ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: BC Membership Work Session
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

DEVAN REED

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the BC membership meeting on Tuesday, 10th of March, 2025. As a reminder, this meeting 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.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in chat for your reference. Only questions posted in Zoom chat identified as a question, will be read aloud during the session as time permits and directed by the chair of the session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Mason Cole, BC Chair.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Devan. Good morning, everyone. Mason Cole here, Chair of the BC. Welcome to our meeting on, what day is it? On 10 March here in Mumbai. It's good to have you with us. And I suspect we have some stragglers coming in, still getting a cup of coffee at the coffee break. But in general, we start on time and we end on time. So, that's our objective and we're going to get moving.

So, we have the agenda for today. We have 90 minutes today. Do you have the agendas on the screen and on your Zoom? By the way, we will take a cue by Zoom when we open the cue for discussion. So, if you haven't logged into the Zoom room, please do so now. Are there any updates or additions to the agenda as you see it presented, please?

All right. We are going to have a quick update from our good friend, Dr. Steve Crocker, who is with us this morning, a BC member and the distinguished former chair of the ICANN Board. And then we will move to a PDP update on DNS Abuse from Luke Tola. I don't believe is online yet. He couldn't join us yet and he can join us here in Mumbai. But as soon as he's on, he'll give a quick financial and operations review.

Second, send me to my left. We'll do a policy calendar review and then we'll cover AOB. All right. If there are no updates to the agenda, then we're going to move forward with our agenda. So, Steve, please, over to you.

STEVE CROCKER Thank you very much, Mason. A couple of preliminary remarks. I was very pleased to be welcomed into the business constituency two years ago. Now, it seems like time passes. My natural home, if you will, is in the security area. But I ventured outside of that after

I finished my Board work because I got to know my colleagues and I've really committed to seeing what we could do to fix the WHOIS

and DNS registration data issue. And I wanted to involve myself more broadly across the ICANN spectrum here. And I thought the business constituency had quite good ideas and I wanted to immerse myself in from the inside, if you will. So, thank you very much.

And then in this meeting, we're making a series of presentations. When I say we, my colleague Klaus Stoll is here and we're working with Taiwan, which I'll describe in a minute. And we have back-to-back presentations.

So, I will exit shortly after I finish here. No disrespect intended to any other business for BC at the moment. So, with that, let me proceed.

We have a project called Project Jake, which is aimed at providing a new framework for dealing with registration data, both on the collection side and particularly on the disclosure side. I don't have control here.

Next slide, please. Yeah, named after Elizabeth Feinler, who was known all her life as Jake, who was the original keeper of the contact information across the ARPANET, 50 years ago or so more and did a really amazing job. And she's still she's still around and ticking and graciously allowed us to name our project.

I keep thinking I have control. I know I don't. Next slide. The basic idea of DNS access to DNS registration data is that registrars and, in some cases, outside of the contracted parties, registries collect a

lot of information about the registrant and about other contact information and indeed about other aspects. When was it registered? How is it registered payment wise and IP addresses and so forth?

And then there are various parties who would like access to that information. And some of that serves useful purposes and some does not. And over the long period of time that all of this has been developing, various bad things have happened, abuse of that data, and then the counter reaction of hiding that data or putting false information in or whatever and stepping back and looking at the whole arc of this 50 plus year process. It's not a well-managed process. It's been hacked at piecemeal.

So, we wanted to step back and look at it more generally and several different things emerged in our thinking. And one of them is just from a practical point of view, you have some large fraction of the legitimate requests, not all of them, but a large fraction arises from repeat business.

You have intellectual property attorneys who are asking for information about a domain name that they think is being infringed upon. You have law enforcement making inquiries at various stages of their investigations. You have security researchers doing certain kinds of things, all of which are perfectly sensible. And the process of being careful about who you disclose it to for what purpose and under what conditions has a large fraction of that work can be done once basically for that class of interactions.

And then on an individual request, you can refer to the fact that that's been done and have all that. So, we just sort of make an orderly process or early business out of it. That leads to the idea of saying, well, for groups of requesters who are in the similar business and operating in a similar way and will abide by the same set of rules, you can group them together.

