EN

ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: RySG Membership Meeting (1 of 2)
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

SUE SCHULER:

Hello and welcome to the Registries Stakeholder Group membership meeting. Please note like that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name and your affiliation for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Sue. Hi everyone, welcome to the Registries Stakeholder Group meeting. This is our first meeting of two we have back-to-back. We also, as a reminder, will have a wrap-up session at the end of the week, on Thursday.

You can see up here the agenda for this first 75-minute block. We're going to start, we're just going to open up, have a little discussion on DNS abuse, our favorite topic of this week in recent meetings. We'll go through the relevant Council updates, we'll have a discussion on the WHOIS Disclosure System proposal, and finally we will do a little preview of the RA and RAA amendment session that's going to take place at the end of today.

Before we go ahead and dive in, does anyone have any items we want to tack on to the agenda? Any other business? Not seeing any hands, then we'll stick with what we've got.

To open today, I just want to extend a warm welcome to the new members that have joined the stakeholder group since the last time we met all together. Sorry, this is the folks who have joined over the course of this year, so it's the Annual General Meeting. I just want to thank .hiphop LLC, .music Limited, Nova Registry Limited, and Who's Who Registry for your interest in the

stakeholder group. We're really glad to have you all onboard as members. This is not a big audience, but if there's anyone in the room, or if you all as members find anyone in your discussions and travels here throughout the ICANN75 meeting who is a registry who isn't already a member of the stakeholder group, our doors are always open to welcome new members in. We'd love to chat with them and hopefully get them involved. Just my little plug for membership increases.

All right, I think with that we can probably dive into our first substantive item, which is some DNS abuse discussion. First, Alan is going to walk us through a bit of an update on the voluntary Spec 11 (3)(b) reporting discussions that have been taking place within our DNS abuse working group.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Sam. Alan Woods, Identity Digital, for the record. You may have heard me talk about this once or twice in stakeholder group meetings, or indeed at the plenary session or the outreach session, should I say, for DNS abuse, but I wanted to take an opportunity to just bring to this public session of the Registry Stakeholder group, go through it just a little bit more at the highest level, to encourage more registries to get interested in this particular project. At the moment there are a few core registries who are involved in it. However, this is something that

will get stronger and is something that I would like as many registries as possible to get involved in to make it more meaningful, make it more worthwhile and be able to help further the discussion that we have on the proper numbers, facts and statistics behind DNS abuse reporting.

To dive into it a little bit, give you a very brief opening on it, this is a project that was created, ICANN basically asked us, noting that we have our agreement and our obligation in Spec 11 (3)(b). That's for the statistical and technical reporting on security threats within our zones. There's a lot of data there that is just not necessarily shared. We know we tick the boxes when it comes to our actual contractual obligations, but there is data there that we don't meaningfully share. The way we've phrased it and framed it is there are an awful lot of reports and allegations of abuse out there, but what we do as registries, speaking for myself as Identity Digital and whatnot, we take everything from column A, that is the reports, the role reports that come in. Most of them are unevidenced and we have to enrich and substantiate, and that brings us into column two. Those are the identified security threats that we as registries have an obligation to report on.

What we're looking at is finding a common denominator means by which we can easily share that data originally with ICANN so that they can present it and publish it, but with no specific set use necessarily, other than to fill in that particular gap in the

reporting, to say, "We know there are reports out there and this is what we as registries are seeing. These are the ones that we have enriched and verified and have escalated and tried to remediate as best as possible." That's the provenance of the project, being able to just fill in that reporting gap and tell a little bit more of that picture.

Beyond that, the document itself is exceptionally straightforward. It's a page and a half with some additional details to be worked out. I mentioned this at the plenary session as well. Not the plenary, I keep going with that, the outreach session, we're although the concept is simple, trying to get as many people in as possible. This is why I asked as many registries to join the work group. The devil is in the detail of trying to find that meaningful homogenous means by which we can provide this data to ICANN. It sets out the project, it sets out key concepts such as the difference between the funnels, the reports versus the identified security threat, and we try and figure out what the matrix of reporting, what would the reporting elements be. Keep it as simple as possible, but also making sure that it is meaningful and that it is data that is useful for people monitoring, seeing, and mapping out what the actual discussion is around DNS abuse in our industry.

That's really it in a nutshell. It is a simple document. We have already talked to ICANN. We invited ICANN, and thanks to Russ

who attended a call recently with us just had a touchpoint, just to look and make sure that it still made sense to him and that we were all on the same page. Definitely, there's a bit more work we can do on it, but our plan is to ensure that this is a collaborative voluntary effort with ICANN.

That's what I'll end on. This is a voluntary effort. It is not intended to bind. It is a voluntary effort, and therefor I would ask as many more people to join so we can have as many volunteers in what can be a meaningful, effective, but simple project.

If there are any questions, more than happy to answer. Awesome.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Alan, and thanks for the continued leadership on that front and in the working group overall. I think this is a pretty interesting project, so I hope folks do, if you haven't already started to be involved in those conversations, I hope you do consider joining and contributing to that effort. Just making sure I'm checking both sides for questions.

