ICANN Transcription
GNSO Council
Thursday, 12 November 2026 at 13:00 UTC

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/play/xVGrLLK6b1NmTO2uG1AqbTA2ZkSgxNVGqbgUzVEbSZ2BpTploRFK12qLg4dX3B5Xp3WWozF4yX0VxBkR.DL43zg1oFf0jq-Uj

Zoom Recording:
https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/xDcfFYRNlNHbCwUYPXz_eLvtzYpkvzzXTHTw4Ei50I5BOmhIVwqZaXg3EUILcE61.dkwIW5kT2qPEjWsh?startTime=1794488416000

The recordings and transcriptions are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar Page:
https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

List of attendees:
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): – Non-Voting – Alan Woods
Contracted Parties House
Registrar Stakeholder Group: Hong-Fu Meng, Ashley Heineman, Volker Greimann
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Ajith Francis, Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung
Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav Vedi
Non-Contracted Parties House
Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal, Nitin Walia, Damon Ashcraft, Hector Ariel Manoff, Susan Mohr (apology, proxy to Nitin Walia)
Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Christabel Mebaghandu, Juan Manuel Rojas, Peter Akinremi, Benjamin Akinmoyeje (joined late, after vote), 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:
Paul McGrady, Chair of the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1
Marc Anderson, Chair of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team

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

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

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)

TERRI AGNEW: The recording has started, and this is Terri Agnew. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the GNSO Council meeting taking place on the 12th of November 2026. Would you please acknowledge your name when I call it? Ajith Francis?

AJITH FRANCIS: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Jennifer Chung?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Hong-Fu Meng?

HONG-FU(TOM) MENG: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Samantha Demetriou?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Ashley Heineman?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Volker Greimann?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Present. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Gaurav Vedi?

GAURAV VEDI: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Lawrence Olawale-Roberts?

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Vivek Goyal? I don't see where Vivek has joined, but we'll reach out to him. Damon Ashcraft?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Terri, I'm here.

TERRI AGNEW: Hector Ariel Manoff?

HECTOR MANOFF: I am here.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. Nitin Walia?

NITIN WALIA: Thank you, Terri. I am here.

TERRI AGNEW: You're most welcome. Susan Mohr sends her apologies, and the proxy will go to Nitin Walia. Juan Manuel Rojas?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I'm here. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Farzaneh Badii? I don't see where Farzaneh has joined, but we'll go ahead and reach out to her. Peter Akinremi?

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Here, Terri. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Tapani Tarvainen?

TAPANI TARVAINEN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Benjamin Akinmoyeje? I don't see where Benjamin has joined, but we will reach out to him. So sorry, Christabel Mebaghandu.

CHRISTABEL MEBAGHANDU: Mebaghandu.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh, my goodness. Christabel, thank you. Mebaghandu.

CHRISTABEL MEBAGHANDU: Yes, thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Christian Dawson?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Present. Thanks, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Alan Woods?

ALAN WOODS: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Sebastien Ducos?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Present. Thank you, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Antonia Chu?

ANTONIA CHU: Present, Terri. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: Most welcome. Paul McGrady, Chair of the DNS Abuse Mitigation, and Marc Anderson, Chair of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team, will be our guests. You have the policy team supporting the GNSO, so you have Steve Chan, Saewon Lee, Feodora Hamza, John Emery, Andrew Chen, Berry Cobb, Julie Bisland, and myself, Terri Agnew.

May I please remind everyone here to state your name before speaking as the call is being recorded. A reminder that we're in the Zoom webinar room and Councilors are panelists and can activate their microphones and participate in the chat. Right now, pause. Councilors, take the time, change your chat, and select everyone. Again, in your Zoom chat, select everyone for all to be able to read the exchanges. A warm welcome to attendees on the call who are silent observers, meaning they do not have access to their microphones nor the chat.

As a reminder, those who take part in ICANN multi-stakeholder process are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest. With this, I'll turn it over to our GNSO Chair, Samantha Demetriou. Please begin.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Terri. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Council call on November 12th, 2026. I hope wherever you are in the world, you're having a good day so far. Okay, we are going to get into our agenda for today.

To start us off, I want to ask if anyone has any updates they would like to make to their Statements of Interest. Okay, great. Not seeing any hands, I'll ask if anyone has any last-minute tweaks or amendments to the agenda or any other business that they'd like to add before we dive in. Okay. Sebastien, I see your hand.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, sorry, Sam. Took me a while to find it. I just wanted to add a quick AOB regarding, sorry, our response to the GAC Communique, the items of interest. I can do that as an AOB, or I can do that at the end of my item four, depending on how much time we have. I'll let you manage that time.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay, perfect, Seb. Thank you for that. We'll see how we're doing as we go through your update and your report, and then we'll see how the time's going there. Okay, I'll note for the record that the minutes from our October 21st meeting were posted on November 7th, so thanks for staff for getting those posted. And I think with that we can move into a review of the open projects and actions list. Does anyone want to flag anything, raise any questions, or note any milestones in our ongoing work?

Okay, great. I think this is also a great time to just note that we have closed out one action item coming out of the ICANN87 meeting, which was to fill some of the open liaison roles for our Council. So I want to just extend a very hearty and warm thank you to Damon, who's going to be our new liaison to the Rights Protection Mechanisms Phase 1 Implementation Review Team, and to Nitin, who is going to be our new GNSO Council liaison to the ccNSO. So thank you guys both for that.

Now, at this point, I'm going to hand the floor over to Peter, and he is going to walk us through our consent agenda for today. Peter, over to you whenever you're ready.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Sam. Can you confirm you can hear me?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I can. Thank you.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you. Okay, awesome. For the consent agenda, we have two items, and the first one is for us to confirm GNSO Empowered Community representative. So I'm trying to see if I can see the screen. Okay, I'm joining from my phone, so that's why I'm trying to see. Okay, I can see the screen now, but I can only see the item agenda number three. So for the GNSO Empowered Community representative, we have Ashley being appointed for this. Previously, we had Jen serving in this role, but since the change of leadership, then we have Ashley for this role.

The second item is recommendations report for the Latin Script Diacritics Policy Development Process. So we've actually talked on this, and I just wanted to confirm, Sam, am I the one that will talk on this, or the LD representative that needs to talk on this, because I wasn't part of the leadership meeting the last time.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yeah, sorry about that, Peter. This is Sam again. I just want to cover two things real quick. First off, and apologies, this is on me, I should have covered agenda item one here under the consent agenda. I am currently still in the capacity of interim GNSO rep to the Empowered Community. We're actually waiting to finalize who the more permanent rep is going to be until we have confirmed the new incoming Vice Chair from the Non-Contracted Party House.

So we didn't want to just assume it should be Ashley. We wanted to give the new leadership team a chance to discuss this. So that one is still TBD, and I should have just covered that at the top of this agenda. I'm very sorry for that.

On the second one, we have a motion here to adopt the recommendations report for the Latin Script Diacritics Policy Development Process. So this is the report that comes after the working group delivers their final report. Staff puts together a report for the GNSO Council to send to the ICANN Board. So, Peter, I believe you just need to tee that motion up for us.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you for that, because I don't want to speak off the point. So this is for Council to consent to this agenda. So based

on what Sam has said and the interim appointment that Ashley is going to be filling, then the Council needs to consent to this agenda. So that said, I will ask Terri to move us to vote on this item. Terri, over to you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. And just to confirm we're on the same page, the motion to confirm the GNSO rep for the Empowered Community has been canceled, and we're only voting on the motion to approve the GNSO Council recommendations report for ICANN Board regarding the final recommendations from Latin Script Diacritics PDP, correct?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's correct, Terri.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Correct, yeah.

TERRI AGNEW: Perfect. Just double-checking everybody was on the same page. Also, just to note, Farzaneh Badii and Vivek Goyal have now joined. The only one missing from the vote at this time will be Benjamin Akinmoyeje, so I just wanted to make sure that everybody was aware of that.

So here we go, folks. Would anyone like to abstain from this motion? Please say "Aye." Hearing no one, would anyone like to

vote against this motion? Please say "Aye." Hearing none, would all those in favor of the motion please say "Aye."

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Aye.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Aye.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Aye.

ALAN WOODS: Aye.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Councilors holding proxy, so Nitin Walia for Susan Mohr, please say "Aye."