And for registries and registrars that share the same set of concerns and business processes, you could group them together. Not that we want to impose any of that from the top down, but there's a kind of natural alliance. And then those groups of requesters and groups of data holders can make agreements between themselves.

And on the basis of those agreements, only have to do the minimal amount of work that's necessary to look at a specific request if it fits into a previous pattern. So, that's sort of the basic blazingly simple aspect. But I'll repeat that there are two elements that give you advantage in scaling and reduction in cost.

One is the grouping of like actors, requesters, and data holders. And the other is the fact that you've got the repeat kind of work going on. So, even if you only had one requester and one data holder, there's a lot of advantage at making that streamlined because of repeat. So, those two elements lead to a dramatic potential streamlining of the whole business.

There's no intention here to force fit this to cover all possible cases. The worst that happens if you have something that doesn't fit into that kind of model is you're no worse off than you are now. And so,

a partial solution that can grow and evolve over time is far better than the current state of affairs.

Next slide, please. So, this is a picture of a group of requesters and group of data holders. And somebody speaking for those groups we call administrator for the group, either somebody who is chosen by that group to speak for them or, in other cases, an organization that says we would like to provide this service. And they set themselves up as a group and then invite others to come in, all possible and all supported by the framework that we have.

Next slide, please. So, what goes into agreements? Well, a combination of things, a bunch of written documentation of kind of a contract style, and then a bunch of mechanical things that are machine processable. And one of the key things that goes into an agreement is the opportunity or the potential for having different kinds of requests depending upon circumstances.

So, you can have, if we take law enforcement, when we talk to law enforcement people, they say, well, there's a stage during an investigation where we might make a request. And then there's a stage much later where we might have a court order that gives us access to more information. So, we have built into this framework, the idea that there can be different levels of requests and that those will generate different levels of results. Next slide, please.

We are now in a fortunate position of having a partner, a couple of partners to actually try a pilot. The good folks in Taiwan who run the top-level domain .TW, TWNIC is their organization, came to us

several months ago and said, we like your ideas, and we think this is the right way to proceed. We want to try this out.

So, we've been working with them on a pilot. They are obviously the people who have data. In order to make this work, you have to have people who want the data. We've been working with a law enforcement group and with an intellectual property group. They have not yet signed any kind of formal agreement and have not yet made any public announcements, so I'll be careful about it. But they're known, reputable sources.

And we've been putting together a demonstration, more than a demonstration, a pilot of a real system that is partially functioning now and is going to be very live within some number of days, weeks, real soon now, as it were. And from a system design point of view, it's a series of layers.

The bottom layer, layer one, even though it's listed on the top, is the request cycle. And above that are the facilities for making agreements and forming groups and so forth.

So, let me tell you a bit more about this pilot. On the left is the picture of the operating parts on the requester side, and on the right the operating parts on the data holder side. A key element, two key elements on the requester side are the following.

One is that identification and authentication of who's making the request is an essential part of this, not so much to put the burden on the data holder to decide whether or not they want to accept

that particular request from that particular requester, but that the requester group is organized in a way to manage those conditions that have been agreed to in advance as part of the agreement between the group of requesters and the group of data holders.

So, the cylinder on the right-hand part of the left side is the authentication survey using standard first-class authentication mechanisms, OpenID, and the protocols that go with that.

The other aspect of this is going to seem very simple-minded, but plays a very big role. The software running on behalf of the requester is not just something where you log in, make a request, and then you walk away, but is a persistent process, sort of a server operating on behalf of the requester.

So, if a request goes to a data holder and the data holder says, I need to look at this, I'll get back to you, there is something running even in absentia that is running on behalf of the requester to receive that response and integrate any kind of interaction with that.

It also makes it possible on the requester side to integrate that into whatever internal systems the requester might have. So, if it's a law firm or if it's a law enforcement agency that has a fairly massive internal system for dealing with requests and so forth, then the APIs are there and they can integrate that, as opposed to it being an external system that is completely divorced from integration.