The next item that we have up for today is responses to, and a group discussion about the DNS abuse small team work that we've heard some updates on over the course of this week. Hopefully many of the folks who are in the room today and who are dialed in on Zoom were able to attend either the small team's readout session that happened over the weekend, or you are

present in our CPH membership meeting yesterday when Greg DiBiase gave an overview of what that group is working on. The group is finalizing some of the recommendations that it has pulled together following a consultation period with the community and some internal deliberations. It's planning to deliver those to the Council, I believe Greg said hopefully by the end of October, so pretty imminent.

One of the things that has come up in the small team's work, and one of the things that we've had conversations about within the CPH and amongst registries and registrars in the past few months, including at ICANN74 at The Hague, is about the contract terms that exist currently that address DNS abuse, both in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the Registry Agreement. On the Registry Agreement side, just to note, most of that is Spec 11 (3)(b). Same provision Alan was just talking about.

I think where the small team is ending up and where conversations that I've been part of and been hearing are ending up is that while there are certainly requirements in the contracts that refer to DNS abuse, and either responding to or keeping reports about actions taken on DNS abuse, the contracts don't have a very clear or explicit requirement to take action on DNS abuse. Mitigating or disrupting action, that part is just not really in there anywhere. I think that is what ICANN Compliance's input into the small team was similarly concluding. It kind of boils down

to, ICANN is good at enforcing the contract provisions that are in there, but where the contract is silent on something, that's the end of what ICANN can enforce from a compliance perspective.

One of the things that has come up in some discussions with registries and also with our registrar colleagues is this question of, is this a gap that needs to be filled. I think one of my major takeaways from our discussions in The Hague was really that it's worth looking into. It's worth us, as contracted parties, working together, registries and registrars. It's worth us taking a lead on this, being the ones who drive this conversation and think about ways we can address this gap. A few of us have had some conversations, really just brainstorming. I want to make this clear, that this is still an open discussion at this point. I've talked to a lot of the folks in this room. I've had conversations, but we haven't yet discussed it at a stakeholder group level.

This idea that we as a contracted party house, we as registries in collaboration with our colleagues in the registrars can make some proposals to start to make some really meaningful progress on the DNS abuse issue. An idea that has emerged is for effectively a two-pronged or two-step approach to this issue.

The first prong of that is to pursue a very focused and narrow, and short contract amendment that would establish a baseline requirement for action on clear cut, well evidenced instances of

DNS abuse in a way that is appropriate to each party. The expectations for registrars would be different from the expectations of registries. We've spoken a lot about the different roles that each actor has in the ecosystem as well as in the course of DNS abuse disruption and mitigation. Also, all of those terms that I just used obviously need to be discussed and defined a little bit further, but that's really what we're referring to here. Not trying to set requirements for every bad action or every potential edge case that could exist, but if something is irrefutably malware, is there an action that should be taken. Take the action to disrupt or mitigate that piece of abuse.

I think it's possible that that is a fairly straightforward amendment to the contract that can be executed relatively quickly. That leaves open, however, the discussion about, A, what about everything else, and B, what about everyone else in the ICANN community who has a very strong interest in making the internet better. Addressing DNS abuse, making meaningful progress on this question of what registries and registrars can do to help address the abuse issue that exists online today. I think it makes sense that the follow-on to any contract amendment would be community work on DNS abuse. This is another thing that the small team has been discussing. It's also something that was suggested in the DNS Abuse Institute's input into the small team, and it was something that we as a Registries Stakeholder

Group echoed, endorsed in our input into the small team. Any community work that takes place on DNS abuse should similarly be very narrowly focused and very tightly scoped.

We, I think, all are carrying some baggage, battle scars, whatever metaphor you want to use, about policy efforts that have tried to do too much, tried to boil the ocean. We all recall the early conversations that emerged in the community about DNS abuse that quickly just ballooned. Trying to solve everything all at once. What about this? What about that? I think we lose sight, sometimes, of the small steps that you can take to start working on a problem when you try to solve the whole problem in one fell swoop. I think there is an opportunity for the community to do work on those small steps through, whether it's policy development, whether it's something like development of best practices, things like that.

This second part is not necessarily for us to figure out entirely. We're only one part of the GNSO. We're only one part of the ICANN community. This part will take a lot of collaboration with not only our registrar colleagues, but also with the folks across the GNSO and across the ICANN community. I think it's all coalescing into what the small team is also thinking about, and into what other parties in the ICANN community are also looking for. I think we're not alone in our belief or our thought that keeping things

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

narrowly focused and dividing this up into concrete and achievable steps is the way to go.

I understand that we're going to be getting the output of the DNS abuse small team work soon, within the coming months. That may include a consultation with contracted parties to talk about this question of contract amendments. What I'd like us to consider as a stakeholder group, and obviously not everyone is here so we're going to have plenty more conversations about this, there'll be emails on the list, but what I'd like us to consider as a stakeholder group is writing a communication to ICANN Org that expresses our willingness to explore such contract amendments as I described at the top here. Narrowly focused, targeted contract amendment that established that baseline and then also our endorsement, and our willingness to participate in further community work that involves larger groups, is open and transparent and gives lots of people the opportunituy to participate. That would then build on the work done is those contract amendments.

