

Minutes of the GNSO Council Meeting 16 April 2026

GNSO Council meeting on Thursday, 16 April 2026 at 21:00 UTC: <https://tinyurl.com/38jbydhn>
14:00 Los Angeles; 17:00 Washington DC; 22:00 London; 23:00 Paris; (Friday) 00:00 Moscow; 07:00 Melbourne

List of attendees:

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

Contracted Parties House

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

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Nacho Amadoz (apologies, proxy to Samantha Demetriou),
Samantha Demetriou, Jennifer Chung

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Gaurav VEDI (apologies, proxy to Anne Aikman Scalse)

Non-Contracted Parties House

Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, Vivek Goyal (apologies, proxy to Lawrence Olawale-Roberts), Osvaldo Novoa, Damon Ashcraft, Susan Payne, Susan Mohr

Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Farzaneh Badii, Bruna Martins dos Santos, Julf Helsingius, Peter Akinremi, Tapani Tarvainen, Benjamin Akinmoyeje

Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Christian Dawson

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers:

Justine Chew: ALAC Liaison

Sebastien Ducos: GNSO liaison to the GAC

Antonia Chu: ccNSO observer

Guests:

Sophie Hey GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews

Greg DiBiase and Wes Hardaker - ICANN Board

ICANN Staff:

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

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

Caitlin Tubergen - Director, Policy Development Support (GNSO)

Saewon Lee - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO)

Feodora Hamza - Policy Development Support Manager (GNSO) (apology)

John Emery - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Andrew Chen - Policy Development Support Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Terri Agnew - Policy Operations Senior Specialist (GNSO)

Julie Bisland - Policy Operations Analyst (GNSO)

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

[Zoom Recording](#)
[Transcript](#)

Item 1: Administrative Matters

1.1 - Roll Call

1.2 - Updates to Statements of Interest

1.3 - Review / Amend Agenda

1.4 - Note the status of minutes for the previous Council meetings per the GNSO Operating Procedures: [Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 12 February 2026 were posted on 03 March 2026.

[Minutes](#) of the GNSO Council Meeting on 11 March 2026 were posted on 29 March 2026.

Item 2: Opening Remarks / Review of Projects & Action List

2.1 - Review focus areas and provide updates on specific key themes / topics, to include review of [Projects List](#) and [Action Item List](#).

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, gave a statement as PPSAI IRT liaison that the group is meeting to progress the work. She thanked the Council Small Team to the IRT Threshold questions.

Christian Dawson, NCA NCPH, Latin Diacritics PDP monitoring the situation to square recommendations during Public Comment during ICANN org to address concerns with nothing substantive as of yet with a possibility of getting off schedule if this is not resolved quickly. There are currently no concrete questions to Council, but it is possible that leadership may have concrete questions to bring back to Council.

Item 3: Consent Agenda

- GNSO Review of the GAC Communiqué
- Board Seat 14 (Non-Contracted Party House)
 - Chris Buckridge

Peter Akinremi, GNSO Vice-Chair, introduced the topics and moved to a vote.

All Councilors present voted in favor of the [motion](#).

[Vote results](#)

Action Items:

- GNSO Secretariat to provide the GNSO Council's review of the GAC Communiqué to the ICANN Board [COMPLETED].
- GNSO Council secretariat to notify NCPH and Empowered Community Administration with a copy of the election results [COMPLETED]

Item 4: Council Discussion - Proposed Process to Un-Adopt Approved GNSO Policy Recommendations

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

4.2 - Council Discussion

4.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, introduced the topic for background going through the proposed edits for the PDP and GGP manuals. This is a procedural gap for a lack of a defined process for the board to consider unadopted. This would be in truly exceptional circumstances, with some additional feedback from IPC sent to the list suggesting a bylaws update. Proposed next steps to vote on these for the next

meeting.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, circulated the IPC concerns on the list. Bylaws amendment is necessary and the change in voting thresholds is now required which is not in the bylaws. The other concern is that generally as policy when the GNSO goes through a PDP and get policy outcomes are unadopted because they sit around for years or unhappy with policy outcome try to relitigate. IPC has significant concerns that have been outlined on the list.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, discussion of CCWG when a recommendation is reversed and questioned if it is comprehensive enough to not want to use the CCWG framework. Review of reviews will also have new guidelines and addressing this in PDP manual does not cover those situations that have not been addressed.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, this did come out of the CCG and this is a GNSO process and does not encompass the cross-community groups that raised the process.