So, very quickly, there's a process that's shown on the top of creating a requester group. Then processes for once a group is created for the administrator of a group to interact by adding new requesters or removing them, as the case may be, and comparable on the data holder side. And for the administrators on both sides to interact and set up the kind of agreements that we're talking about.

Once the agreement is established, it remains accessible to all of the members of the group on both sides, so that for an individual request, you only have to refer to the agreement and to the particular request type. You don't have to copy the whole thing over and repeat all of that and negotiate all of that.

And then finally, this shows the interaction on making a request. The requester system gets a bearer token out of the OpenID system that's included in the red line that goes from the left side to the right side, carrying the request included in RDAP with extensions. The token that has the identification information can be verified by the data holder by going back to the same OpenID server, and things progress from there.

That shows a similar kind of documentation of that back and forth, with slight rearrangement of where the parts are. This comes out of the design process. All of this is real. It's being built, and parts of it are up and running. -So, some things have emerged over the long thought process that's gone behind this, and here's the essential elements of it.

When we listen to what controls people want on who gets what information, very common is a distinction between public versus private information. But when we listen more carefully, or sort of for a longer period of time, we discover some things that may seem a little odd. For example, if somebody is not given very high privilege to get the data, and there is data there that is above the level of access that they have, they get back, quote, redacted.

So, that's a kind of distinction between public versus private, where you get told that there's private information as opposed to it not being there. However, when we listen even further, we get into other conversations where somebody says, well, we're not going to tell you anything about that data, whether it exists or not. So, the inference is, well, that must be more sensitive than just private.

So, we have evolved a four-level structure of privacy, where you can imagine that the highest level requires a court order to get at, as the usual case, although we don't enforce that. But that's kind of why the structure is like that.

Another element is how much work went into validating the information when it was collected. And in other settings, there has evolved, coincidentally, another four-level structure, the bottom being the data was given to us and we didn't check it at all. We just took what was given. The next layer above that is syntactic level checking. If it's an e-mail address, does it actually look like an e-mail address, for example?

The level above that is an operational test. Okay, it's an e-mail address. Suppose we send an e-mail to it. Will it respond and come back? And the level at the top of that is, do you have separate and distinct reasons to believe that that actually matches the contact that you're trying to get to, that it's been checked in other ways?

So, underlying all of this is the idea that there's, in principle at least, for every single data element, a notion of how strongly it's been checked for validity and what level of sensitivity should be assigned to it. That comes into play later when there's a request for that data, and you look at who's making the request and what level of access they've been given.

Some examples that come up in real life, it's not uncommon to make a distinction between businesses and individuals and to suggest that individuals should have a higher level of protection of their privacy. But even within that distinction, considering individuals, for example, you have some individuals who need extra protection. Think of politicians or celebrities and so forth.

And interestingly, on the business side, there's some good reasons why some businesses might need extra protection. One example might be a nongovernmental organization that's operating in a contested area, and they might think that their physical address is something that they really do not want generally made available, if possible, and so forth. So, as I said, we now have a pilot coming into operation with TWNIC, and we said, here's our system for encoding what level of validation and sensitivity should be

assigned to every single data element, and you can divide these up into these different categories of registrations.

And they said, good. And they said, actually, we have another one besides the four that come from just making a distinction between business and individual and whether or not they get normal protection or extra protection. And that is there is a class of registrations that have been subjected to extra validation so that when somebody receives that data, they know that it has been checked.

They use the color green to designate that. It has nothing to do with ecology or saving the planet, but that's the way they describe it. So, we actually have extensive documentation of the sensitivity of each data element.

Next slide, please. So, this is a little hard to see. This is a snapshot of a portion of one of these detailed documentations. This is the data elements for the registrant. There's another one of the same size for the admin, another one for the tech contact, and also for things that aren't related to contact information having to do with other aspects of the registration.

And the first colored column there has to do with whether the data is required to be collected, optional, or not of interest to be collected. The middle column is the assignment of a sensitivity of a validation level, and the far column on the far right is the

sensitivity level. And this particular snapshot is for individuals with extra privacy.

And this is for an ordinary business. And if you'd be kind enough to toggle back and forth once or twice, you can see by looking at the right side the big differences in the sensitivity levels that are assigned to those data elements. All right, now go forward one more slide. And now we are looking at a so-called green, I believe it's right, I can't see that far, a green registration.