NITIN WALIA: Aye.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. With no abstention nor objection, the motion passes. Back to you.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Terri. Okay. Yeah, over to you, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Sorry about that. Thanks for bearing with us, guys. We're still figuring out how to do this. So I appreciate your patience with us, and sorry for the slightly bumpy ride on that first one. We will revisit the GNSO representative to the Empowered Community, like I said, at a later time.

With that, I think we can go into agenda item four here, which is going to pass over to Sebastien Ducos to give his report from the past year as liaison from the GNSO Council to the GAC. As a little bit of background, especially for some of our new Councilors who have joined, I'll just note that the GNSO Council liaison role was initially piloted a little while ago from between 2014 and 2016, and the purpose of that role is to facilitate earlier GAC engagement in the GNSO's policy development.

And that pilot went well enough that the liaison became a permanent role and now serves as a really important link between our two groups. It's a point of collaboration, and I think given our conversations at ICANN87 and over the past year, we've seen a lot of value out of this role.

So the goal here is for the liaison to facilitate the exchange of information, provide timely updates, and also to respond to

questions from the GAC, which then in turn helps keep us as GNSO Councilors informed on the relevant things that the GAC is working on and developments that might impact our work. So as part of his responsibilities, the liaison is responsible for providing us with an annual report summarizing the past year, and that is what Seb is going to walk us through today. So Seb, over to you whenever you are ready.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: All right, thank you, Sam. This can be a very short exercise in the sense that we've discussed this already twice in the last four months, but not specifically this report, so I'll just walk you through very, very quickly. So I submitted the report, I want to say, two months ago. It was at some point in September. For those of you who weren't Councilor yet, it's in the agenda and you would have been able to see it.

So just in a few slides, this is my second annual report. It covers Dublin, Mumbai, and the ramp up to Bali. I am the GNSO Liaison to the GAC. There are two liaisons from the GAC coming our way. They don't participate directly in council work. They usually attend those calls and they might be on the call today. If not, they usually listen, so quick shout out to Manal and Rita, who are my counterpart on the GAC side. And next slide, please.

So again, I wrote this in September, so it was before Bali, covers Dublin, Mumbai, and Seville. We've looked at a number of topics. They're basically the topics that we're working on, usually matched by work on the GAC side.

The only topic that has emerged in the last year that wasn't directly ours to start with, but more of a sort of a GAC ask, is the topic of the 15-day verification, which is part of an ongoing conversation that's been going on for years about accuracy, and that's why I put it under the two labels.

Other than that, the GAC basically follows our work, looks at what we're doing, and gives pointers when they feel like it. Usually these come in the shape of issues of importance and not items of interest, as I said earlier. I got the term wrong and got a bit flustered. The issues of importance are part of the GAC Communique, and we may talk about those shortly after.

Next slide. So one of the main aspect of what I was trying to bring to this role when I first jumped on two years ago was to create bridges between the different working groups on the GAC and our working groups, to make sure that the conversation could happen intersessionally and not wait until we're in plenary in front of mics and cameras to discover what each other is doing. And to that extent, I have created links essentially presenting people, sharing addresses, and I have to say that for the first year of that exercise, there was little movement. There was with the group of the Internet Governance.

You would have remembered that last year was a big year with WSIS+20. And so there, there was a lot of interaction and regular calls between their group and our group. It was a working group within the Council. It wasn't work that the Council was directly managing, but there was enough interest at GNSO level to make sure that we were following that. And there, those groups were

pretty engaged. This year a lot less, simply because the agenda didn't call for it.

The other groups of big activity are DNS Abuse and Registration Data Accuracy, which is a big topic for the GAC, and they're following our work and even participating at our work.

The last group is Human Rights. This is more of an ask actually from us and from the civil society side of our groups in the GNSO. I have to say that there is reaction from the GAC, but there's little engagement from that side. Maybe something I should be working on in the next few months, but I'll see that with those interested within Council.

Next slide. So, in Seville, we had a bit of a breakdown, a communication breakdown in the lead-up to Seville. A few things happened at the same time, including the fact that early on, the GAC announced or shared with us the fact that given the tight agenda, they didn't have time to meet with us.

And then later on in the calendar, suddenly felt like we needed to meet over the 15-day verification topic. And it just created a bit of confusion. Things arrived possibly a bit too late for us, and particularly as a topic that concerned registrars very much more than Council in general, the back and forth between the groups. Sorry, the little amount of time that we had was probably not spent the best way. And as a result, there was a bit of confusion and a bit of reproach from the GAC saying that we came to the discussion table unprepared, which wasn't true. But at the same time, it was what it was.

And so over the course of the summer, we've changed a bit the way we're engaging, we pushed the bridges that I discussed before to make sure that people were actually engaging more and inviting them. Instead of having those groups talking to each other, there was a bit more sort of organizational takeover both from the liaison and from the different ICANN org teams here to help and facilitate the conversation.

And we had a few discussions on those topics or the topics that were to be prepared for Bali during the course of the summer and in September, which meant that we arrived in Bali a lot more prepared for this, and the whole conversation went a lot smoother. I see a hand up, Ashley. Did you want to intervene?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, I just wanted to correct the record a little bit. For Seville, we were very much prepared. They didn't like what we had to say. So I would just make that little bit of a change there because I don't want it to sound like registrars were unable to be prepared because I believe that we were. The message was not well received. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You're right. Sorry, you're absolutely right. What I wanted to note is that there was little time given to that conversation, and the registrars in particular had to, not to scramble, but had to haste a conversation that they would have loved to have a bit more time to have. Sorry, I absolutely take that. Next slide.

So going forward, we need to and we keep those regular calls between the liaisons, but also encouraging those calls between the peer, the topic peers, to make sure that everybody's on the same page and we're following each other. The earlier warnings, so again, don't send across each other's tables, and this goes also for us when we're sending them questions, questions at the last moment.

We have to understand that both groups involve a lot of moving parts, a lot of people who all have an opinion and want to be able to express it, and the shorter time we give the other party to react, the less efficient it's going to be. Sorry. We keep also the communique response, and I'll talk about it in a second, specifically about the one coming out of Bali.

One of the items that my predecessor, Jeff Neuman, really insisted on during his tenure was for the GNSO to respond to Issues of Importance. This is a section within the GAC Communique where the GAC not only relates the work that they've been doing, but express opinions on that work and the work of others in the community. This wasn't in terms of bylaws or in terms of rules that we have between our different groups. This is not specifically something that originally was for us to respond to. It was just more sort of informational for the rest of the community.

But we have agreed to formally respond to those, and we have been doing those responses for a few years. There was a bit of pushback originally from the Council, who was ready to respond to GAC advice, which that is a formal duty, by providing essentially where the GNSO stands on the topics discussed in GAC advice.

But we have also now, for the past few years, prepared that response to the Issues of Importance, which I feel is very important, again, because it's not advice. It's a way also to be able to share information between the two groups and how the feelings are going on different topics. It serves as a form of escalation.

I think that we should read those Issues of Importance always with a fine-tooth comb to make sure that we don't miss any of the, particularly in the more diplomatic terms that the GAC use. Sometimes they mention things in short sentences that actually have a lot of meaning. And so we need to do this with intent, even if it's not technically in our rules or the rules of engagement between the two groups.

I would strongly encourage that we continue doing this. I don't think that it's been questioned, but I strongly encourage that we continue doing this, and maybe actually at some point add it to the role, and I'm not sure that it's in the latest version of the role to do that.

It is in the role of the liaison to conduct the response to the GAC Communique, but it doesn't say specifically Issues of Importance, which are not, if I remember well, technically part of our work, or the way the GAC advises. With this, I have I think only one last slide, which is about opening the mic for questions. Hi, Farzaneh, I see your hand up.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, hi. So, you had on your other slide that GAC engagement with our human rights questions was not very -- it was very one-way, we would ask them questions.

And I remember the past two meetings -- no, sorry, it was in Mumbai that we asked how they do a human rights assessment, if they do a human rights assessment, and they said that, "Oh, yeah, well, we don't, but how about you work on intellectual property and fraud as the two other human rights as well." And then the last meeting when we asked them what are the practices for the registrant's rights and also end user rights, because if the registrant is affected sometimes, the end user cannot access the websites of their choosing and stuff like that.

And the GAC's reaction to our human rights questions have been really -- they haven't been really prepared to answer our questions, and it got a little bit better the last meeting, especially in chat, when we were discussing, "So what are your practices in each jurisdiction and stuff like that?" They were a little bit more forthcoming. I know that we are not seeing any kind of momentum on human rights, but I would like to see human rights be added to that issue of DNS Abuse. I'm not so sure about accuracy. I think that was somebody's passionate topic that they wanted to discuss.