Ashley Heineman, RrSG, RrSG reflects the registrar's comments and this is limited to extraordinary situations. Asked Damon to comment on being used to game the system, but it does not appear that it would permit a group to have a second bite at the apple.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, IPC biggest concern is bylaws issue and we should not be adopting policy waiting to implement then have a built in approach to un-adopt them. The second bite of the apple was more his personal comment and not an IPC position. He emphasized that this change should be in the bylaws.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, asked about the IPC public comment about changing voting thresholds and asked Damon to clarify this position.

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, read from IPC comment concerning the supermajority vote. The imposed GNSO process would require a supermajority vote

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, encouraged Councilors to take a look at the IPC comment in preparation for a potential vote during the May meeting

Action Items:

- Leadership and staff to integrate any suggested changes for voting in the May Council meeting.
- Staff to integrate Justine's suggested redline to include the "impact of the Board's intended action" in the PDP and GGP Manuals [COMPLETED].

Item 5: Council Update - SSAD Supplemental Recommendations: Team Composition and Assignment

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

5.2 - Council Discussion

5.3 - Next Steps

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, outlined the process for supplemental recommendations for section 9 of annex A of the bylaws. Joined by Greg and Wes from the Board in case anyone has particular questions for the Board while discussing this. To progress things, the Council has been discussing team composition and what that team should look like. NCSG raised questions and concerns and leadership has responded and hopefully addressed those. There have been no other specific comments on the

composition element of this should be something that can move forward. There had been comments in the Assignment form from Farzi and Anne that have hopefully been addressed by edits and revisions. The main concern expressed about this process has been about the safeguards against creation of new policy. She reminded everyone that this process is in the bylaws for amending recommendations that have already been made and are limited by that previous work. She outlined the concerns and how they have been hopefully addressed. The request for a single Councilor to refer it back to Council seemed a bit too far, as any Councilor can raise anything on the list or for future Council meetings. She opened the floor for discussion on the topic for intent behind Tripti's letter in particular in the four items and Wes volunteered to speak to that issue.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, wanted to ask about the four items requested. NCSG has doubts that those were recommendations by the SSAD and if they were not, she looked forward to Wes's answer on this. She also made the point that if there is a Council member in the group that can bring the issue up to Council information, they should not block progress, but can in parallel bring it up to Council. She wanted that in the assignment form.

Wes Hardaker, ICANN Board, the Board's intent was to communicate the outstanding issues from the community. Clearly this is something the Council is aware of. This is duplicative communication and there is no desire to impede the bottom-up process. The Board continues to listen to the needs of the community to amend the recommendation and do so in a timely manner. The Board is open to the Council going forward the way they see best for these four items.

Greg DiBiase, ICANN Board, the Board thought it would be productive to state their views and the community views from the RDRS report and others as open issues that could be addressed in supplemental procedures and within scope. What is within scope of the work is the GNSO decision, it is just being open for how the issues could be resolved within the policy recommendations that exist. He gave the example of mandatory registrar participation and this is different from the RDRS trial as consensus policy is then mandatory for registrar participation because that is how consensus policy works. He also mentioned Privacy/Proxy as an opportunity to give feedback on how these can be aligned. These are ultimately just the Board's thoughts but the scope is within the GNSO Council's decision.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, thanked them for their helpful comments that the Board was not trying to constrain how the GNSO proceeds.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, sought to clarify the assignment form and the task for the small group would be that it presumes an outcome or that the Board presumes a certain outcome. The Board expects that the team will incorporate the following four elements and these are expected to be implemented. That reads that the small team should not decide whether, but how. It should be phrased in a way to consider the merits of whether these questions should be incorporated, not just how.

Greg DiBiase, ICANN Board, the expectation is the broad areas that should be addressed rather than dictate an outcome. Coupled with the GNSO deciding what is within or out of scope.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, requested the language be amended in the assignment form.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, noted that the subsequent paragraph tempers this a bit, but a slight amendment to the text to make that clearer could be useful.

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, stated that the Board letter is helpful, especially given the Board readiness work done over the past year. It appears the Board believes the four elements identified in its letter are in scope for Supplemental Recommendations. As the Council Supplemental Recommendations Team deliberates, Council needs to be careful to avoid separating out certain issues since SSAD Recommendations were a package and were non-adopted as a package. We would not want to see the Supplemental Recommendations rejected by the Board because of elements being separated.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, the four focus areas in the Board letter that now forms the core of the work for the team to focus on, helps the Council to not sway into other territories of creating new policies or not. He expressed his gratitude to the Board for the level of guidance. The BC is in support of all the actions taken by leadership and would encourage it to stay within the guardrails developed so far. This will help to maintain the outcomes that recommendations will be adopted and improve those areas where the needs have been carved out from. It will help to keep the group focused.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, flagged that the four items are to be considered, but they are not the only elements given that the full suite of SSAD needs to be considered.

