
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: RySG Membership Work Session (3 of 4)
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

NIKKI SCHULER

We are at the start time, but we will wait another minute or two. Thank you. This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Recording in progress. Hello, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group 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 this 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

Thanks, Nikki. Hi, this is Beth Bacon, the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Nikki, I just want to flag, is there a chance you could refresh the screen if you are in the Zoom? I think some people are just seeing that it says you have paused screen sharing. I know sometimes you just have to do it. There we go. Okay. I want to make sure everybody online can see what we were doing as well. Anyone? Okay. Just one of me is okay.

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.

I think due to some really aggressive efficiency on our part, as well as some attrition on the agenda because of people's ability to access and time zones and travel, this may be a fairly efficient session. I do want to flag that I know that we generally have the fourth meeting, and that will be on Wednesday. I do expect that to be more substantive. I know that many will often skip the fourth one as if it were not an actual meeting. We will have substantive discussions. We are going to have the GNSO counselors give us a readout of some of the discussions that they are going to have, especially on urgent requests, and then they will be running into that Thursday full session. We are going to have updates, so if you care about urgent requests specifically and other GNSO items, please make sure that you keep in mind that we do have that fourth session.

Then we are going to get some updates, again, maybe some review of reviews readouts because I think, Sophie, you have a few more sessions and closeout, so there could be that and then any wrap-up items. But I do think that I want to flag that urgent requests is going to be moving pretty quickly, and we do have time on the calendar to discuss that. With that said, part of our efficiency is that Kalina has already gone, so we are going right to Rick Wilhelm with an IANA SLA CSC update, please.

RICK WILHELM

That explains why you were looking for me at the beginning. Okay. Rick Wilhelm, PIR, talking about CSC, giving a brief CSC update as

we are wont to do from time to time because otherwise it would be remiss. Just as a reminder, I am your duly appointed representative to the CSC, along with Gordon, who is here too. Gordon and I are here. We did not collaborate on this, so after I get done, I will be like, "Hey, Gordon, what did I forget?" and Gordon will chime in with a thing or two. We met; the CSC met here this week already. We took care of our business. PTI has been doing a good job. We have not had any material issues.

PTI did have an issue a couple of months ago where their email service, their outbound email service, got jammed up for a while, and notices did not go out for a couple of days. As a result of that, they missed several SLAs in one report. After that, they put in a bunch of new instrumentation in the monitoring. It did not affect any of the actual operations, but it did affect how people got notices from IANA. That was interesting. That was in sometime late last year. Maybe Gordon remembers exactly what month it was, but maybe he does not. It does not matter that much, but they did that.

We are just starting an update to the SLA process. We are starting the process to update the SLAs that PTI abides by. IANA and PTI put forward an initial proposal of probably somewhere between a half dozen and a dozen proposed changes, all of which look pretty reasonable at first blush, but all of which will probably get more complicated as we go deeper into them. We will be working on those over the next period of time. The way the SLA change process works is that any SLA changes have to be agreed by the CSC, by IANA or PTI, and also by ICANN. Without all three in agreement,

then no change gets made. The CSC will have a chance to vote on those. Before we provide any vote, we will be back here to brief everybody on any proposed changes.

That is an update on that. Probably the only other two things: the CSC submitted a comment on the proposed bylaw changes, which is exactly the same thing that we have a comment cooking on here in the RySG. Our comment at the CSC basically rhymes with what we are saying in the Registry Stakeholder Group, so it is supportive, in short. Lastly, we did a chair and vice chair selection, and I got re-upped as chair, and Hiro Hotta was re-upped as vice chair by unanimous vote. It was not contested; let the jokes ensue.

The other thing that was probably the most interesting thing for this crowd is just before a bunch of us got on the plane, the registry or the IANA customers got a notice about something that they found in the RZMS about credentials being logged. We asked Kim for an explanation of that. He basically hit play with a few more words on what was said in the blog post, that they found a situation where there was some logging going on which was logging some credentials, which is not good. I think almost everybody here, no matter how technical you are, knows that logging credentials is not good. They did not find any evidence initially that any logs have been breached or there has been any untoward use of those logs.

As a matter of extreme caution or conservatism, they basically rolled everyone's passwords or invalidated your password. If you have credentials for the RZMS, you have to reset your password.

That is basically about it. They are going to be doing some investigation both to find out why it is that this got logged and what logging was going on, and also to make sure that none of the logs were compromised. In my experience, this kind of thing can happen if stuff was... frequently, you would turn on that extra logging if you are thrown into debug mode. In my experience, even in debug mode, you do not want to be logging credentials. There is a fair bit of research that they need to do there to fix their software processes.