And if you toggle back and forth between this and the previous slide and look at the middle column, you can see big differences in the level of validation applied to those data elements. And this is, as I say, representing what the actual policies are that are in place. We're just bringing that to the surface and providing a way of documenting that.

Next slide, please. Here's an example of the differences of what comes back when making a request for some information. On the left is access to a registration where the requester is not permitted very high-level sensitivity, and on the right, much higher level. And what's highlighted in red are the redacted portions on the left, and what's highlighted on the right are where the actual data is included.

Next slide, please. So, this is a summarization. What are the benefits for the data holder? Well, streamlining of access and a lot more clarity and the opportunity to make a much stronger

representation of the quality of the work that they do and the service that they're providing.

And a couple of very key points is that this in no way imposes any kind of policy restrictions. All of the authority and control continue to rest in the same places that it does now. If a data holder wants to make an automated response for certain classes of requests, they can do that. If they want to review each one of them manually, they can do that. And they can evolve their practices over time if they choose to do that.

And so, one of the things that we feel obliged to say over and over again is that we're not making policy here. We're making mechanisms and concepts that help clarify the conversations that we all have been subjected to over many years, and hopefully that will lead to some virtuous cycle. That's the big gamble that we're taking, basically.

So, we're looking for anybody who wants to engage, raise questions, make suggestions, provide support, and get involved in an actual way. We're here making a series of these presentations and getting a certain amount of positive reactions that are very gratifying.

Last slide. So, what's next is all of this is beginning to blossom, and you'll see more of this over the next few months. And these slides are online and available. You don't have to take pictures at a distance here if you don't want to. And thank you very much. Sorry.

MASON COLE

Steve, thank you for that comprehensive presentation. I know that you've got to go elsewhere in the convention center to make the same presentation, but before you leave, are there any questions or comments for Steve? Please. Oh, ask away.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Yeah. Thank you, Dr. Crocker, for this presentation. I'd say very efficient. An OpenID based, a kick lock-based OpenID system. I already have a project on a pipeline on this system, and I'd say it's a good choice because it's Open Source and you can also manage it in any way that you want. What I am probably missing in your presentation is I'd say the clearance aspect of the requesters is, I think, a huge complex set of work that is expected on your behalf because a whole set of due diligence service is going to be required on the side of the requesters.

An entity or a body may claim is a law enforcement agency, might not actually be a law enforcement agency. So, a whole set of clearance might be requested on the side of the requesters. That's one of my questions. The other is, how are you planning for requests to be actually made to this system? Because you have said something about emailed based requests to your system. But I'd say that that aspect is going to require its own protocol-based request. And I'd say a whole set of platform needs to be built to

represent this aspect of your system. I'd say very efficient and thank you again.

STEVE CROCKER

I'll be very quick about the response, but ask that we engage more and more and I'm happy to do it at a time. But very briefly, who is a legitimate law enforcement agency is not something that is imposed from the top. The data holders would have to agree that that set of law enforcement agencies is a legitimate one that they will recognize. So, we don't envision that there is a one size fits all, even within a category.

So, you can have multiple law enforcement agency groups and over a period of time, they can either merge or separate or evolve over time. And that attitude of not trying to solve the hardest problems right off the bat, but take the ones that are more accessible and find a solution for those and then deal with it incrementally over time is one of our guiding principles.

So, with that, I apologize. I'll excuse myself, but I'm more than happy to engage. Yes, email. We have an email on there, right? How the request is made. No, not by email, not by email. Apologies, I didn't catch the question.

MASON COLE

All right. I know you have to go, Steve. Thank you for the presentation class. Thank you as well. All right. Very good. Devan, if we could have the agenda, please. There we go.

All right. Next on the agenda is an update on the DNS Abuse PDP currently underway in the GNSO. We're going to turn it over to Luke. Luke, the floor is yours.