Also, another thing that I'd like to say is to have an honest conversation with GAC, considering they have a new leadership, to mention the concerns that we had about asking for a bilateral meeting in order to discuss a policy issue that was very much a community thing that should have been done, and it kind of came across as circumventing multi-stakeholder process.

And I like the capacity building plan for the GNSO. This is what at NCSG we wanted to do as well, to tell them a little bit about human rights impact assessment, but GNSO capacity building session for GAC would be really good because last time I heard that they had 94 new members. So these people don't really know us. So anyway, thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So going backwards in the 94, I think it was a quote from me, and I think I exaggerated a bit. I can't remember what the number was, but it was in the 60s. Still a high number of new members, or new representatives. Most of them were already GAC members, but the actual human being representing switched, and that's a lot of them year on year. For the conversation about human rights, I tend to agree with you.

The question was asked, and the response was a bit ad hoc. And I encourage you, and I'm ready to help, but I think that we need to have those conversations again, not so much offline, but in the interim. They have a group that deals with human rights, and I've introduced you to those two members so you know who they are. We need to engage more with them and make sure that they also prepare the answers and that the answers are not given just, again, ad hoc on the mic just because we seem to have surprised them with it. The questions were sent.

As always, I encourage to send the questions early so they have real time to prepare for them. Those were sent within the normal time for document sharing, so that was fine. But we need to have more conversations. If that is a topic that you want to follow, we

need to have more conversation directly with the group involved. The last bit is about the new leadership. Indeed, there is a new leadership on the GAC and on our side.

We've discussed in Bali having a call between the two leaderships. This hasn't been scheduled, but we need to do this now. And so we can present Sam and him. I think that you know each other, but possibly in that role, and see where the priorities are for the two groups. I know the new leadership on their side was very keen to do that. I've heard from Sam that she is too. So it's just a question of organizing. Peter, I see your hand up.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you, Seb. Thanks for sharing your strategy with us. So just wanted to touch on the GAC capacity building. Wanted to hear your thoughts and how we intend to do this, since the Council have actually agreed on it's essential for us to develop GAC capacity to understand GNSO processes and priority. So how do we intend to advance this?

Do you have a roadmap or a strategy in mind that can help to engage GAC on GNSO priority and processes and continue? We don't want this to be a one-time agenda, but some things that can be in place as a process that can help to continue to educate GAC on GNSO process and priority. Do you have a strategy in mind or something that you're thinking that can enable us to ensure this is effective? Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: So this is a topic that I bring back on a regular basis. There is a bottleneck. There's a capacity problem, and it's not on our side. We've offered to go and do these every time, and every time, or most of the time, it doesn't make it on the schedule. Essentially, they have only a few sessions at the beginning of each ICANN to do that capacity building, and the number of topics that they have to review are wide. And so we don't make it on the agenda most years. It's a shame.

I've proposed also intersessional. I have proposed to, sorry, to present to maybe not the GAC plenary, but at least the new members that want to join. I've proposed to record webinars. I've made several propositions. We need to keep on following on this.

But the general feeling on the GAC side is that there's so much that they already have to go through that they don't want to put any more for us to keep on pushing, and I'll keep on pushing that item. I think it's quite important for them to understand that. I see your hand up. We're going to make it quick because Sam is already taking the mic away from me. Go ahead, Pete.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thank you, Seb, for that. So just a proposal. Our GAC meeting with GAC, if there is a way we can make that also educative, I know that this is for us to engage with GAC on what GNSO is doing on processes and our work. It would be good if we can make this a kind of educational purposes for them, since GAC doesn't want to have anything more on their plate, so we can find a way to be creative in how we engage with them in our meeting. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Yeah, again, those meetings usually the agenda is pretty tight. There's little room to -- But I'm all for it. I'll keep on pushing. Sam, I'll be quiet and give you the mic back, and thank you for the time.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Seb, and this is Sam again, everyone. I really appreciate you walking us through this, Seb. I think that having the opportunity to look back at the full year when we have a little bit of distance from an ICANN meeting is a really good opportunity, and I promise this is not the end of this conversation. We will definitely revisit it. But in the interest of time and sticking to our agenda, we will table the update on the Communique response for ICANN87 to AOB at the end of the call. So I appreciate it, Seb.

Next item we have up is going to be an update on the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 from the chair of that working group, Paul McGrady. Paul, thank you for being here with us today. I'm going to give a very short backgrounder for everyone to get ready for this item. So as a reminder, this PDP was initiated in December of 2025, and we as the Council adopted the charter in January of 2026.

So the working group has dutifully done its work, produced an initial report for public comment in August of this year, and then following that held four different working sessions at ICANN87 to work through those public comments, and is getting very close, as far as I know, to developing its final report. That final report is

projected to contain eight proposed recommendations and six different items for implementation guidance. And so Paul is going to walk us through those items today.

What I really need everyone on this call to focus on, I need you guys to lock in here, because after we receive this report, we will have the opportunity to review it, and the purpose of us scheduling this update for November is to lay the groundwork for us to be able to vote on the final report potentially during our December meeting, which will, I think, officially set a land speed record for an ICANN PDP of this caliber.

So I really need you guys to be focused in on Paul's presentation, please, and also note that this is your opportunity to ask any follow-up questions and dig into the discussion a little bit following Paul's presentation. I would love for us to be able to be in a position to vote for this in December if we are all comfortable doing so. So that's your assignment for now. Paul, I know that you are going to be compelling as always. I'll hand the mic over to you whenever you're ready.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Appreciate that, Sam. All right, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, Council. I'm having fond memories and a little bit of PTSD from these calls, so it's always good to be back. I'm going to walk you through the scope of the PDP, the overall final recommendations, and then we'll have some Q&A time. So let's go ahead and jump right in.

All right. So the problem we were trying to solve is that malicious actors often register multiple related domain names, and currently only the reported domain names need to be investigated. There is no obligation to review the wider portfolio. Of course, many of the registrars that we all know and love already do associated domain name checks, but there's no contractual obligation to do that, and we're trying to bring the other registrars up to the same quality level as the registrars that we know and love.

The policy goal is a new requirement for registrars to proactively check associated domain names linked to malicious actors and domain names. So in terms of deliberations, we had some very basic things to do. We had to define the trigger. When would an ADC check be necessary? What is the scope of the ADC check? For example, do we want witch hunts or do we want narrowly tailored ADC checks that are meant to actually bring back good information?

The timelines: do we want those to be short, do we want them to be long, do we want them to be reasonable, prompt? What was the timeline? Safeguards: we spent quite a bit of time on safeguards for registrants and worked those out. The documentation that registrars will need to think about in terms of being able to show compliance with the new policy.

And then lastly, metrics. Metrics is sort of a euphemism for review. How do we know, what are we going to measure to know whether or not the policy has had a positive effect? So because it's the right thing to do and because it's an ICANN requirement, as part of this, we worked through the human rights impact, the global public impact, impact on consensus policy, and data

privacy considerations, and that is a document that is going along with the recommendations.

So that's what we did. Let's get into the actual recommendations themselves. We only had a handful, but I think they're good. Let's start with number one. We looked at the ADC trigger.

Recommendation 1: a registrar must perform an ADC when it has actionable evidence of DNS Abuse under the RAA. And compromised domain names are excluded from this. In other words, we've worked so long over the 20 years we never came up with a name for this person, so I'm just going to say the actual owner of the domain name had no idea what was going on.

We've excluded that from the ADC checks. We spent some time in implementation guidance for recommendation one. What counts as actionable evidence, and compromised domains: evidence may be current, recent, intermittent, or recurring, including ceased activity.

And the evidence could come from internal registrar resources or other external sources. And we spent some time defining the compromised domain names in implementation guidance one. The evidence must support the reasonable determination registrar assesses compromised status.

So that's where we ended up landing with implementation guidance one. Recommendation two is about the investigation, and it requires registrars must investigate whether associated domain names are also used for DNS Abuse. And the

investigation concerns domain names associated with the triggering domain name. So that's an investigation requirement.

And the nature of the investigation is found in Rec 2: registrars must review reasonably accessible information in normal operations. Investigations must be practical and proportionate. In other words, we do not want to see a boiling of the ocean and the proverbial witch hunt. The investigation needs to be proportionate in relationship to the nature of the abuse. There is no requirement to generate or access information that is not reasonably accessible during this investigation process.

