Accuracy Small Team recommendation intended to give registrants greater understanding of why they should maintain current data and to remind them of their rights and responsibilities. She supported the direction while noting that the materials could still be improved.

**Vivek Goyal, BC,** asked whether there would be a way to measure whether the educational materials have any effect on registration data accuracy after deployment and whether registrars would be required to use the materials.

**Volker Greimann, RrSG,** suggested considering whether the new educational material could be integrated with the existing Registrants Benefits and Responsibilities materials required under the RAA, rather than adding additional friction to the registration process.

**Ashley Heineman, RrSG,** noted that measuring accuracy was outside the immediate purpose of this exercise and that the registrars had not undertaken a collective measurement effort. She added that individual registrar studies and other sources offered differing indications regarding the impact of verification practices.

**Hong-Fu Meng, RrSG,** described his registrar experience with primarily corporate clients, noting that their registration data is generally accurate and verified at registration. He reiterated that the verification requirement itself already exists under the 2013 RAA.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC,** asked whether ICANN tracks domain names suspended because of registration data inaccuracy and whether any such data could help inform future iterations of the educational materials.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** clarified that the educational materials are not Consensus Policy and therefore would not themselves be mandatory, while the underlying contractual verification obligations remain mandatory. She summarized that the draft would require some additional work, including the privacy-related edits and questions about available accuracy metrics, before returning to Council for a final review.

Action Items:

- Councilors to share their proposed revisions, changes, and or inputs via redlines to the document or on list.
- Staff to look for additional information from the Accuracy Small Team available on this topic and to recirculate relevant information to Council and provide additional background information.

**Item 9: Council Discussion - Prioritization Exercise Next Steps**

9.1 - Introduction of Topic (Susan Payne, GNSO Chair)
9.2 - Council Discussion
9.3 - Next Steps

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** reviewed the discussion from the ICANN87 Council working session and noted that the methodology itself, including scoring and weighting, could be refined during the upcoming Strategic Planning Session (SPS). For the immediate discussion, she proposed focusing on practical sequencing and viewing the work as a portfolio rather than five isolated items.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** described three proposed buckets: Advance for work that is ready to begin in the short term; Prepare for work requiring additional analysis or development before Council action; and Monitor for longer-term items. She noted that the remaining DNS Abuse gaps would require additional prioritization and that the roadmap shown was a straw-person intended to test whether the sequencing made sense.

**Vivek Goyal, BC,** supported concurrent work where feasible and questioned why some activities were shown as beginning in January 2027 rather than sooner. He specifically asked why requesting an Issue Report appeared to take approximately a month and a half.

**Feodora Hamza, ICANN org,** clarified that Council must adopt a motion to request an Issue Report and that, once requested, staff has up to 45 days to prepare and submit it. She noted that the roadmap was intended to show when work might begin rather than to prescribe the exact duration of each step.

**Sam Demetriou, RySG,** stated that the proposed sequencing appeared to be a reasonable starting point and suggested Councilors review the slides between meetings and refine the roadmap in preparation for the SPS. She also noted that Council would need a method for adding newly identified work items into an existing roadmap over time.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** closed the discussion by noting that Councilors could continue to refine timing and sequencing and that the broader prioritization methodology would be taken up during the SPS.

Action Items:

- Leadership and Staff to prepare next steps and planning for implementation of prioritization.
- Councilors to share via list any additional feedback for future methodology.

**Item 10: Council Discussion - Transfer of IANA Intellectual Property Rights**
10.1 - Introduction of Topic (Greg Shatan, ALAC Liaison to the GNSO Council)
10.2 - Council Discussion
10.3 - Next Steps

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** introduced the proposed transfer of IANA Intellectual Property Rights-related agreements from the IETF Trust to the IETF Intellectual Property Management Corporation. She clarified that Greg Shatan had brought the matter to Council in his capacity as a GNSO representative to the IANA IPR Community Coordination Group (CCG), rather than in his role as ALAC Liaison.

**Greg Shatan, GNSO representative to the IANA IPR CCG,** explained that the IANA IPR was transferred to the IETF Trust as part of the 2016 IANA stewardship transition and is governed through five related agreements. He noted that the IETF is restructuring the holding arrangement from a trust to a nonprofit corporation because of insurance and trademark-law considerations. Completion of that restructuring requires transferring the Trust's rights and obligations under the existing agreements to the new corporation.