LUKE WOOD

Thank you, Mason. Just screen share. This will be a run through of the current DNS Abuse mitigation PDP 1 that's undergoing within ICANN. We had four sessions so far, two on Saturday and two on Monday. So, currently the leadership for those who aren't aware, the chair elect currently is Paul McGrady.

Effectively he's going to be voted in as chair, hopefully tomorrow. The BC chair is currently open to nominations. We've got five candidates who've put their names forward. Council liaison is Jennifer Chong. And within the BC specifically, we've got myself and Jeg Chong as members. We've got Lawrence as a participant and we've got Vivek as an alternative.

Regarding the actual overview of the DNS Abuse charter and what we are looking at. The problem scope we're looking at is effectively looking at malicious sites that are effectively registered. I'm just trying to get that. Malicious actors can register multiple domains in various campaigns that they operate under.

Currently only a reported domain must be investigated by a contracted party, such as a registrar. And they've got no obligations to review the wider portfolio. This PDP is looking at effectively liberating the effectiveness of looking at the wider

portfolio of domains that same customer or registrant has under their control and power.

So, this PDP is looking at the deliberate, the effectively what defines a trigger for a registrar to take action on a domain and investigating other domains under that same account or register or other factors we've yet to decide on. And the scope, timeline, reasonableness, safeguards, documentation, metrics, et cetera, as outlined on this slide.

Effectively, the policies looking at to proactively check, as I mentioned, there's a very interesting straw poll put forward by the registrars. I'll get to it later. And we've got an early input request that's due on the 20th of March, which is effectively in a week's time after ICANN.

The BCs have put together a brief input, luckily our member Ching has put a deep core emphasis on that with some core collaboration across the team. So, we put forward our input for that deadline. Regarding the overall timeline, it's quite an ambitious, long-winded PDP currently. So, the initial report is going to be sent currently at the time of speaking while after we deliberate this internally within the PDP.

Again, this is just a draft. Initial report's going to be sent in for February, 2027, with the final report being submitted in September. Again, this is just a draft. And I think most of the PDP members did state this timeline is too long and it wouldn't be effective in its

current state. So, we are looking to shorten this. Again, this is a draft, but this is a current plan the council have decided upon.

Regarding the Work Plan that is going to be looked upon currently, after the ICANN meetings that we've just been held on Saturday and Monday, we're going to be looking at the first week of 24th of March to review the initial charter questions, determine our approach, the work plan, and review the early input that's due on the 20th of March, as I mentioned.

And again, looking at the other dates, 30th of March, looking at the submission of the project plan to the GNSO council for confirmation. The 3rd of April we'll be looking at review of the topic, charter questions and approach alongside the meeting after that. In terms of the meeting cadence, the chair and several others put forward a plan initially for two twice weekly meetings for 120 minutes each.

That was very quickly shot down by effectively every member of the PDP. And they've effectively now agreed on a once a week, 90-minute call on Mondays at 12:30 PM UTC. It was confirmed that that timeframe is PM not AM, which is much relief to everyone on the call.

One of these sessions on Monday also looked at subject matter experts who provided input on their current workflows they do within their registrars or partners within the industry that they accomplish. So, some of the highlights for my personal opinion, that's more relevant is for example, for you from Realtime Register,

he walked us through their register platform and showcased how they can pivot from domains currently.

So for example, looking at the emails, the phone numbers of the registrants of the domains, and even searching wildcards on the domains themselves. So, for example, when a threat campaign is ongoing or in the news, they can do a wildcard search across the entire domain portfolio and find other associated domain names with that string in the domain name itself.

Realtime is one of those registrars that are currently doing this practically. And of course, we had a subject matter expert discussing about the human rights and data privacy impacts that we have to consider obligated within this PDP. That was via GoDaddy's input. And then NetBeacon has provided an overview of the state of play that they see across the registrar space.

So, this is a graph they presented showing registrars per color per month over the last year. So, for example, this is a graph of registrar from January 2024 to December 2035. The colors represented here are individual registrars. They are the same registrar. So, for example, the dark blue on the screen is one registrar with a consistent pattern of high abuse rates in the middle of the graph.

The registrars have been redacted just for privacy reasonings. They detailed campaigns that they've managed to associate internally. So, effectively most of the domains they identify, effectively half of them are part of a wider campaign. From a NetCraft perspective, which is who I work for, we effectively see the same stats internally.