So, for implementation guidance for Rec 3, when we look at the investigation baseline, relevant information categories guide the review. Reseller may undertake ADC steps on accessible data, and there's no prescribed method or obligation to review every category in every case. The registrar remains responsible to conduct the investigation in a reasonable manner.

All right, let's go on to the next slide here. For recommendation 4, this is about determining association between domain names. Registrars must consider reasonably accessible, relevant indicators likely to yield useful information when looking into the association issue. Signals can include account holder data, technical indicators, and coordinated activity, and they are all very case-specific. There's simply no way to bake in all the association indicators into a policy.

The policy would be old the minute we shipped it, so we have made this flexible on purpose. Implementation guidance: we put in here illustrative association indicators. So examples are same

customer or account, shared infrastructure, naming campaign patterns, and internal, external intelligence.

These are non-exhaustive indicators, and they vary in weight. One specific indicator may suffice or several may be needed. Again, so because we couldn't bake in what the indicators are, we've tried to put into implementation guidance some examples, but they're non-exhaustive and they're illustrative only, but again, meant to guide the IRT when they implement this.

This then takes us into Rec 5, contractual and legal standards. And this is somewhat straightforward. The ADC check must comply with applicable contractual requirements, including RAA 3.7.2 that has to do with compliance with law. In other words, there's nothing in the policy that requires a registrar to violate their law in order to conduct this. So the policy does not bar lawful use of data, tools, or services normally available to registrars, but it also doesn't compel anything illegal either, of course.

Implementation guidance for Rec 5 has to do with proportional implementation. Registrars should apply associated criteria reasonably and proportionally considering data minimization and false positives. This is part of the safeguards that the working group talked about. These safeguards are non-exhaustive considerations, not separate independent compliance tests. So this just has to do with not overdoing it.

All right. Moving on to the next slide. Recommendation six, this has to do with the timing of the ADC check, and the word "prompt" already existed in the RAA. So we decided to not create new standards. The prompt standard has to do with DNS Abuse

mitigation, so we stuck with registrars must conduct an ADC promptly following the Rec 1 trigger, and the timing depends on the circumstances of each case.

And so with this, since ICANN Compliance knows what the word "prompt" means and they confirmed that, we're sticking with "prompt." And so the relevant factors may include the severity, immediacy, or imminent harm, scale, complexity, and available information. And we also have to consider operational realities and potential collateral impacts. Those are again part of all the safeguards that the working group worked on together here.

We're told by the registrars around the table that this can be a bit of an orchestra, where you may do this or you may do that or you may not do the other thing depending on not wanting to tip the hand to the bad guys right away, and to be able to deal with a broader scheme. All those things were considered by the working group, and that's one of the reasons why when you're seeing things like "promptly" and you're seeing non-exhaustive, illustrative factors, it's to give the registrars the freedom they need to keep us all safe.

All right. Recommendation number 7, this is about reviewing the policy outcomes. This one says that icann.org should review the resulting policy two years after its effective date, using both qualitative and quantitative information.

The IRT is going to help refine metrics and baseline, and we note that changes in overall DNS Abuse may be difficult to correlate to this policy alone. If it goes down, I hope the policy helps it go down, but there may be a thousand other factors that helped it go

down. Likewise, if it goes up, we can't declare our policy a failure just because the bad guys got a new piece of technology and it helps them abuse at scale. So that's just a sort of caveat there.

Potential review data sources in the implementation guidance: non-exhaustive sources include domain-level evidence-based lists, registry's own passive DNS data, compliance and auditing reporting. So the registrars are only required to use available appropriate sources. No new data obligations are created by Rec 7, and they can obviously publish aggregated data. We'd like that where it's lawful and feasible for them to do that. So that's Rec 7 having to do with measurement of policy outcomes or a baked-in two-year review.

And then lastly, recommendation eight: demonstrating compliance. Registrars must show compliance through records and documentation and maintain an internal ADC process description. There is no prescribed evidence format. The process description must be available to ICANN on its request, and really whether or not ICANN Compliance is happy with a registrar's demonstration of compliance, it will go to ICANN compliance staff to sort of work that out. So I know it says Rec 6 to 7 at the top, and we've got Rec 8 here. Is there another slide? There is not. Okay. And so those are the recommendations.

Now I want to walk you through the things that we did based upon public comment. And at a high level, I would like to say we handled public comment a little bit differently this time, instead of burning ICANN87 going line by line through 83 comments, many of which were duplicative of each other, many of which were

suggesting that we do things or talk about things that we already spent a lot of time talking about and doing and had discarded.

Instead, leadership, with staff's help, put together the public comment summary, encouraged the working group, in fact insisted that the working group read every single public comment on their own, and be ready to challenge leadership if they felt like something was not included that should have been. The GAC members were especially good at this. They did challenge us, and we did talk about things that leadership had not given the attention that the GAC thought it should get.

I think there may have been a couple of others that also did the same, but it was much more of a do-your-homework, we're a grown-up working group, we're not going to spend endless hours reading 83 public comments together.

So we had a summary, we walked through it. The outcomes from that: for Rec 1 on the ADC trigger, we clarified actionable evidence and the compromised domain name definition, so that was an important upgrade after public comment.

For Rec 2, we clarified the wording on conducting the investigation in alignment with ADC requirements. Again, a good upgrade.

Rec 3, we reviewed additional specificity proposals, retained the original flexible approach though, so the public comments pushed us to examine it, though we ultimately ended up where we started, which is perfectly fine.

Rec 4, after public comment, we clarified that indicators are non-exhaustive and may carry different weight, and we added some

examples. So again, that was a good upgrade from public comment.

Rec 5 on safeguards, we refined the obligations, proportionality, and data minimization sections, and we clarified the role of safeguards. So again, good upgrade from public comments.

Rec 6, timeline for ADC: after public comments, we clarified that ADCs must be conducted promptly and added relevant considerations. So again, good upgrade from public comment. Rec 7, we significantly clarified the review objectives and the two-year starting point, metrics, and data sources.

So Rec 7 the public said needed some work, so we gave it some work. So good upgrade from public comment. And Rec 8, we considered proposals on new records for demonstrating compliance. Ultimately, we retained the existing compliance obligations in Rec 8, so Rec 8 really wasn't edited very much from public comment.

So public comments were robust. I think it was 83, if I'm getting the number wrong, I'm sorry. We had inputs from people who had never had public comments before. And so, oh, Feo says 42 submissions. Well, at least you guys know when I'm bragging about how many fish I caught over the weekend, you should divide it by about half.

So there were 42 submissions. But some of them were lengthy, and some of them were from new people. And so I thought it was great, and I think we shaved off a significant amount of time by handling public comments this way, and so for future PDP chairs, I

encourage you to get together with staff and have them talk to you about how they did it this time. It may not be right for the next PDP, but it seemed to work pretty well for us, although we did have some grumbling that it wasn't the same old way, but I think we were able to move that along.

So, okay, let's get on to the how did we get here. All right. So, we had 35 working group meetings, we had 12 ICANN sessions together at 85, 86, and 87. We had three community webinars with progress updates and Q&A. 42, there's the number, public comment submissions during one public comment period. We had two Council updates, progress, outcomes, and next steps.

So on deliberations, we went from charter questions via a collaboration document and worked that collaboration document as a rolling live document through the process. We then moved into preliminary recommendations with a "can and cannot live with" exercise. We had five reads of the initial report. We had community feedback in ICANN86 sessions, webinars, and public comment process, and then a public comment treatment.

As I mentioned, we put together a review tool, clustered the inputs, we used our time together at ICANN87 to review them, tracked those changes, and then a finalization on the revised recommendations and rationale, followed by two final report reads, and hopefully we'll be going to Council soon. I apologize, we're in the consensus call phase right now, I think there's a slide here. So the consensus call will start November 13th, and we will seek consensus on the recommendations.

Right now, leadership has them down as full consensus. If we have pushback, we may have to modify the consensus designations a bit. If all goes well, the report will go to Council December 1st or earlier, and then y'all hopefully can consider it on December 17th at that meeting.

Obviously, we can't prescribe that you guys do anything, but we're hoping you do because we'd like for this to keep going on track and would love it if it ended up with the Board within one year of kickoff, actually less than one year of kickoff, from the PDP's first meeting.