One of the things that I would encourage everybody here that is listening to this to go back home and check with their users that use the RZMS to make sure that you have two-factor authentication turned on. By two-factor authentication, I mean using something like Microsoft Authenticator, Google Authenticator, or Duo. The password that you have is of much less importance because you have an app-based authenticator that is required in addition to your password to get you into this thing. For reasons that are reasonable, the RZMS does not require two-factor authentication. This is because if you undergo a change of identity regarding who is holding logins, and if you have an ungraceful handover and your two-factor is tied to a phone, ungraceful handover can get very difficult and complicated. At most gTLDs, business processes protect you. At some ccTLDs, it can get pretty complicated. This is why IANA and PTI do not mandate it. But for gTLDs, we are all commercial enterprises, even if you are a nonprofit like we are. I would strongly suggest that you... sometimes you have to wake

them up. It is 04:42 PM local time, and it is sometime in the wee hours somewhere. I would strongly suggest that you go back home and make sure that whoever has access to the RZMS has two-factor turned on. Thank you. That is it.

BETH BACON

Thank you, Rick. Questions, comments? Gordon, do you have anything to add? He nailed it. Great. It is on the record. All right. Thanks very much. For the CSC update, I just wanted to flag that we do have that public comment open, and it is the same fundamental bylaws that we have been talking about. We coordinate with the ccNSO on that because we are partners in crime for the CSC. If you have questions, we do have the public comments workshop, so we will talk about it there. Anything else on the bylaws, Rick? No. Never mind.

RICK WILHELM

Sorry, I was not paying attention. You said something about the bylaws.

BETH BACON

I said I was noting that we have this fundamental bylaws public comment that is the CSC one, and we are coordinating with the ccNSO, but there is nothing new or spicy or concerning.

RICK WILHELM

No. The CSC's comment, if Wim looked at it, he would be like, "Is that the registry stakeholder?" Now, I did not write it, but if he looked at it, he would be like, "Is that the registry stakeholder comment or the CSC comment?" They are very similar.

BETH BACON

Actually, I am pretty sure Wim would be like, "Mine is the one I wrote, so much better." It would have that Wim sparkle on it. All right. Thanks, friends. We have Nacho for a gTLD update. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ

Thank you, Beth. The gTLDs had a session yesterday, Monday, where we covered most of what are going to be the activities where we put our focus this next year. The first one of them, the one that took most of the session and the one that I think is going to be more impactful ICANN-wise, is the project that is funded by an ICANN grant on assessing gTLD performance for enhanced internet accessibility. That basically is trying to measure if choosing a gTLD has any impact on your ranking in a search engine. The thing that has increased the visibility since we started with the project is that we are also including some AI-powered search engines because of the way that the gTLD or the domain name plays a role, and how that role affects identifying that domain name as a source that is considered valid by the AI search engine. I think it is one of the best things that we are doing with this project.

As we discussed in the session, the idea is to have some facts based on experimentation that then allow us to see what the result is, if there is a result at all. If that result shows that the gTLD helps that ranking, does not help but does not harm, or if it undermines your position in that ranking, whatever the result may be, we will be having a conversation on what that means for the gTLDs. That is going well. Bea Guzman, the .cat domains director, walked us through how .cat is working with the contractor that was selected to drive the project. This is a .cat project, but it is based under the umbrella of the gTLD group because there are 11 TLDs participating. We will be showing you some results when we have them because we have to go through the different phases of presenting the report to ICANN and seeing how that is measured in the future in the results that the search engines are providing. We are seeing how we measure data between domain names that already existed with content versus domain names created just for this purpose with some randomly selected words that we know have no meaning in that language. In the final report, I think that is going to be interesting.

The time for this to be finalized is April 2027, and that plays well into one of the other sections of our focus, which is trying to get to the meeting in March 2027 in Lisbon with a clear idea on who the new gTLDs are, if there are some in the next round, and try to do something in connection with the ICANN meeting to do a workshop with these new gTLDs. This would be a workshop focused on the geo aspect because we hope to be active in the future of the NTAG

initiative. This is not intended to be anything that collides with what NTAG will be doing, but only focused on the geo aspect. That is part of a communication campaign that we are considering now that has on its perspective the Lisbon meeting as the end of that campaign. We have two stages in that campaign: before Reveal Day and after Reveal Day. This is something that we are working on, and whoever has any more interest or ideas to provide, we are here and we are very happy.

What else do we have? We have the Geographic Names Panel review, which is one of the things we have been very vocal about because we still think it is absurd that it has an extra fee on top of the extra costs. We had a good exchange with ICANN. We had a good presentation with the GAC in Dublin, and we appeared on the communiqué. Our item and our opinion made it within the communiqué, and this was very useful for us to use in further exchanges with ICANN. We had a good exchange with Marika, and I think that has been made public. They said that they are going to be working with us, and I think that has been useful. Even though we are not very happy with this "not higher than 12,000 US dollars" fee because we still think it is absurd, we think we are moving in the right direction.