Most of the large campaigns we see are phishing as a service, which is relevant to this data that NetBeacon has shared here.

This is an example of one such campaign that NetBeacon has shared and something that NetCraft are seeing large scale affecting multiple governments around the world. This is a parking and finding phishing as a service generated at a phishing site.

You can see the exact same screenshot here on two different domains. And on the next slide, they've provided some further stats on the domain names themselves. And you can see some campaigns here, almost likely run by the same threat group, but all using various different metrics that a registrar potentially could use to pivot and find associated domain names. For example, the parking run found 555 domains, payment 68, paying 315.

And these were all registered across two registrars and two different TLDs listed on the screen, all gTLDs and registrars. NetBeacon has posed some questions about how to measure success. Effectively, how can we determine if this PDP was successful?

This is looking at, from the NetBeacon has perspective, of identifying the campaigns are getting smaller, using less domains spread across more registrants. The domains are being taken offline faster and more completely, which is effectively meaning the associated domains are being also removed, which is what the core goal of this PDP is.

The campaigns being centralized in less registrars. Currently, from a NetCraft has perspective, we are seeing it being a pivoted towards several registrars, one or two. Some threat groups we are monitoring are pivoting towards five or 10 registrars to decentralize their attack portfolio.

And, of course, improving the way to prevent detection from threat groups like NetCraft and others around the table in the industry. And again, NetBeacon has put consideration across to the compliance team for ICANN to basically say, how do you conduct an associated domain check? How did you do it and what were the results?

The registrar could simply say the report was for a single domain. Customer had no other domains in it. They didn't find any other domains by searching for the registering details like email or phone number, so they didn't resolve anything else within that customer. This is what I referred to with the threat groups we're tracking. Effectively, they have a domain portfolio spread across hundreds of registrants, so searching upon one registrant is not likely to be a successful way forward for this PDP.

That was initially discussed in its deliberation on Monday, which is what we initially discussed this question, what triggers the requirement to investigate an associated domain name. We deliberated and came across three or four different criteria, which effectively is a confirmed DNS Abuse report, was effectively the DNS Abuse report was taken offline and might be, which we've since

deliberated effectively, is going to be how likely it is going to become a DNS Abuse report.

Those were the three main ones we came across in part of this deliberation. Again, nothing has been confirmed yet. The council could take away the questions that the members has discussed on Monday to determine the next approach and requirements that the PDP will go forward. And that was just a very short overview of the PDP. I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Luke. I think you set a land speed record for that presentation, so excellent work. Questions or comments for Luke, please? Particularly maybe Vivek or Lawrence, as representatives in this group, you might add some thoughts or ideas here if you feel like it after the question. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see questions. Crystal?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, Mason. Crystal Ondo with Google. I'm really excited about this PDP. I think we can get it done quickly. I think the parties are mostly willing to engage in good faith at this point. I'm from attractive parties. Google no longer has a registrar. We had quite a large one for many years. When we had one, I implemented associated domain checks at our registrar, and it was hugely effective to drive away campaigns. We ended up saving money in

our abuse program. We ended up saving money in chargebacks, and it's all just an agent process.

What we're asking registrars to do is say, tell your not agent, online agent, agent, like the people who investigate online abuse. So, you say to someone, you got a report for payment.uk, whatever it is, and it's confirmed DNS Abuse. Go look at that account. What else is in that account? Look at the payment profile. What else are they buying? Look across your registrant accounts. Are there any other similar ones?

It's literally a process you're giving to a human to do based on the registrar's portal. That's all we're asking for here. This is not a big ask. I think registrars should be able to do this. I understand the difference between a retail and a wholesale registrar.

This should be a very easy thing to do, and I appreciate all the work that our members are doing to get this done because this should be a very fast PDP, and I trust that obviously NetCraft knows what they're talking about, and I am on the advisory council for NetBeacon as well, so definitely support what they're pushing as the subject matter experts. So, to the extent we get to choose who is a subject matter expert, I would support them and their research.