Let's go back to the other slide if we can that I skipped just now because I think it's important. So the key takeaways right now is that leadership believes that the report is mature and stable. It's been through multiple reads, extensive deliberations. We've refined it, we resolved key issues, we went through meaningful public comment review, and as we talked about, the related comments were clustered to address underlying issues. Targeted changes were made where warranted from public comment.

In fact, more recommendations than not had changes after public comment. We considered practical implications around community and ICANN org input, especially in relationship to compliance, enforceability, implementation. Those were all looked at closely, and as I've said on the following slide, it's on track for Council consideration.

Now, that having been said, consensus calls are always interesting, so we'll see what happens. It is my personal hope that the various alliances and compromises and horse trades that went

down all through this working group are in fact honored by the working group members at the consensus call. But never count chickens before they hatch. But I think that we are as on track as we can be. I think that may be it. I feel like I've spent a lot of time, and I hope I didn't cause you problems, Sam, with your calendar. I'm happy to answer any questions.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: No worries, Paul. We will manage the time as we need to. I would love to have, we'll say at least 10 minutes right now for questions, and I think that'll keep us on track for our schedule. So I'll let you manage the queue if you're comfortable with that.

PAUL MCGRADY: Sure, that sounds great. Lawrence.

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: Thank you, Paul, for your leadership of this particular work, and for all that you have been able to brief Council on so far. Kudos to your leadership, and definitely this is a record that has been set, and kudos to all who have joined in the process.

I believe that in the course of this work, talking about the PDP, there would have been certain outcomes perceived or intended that were not deliberated on or addressed because they seemed to be out of scope. Would you want to speak to anything you feel Council should consider or reconsider further work around this particular track of associated domains check if there were a future opportunity to improve this process?

And I know that there had also been some kind of discussions with different DNS Abuse PDPs down the stream, how would you advise Council to keep track of changes so that we don't have clashes coming out of the policy development? Thank you again.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Lawrence. So I'll do even better than addressing the things that we indicated or that we found that we thought were useful ideas, but out of scope. Your Council liaison, Jen, is going to be sending a letter to Council. That letter will have captured all the things that the working group thought were important, good ideas that were raised, but were out of scope of our particular charter. And that letter is currently under review. I'm the bottleneck on that.

But that will be passed along to you at some point soon. But there were quite a few good ideas, but our charter was narrow, and we were glad for the narrow charter. We thought that Council did a great job giving us a narrow charter that we could actually get this done on time. It was a good charter. So we had to stay in scope. That's on its way.

In terms of advice about the next PDP and how not to have collisions, I don't know the answer to that other than we had an amazing Council liaison in Jen. And because Jen sits on Council, she has the full view of everything that Council is doing. And so I think that the real key for Council is to really have a very strong Council liaison to the PDP who's active and involved and helps leadership move things along and make sure that they're not colliding with other work. All right. Peter. Hi.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Hi, Paul. Can you hear me right?

PAUL MCGRADY: Sure can.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Yeah, thanks for this. This is an impressive result, and thanks for your leadership and the work that the group has done. This is very impressive. So, wanted to just pick your thought and also follow up with the questions that Lawrence asked. We know that there are out-of-scope areas for further deliberations.

However, so I call it dependency, what are the dependencies that may actually affect the implementation of some of the recommendations that the group has actually come up with, so that we know that because this is a crucial topic and fighting DNS Abuse, and if there are other areas that are not targeted or maybe implemented or that are difficult to implement because of dependency, then it's something that we might need to look into?

So can you talk more about that, and while we are waiting for the letter that details those issues, maybe we can hear from you and what you think or what the group thinks about those dependencies?

Then the second question that I would like to pick your thoughts on, those recommendations are good, and I know that there are interactions that have happened with ICANN Org, implementation

groups on that. So how does the group actually measure each of these recommendations in terms of implementations and it's addressing DNS Abuse? Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. So the first question is easy to answer. There is nothing in the letter of out-of-scope things, out-of-scope ideas that would create a dependency on the implementation of this ADC check policy. They're just really good ideas that were out of scope. So that's an easy answer.

As far as dependencies, other independent dependencies, I don't see any independent dependencies other than a positive consensus call, followed by a positive vote by Council, followed by a positive vote by the Board, followed by implementation by a staff-led IRT. And so if those things happen, then this policy is ready to go and can be implemented without any dependencies.

All right. Any other questions for me? Don't want to cut it off too early, but if there are no hands, I will do what my trial advocacy professor told me to do, which is sit down and shut up. All right, Sam, back to you. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Paul. I really appreciate you taking the time to walk us through the recommendations today, and I will just join in the chorus of voices who will thank you for your guidance and leadership in this PDP. Thanks to Nick as well. And also thanks to everyone who participated in this PDP and got us where we are today.

I know that it can be taxing to work very quickly and stay on a strict time schedule, so I really just want to extend my appreciation to everyone who volunteered and participated in that group. Are we sure we have no other questions for Paul before we let him go today? Okay. Oh, well, there we go. All right, Farzaneh, Alan, and Peter, and then I will close the queue on this topic.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Sam. Hi, Paul. I put it in chat, but I want to know if as a part of the report, I think generally they do that in the public comments analysis, but I think we need a section on which comments were not incorporated and why. I think that that's a part of the report. I just wanted to make sure because it was not part of your slides. You just talked about what changes were made as a result of the public comment. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Farzaneh. So that is not part of the final report. I do know that there is a public comment tracking tool, and it is on the wiki. So I encourage you to look there. All right, Alan.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, and sorry for a late question on this, but I was percolating. I suppose the biggest question for me, and thank you very much, obviously, for everything. I know how difficult a task this is and especially working on the DNS Abuse side of things. But I suppose my question is about the enforceability, and I'm going directly to the charter questions and the charter

specifically about ensuring that there was specificity in the language to ensure enforceability. You've gone through there.

There is a lot of necessary kind of, I suppose, gray within the recommendations that are through the "shoulds" and the "mays" versus the "musts." Are we satisfied, and I think this is something that the Council and the different SGs need to think about, are we satisfied that ICANN Compliance are in a position to enforce this?

Is this meeting the requirement of the charter? And is there an enforceability issue there, and if not, can we just address that and make sure that that's off the table, put it to bed straight away? Because, again, this will, as there's two years already in this of a review, and it will fall on two years if that enforceability is not met. So I just want to make sure that we're all thinking about the enforceability aspect of that and having that question. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, thanks, Alan. I remain extremely hopeful that the IRT will be able to move faster than two years. It is a very narrow policy. It is the first of its sort of, I heard somebody call it a micro PDP. I'm a little afraid that that will become a McGrady PDP, so let's stick with micro PDP. And so hopefully the IRT doesn't take its usual two to nine years. But in this case, yes, we had worked with ICANN Compliance all along the way, and they have signaled clearly and unambiguously that they have what they need for enforceability. So I think we are in good shape there. All right.

Well, no other hands, I'm going to just say huge thank you to my vice chair, Nick Wenban-Smith. He did fantastic work. He

stepped in when I couldn't be there. He helped move things along, worked enormously in the background.

I've already said Jen was the best Council liaison I've ever dealt with. She killed it. She helped keep us on track. She helped keep us intellectually honest, really fantastic. John and Feo from staff, ridiculously amazing, on the spot, moving it along, getting work done. And I also would like to thank the various people groups because they're not all constituencies or stakeholder groups because we had ALAC and GAC and everybody else.

But all the different groups that sent their representatives. This was a representative model. And they sent their best people, and I firmly believe if you send the best people to do the work, it gets done. So thank you to everybody that participated and to the groups that sent them. Now, I'm going to sit down and shut up, Sam. I thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Paul, and I promise we're not going back for round three, because we do have to move on at this point. So thank you, everyone, thanks for the questions, and Paul, thanks again for being here to chat with us. Getting ready to embark on our next agenda item. We are going to have a presentation from Marc Anderson, who has been chairing the SSAD, that's the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure, Supplemental Recommendations Team.

So again, I'll set the scene a little bit here by just reminding everyone that back in March 2026 around our ICANN public

meeting in Mumbai, the ICANN Board opted not to adopt the original SSAD recommendations that had come out of the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2. Subsequent to that action, we as the GNSO Council initiated a supplemental recommendations process and pulled together a Supplemental Recommendations Team, which began their work on May 12th of this year.

