
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: RySG Membership Work Session (4 of 4)
Wednesday, March 11, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

NIKKI SCHULER

Hello and welcome to the Registry's Membership Meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct Concerning Statements of Interest.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Beth Bacon.

BETH BACON

Thank you, Nikki. This is Beth Bacon, Registry Stakeholder Group Chair. This is four of four. We made it. You're free after this, which is encouraging. So, we have some minor updates from a couple of the bigger issues that have been floating through. We also have a few catch-up items.

As you guys know, we were equally efficient and also a little scattered because of people's availability and so this session as usual ends up with a few things that we have moved from other sessions. So, we'll get our BRG update and then we're going to get

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.

a council readout. And I think that is going to be largely focused on the discussion we had on urgent requests.

The GNSO Council met about an hour, maybe two ago, and discussed the proposals from the board, the one, two, and three options. And I think that we will just get a little more detail there and then save the rest of the council updates for the next drop-in call or I'm sorry bi-weekly call. But we wanted to make sure that we close the loop there. So, let's start with a super quick PDP update. Brian?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Yeah, thanks and there's not much of an update because we haven't had another working group session. I just wanted to briefly come onto -- sorry, Brian Cimboric, PIR, and Dennis and Neha, please chime in if I miss anything or you view things differently. But just wanted to give a quick readout on the CPH and CSG meeting this morning where we started about the associated domain check PDP and then sort of floated the notion that has been discussed in the group of the straw man.

Of you know rather than trying to over engineer this which would lead to an 18-month timeline as proposed by staff, really having a pretty tight contractual language and we walked through some of the machinations on why the phrases in 3.18 of the RAA are enforceable as they are, and so trying to lean in to have that be a model for the associated domain check. And it seemed as though it was largely well-received, not to say any constituencies

endorsing anything at this time, but I was encouraged that the CSG seemed to be curious about the approach, engage in real good faith, asking questions about how it might work.

And so, all that to say, I think that if we continue down the path we're on, I think I'm encouraged that we can blow past that 18-month time frame. So, your registry reps will do our darndest to keep this on the rails and moving ahead, but encouraged by the dialogues we've had so far about it. Dennis, Neha, please chime in anything, if you had a different read or anything else you'd like to add.

DENNIS TAN

Thank you, Brian. That was a good -- I'm sorry, Neha.

BETH BACON

Sorry, Neha's got her hand up.

NEHA NAIR

It's okay, Dennis. Go ahead. I'll come after you.

DENNIS TAN

Okay. So, really quick, Brian, good summary. Just a reminder as next steps, we have the work -- need to organize my thoughts here. So, next week on the 19th Thursday, we have a registry DNS abuse working group so we're going to be reading out for the rest of those who are not here, but also have a discussion on, how are we going to be voting on the vice chair position? It's not just one vote, but

it's a ranking so I think we need to think about, you know, what's our top preference and then so on and so forth.

Our next working group, the PDP working group, is going to be on the 23rd of March. So, things are going to happen quickly and I think on the 23rd of March, the first order, it's going to be looking at the revised work plan timeline, which we know it's too long now. So, thank you.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Dennis. Neha?

NEHA NAIR

Thank you, Brian and thank you, Dennis, for reminding us about the meetings. I also wanted to bring up a couple of points that came from the ccNSO and RySG meeting today. There was a point that was floated around that there is a notion that this PDP might be trying to force the work of ADC on registrars. There was a question of who's going to pay and whatnot.

It was just a general comment, so it was not picked up, but we know that at least one person from the registrar group has been hinting that registry should be within the scope. Not in the exact words yet. So, as Brian said, that we as registry representatives will be on the watch, that this spark does not get fanned so much that it becomes a flame and we should remain within the scope of the Charter.

The good thing is that there was a sort of survey in that meeting, a mentee poll, which already suggested that almost 80% of the

participants, which included both a ccTLD, members from ccNSO and registry stakeholder groups said that almost 80% of the participants already do something about ADCs. And we also know that some of the registrars also do some work, so it will not be very hard to push for that, but something to keep in mind. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Thanks so much, Neha. And I have my hand up just to ask the question logistically. We do have that call for early input that I think is usually the 19th I'm making up a day? Sorry?