Wes Hardaker, ICANN Board, the Board has to consider these points based on the feedback received during the RDRS trial and the implementation. Whether the Council takes on these four items the Board has to figure out. No need to use the word “expect” in the small team document, but the point is that if these four are not addressed at some point, the Board will have to decide what to do one way or another.

Farzaneh Badii, NCSG, expressed her discomfort with the Board addressing these issues and she suggested coming up with another mechanism to see what is in the SSAD recommendations. It is the Council’s job which of the four items need to be discussed and what to do and not delegate it to the Small Team.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, asked if it really matters given that all Councilors can participate. If work is to be done to look at those four items, whether the full Council does it, that would require volunteers vs. the small team. Why would that be a concern?

Anne Aikman Scalese, NCA Non-Voting, appreciated the Board clarifications. In the long run this is better for dialogue for Board readiness and open communication from the Board it improves organizational effectiveness within ICANN for this direct communication. She is grateful for it. This is not a small team. It is a supplemental recommendations team and these four things to be considered would be by the enrolled expertise. With some of the proposed wording changes that can be accommodated we would be going down the right path and send out a CfV and begin working.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, now we have clarity on the intent of the Board mentioning those four items. If those fall within the scope of the supplemental recommendations process then they should be addressed. But the document is good enough as-is for the call for volunteers and the finalized assignment form can come in before the work kicks off.

Action Items:

- Leadership and staff to amend the text in the assignment form that the Board “expects” at multiple locations in the assignment form to indicate it is the Council’s remit to decide what is in and out of scope [COMPLETED].
- Staff to suggest changes based on discussion and to circulate revisions to the document to the Council for non-objection.
- Staff to send the call out for the Call for Volunteers for the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team [COMPLETED]

Item 6: Next Steps on Urgent Requests

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

6.2 - Council Discussion

6.3 - Next Steps

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, shared the following [slides](#) for background. There is generalized community alignment on the timeline and org will publish the updated policy language in the Registration Data Policy. Number two on authentication is currently missing. There is community work in the PSWG on an authentication mechanism. There was some community feedback given that work is not open/transparent, there should be more opportunities for community input. The gap is for there to be an enforceable timeline there needs to be some kind of language around authentication. She outlined the options for authentication on slide 2.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, the reminder of these options on the Council mailing list it seemed that it was coalescing around option 2 with the expectation that if folks do not align around this, then it was time to flag that for Council. There was no feedback to the contrary. This is a final opportunity for strong disagreement otherwise option 2 of supplemental recommendations will be the path.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, queried if this would be a vote.

Caitlin Tubergen, ICANN org, responded that the intent can be handled by a letter to the Board circulated to Council through non-objection. So a vote is not necessary.

Action Item: Council to formally notify the Board of the decision to incorporate authentication as part of the work on Supplemental Recommendations on SSAD and to confirm the urgent request timeline and associated policy language can be published as an update to the Registration Data Policy.

Item 7: Review of Reviews Update

7.1 - Introduction of Topic (Osvaldo Novoa and Sophie Hey, GNSO representatives to the Review of Reviews)

7.2 - Council Discussion

7.3 - Next Steps

Sophie Hey, GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews, shared the following [slides](#) to go through the Review of Reviews CCG. Rather than 5 buckets there are three categories outlined on slide 3. Overall, the idea is to attempt to avoid pileup and to end up with current thinking that Accountability & Transparency along with On Demand would be within the scoping team for tightly scoped reviews along with community buy-in. She continued to outline the details of the proposal throughout the slides on options for Review of Reviews. She outlined the next steps and encouraged Councilors to provide

feedback.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, asked to clarify the 10th of July is Public Comment for the entire work or sections.

Sophie Hey, GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews, replied that it likely should be the end of the work, but that will be the Public Comment date.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, the main thrust of this engagement was to find a solution to the buildup of reviews. How comfortable can the team be that there is a resolution within view? Is there a way forward with the current state of play mitigating all the reviews that need to be done and having a smooth flow. In Mumbai the team touched on for there to be any work on reviews for the GNSO would have to be initiated by the GNSO, and that would fall in the third bucket of structural review, for how this process is treated. Is this to be expected by the July date?