The SRT has now modified many of the recommendations that were originally contained in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report, and we have published those modified recommendations for public comment just a mere two days ago on November 10th. So Marc is here to provide an overview of the Supplemental Recommendations Team. Many of you will be familiar with this because many of you have been participating on this SRT, but we will definitely have a chance to ask Marc questions about this.

Before I hand the floor over, I want to note one item for your planning purposes. There is going to be a community webinar on the SSAD supplemental recommendations on November 24th at 1300 UTC.

Marc has sent a note to the SRT mailing list encouraging SRT members to be on that webinar. You do need to register in advance to receive the Zoom information. We will drop the link for registration in the chat here again today. Please make sure that you're registering and put that on your calendars. With that, I will hand over to Marc. Marc, whenever you're ready.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sam. Hello, everybody. It's Marc Anderson, and as Sam mentioned, I'm the chair of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team. Thank you for having me here today. As Sam noted, the SSAD supplemental recommendations went out for public comment just two days ago, so the timing is great to provide GNSO Council with an update on those recommendations, on those supplemental recommendations now out for public comment. Next slide, please.

I'll start with just giving a little bit of background. The Supplemental Recommendations Team is not a typical PDP working group. It's chartered a little bit differently. However, we've operated like a working group.

For example, we're not required to have a public comment period or a formal consensus call. However, we're going to do both. We want to treat this like a typical working group and produce supplemental recommendations following the community processes that you would be familiar with for typical PDPs. As we're not a typical working group, we're not starting from scratch. We have 18 original SSAD recommendations. And perhaps most helpfully, we have two years of experience with an RDRS, Registration Data Request System, pilot, which provided data and actual experience operating a request system for non-public gTLD registration data.

There was an RDRS Standing Committee which produced a report providing recommendations informing the SSAD SRT's work and providing a useful starting point to jump-start our deliberations. So our goal is to develop supplemental recommendations based on the learnings from this pilot, the

original SSAD recommendations, and input from the broader community.

Just a quick note, it says one-year Council-set deadline. We don't actually have one year in the SSAD SRT. The goal is to have a final report in front of Council one year from when the ICANN Board rejected the original SSAD recommendations, which was in March of 2026. We didn't have our first meeting, also as Sam noted, until 12 May of this year. So that one-year deadline isn't one year for the SRT, that's one year for the entire GNSO Council process. So quite an aggressive timeline, but we've been working hard to meet that deadline.

Next slide, please. All right, let me talk about the supplemental recommendations themselves. As I noted, we had 18 original SSAD recommendations. The preliminary supplemental recommendations that went for public comment have just 12 in them. And that's for a number of reasons. Some of the recommendations no longer applied. Some of the recommendations we found to be a little bit redundant.

And one of the things that was interesting when the original SSAD recommendations were being developed, duplication was considered a feature. But having some years of implementation experience behind us as sort of an overall GNSO process, we found that duplication, rather than being a good thing, can lead to questions and concerns in implementation and slow down the implementation process.

So where the original SSAD recommendations had some duplication, some intentional duplication in them, as part of our

work, we tried to remove that duplication and streamline the recommendation package. One of the questions I get asked a lot is, what changed? What are the biggest changes moving from the original 18 recommendations to the 12 supplemental recommendations that we've developed?

So I want to highlight those changes here. The first one deals with authentication. The original SSAD recommendations envisioned authentication for all requestors all the time, no matter where you were in the world, no matter who you are, and no matter what your purpose for requesting non-public gTLD registration data is. Accomplishing that is a prohibitively complex and potentially cost-prohibitive exercise.

And so based on the experiences with RDRS, which didn't have authentication at all, we came up with a much more streamlined process where authentication by third-party authentication providers is possible, but not required, and that this would focus initially on a separate process to develop authentication for law enforcement entities globally. That was perhaps the biggest change, but there are a couple of other changes that are worth noting. The second one I'll call out is around automation and this concept from the SSAD recommendations, which was called an SSAD gateway.

All automation or all the concepts of automation from the original SSAD recommendations were removed. I think it's well understood within the SRT that automation just isn't practical in the recommendations themselves, and that any kind of automation would have to be done by the contracted party itself, subject to their individual requirements and jurisdictional

challenges. So any kind of automation that was included in the original SSAD recommendations has been removed. However, there's nothing that prohibits the individual contracted parties from implementing their own automation as appropriate for their individual requirements.

Another change I want to highlight is around financial sustainability. The original recommendations envisioned a full cost recovery model where fees paid by requestors would cover the full cost of operating the SSAD system.

Based on lessons learned from RDRS, it was identified that this wasn't really practical, but the SSAD SRT agreed that some fees made sense, and so they recommended, rather than a full cost recovery model, a process where requestors would offset the cost of operating the SSAD system.

Another thing I want to highlight is around privacy proxy. I'll talk a little bit more about that later, but privacy proxy requests were out of scope of the original SSAD recommendations. However, based on community feedback, it was included in deliberations for the SSAD supplemental recommendations. Let me move on from here, if we go to the next slide, please. Here I want to talk a little bit about the way the SSAD recommendations are structured.

In some ways, I think of the SSAD recommendations in three different buckets. Some of the recommendations are to develop consensus policy that would be applicable to contracted parties. Which of those recommendations apply to contracted parties in how they handle disclosure requests through the SSAD? Some of

the recommendations are to ICANN org for how they should develop the SSAD system itself.

And the last one, just a little bit different, is for the GNSO Council, a recommendation to charter a Standing Committee, which would be responsible for working with ICANN org for ongoing operational questions related to the SSAD system itself, something that was very effective as part of the RDRS Standing Committee, and so that concept is carried forward as part of the SSAD recommendations.

Here on the slide, you see them grouped in a couple different buckets. Recommendations one through five cover the SSAD request process itself: how a requestor would be authenticated, the requirements around submitting a request, requirements around how the request would be routed and tracked.

Then you have important recommendations around request types and response times, their SLAs. And Rec 5 deals with a critical piece of recommendations, obligations for the contracted parties for how they are required to review and make a determination of what to do with disclosure requests.

Then we have three recommendations around accountability and guardrails: what are the agreements and policies, query abuse policies, and financial sustainability recommendations for the operation of the SSAD itself? We have what we're calling the evidence and improvement loop.

These next three recommendations are similar and tightly coupled, but what are the recommendations around logging,

auditing, and reporting on the SSAD system? And the last one I already mentioned deals with the Standing Committee itself, which will advise the ongoing operation of the SSAD system once it's operationalized.

Next slide. So next couple of slides provide a little bit more detail on the SSAD recommendations themselves. I'm not going to read all this. It's available if Councilors want to go through it, but there's a couple things I want to highlight. The first one I'll highlight on this slide deals with Rec 4, request types and service level agreements.

This was hotly debated within the SSAD, I'd say. Maybe hotly debated isn't the right word, but it was something we deliberated on in a lot of detail. And where we landed here was to set the SLAs for the SSAD to be in line with the Registration Data Policy.

And that decision, I think, set the groundwork for a number of other later decisions to take the SSAD recommendations and make sure they were in line with existing policy recommendations, particularly the Registration Data Policy. And so in a lot of cases, the SSAD SRT took the approach of making sure the SSAD recommendations are standardized or in line or in sync with existing policy or contractual obligations on the same topic. Next slide, please.

On this one, once again I want to highlight the financial sustainability item. Rather than a full cost recovery model, we have flexibility for ICANN org to set fees, but we did underscore the point that the data subjects must not bear the burden or the

cost of paying for or funding a system for disclosure of their personal data.

Next slide, please. And here I just want to highlight the Standing Committee. Here I'll say that this was somewhat of a new concept when the original SSAD working group deliberated on the recommendation. In the original SSAD recommendations, this was Recommendation 18.

But we've had some experience since then, and in particular, we had experience with the RDRS Standing Committee, which operated along similar principles and in my view was very successful. It was a very successful and productive collaboration between the RDRS Standing Committee and ICANN org and produced the report and the recommendations that helped inform the SSAD SRT's work. And so we tried to build on that and develop a recommendation in Rec 12 that would take the lessons learned from the RDRS Standing Committee and carry that forward to the SSAD SRT.

Next slide, please. So some of this you've already heard from me as well, but some of the key challenges we had to overcome in the SRT were around authentication, privacy proxy, and financial sustainability.