Just before I throw it out there for your reactions, I know that there's still a lot to think through. We need to spend a lot of time as a stakeholder group thinking about what that contract amendment would look like, definitions, things like that. We know from conversations that we've had with ICANN Org in other settings and in other contexts, and from their input into the small

team, that whatever we do has to be both meaningful and enforceable by ICANN. Understanding what that means to us is going to take some work. We're going to have to have a lot of discussions about this.

What I'm putting out there on the table today and what I'd like folks to consider, and we'll do a formal process to try to get folks onboard with this, is whether we can go out there into the ICANN world and propose this to ICANN, propose these kinds of contract amendments and then officially kick off another RA amendment process.

While that sinks in, give it some thought, Mike's go the first hand. You get the first reaction, Mike.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Overall this, I would say, sounds encouraging. The one concern I have, and I raised this I think in the joint meeting yesterday, you reference conversations that you've been part of, other conversations, and I'm trying to look back. The question I asked yesterday is, "Have there been negotiations with ICANN on this?"

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Mike, there have not been negotiations with ICANN on this topic yet. A few of us did have a conversation with ICANN about whether a narrow contract amendment would make sense, and if

it was something that they could support. We needed to know. This came from, again, both registries and registrars, that folks needed to know if ICANN was willing to keep it focused and keep it narrow before we were willing to take it to the full stakeholder group. We were a little concerned that there could be a situation where ICANN agrees to a negotiation and then it blows up, the doors get blown open and it loses the effectiveness. We have a conversation with ICANN about, if we do something like this, if we start a negotiation, do you agree that it makes sense to keep it tight, keep it short, keep it focused. The feedback we got to that was very positive. They said they were in fact willing to do that.

MICHAEL PALAGE: My follow-up question is, when you say "a few of us" can you elaborate on the few of us?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I'm going to try to remember. It was a bit of a meeting of the minds of some folks that were attending an earlier meeting this year. Verisign was in the room, PIR was there, Identity Digital. I've had some conversations with other folks in the stakeholder group subsequent to that, including I had one conversation with Craig over at FTLD about this. I just want to be clear; it wasn't meant to be a secret at all. These conversations that I had with folks were to get ideas and to get early reactions. This is meant to be an

inclusive process, we just wanted to feel it out and get early responses before throwing it out to a whole stakeholder group and get early input.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Michael from GMO. Apologies as I might be a little bit late to this conversation. This is the first I've heard about it. My question is, this supposed amendment or whatever it may be in nature, has there been any consideration about what this might look like for .brands for example? I don't know if Crews or Isha, if you've heard of this yet, but I don't think we've discussed this in BRG at all. I'd be interested to know what folks might have in mind.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Michael. I think that's a really good question to introduce into this. Obviously, we have a pretty diverse membership, so understanding how something like this would be relevant to brand owners is something that we would want to understand before we initiate those negotiations with ICANN. I think we can absolutely build that into the process.

I have a little bit of a queue, but I'll also open the door if anyone wants to weigh in on Michael's question about whether any other brand TLD operators, a lot of us are brand owners, have thoughts on what Michael weighed in on. I have Kurt in the queue, and then Nacho in the room. Kurt, over to you.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Sam. I think the goals are exactly right. I think it might be hard, without thinking about this nearly as long as you have, I think it might be more difficult to draft a very narrowly tailored clear contract amendment, and secondly a narrowly tailored charter for a policy development process, so we should try that. For example, we are required to act if a domain is clearly used for phishing, but what's the definition of clearly? It can vary from person to person. I think it'd be a great thought exercise, even though it's a little bit strenuous, to try to draft a contract amendment that would be acceptable to us and try to draft a charter that is leakproof, that can't be expanded. That would be a good test for going forward. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kurt. I think those are both really good ideas. I think us understanding and having our ducks in a row going into the contract negotiation makes all the sense in the world. I think it's going to make that negotiation process go a lot more smoothly. On the charter and PDP side, obviously that's a little further down the line, but in the past we, as a stakeholder group or as individual registries, haven't done that when we're thinking about the GNSO Councils, thinking about initiating policy work on X, Y or Z. I think engaging in that exercise, I know everyone is really busy and that

could be a tall order, but I think engaging in that exercise is a very strategic thing for us to do as a Registries Stakeholder Group. Good advice there. Nacho, and then Crews.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Sam. I just wanted to say that I think it's a great idea to have this conversation, and that we want to, because we think that in some cases the gTLDs have been doing some things that go beyond the contract, but we think it's good to do, to react and to proactively adopt measures in those cases, so we are in. I don't have any concern; I don't have any caveat. I'm just thinking aloud as we go. There are some instances where we think that more clarity in the contracts would just be helpful for us to know what we are doing, but that they shouldn't be something that ties us to only doing that. That's why we also think that our perspective has to be added, but I think it's good that you have started the conversation.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you so much for that, Nacho. I think that is a really critical point for us to keep in mind. Thinking about this amendment as almost setting a floor that elevates the entire industry, but certainly not handcuffing or putting any constraints on those parties who do have robust anti-abuse programs in place. Definitely not wanting to get in the way of that at all absolutely

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

makes sense, so having the GO perspective and really every stakeholder group member, having your perspectives before any negotiation goes on, and then that ongoing feedback while the negotiations are taking place. Yes, it's absolutely what I'm thinking about an envisioning if and when we do decide to initiate this. Quick follow-up? Go ahead.