Sophie Hey, GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews, for the pileup the on-demand reviews would be a high threshold for accountability and transparency. Discussions within the group about any number of reviews at a given time perhaps there is only one on-demand review within that cycle. These are current discussions. In terms of GNSO structure, that mechanism coming out of this is a discussion to be continued. This is a band aid review.

Osvoldo Novoa, CSG ISP, clarified that right now the cadence of the reviews is being defined, some think less than 10 years and each SO/AC can initiate its own review if it needs to be done. Also evaluating the resources needed for each type of review to condition the cadence and quantity of reviews done at a given time.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, appreciates the fluid as-needed rather than structural approach. Asked about resourcing and how that may/may not happen? Will there be a budget allocated in case there is a review and what would happen if a review did not happen?

Sophie Hey, GNSO representative to the Review of Reviews, this is going into the discussion currently and does tie into the scoping work trying to work out what comes with the cadence and condition. That could be a question of work sharing with the group within the next couple of weeks to factor into that proposal.

Action Items: None

Item 8: Review of DNS Abuse PDP1 Work Plan

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

8.2 - Council Discussion

8.3 - Next Steps

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, shared the [slides](#) and the [project plan](#) reduced the project plan by 4 months to deliver its work to Council by May/June of 2027.

Volker Greimann, RrSG, observed that there is an ambitious timeline and what happens after the GNSO Council with the Board vote. He emphasized if there is anything to do as a Council to speed up on PDPs in general in a more expedient way. This is a high priority topic and he noted his hope for a faster

turnaround.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, Council can also be ready to receive these recommendations. For the Board that has been a topic of Board readiness, and they have been impressed that the Board is looking to communicate with Council to reduce friction.

Sam Demetriou, RySG, stated her appreciation for tightening the timeline for four months. The group seems to be proceeding expeditiously. She is very happy with the progress of the group. That said, there was a huge effort to keep the scope of this PDP very narrow, hoping to get this done in a timely manner. Micromanaging the PDP and it seems too long and this group is capable of doing this group faster. Encouraged the group to move this up 3-4 months and we could likely surprise ourselves as a community.

Jennifer Chung, GNSO Vice-Chair, noted the feedback and she emphasized that the effort to sequence the work and cut out the time that can. Some timings are set pieces by the bylaws. Trusting in the expertise of the WG and there is goodwill to get the work done correctly as well in addition to its speed. Speed is not the only factor. It is tightly scoped and structured. As liaison she will keep the Council posted.

Action Item: DNS Abuse PDP 1 Council liaison to convey that work plan has been received to the WG.

Item 9: Any other business

9.1 - Update on ICANN86 planning and GNSO Draft schedule

Terri Agnew, ICANN org, went over the ICANN86 draft schedule looking at Seville outlining the schedule for Councilors.

Action Item: Pre-ICANN86 GNSO Council Webinar will take place on 28 May at 13:00 UTC Councilors are required to attend.

9.2 - [Council Process for Response to SPIRT Request](#)

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts, BC, went through the following [document](#) for any issue that may arise in the Next Round how SPIRT gets the directive through. Highlighted that aside from SPIRT going to the Council to discuss the application of the predictability framework, there is also the track that SPIRT can be directed by ICANN org or ICANN Board, but the preference is for the Council to direct them on what to do. To this end there are two processes for the SPIRT that Council adopts: Standard Process and Expedited Process outlined in this [proposal](#). He shared that Council is required to adopt this particular process and staff will work on further language to present back to Council for adoption.

Anne Aikman Scalse, NCA Non-Voting, will look at the document. The form to be used asked the nature of the request to Council. One box to be checked is the box relating to a request for new policy. She noted that a request related to new policy, even if time sensitive, should never be the subject of a 72 hour turnaround time at Council based on a negative response mechanism. For a policy concern, 72hrs should not be applicable.

Action Item: GNSO Liaison to the SPIRT to provide clarification regarding the council process for response to SPIRT request and the process use case.

9.2 - IGO/INGO Liaison Update

Damon Ashcraft, IPC, passed along an update for IRT IGO/INGO basically there is a typically that IGOs cannot litigate in front of a court. For UDRP for IGOs/NGOs there was an idea for the PDP for a special proceeding for the UDRP as to whether this court. An issue arose, Council brought this issue in January and the intent was that this can be used at any time to harmonize UDRP with IGO/NGOs to get into arbitration. IGOs do not like that resolution and feel it is against the PDP outcome. It talks about arbitration at any time, but outside the UDRP scenario. Working to find a compromise, he gave the update via email.

Susan Payne, GNSO Chair, closed the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at: 23:00 UTC