How to implement this new authentication concept, where instead of having authentication for everybody all the time, we develop a concept where authentication would be possible with third-party authentication providers that would have to integrate with an ICANN-operated SSAD system, was a significant challenge for the group. One of the challenges we had to overcome was how do

we provide sufficient direction, sufficient policy direction, while still giving or still providing enough flexibility for implementation?

So around authentication in particular, this was a tricky balance: how do we provide sufficient policy recommendations while giving enough flexibility for implementation to do its job? I think we landed in a pretty good spot. It'll be interesting to see what kind of public comments we get around authentication. But that was a challenge that I think any working group faces: how do you balance providing sufficient policy recommendations while allowing flexibility for implementation? But I think nowhere was that more acute for our group than in the authentication recommendation.

Moving on to privacy proxy, I think if you asked me what the single biggest challenge of the SRT was, it was privacy proxy. I think we spent more time on this topic than any other. As I already noted, privacy proxy was out of scope of the original SSAD recommendations.

However, based on community feedback, what we heard from the Board and the GNSO Council, it was clear that we needed to consider privacy and proxy as part of our deliberations. But how to incorporate privacy and proxy into the SSAD's work was, in my view, the biggest challenge we faced. And here again, we decided to, I'll say, standardize our recommendations on the ongoing privacy proxy implementation work from the PPSAI IRT.

And so where we landed is to require that contracted parties consider disclosure requests for privacy proxy registrations, and that any of the obligations that are developed under the PPSAI

IRT will apply to SSAD disclosure requests. So where we landed is we're not creating new or separate obligations for how to handle disclosure requests related to privacy proxy registrations. What we're doing is synchronizing the considerations for those disclosure requests with the policy that's ultimately developed by the PPSAI IRT.

And I think that compromise will serve the community well moving forward. We'll have a single path or a single set of requirements for how disclosure requests for privacy proxy registrations are handled or considered, whether they go through the SSAD or not. But that was, in my view, one of the biggest challenges we had to face. And finally, I want to highlight once again the financial sustainability piece.

The Operational Design Assessment that was produced for the original SSAD recommendations provided detailed analysis on the financial sustainability. It had very high cost-level estimates, in large part because of the complexity of developing an authentication system that authenticated all requestors all the time, everywhere, regardless of jurisdiction or who the requestor was and what their purpose for requesting data was.

So this was overly complicated and cost-prohibitive. By taking out that piece and relying on third-party authentication providers where it makes sense, we were able to streamline potential cost drivers associated with the original SSAD recommendations.

And we also, based on the lessons learned from the RDRS and the costing estimates that came out of the RDRS, we came to agreement that full cost recovery wasn't the way to go. However,

having some cost charged to requestors to help offset the ongoing operational costs of a future SSAD system made sense. I think this was one of the key compromises that the SSAD SRT came to fairly early on in its deliberations, and I think this is a good balanced path forward that the SSAD SRT was able to develop. Next slide, please.

All right, as far as next steps, next slide. As noted, public comments started two days ago. The public comment period is open until 23 December. As Sam noted, there'll be a community outreach webinar on 24 November, and you do need to register in order to get the link. The SSAD SRT will reconvene in January to review public comments and will be working to submit a report to Council in early March 2027 to meet the goal of finishing our work one year from when the ICANN Board rejected the original SSAD recommendations, kicking off the process of developing supplemental recommendations.

Before I wrap and move to Q&A, I want to thank first all the SSAD SRT members. Paul mentioned in his work that the DNS Abuse PDP was a representative model, and that a lot of the organizations represented sent their A-team. I want to reflect that as well. We have a large and diverse group of members, but we had really great participation. This was an aggressive timeline that we had to face.

It required a lot of involvement, active participation by SRT members, many of whom are GNSO Councilors. So thank you to all of you who participated in the SRT, and all the SRT members that participated in good faith towards producing these recommendations. It was a great group of people to work with,

and I very much appreciate, one, them having to deal with me, and two, their good-faith participation in producing the recommendations that we developed.

And second, I'd be remiss if I didn't thank support staff: Feodora, Steve, Andrew, and Caitlin, who's currently on maternity leave. Had a great group of dedicated staff support who had to put up with me once again. They put in a lot of hours, a lot of effort to help keep us on track and help us meet the aggressive deadlines that we did have. So thank you to all the SRT members and our excellent staff support for getting us to where we are right now. With that, I'll wrap up my planned remarks and open it up to any questions that people have. Farzaneh, please, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADII: Hi, Marc. Sorry, I just couldn't follow up. So there were some issues with the authentication segment, and there were some comments and stuff like that. Did we make many changes to that, or are we going to make it ready for the public comment and then come back to it after the public comment?

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Farzaneh. On authentication, as I already noted, that was one of the most challenging topics we faced. For public comment, we put our, what I like to say is put our best foot forward as far as the language that went to public comment.

There were certainly compromises. I think that some groups wanted to see more, see the language be more explicit, and some groups wanted to see more flexibility for implementation. But the

version that went to public comment is really our best foot forward as far as the language that we think represents a compromise of all groups and accomplishes the goals and what is required for the SSAD.

That said, obviously if we get public comments to the contrary, if new information comes up, or if new issues are identified, we'll consider all of that post public comments and will adjust the recommendation as necessary. So hopefully that helps, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, thank you. So we are specifically interested in, and I'm sorry it's very obvious that I have been ignoring ICANN for a few weeks, but we are specifically interested in, because the authentication, especially the modes of authentication, were a little bit too prescriptive, and now, it mentions password and stuff. So if that has not been changed, NCSG can of course put it in our public comment and we can bring it back to the group when you are considering it. Thanks.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Farzaneh. You mentioned the password example. Once again, that's an area where trying to balance recommendations versus implementation flexibility is tricky. I believe that particular example's a should, so we're trying to give some guidance, but not be too constraining for implementation, but as I said, we'll of course look at public comments and adjust as needed. Lawrence, go ahead.

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: Thank you, Marc, and thanks for all you've done to shepherd this work to the point where we've gotten to. If you will please go back to the second or third slide, it was a slide that had at its second point automation and gateway, and then the third point was financial sustainability. And financial sustainability also came up as, yes, this slide, thank you.

Financial sustainability also came up as one of the three key challenges the SRT is also looking at. And this brings to mind questions that had come up before now and still getting me wondering if this is an issue we can comfortably say has been addressed.

In terms of the automation and gateway, we have successfully swapped that with action that leaves the contracted party making the determination if disclosure should happen. And I believe that there are safeguards in our proposed system to kind of address concerns if there's some discomfort or disagreement, so to say.

But juxtaposing this with the factors of financial sustainability, even where we have third-party accreditation or authentication agents now coming in and helping to cut cost by about 50%, there is also a need to ensure that whatever investments they are making in this particular SSAD version of the system is justifiable by traffic.

Yeah, I think traffic might, excuse my using of the word traffic, but in terms of number of requests and requestors that get to use the system. If there is a high number of requestors, I believe it's a

much more suitable situation. And so, in order not to belabor this point, are we comfortable with what we have right now that it to a large extent guarantees requestors coming to use the SSAD?

Because if there is still the fear that despite the requestors also having to pay a fee to keep the SSAD operational, and they do not get the kind of information they require, they can still go through other mechanisms to request this information outside the SSAD from the contracted parties.

And if the SSAD then does not have the kind of traffic that is envisioned, it would not only be a failure, but would also be a liability on the third parties who are now creating mechanisms for authentication. How can you just speak to how this concern has been addressed so far? Thank you.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Lawrence. It's a great question and one of the biggest questions I think that plagued the original SSAD recommendations considering, as you pointed out, that requestors can't be required, don't need to use the SSAD system. There are other avenues they can pursue, including going directly to the contracted party. And so in order for them to use a system like this, there has to be value. There has to be at least a perceived value to motivate them to use the system. And your question used the word "guarantee," and I'll say no guarantees in life, and I'm not going to guarantee anything here either.

But I'll say that I think the SSAD SRT put its best foot forward, I'll use that phrase again, in developing recommendations to produce

a system that standardizes the request process, creates a single centralized system for standardizing the request process through any gTLD domain, and having a system that has processes and procedures in place for auditing and having escalation paths if any of the processes established aren't followed, and also has reporting and auditing capabilities.

And so, absolutely no guarantees, but we've put our best foot forward in developing a system that provides a single, central, standardized process for requesting non-public gTLD registration data for any gTLD domain that's registered through ICANN-accredited registries or registrars. So I hope that helps. I know that's not necessarily a full answer, but I think that's probably the best I can give you given the question.