NACHO AMADOZ: Just one follow-up, because I was thinking when you were speaking about the efforts that we did individually in the meeting in Ireland, 2014 maybe, when we had meetings not as a group, I had meetings, other people had meetings with ICANN's technical staff to try to understand what they expected from us in 11 (3)(b), and we followed up and we followed up and we ended up tired of following up and we didn't get any answer. Do you envision this as going into 11 (3)(b), into more details about, "This is what you should be looking at, this is what you should be reporting to us, this is what you're allowed to do," or, "This goes beyond that"? I'm just again thinking on the top of my head, and when we have in our case some community Spec 12, would it be going there? I don't know. I am just throwing ideas to see if they can help the conversation. Is this technical? Is this more policy? I know sometimes the line is not just where we put it, but how do you think we should go about it?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's a really good question. I don't know if I have a fully baked answer at this point. I think, not wanting to get too deeply in the weeds of prescriptive of how to go about everything, because I think that is great fodder for the full community to discuss potentially, or also maybe not. Maybe we decide as registries that such a level of prescriptive detail is not fit for a contract. Maybe it's fit for something like best practice documents or other kinds of educational materials and resources that we can work on in the context of the DNS abuse working group. I think it bears thinking a little bit more about what the core goal of the amendment would be. The way I've been thinking about it is really just putting a foothold in, creating an initial requirement that then individual registries, again emphasizing this is also going to be really important if not more important on the registrar side, but allowing them to build off of that.

That's a really good point. "Is this a mechanism that we want to use to give contracted parties more details about how they can comply with the requirements," is something that I think is a good question to be asking ourselves as we go through this.

I had Crews, and then I have Sophie, Colina and Alvaro in the queue. Go ahead, Crews.

CREWS GORE: Hi, Crews Gore here, Brand Registry Group. I just wanted to follow-up with Michael about this policy discussion. For brands being Spec 13 and verified registrants it wouldn't make sense to us essentially, because we have little to no abuse in our zone but representing a brand I do understand the importance of that. My question is for our members, it is important that we get to that next round sooner rather than later, because we do have brands that have launched, new brands and new companies that didn't have a chance to apply for that in the last round. Drafting this kind of policy language, do you expect a delay in the next round because of negotiations and drafting that kind of language?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: You guys are full of great questions today. I don't expect that an amendment, especially if we're able to keep it very targeted and narrow, would have any delaying effect. I can't answer the question on the policy development because I don't get to make those decisions by myself. I asked, they said no. I think it's going to be a community decision as to whether it's more important to do policy work on DNS abuse before new gTLDs launch, but I don't necessarily think that they have to. I think that a policy that gets created around DNS abuse would apply to existing TLDs, gTLDs, and to any gTLDs that launch in the future. I don't think the answer to that question has to be yes, it would delay it. Certainly, understanding that it's in the interest of many of our

stakeholder group members that new gTLDs not be delayed further after they've already been delayed, we can bring that into the conversation to and make sure that doesn't happen. Does that answer your question? All right.

Into the queue. Sophie.

SOPHIE HEY: Thanks, Sam. A couple of things I wanted to build on. My first one is, what is the planning process going to look like for the amendment? Kurt made some great points earlier about making sure that we keep on track and hearing that we're looking at this two-pronged approach where we're going to do the contract negotiations and potentially some community efforts, how are we actually going to be making sure that there's no overlap between the two and we're not inadvertently passing the word back and forth between the two and ending up getting nowhere? That's the first part. Within the group ourselves, when we're looking at potential language, are we going to be all suggesting different language be put forward? Is there language already being developed that we're working from as a starting point? Just how big is that group going to end up being?

The last point I wanted to build on what Crews said. I'd maybe throw out a suggestion, as you were saying as well, Sam, when we send this letter we say, "This is an amendment for the base

registry agreement." This is something that affects, as you said, all gTLDs, so maybe we say, "This really doesn't have anything to do with the next round." This is something we're doing that's going to come into force and apply to everyone, so frankly no, this isn't a dependency, and we don't need to worry about that issue.

Sorry for the long question and so many, but thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Absolutely no need to apologize. Those are great questions. As far as I know there's not pre-baked language for the amendment yet. That's work that needs to be done. I think that the best way to approach that is to do what we always do in the stakeholder group, which is gather up volunteers who are interested in working on that and then we'll just schedule some time. It would be great if we could do it during in-person time, but I don't know if schedules will allow for that. We'll get on those Zoom calls and put our heads to this task. I think it makes sense to have that process rolling to understand who's going to want to be involved and that and start to set up the logistics for that slightly before we communicate this to ICANN. I don't think we need to have it fully finished before we feel comfortable initiating it with ICANN because we will have time to get our ducks in a row as a stakeholder group on the amendment side.