**Greg Shatan, GNSO representative to the IANA IPR CCG,** noted that the CCG includes representatives from the names, numbers, and protocol parameters communities. He stated that the relevant transfer documents had been reviewed over an extended period and that he was seeking Council awareness and non-objection before giving consent on behalf of the GNSO-related portion of the names community.

**Samantha Eisner, ICANN org**, clarified that the transfer concerns the IANA trademarks, associated logos, and related domain names, and does not transfer technical processes, patents, trade secrets, or similar operational assets. ICANN Legal further noted that ICANN would sign the relevant community agreement on behalf of the names community only after receiving the necessary community consent. Councilors asked about the continuing community oversight role, the scope of the intellectual property involved, and whether formal Council action was required. It was clarified that the CCG would continue its oversight role with the new IETF Intellectual Property Management Corporation and that the change does not alter the community's existing role or other IANA accountability mechanisms.

**Greg Shatan, GNSO representative to the IANA IPR CCG,** clarified that he was not formally required to obtain a Council vote but did not want to provide consent on his own initiative without ensuring that Council had no objection.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** proposed that Council proceed by non-objection rather than schedule a formal vote. No Councilor objected.

**Item 11: Any other business**
11.1 - SPIRT update on Registry Service Provider (RSP) issue

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC,** reported on the SPIRT work following the Council's 10 June 2026 referral concerning the RSP evaluation issue. He noted that the SPIRT and ICANN org determined that a permanent solution would take longer than the 30-day period contemplated by the SPIRT framework, so an interim solution was implemented on 30 July before the RSP application period closed.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC,** explained that the interim solution allowed RSP applicants to indicate that they did not intend to use the standard EPP extension and continue through the portions of technical screening that could be completed. ICANN org communicated the interim approach to applicants and updated the relevant public materials before the application deadline.

**Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC,** noted that ICANN org subsequently advised the SPIRT that the permanent solution is expected to be implemented no later than 28 February 2027, including updates to the RSP handbook, portal, publication system, and registry system testing and evaluation processes. He considered the interim concern resolved and noted that any further issues could be brought back to the SPIRT and Council.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** welcomed the update and noted that the SPIRT process appeared to have operated as intended.

11.2 - Farewell to Councilors

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** thanked the six outgoing Councilors - Anne Aikman Scalese, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Susan Payne, Julf Helsingius, Nacho Amadoz, and Osvaldo Novoa - for their contributions and service to the GNSO Council.

**Bruna Martins dos Santos, NCSG,** asked the incoming Council to continue the Council's work and discussion on human rights issues and expressed appreciation for her time on Council.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** thanked Councilors for their support during her term as Chair and reflected positively on her experience serving with the Council.

11.3 - Open Mic

**Sam Demetriou, RySG,** thanked Vivek Goyal for volunteering to run for GNSO Chair and for withdrawing his candidacy in a manner she considered supportive of Council stability. She recognized the time and commitment involved in volunteering for Council leadership.

**Paul McGrady,** identified himself at the microphone and thanked Vivek Goyal for stepping aside. He recalled the longstanding practice of rotating the Chair between Houses and highlighted the value of maintaining cooperation between the Houses.

**Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting,** reflected on her experience serving as a co-liaison with Susan Payne to the SubPro IRT and encouraged Council to remain creative about collaborative approaches to demanding liaison roles.

**Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair,** thanked Susan Payne for her work as Chair and emphasized the significant amount of leadership work that occurs outside the formal Council meetings.

**Manju Chen,** introduced herself at the microphone and thanked the Council leadership for their work and service.
**Tom Barrett, outgoing NomCom Chair,** introduced himself and gave an overview of the positions the Nominating Committee will fill in the next cycle, including three Board seats, one ccNSO seat, three ALAC seats, and two voting GNSO seats - one for each House. He noted that although the number of applications increased in the prior cycle, most applications were for Board positions and asked the community to help amplify outreach for the policy roles. He noted that the application window would run from 18 December through 16 February.

**Susan Payne, GNSO Chair,** closed Part 1 of the Council meeting and reminded participants that Part 2 would begin at 15:30 WITA.