DENNIS TAN

20th.

BETH BACON

20th? Okay, I just want to make sure that that was on the radar and that you guys are on top of that and I'll look to you to draft and circulate and all that. So, I just wanted to make sure that was on your list. I'm getting nods in the room, great. Okay, all right, thank you very much. Any questions, comments on the PDP? Okay, let's turn to an update from the BRG please. Thank you.

NISHA PARKASH

Thank you. Yeah, hi, so Nisha Parkash from Sky, head of domain management. I'm also on the board of the BRG obviously of course representing .sky. So, we had a session a couple of days ago and so just here to briefly recap on that.

It kicked off with me providing some examples of our .sky kind of use cases, some of the websites that we have fired up for you know whether it's internal, external content. I didn't give any examples of any back-end API infrastructure, but I always say if anybody wants to discuss that use case with me, please feel free to reach out.

We went on to then discuss some of the use cases around using your .brand TLD for phishing attacks, fraudulent activity and how you can leverage your .brand to create customer safety. Essentially the message there is, if you are a business built on consumers, then we do have an obligation to keep our customers safe. And given the way the world is turning at the moment and the amount of phishing and scamming that we're seeing in our business, given we provide tangible goods and we sell physical goods, we're seeing a lot of activity around our customers being scammed for mobile handsets and anything that a fraudster could try and exploit, I guess.

What we're trying to look at doing is sending out consumer emails on the .sky domain which would essentially mean, if the customer receives any emails from anything that isn't .sky to not transact because it wouldn't be us. But we have to kick that off and that's a real work in progress. It's not going to be something that happens overnight and we would be sending out consumer comms so that the message has landed.

So yeah, that was one of the updates and I'm looking forward to kind of giving more updates as the year goes on, but that was really to look at the encouragement around the next application window and use cases around, you know, it's not just something that can be used for aesthetics. Having your .brand TLD can really give you opportunities in the cyberspace, back-end infrastructure, and also, you know, brand reputation. So that was that message.

Then we had an update from Cruz, who's the president of the BRG, and he runs .fox. And he was just running through sort of the application process, I guess, the journey up until the application window. Some of the challenges that applicants may be seeing because there's some conflicting information within the wording. So, as the brand registry group, we're trying to get those addressed as well which is one of the reasons we really encourage the model of membership for the BRG. You know because any questions that may be confusing you can bring to the BRG and we can discuss those directly with ICANN and ICANN compliance. So, it's just a way for you to get your voice out there as part of the BRG. So again, it was some really detailed slides on that journey and I would recommend anyone reviewing those.

And then lastly, we closed off with, a few of the board members have reached their term as of May and we are actively looking for participants and you know members to step up into certain roles. There'll be an opportunity to step up to the president position and a few of the board director positions. Again, this will come back down to existing members or prospect members that would like to

join who then would look to consider to join the board and bring their expertise. So, that was how we ended the session and any questions?

BETH BACON

Any questions for our BRG friends? I think that just means you were thorough and nailed it. That's what that sounds like. We really appreciate it. I think that it's important for us to get the updates from GOs and BRG lets us know, you know, the full gamut of what the membership is doing. And, you know, if ever you need to raise issues or anything, obviously, we are always here and appreciate you making the time. Thanks for coming. All right. Okay. We will turn to Sam for GNSO council update.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Sorry about that. Hey, folks, this is Sam joining remotely. I'm going to keep this quite brief. Unfortunately, Beth mentioned at the top of the call that we might be covering an update on the urgent request process. However, the council's agenda for today was already set prior to getting that question from the board. So, we did not get to that topic.

What that means is, we as a stakeholder group will have more time to consider the options and that discussion will be put off to a later council date. So, just good news for us that we have a little bit more time to chew on the different paths there.

What I will very briefly recap for you today is, first the council's meeting with the board that took place this morning and then second, the council regular meeting that took place this afternoon. So, on the board side, as you guys recall, the board posed two topics to community groups. One was on the next five-year strategic plan and factors that ICANN should be considering in updating that. During that portion, the council talked a lot about its focus on improving the policy development process so that ICANN is able to create and develop policy in an effective and efficient manner and really focusing on trying to shorten timelines and produce good policy results in a timely fashion.