I think the second part of your question is about ordering. In my mind, and I don't think this is decided, this is something obviously for the group to consider, but in my personal opinion sequencing these and having the amendment not maybe be fully, fully finished, but at least get to the point where it's out for public comment in front of the community and then on the path to being finished, probably that makes sense before diving to the policy work so that we are able to, like you said Sophie, avoid too much back and forth, too much bleed in between, and potentially making each individual phase less effective because the waters have been too muddied on that. That's my thought on that, but again, that's something I think that's up for discussion among our group.

One other point that I wanted to make is this whole thing is going to require a lot of coordination with our colleagues in the registrars. Ultimately the contracts are very different and will need to be, if we do pursue a contract negotiation and they agree to also pursue a contract negotiation, they'll need to be separate, but each party needs to be informed and to understand what the other is doing so that we're not working at cross purposes. We're working towards the same end goal.

Next is over to Colina.

COLINA STARSGOV: This is Colina Starsgov, Google Registry, for the record. Sam, thank you so much for bringing up contractual amendments for DNS abuse. I don't really have a question, I just wanted to say that Google Registry is very supportive for the applications related to mitigation of DNS abuse in our contracts and for the entire process that takes us there.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much for that, Colina. Alvaro, Chris, then Jeff, and then I'm going to tentatively close the queue after Jeff, just because we do have a couple more items that we want to get to, but while doing that, reassuring everyone that this is not the end of this conversation. It's going to be on the agenda for a lot of upcoming biweekly meetings, can't wait to see you all there. We'll also put this out for review and discussion the mailing list as well for anyone who isn't able to attend the in-person or calls. Alvaro, over to you.

ALVARO ALVAREZ: Alvaro Alvarez with Identity Digital for the record. Just wanted to lend our support at the Identity Digital level for this effort, and I did want to underscore one thing. I think Sam did a good job, but it's worth repeating that this is really aimed at raising the floor and not putting a ceiling on what we can do within the Registries Stakeholder Group and individually. We all deal with abuse in

many different ways, and I think we want to make sure that everyone can continue handling it in the way that they'd like to, but that there's a new floor, a new minimum for everyone. I think that'll be really helpful for the industry as a whole. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much Alvaro. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, hope you can hear me. Alvaro said everything from the point of view of endorsing. I just wanted to call out a couple things. One, what Keith has said in the chat about existing GAC advice on DNS abuse, which goes back to the brand question, which is a really important question. I see it as being actually a removal of possibly obstacles to launching new gTLD, the next gTLD window rather than a blockage. Frankly, if the organization needs to be able to develop policy on things that are moving all the time in the background whilst there's big stuff like the opening of windows happening, otherwise we're never going to get anything done. It'll be a good test of that. Yes, I think it's a great initiative. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right, thanks Chris. Again, a few more people snuck in the queue, so next Jeff, and I see Donna and Brian, and then probably we'll close it out at that point.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Jeff, .hiphop Registry. I wanted to also lend the same support as Kurt and others, and as Chris just said, and Keith actually said this will help us go a long way to getting the next round or at least addressing the GAC advice in a better way. I want to say that, and then the other thing, I think we also should do a post-mortem on this current amendment to figure out how we can get a much smoother process, and I think for something like this I like Kurt's idea of pre-drafting for ourselves, not to pre-bake the outcome, but drafting amendments so that we can all see it and just feel what it's like before going in. I think with ICANN, I think we should make sure, in order to speed things up a little bit, make sure legal is also on those calls because obviously as we know with delay that took place the last time, we could be working at top speed and then all of a sudden it just goes in a black hole. I'm all for all that. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jeff. Yes, just want to heartily endorse the point that you said, and like you said other have raised in the chat, that the advance work to be done is really just to get ourselves organized around this and make sure that we're going into the official negotiations from a strong point that also makes sure we're accounting for all the diverse views of our membership and we

have something that works for everyone. I think that's going to make the actual negotiation process work a lot better. Big plus one, big thumps up to that one.