This is also part of this plan that we have to add into the communication to help any new gTLD in the next round. The last thing is that we went through the Universal Acceptance local initiative very quickly because we ate up all of our time. We have this framework agreement with ICANN to be able to work with our

members in their UA activities so that we can remove the friction of them having to go through the ICANN process any time they come up with something. That is working well, and we are having these different initiatives focused on what ICANN has indicated should be the focus. I think it is going well, we are very happy, and we still believe in Universal Acceptance, so we will be doing more things in the future. That is it.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Nacho. Does anyone have any questions on the update? I think the research that you are doing sounds really interesting, so when that is finished, feel free to send that stuff around to the registry list. That is what it is there for.

NACHO AMADOZ

I think that for Lisbon 2027, this could be a topic because then we will have the final version of the report.

BETH BACON

Perfect timing for some NTAG, too. Wonderful. Thank you so much. Again, due to some shifts around with folks that were traveling and not traveling, we were going to have a BRG update, but I do not think Cruz was able to travel. I do not think we have Jen on.

SUE SCHULER

I sent an email to Mike Rodenbaugh and Nisha Prakash, and I think Nisha is going to come.

BETH BACON

Okay. If Nisha is able to make it, we will squeeze it in, but let's instead move to the registry elections timeline with Sue first. Great.

SUE SCHULER

Hi, everybody. This is just a quick update on our elections for our fiscal year. Next slide. Boy, that is hard to read. Okay. So our elections will be held on June 17th. That will be one of our bi-weekly meetings. We have to have our GNSO counselor names to the GNSO Secretariat by the 19th, so that gives us that window. Working back from there, you can see that we will open the nominations on the 6th of May. That gives us a two-week period then to close it on the 20th. Then we can do our candidate interviews and so forth. We have some time then because we have a meeting scheduled in there; we could probably do a face-to-face one as well.

Go ahead and go to the next slide. The seats that we have up for our officers, our chair and our vice chair of policy, are up. Both Beth and Catherine are eligible to serve one more term. Next slide. We have two GNSO Council seats available. Sam is also eligible to run again for another two-year term. Nacho is termed out. We do still have Jen, who will be filling our AP seat. Those two seats will be either from Europe, North America, Latin America, or Africa. Yes. This is the year that we also have to do a weighted vote on one of those seats. We usually do it on the incumbent seat.

Next slide. Our Nominating Committee representative is not up for election this year. Now that we are doing two-year terms, we do not actually have to vote somebody in on the Nominating Committee this year. Yay. Next slide. This just gives you some more information about the eligibility for our officers. You have to be one of the voting members to be one of our officers. You do not need to be a voting member to be nominated for GNSO Council. Next slide. Just some general notes in there: we will obviously send out a call for nominations. All candidates must have a current statement of interest on file with the GNSO. You will have to accept your nomination and your willingness on the mailing list.

Next slide. Again, just to reiterate, our nominations will open on the 6th of May. We will have a proxy ballot that will be available on our website once we close the nominations. That will close two days before the election on the 17th. Those proxies need to go to either Jeff Neuman or Christina Rosette, our other officers that are not up for election.

BETH BACON

So I think they are just going to end up being sent to either you or Jeff because I think Christina is going to be out by May.

SUE SCHULER

Good call. It is only going to Jeff.

BETH BACON

Yeah, it will be fine.

SUE SCHULER

Okay. Just to remind you also, the budget will be on the ballot as well. Then, of course, we announce the elections at the end of the meeting on the 17th. Next slide.

BETH BACON

This just gives you some requirements of what it takes to be a representative on the GNSO Council. Next slide. I think that is the last one. Thanks, Sue. Thank you always for keeping us in line and on target with timelines. Just to note, we do still have Jen. I think this is her... we have one more year. One more year. Okay, wonderful. Just making sure that we do not have to say goodbye to Jen because that made me sad.

Just an FYI, during this election, Catherine Paletta's seat is up, but she will be out on maternity leave. She is still eligible, obviously, to run again, but we are going to try and be a little sensitive if she does want to run again. We can try and get her into a virtual candidate interview when she has some time, just in case people were wondering. She is out either now or starting on Friday. Then we will also have Christina, who is going to be out, so we are going to rely upon Jeff for the proxies.

We will send all of this, as we do, in a great number of annoying, repetitive emails so that everyone is very clear on when we are going to vote, when proxies are due, and what to do with a proxy. If

you have questions whether you can run or how the mechanics of this work, please reach out now and ask questions, and we are very happy to let you know. Sue, the slides are really helpful. Those are all the pertinent parts of our bylaws and operating procedures. I encourage you to read them. They are a great time and have all sorts of very helpful details.

Does anyone have any questions on elections and timelines? Again, it is the chair and vice chair, and then two council seats, one incumbent and one replacing Nacho. You look too happy, Nacho. All right, great. Does anybody have any other business? We are ahead of schedule, but we also have lost a few due to time zones, and also we were just too efficient in our previous meetings. We will try and see if we can nail down Nisha and get a BRG update in our wrap-up session. All right. Anything from anybody else? A gift to you: 30 minutes in your ICANN schedule.

NIKKI SCHULER

We can end the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]