This also opened a bit of a discussion about the timeline for the DNS abuse PDP. That's already well-trod ground, so I'm not going to go into it, but just suffice to say that lots of folks are interested in advancing that timeline, not having it take a full year. Although, of course, we do need to make sure that all the topics do get deliberated sufficiently.

On the topic of Review of Reviews, which is the other thing the board asked the community groups about, there's not really a consolidated GNSO council position on that because folks are engaging as individuals or through their stakeholder groups and constituencies. So, we didn't go into a ton of detail there.

The council proposed a couple of topics. One was about the ICANN grant program. We were asking when the interim reports from the initial grant recipients would be published, and we were sort of

surprised to find out that there is not an intention for the grant recipients to make their reports public. They're just going to be submitted to ICANN, to the grant program. So, council's feedback on that was it's in everyone's interest to see how this grant money is used. So, maybe encourage the grant recipients to make their final reports public. And also, there was only one tranche of money granted. In the future, there should be more transparency as to what the groups and the recipients do with those funds received.

Finally, we talked a little bit about the WSIS+20 outcomes and kind of what the next steps are, and just talked about the need for continued engagement by the technical community in broader topics around internet governance, including at the Internet Governance Forum. That's very high level on what we covered with the board. We had a full hour with them. So, folks are curious to hear more about that. One, of course, you can always view the recording and then we can maybe have a deeper discussion when the full counselor group is here, maybe on our next stakeholder group call. Pivoting over, I'll pause if anyone does have any quick questions, and then I'll jump into what we covered during the council meeting today.

BETH BACON

I don't see any hands for you, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Okay, great. Then I will truck along. All right. So, during the council meeting, I'm just going to kind of highlight the really relevant topics for you guys. A lot of what we discussed today was sort of internal council planning, including a discussion about how we can start prioritizing work in the future. But that's a little less relevant to the registries here because it's really process oriented so I'm not going to spend a lot of time on that.

We voted to confirm Paul McGrady as the chair of the DNS abuse mitigation PDP number one on associated domain checks. He is now officially licensed to run that group. We talked through some of the things that we had accomplished since ICANN84. No news there. We discussed a little bit further this process on how the board can un-adopt approved GNSO policy recommendations. This is an item that went out for public comment a couple of months ago. I do know that the registry stakeholder group submitted a comment in support of having a process like this in place and well documented, with the caveat that it should be used extremely rarely.

It is really only to be used in the case where the board has adopted a recommendation, but then later gets information. Or circumstances change such that following through with that recommendation would no longer be in the public interest. So, it should be used in extremely, extremely rare circumstances.

As a council, we had discussed that there needs to be a place where this process is memorialized. And where we decided to do that is

in the manuals for the policy development process and the GNSO guidance process. So, we spent a little bit of time on the council meeting today going through the red lines of the text where that process will be integrated into those two manuals.

All right, we talked a little bit about some of the outcomes from our strategic planning session in January, which we already have recapped pretty thoroughly for this group so I won't go into a lot of detail there. And then the last thing, we talked a bit about the next steps for the SSAD recommendations, but there is a dedicated session on that tomorrow morning at 9:00 AM local time so that's really where the meat of that discussion will take place. If anyone is interested in that and how we're going to move forward with developing supplemental recommendations for SSAD, please plan on joining that and we'll talk a lot more about that in our readout following ICANN85. I think that's all the highlights. Beth, I'll hand it back to you.

BETH BACON

That is a lot of highlights. Thank you, Sam. Does anybody have any questions on GNSO goings on? No, thank you to Sam and Nacho and Jen for holding down the fort there and always representing us so ably. We really, really appreciate it and I know especially Sam it's a challenging time zone and all our other friends online this one is especially challenging I think so really appreciate everybody being available.

That is all we have on the agenda for this wrap-up session. Does anybody have any other business things they'd like to discuss or flag? Okay, I think we can call it a night. I really appreciate everyone's engagement. Thank you for another excellent ICANN meeting, really productive and we will continue our work intercessionally. Thanks.

NIKKI SCHULER

Please end the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]