Donna, Brian, and then JC.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sam, I just wanted to focus on something that you just said. I really think this is a conversation that we need to have at the full SG level, not something that we hive off to a small working group. Maybe that will address some of Mike's concerns about who's been talking to who, or involved in what, but I think this is significant enough that these are discussions that happen at the full SG level during our biweekly calls, but not something that gets sent off to a small group. I think visibility and transparency into the conversations and who's involved and what's going on is really important for this, particularly given we have a diverse membership in terms of the types of registries that we represent. We don't all operate the same, so what may be good for someone may not be good for somebody else. We need to keep that front of mind. I support the initiative, but I'd really like to see this done at the full SG level and not hived off to a small working group. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Donna, I appreciate that input. I don't recall that from here there was a suggestion that this would go to a small team. I think obviously once we embark on a negotiation, if and when that does occur, we will need to establish a negotiating team, but at this point I am interested, and I hope I've made that clear, but I'm going to say it again just for the cheap seats in the back, or just to really drive the point home that I am interested in hearing from literally every single member if I can get your input. I think you're absolutely right, the diversity of our membership is a critical aspect to this work in particular. It's critical to a lot of the work we do, but it's going to be especially really important here. I am interested in getting the input from everyone, especially once we reach the decision that if this is something we want to pursue as a stakeholder group, really making sure that the process of understanding what an amendment would look like is as inclusive as possible. This is me as Chair making the commitment that we will absolutely make sure that gets done.

Brian, and then JC.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Sam, Brian Cimbolic, PIR. Just a plus one to a lot of what's been said. I think PIR supports this approach. It seems like a practically minded approach, very much in line with what the GNSO small team laid out, so we're ready to roll up our sleeves. I

think we're in a good place and looking forward to what the next few months bring.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Brian, appreciate that. JC?

JC VIGNES: Briefly, just a plus one on what Jeff said, that we need to learn from what happened with the previous RRA, which was a bit of a nightmare. I still have nightmares even though I had to leave the group early. Any expectation that it will be smooth and quick I would challenge. We really need to be aware of that. I agree with what Chris said, that it's better to clean the space before we move forward, but I'm also super worried. I know we didn't have a choice, and I know it's the best proactive action to do that, but I'm also super worried that it's going to be the mother of all tangents in that when we know what a simple RRA on RDAP took, something that is the mother of all issues right now could take several orders of magnitude longer, which means that if it's a prerequisite to SubPro or to SubPro being implemented, I just think we should be careful what we wish for. That's all.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, JC. Those are really good points, and it's good for us to be realistic about this even as we're pursuing something with a

bit of optimism and hope, being realistic. I think what you just described there is actually one of the benefits of following up an amendment with community work. It gives a place for all those extra tangential things, all the things that make this the mother of all issues right now, as you said. A place for those discussion to be had so that, again, hopefully, the contract amendment piece of it can be narrow. There is a slight issue or challenge that emerges when we have contract negotiations with ICANN, including one that came up in the RDAP discussions, which is ICANN saying to the negotiation team and expressing to us that they feel like they need to represent the community in those discussions.

What we're trying to do here, I think, is by understanding and endorsing that there should be community work it is making it very clear that this negotiation should be between registries and ICANN and registrars and ICANN. All that stuff doesn't need to come in yet because it is going to be addressed very soon afterwards, but all those points are super well taken. Making sure that we go into this with our eyes wide open and learning from recent experience and trying to do the best we can to not repeat mistakes of the past is absolutely great advice.

Just to wrap this item up before we move to the other, because by my clock we have about 25 minutes and a few good substantive things that we still want to get to, the ask here for

stakeholder group members is this question of, "Do you support this idea generally?" More specifically, are you onboard with the idea of initiating contract negotiations with ICANN?

This is not the only time we're going to talk about this. You don't have to have your decision made today by any means. We're going to have lots of time to discuss this on our biweekly calls going forward. We can use drop-in calls; we can do dedicated calls on just this topic if that's what folks want to do. Within the coming weeks, that's the ask that's going to be out there for folks. That's what I'm going to ask you to take back to your organizations, back to your legal departments. Is this something that you are onboard with? Therefore, do I have the consensus of the stakeholder group, do I have the general support of the stakeholder group, as Chair, to initiate those contract negotiations.

It's worth noting Ashley Heineman over in registrars is having a similar conversation right now with the registrars about whether to initiate a similar amendment on the registrar side. Again, when it comes to DNS abuse, we both have a role to play, registries and registrars both have a role to play, even though that role is in many ways different. Making this effective is not a registry-only effort, it's also a registrar effort. Just look for that formal request at some point in the coming weeks. I'm going to do a call for the input, "Does everyone support this idea," and we'll also work on

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

what that communication to ICANN to kick this off is going to look like. Folks will have a chance to review that and make sure that looks okay to them and things like that. That's the official ask here. Keep your eyes peeled. Obviously, see you all on many amazing biweekly calls when we will continue to discuss this.

Maxim, go right ahead, and then we will turn to Kurt for the Council update.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba, for the record. Can you hear me?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Yes. It's a little faint, Maxim, but I think we can hear you.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Given the amount of time we spent on the previous two amendments to the contract and the linear nature of the amendment procedure, if we start an amendment, we cannot add anything on the top. We can do only one change of the contract per time. I suggest we think about what we want from ICANN because in the contracting it's usual if one side gives something, it wants something in return. We might think about what we want in return and to add it, because if we do not then we will have to wait until this cycle ends. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Maxim, good point. Yes, I think that really speaks to us making sure that we're well organized going into those negotiations.