LAWRENCE O-ROBERTS: Thanks, Marc. It helps.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right, this is Sam again, guys. I have to jump in because we are rapidly running out of time. We only have 13 minutes left in our agenda, and we do have a couple of AOB items that we do need to get through before we adjourn. So, Marc, thank you very much for joining us. Thanks for taking the questions.

Reminder to please register for the webinar on November 24th, and this work will start up again after the public comment period closes in January. So, Marc, thanks very much for being here. All right, on to AOB. We had tabled an item from Seb on updating the progress on the response to the GAC Communique.

Unfortunately, I think we have lost Seb, so I will ask him to follow up with just a brief update to the Council mailing list for that one. All right.

Item number two for AOB then is the update on our Council Strategic Planning Session in January. So, you all should have just seen an email come out from Terri earlier this week. The SPS is going to take place on Thursday, January 28th and Friday, January 29th, 2027 in Mexico City, Mexico. Councilors, please plan on attending for the full duration of both days. That probably means flying into Mexico City sometime on Wednesday the 27th and departing either Friday evening or Saturday, because we will have a full agenda. We're planning to use the full two days because we have a lot that we want to cover.

The agenda is still a work in progress, but we will share it in advance of the meeting so that you guys will have plenty of advance notice. With that, I'm going to kick it over to Terri, who's going to take us through some more of the logistical items for this. Terri, over to you.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you very much, Sam. Okay, GNSO Councilors, I have submitted your name to ICANN Travel. Please, please, please, once they start sending you information, respond to them in a timely manner. Nothing has been sent out to you yet. I just wanted to give you that, but just keep checking your email. Also, once I get notice something has been sent, I'll send you notification as well so you can go check your emails in case it's missed.

Funded travelers will receive the accommodations paid by ICANN. It's air, economy flight, hotel, and stipend. You can deny or accept any of those that I've listed. icann.org does not allow self-booking if you accept funded travel. So that's your decision.

As Sam had said, please see the emails that have been sent out. One of them was the Community Travel Support Guidelines, so if you're not familiar with that, look for my email I sent this week and take a scan through that so that you're a little more familiar with that.

If you have dietary restrictions, please email us at gnso-secs@icann.org so we can get that accommodated. Reminder for this event, we do not use the main Council mailing list. We use a Council SPS mailing list. So it's the gnso-council.sps@icann.org. So if you're not seeing those, look for that email. As Sam had mentioned, calendar and email invites have been sent. Please check your email.

On Wednesday the 27th, it's likely your arrival day, and that evening we'll offer an informal welcome reception for those that have arrived. Not everybody arrives all the time, but for those that have arrived, that'll be available to you, and we'll have light refreshments and drinks.

The 28th and 29th, as Sam had mentioned, are full working days, but on Thursday the 28th in the evening will be our group activity and a dinner. We do not have that booked yet. It's a work in progress, so more information to come. Friday night the 29th of 2027, it's a free evening for you. There you go. And Saturday the

30th, it's your travel home. Let me know if you have any questions, and if not, back over to you, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Terri. Any questions for Terri? All right, not seeing any, then we can move on to the next item. Jen is going to give us an update on the drafting team work on the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2. That group's working towards finalizing the charter, and this is an update to get us ready to take a vote on this at an upcoming meeting. So Jen, over to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Sam. This is Jen, and hope this update's going to be nice and short and sweet. So, PDP 2 Charter Drafting Team, we just finished our eighth call this Monday, hopefully the last call. We still do have a call scheduled for next Monday, but unless anybody in the actual drafting team really thinks it's needed, please do mention this before Friday the 13th, which is tomorrow. So a little bit of background on this. In July, in the July Council meeting, we gave an update on what the updated PDP 2 charter looks like.

Obviously, it was circulated and all Councils were advised to take this back to their SGs and Cs and different groups to get initial feedback from all of them. So even the liaisons were encouraged to take this back to their communities to get feedback. We got feedback. We also got a lot of interest, of course, from our GAC colleagues who also sent us feedback, which the drafting team took into account as well as we discussed through all of this.

We had made quite a lot of progress on keeping the charter for PDP 2 very narrow. We took all the lessons learned that we did for the chartering efforts for PDP 1 as well as how the PDP working group was working through. Again, this is kind of a delicate balance of making sure we have language in the charter that reflects neutrality, especially when it comes to technology, because for this specific one, it is particularly important.

And then, of course, to make the compromises where we are making sure that we're balancing this well. We're keeping the participation format as representative. And I think there is a good summary of this that was sent on Monday as well from John to the Charter Drafting Team to make sure you take a look through all of those items.

For Council, please expect us to be able to, I guess, ship this charter to you very soon after we finish our final call, which I again hope was the final call on Monday. But I think we're on a really good track. We've taken the lull, I guess, especially the public comment period of PDP 1 to be able to concentrate our efforts, our bandwidth, and our time that we can actually use to engage with our SGs and Cs to look at PDP 2.

So I thank very much the Councilors who have taken the time to contribute significantly to PDP 2. I'll say that the text has been pretty stable for quite a while now, and a lot of the tweaks are really just for clarification and balancing instead of something that is totally out of the blue.

So with that, I'm happy to hand this back to Sam or answer any questions. I saw a hand, but then it dropped. Oh, and now there

are two hands. Okay. Sam, did you want me to run the queue for this?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yes, please, Jen. And let's keep it zippy, guys, we have five minutes.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay, really zippy. Be very concise. First, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: So I did not manage to attend two of the meetings that you had. I'm sorry. And we need to look at the changes that you have done. We talked to NCSG and they had a few issues with the text, but that's around three weeks ago. I don't know what the changes are, but you might receive some recommended changes from us today maybe.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Farzi. Please, please, please do make it today because as you know, we need some time to take a look at all of this. And then Peter, concise if you can, please. Thank you.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI: Thank you, Jen. Peter for the record. Just wanted to acknowledge the work that the chartering teams have done. So I'm not on the group, that's why I wanted to ask this question, because looking at the PDP 1, we treated a lot of subjects out of

scope, which is on remedy in accountability and different things, because these are the things that are supposed to actually form part of the scope when we are discussing any topic or any policy work.

I just wanted to hear your thought whether this is also embedded and the lesson learned from the PDP 1 was actually taken into consideration in terms of the scope and remedy is part of any future policy development works from the GNSO Council. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thank you, Peter. I'm going to try to use 30 seconds to answer you really quickly. All the lessons learned from PDP 1 has been taken into account for the chartering efforts for PDP 2. Certainly, the scope is going to be as focused as you have seen it in PDP 1, but allowing for substantive discussion when the PDP working group actually starts working.

So we're not going to prescribe any formatted kind of responses or narrow that too much so it's actually predetermining the outcome of this, but certainly we are going to keep the narrow focus as we have done so in PDP 1. So hopefully this is going to answer your question on this, and I'll hand this right back to Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Jen. And thanks guys for the questions. We have two minutes left in this call. Damon had asked to provide an update on the IGO and INGO Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP, sorry, IRT. Damon, is two minutes enough or

would you rather send an update over email and put this one on the agenda for December?

DAMON ASHCRAFT: No, I'll go ahead and I'll give a quick update. It's very quick. Do you want me to do that?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Go for it.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Okay. So basically, I went to a meeting after our Council meeting in Bali. And it was the IRT meeting and there were a lot of dispute providers at the meeting expressing concerns over the arbitration provision that we've discussed before.

Big concern I have over that is the dispute providers are pretty concerned about this and they raised a lot of different concerns, and certainly wouldn't want to be in a position where we pass a policy, we don't have a dispute provider that's willing to actually provide the service. I don't think we're at that point yet. I know staff is working on it. So I just wanted to let you know that that's the concern, working it through with staff and stuff, but that's pretty much it. If you have any questions, just shoot me an email, and I am sorry for being so brief, but that's what I have.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: No problem at all, Damon. Thank you for the update on that. Folks, I will defer that if anyone has any questions or wants to

follow up with Damon, please do so over email. We are in the last 30 seconds of our call today.

I want to thank everyone for the time. Thanks for the good discussion. We will meet again in December on the 17th. Please stay tuned to your email for any follow-ups from this call, and I think with that, we can wrap it up just barely on time. Sorry to be a little rushed at the end, folks. We'll do better next time.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Sam.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you, everyone. Job well done for two hours. All right, the meeting has been adjourned. I will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, everyone. Check your emails. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]