Thank you all so much for the great discussions on that, the great questions and the great ideas and suggestions. I really appreciate the conversation we just had. Next, we'll turn it over to Kurt to go through the Council update.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, and channeling Maxim I hope you can hear me. My connectivity is a little spotty sometimes. Anyway, on behalf of my Councilors Sev and Maxim, and our new Councilor Nacho, I will quickly present an update concerning what the Council will talk about in its meeting coming up and what it's done on this meeting. It's not a controversial set of issues for this meeting, so I can fit it all on one slide.

There'll be a PTI or IANA briefing to the Council and reading the agenda it seems like a check-in on the 2020 to 2024 strategic plan. Here's the plan, here's where we are, any midcourse corrections needed in your opinion, satisfactory progress, that sort of thing. There's an agenda item to discuss the registration accuracy scoping team work, and they've asked for a change to their charter or whatever their founding document is. They've made

two recommendations so far to conduct a registrar survey to better understand the accuracy of the data, and understanding that the survey might not work, considering doing a registrar audit of that same information. The two recommendations to come will involve an analysis of the data and improvements to be made to the system to sequentially improve the accuracy. Those last two work items require access to data that they not have. Evidently there's this GDPR thing or something like that, so that's going to take some working out. Because they can't start on that work right away the team is seeking to bifurcate their work and say, "Let's get to work on recommendations one and two now, and do three and four as soon as we can." I think that's probably a fine recommendation. I'd listen to our registrar buddies before approving that, but I think that's the way to go. It'll affect them more than us.

I don't know what CCO ICI stands for, but one of the Cs is Council and the CI is Continuous Improvement, so it's an exercise to identify ways to continually improve what the Council does and how it does things. Not just the Council, but the whole GNSO. It's collected. There's a typo there, but the first two projects they undertook were revamping the SOI and improving how working group feedback is collected and what actions are taken. Not terribly controversial projects. They thought they'd cut their teeth on something pretty simple, but they have several

recommendations that'll require changes to the rules under which the Council operates.

The PDP improvement tracker, we've talked about this in several meetings and it's essentially a list of improvements to the PDP process that are incremental at best. One set of recommendations includes how policy development processes include in their consideration effects they're having on other policies, and how the Council could better communicate with the Board. Those are two, but in this meeting, as you might have heard in other meetings, the issue of the ODP has come up and many groups are talking, including ours, about now that we have an ODP and a half under our belt, what do we think. For the Council, we had a pretty interesting discussion, this is me talking, but similar to what others have said, that the ODP adds an additional handoff in the process, which is always bad, and additional silo to a process overburdened with handoffs and silos. There's talk about moving elements of the ODP upstream into the policy development process where it can inform the policy development discussions and the rest of it downstream. Not really more work, it's just about when it's done. We can talk about that for a long time.

The formally known as SSAD, and I'll call it the Registration Data Disclosure System is on the agenda, and I understand Mark is going to update us on that. I have a point or two to make, but

maybe Mark will make those. If not, I'll ask him. That is coming up, and there's a universal acceptance steering group update where they're looking to, I don't know if revitalize is the right word, but they're looking to increase participation in the group. They're going to provide a presentation.

I have one more slide after this to talk about some of the other things we've done, but I'll stop for a second to cough and see if anybody has questions. I didn't see any hands. Stop me if—

We've had meetings with several other groups. The two I want to point out are SSAC provided briefing to the Council with two pitches. One was to consider creating a space in the ICANN universe for security practitioners because they're fighting DNS abuse and need access to data, and it's good if they have a soapbox to stand on within ICANN, and DNS operators, which are the finest managed DNS services and global resolvers, so think Amazon, Cloudflare or Google. They are pitching creating a space in the ICANN realm for them and providing some type of home for them. I think part of their presentation was about, "We can't really find the right home," so maybe they need something new.

Then they're working on an abuse mitigation strategy for ICANN that really has four points, which is better coordinate all the efforts across ICANN, straighten the root server system governance model, involve others outside of ICANN, such as

hardware, software, and service vendors, and increase the robustness of the DNS efforts on key signing and distribution. The big idea there is to look at the ICANN strategic plan and look at the needs of DNS abuse mitigation as defined by SSAC and identified gaps. They're working on that. It was a pretty positive meeting, and the upshot was that we want to meet with SSAC again sometime before the next ICANN meeting.

Finally, the ICANN Policy Research and Stakeholder Programs team presented to us. That's Karen At-Large primarily, but they have a team under them of course. One helpful thing was an organizational roadmap. Here are the projects they're working on and here's who's working on them, so a phonebook. You know phonebooks work well. The other is to talk about a more proactive role of the GDB liaison to PDPs. That's what really kicked off, "Yes, that would be great," because if the liaison was more proactive then maybe we could get some of this work that's been reserved for the ODP done ahead of time and the PDP participants can make more educated decisions. Those are the two meetings I chose to report on here. That's it.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: All right, thank you very much Kurt. Thanks for walking through that. Does anyone have any questions or feedback for Kurt on the

Council stuff? All right. Alan, sorry. Jesus, you even signaled to me. Sorry, please.

ALAN WOODS: Kurt, you were talking there about the SSAC presentation and specifically about the potential of looking to find, is there a way of creating the SG group. Obviously, I was at the meeting myself, but has the Council head anything else from the SSAC specifically relating to how one would define that group? Is there some sort of unifying factor of a security practitioner? If it's not something that they're thinking about, how would we make it a much more distinct group as opposed to anything ranging from a person in the front room to a very complex international organization? I think that's one of the qualms I would have, but it's something that I think needs to be very much focused on. Was there any clarity or extra discussions on that?

KURT PRITZ: I'll tell you, no, there wasn't and a lot of the same sorts of qualms rose in me, too. I think it's a suggestion by the SSAC at this point, but yes, I think we should be very careful about amending the current structure for several reasons, without going into them, but all the reasons you just mentioned.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: I think the queue is clear. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Kurt, did you just want to go over the second, the admin session and the election of new officers for the Council?

KURT PRITZ: I think we've done that in a previous meeting, so for us we welcome Nacho onboard and welcome Sev as the Chair of the group, and Greg as the registrar vice-chair. You can go ahead. My mind is drawing a blank, so you can go ahead and expand on that.

JEFF NEUMAN: That's okay. My understanding is that John McElwaine from the IPC will be the other vice-chair. They do a rotation within the non-contracted parties house of who gets to be the vice-chair, and because it's been Tomslin from the NTSG it goes to CSG. My understanding is John McElwaine will be the vice-chair.

KURT PRITZ: Yes, and I do want to mention something that wasn't on the agenda. The word on closed generics is starting with the GAC. I think someone else can tell us, I think as early as this meeting, I think Thursday, and Sophie Hey is our representative, which is excellent for us, I think. That's starting. Now I'm really done, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you, Kurt, and Jeff, thanks for the update. I think I had not heard about John, but I wish him all the best. I think he'll do a great job. All right, just checking our agenda. We are running a little short on time in this first block, but luckily, we've got the next block scheduled for this same group. The next block that starts at 3:00 p.m. local, we're going to go through a number of the PDP updates, the policy work that's being done in the community. Mark very graciously has agreed, he'll move the discussion and overview of the proposal on the WHOIS Disclosure System to the second block. I think that'll just give us a little bit more time and breathing room to have a more fulsome discussion about that topic in the next block.

In these last waning nine minutes I'll turn it over to Donna to give us just a little preview of the RA amendment session that's taking place later on, and then any questions, and then we'll take a little break, go grab a coffee and then reconvene for the next session at 3:00.

DONNA AUSTIN: Most of you are probably aware that the RA/RAA amendment red line has gone out for public comment and the intent of the session that's happening at 4:30 this afternoon is just an opportunity to provide the community with some background and context to

how we started the process and what the main deliverables or outputs were from the negotiation. I think primarily Carla is going to be driving the session this afternoon, but we will have members of the negotiating team there as well just in case there are any questions from the community about any elements of the process. I think part of what you potentially had in mind Sam, was that this is an opportunity for registries that may not necessarily be members of our group and not familiar with the process might get a little bit of an inkling that this is coming. Pretty straightforward, I would think, although it just depends on who turns up and whether we get any tricky questions or not. We've got Rick Wilhelm, so he'll be able to respond to any tricky questions. That's it, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Awesome, thanks very much Donna. I just also want to point out, to what Donna said about this being an opportunity to put this on the radar of contracted parties who may not have been following this, obviously the very critical final step or almost final step to an amendment is the vote, and it requires a plurality of both registries and in the registrar case, registrars, to participate in the vote. There was a little bit of an unfortunate scheduling overlap here where the APAC space, where I expect that some of the local registries and registrars who are not as engaged with the

stakeholder group, I expect that's where they'll be during this session.

Fortunately, Sue worked with the APAC coordinators and got us a slot. It's a brief slot, but I can speak really quickly if I have to, on their agenda today. I'm actually going to duck out of the amendment session a few minutes early so that I can go over to the APAC room and introduce this, make them aware and at least point them to the recording of this session to hopefully make sure we're maximizing our opportunity for outreach here.

ICANN Org is also going to be conducting webinars and they're going to be sending emails about this, too, so this is certainly not our only engagement point, but I think it's a good one. Just thanks to Donna, Rick, the folks on the registrar side for being here and willing to participate in this kind of outreach, and thanks to staff for doing what they can to get the word out and make sure that everyone is looped in on this.

Any questions? I think my Zoom queue is clear as well. We're going to go ahead and wrap this one five minutes early. The next session is a room change. We're going to the banquet hall, which is just a little further back down the hall. We'll see you guys there at 3:00. We are going to do a group photo.

SUE SCHULER: No groaning.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: No groaning. Sue and I are insisting. We haven't had a group photo since ICANN66 in Montreal and some of us look different. The photo will be without masks. I want to see these faces, guys. When you get to the banquet hall put yourself down, we'll designate a spot, line up for a group photo. I promise we'll make it as painless as possible. Thank you, guys, for humoring us. We'll see you in 34 minutes. Thanks again for the great discussion.

SUE SCHULER: We can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]