MASON COLE Thank you, Crystal. Indeed, I think everybody here shares the idea that a short PDP would be very welcomed and not a two-year PDP. Yeah, thank you. All right, Marie.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thank you. Marie Pattullo, BC, obviously. First up, Luke, thank you so much. You and Ching and everyone involved in this process, it's been nice knowing you. I hope we still know you in a couple of years' time.

In all seriousness, picking up what Crystal just said, this is vital because it's not something that just one side wants. It's something that would be so good for our contracted party colleagues. It speeds things up. It cuts down costs. It's practical. It's realistic.

What I would like to do is throw both to you, Luke, and to Vivek, if you wouldn't mind surfacing a bit the conversation that came up this morning with CSG, because there has been a fair amount of concern that if the outcome is you should go and check if there are associated domains, that's great. But what do you do? What's the next step? And I do appreciate your answer this morning, Vivek, but I think it would be useful if we could surface that here afterwards. Thank you.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Marie.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

All right. Asteway. Thank you, Mason. I'm just wondering, have there been any change or any further deliberations on the time that the staff is taking to finalize the report and actually submit to Public Comment? Because I've seen some disagreements have been

going on between Vivek and a staff member, I guess, because they're already taking about three something months since March to that on top of actually the actual squeezing of the time, the weekly sessions from two hours to one and a half hours. Actually, I have concerns it might constrain the PDP to actually making it deliver on time. Thanks.

VIVEK GOYAL

Okay. First of all, I never have disagreements with ICANN staff. They are fantastic. And what they have produced was a draft for everybody to consider. And the six months that are needed to process the feedback is up for discussion. And there are some discussions going on, on how we can reduce this.

I suggested using AI. I mean, abusers are using it. We should use it too. So, but it's up for discussion and the draft timelines are being looked at on how to improve them for sure. I know you wanted to do four hours a week meetings that you were in support of that. But I think the general agreement was that it's very impractical given that we would like to start the second PDP also along with that. So, if you look at it, it'll become a full-time job, which not a lot of us are able to handle. Thank you.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

My position would be two hours should never have been requested in the first place because it's very extended. And I have seen that it

wasn't gaining traction on your side at all. So, maybe your next request might need to be very looked at in that respect.

VIVEK GOYAL Happy to go the way BC wants.

MASON COLE All right. Thanks for the question, Asteway. Chris?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS Before I go, Marie asked a really good question. I don't know if there was any response to that.

VIVEK GOYAL The question was that what happens once a registrar looks at other domains and found either one or a few of them abusive. We had raised this question to the charter team and we got a response that if any domain is found to be abusive, it will again fall under the limit of the RAA and they will be forced to take action on it because a malicious domain has been identified. What does the discussion I had with Margie later on, on this is what she's saying.

The requester, will the requester come to know that I had only reported one, but you found 10. Will you tell me about the other 10 or not? That we haven't yet discussed or has been brought up till now. And I know Crystal, maybe you can add to it, whether this is worth fighting over or not. Thank you.

CRYSTAL ONDO

It should definitely require an action at the account level or at the domain level. If, and if you have an account at GoDaddy, I don't mean just to pick one and you use it for fish, you use a domain for fishing, you violated your terms at GoDaddy. So, all of the domains in your account are therefore subject to being suspended per their terms. All registrars have terms that say this.

So, they should be legally allowed by their terms and their contracts to suspend all domains. Once they have flagged a single one in that account. There is no way a registrar is going to tell a requester what they did that is dead on arrival. We will make no progress with registrars on that. They have no obligation to tell a third party who is not privy to their contracts with their customers, what actions they took and why, like that's not even worth fighting about my opinion.

That's just adding to the cluster and the noise and getting pushed back from registrars instead of moving forward. I wouldn't waste our energy, our time, our goodwill with the contracted parties trying to ask for that.

MASON COLE

Chris, did you have a follow up?

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS

I didn't actually ask anything. I just said that was a really good question. So, I just want to go on the point at the start. I think there

was some really good demonstrations. Theo's demonstration was really good, showed how it was very much part of their process. I think we heard from Owen as well. I would like this to get through really quickly. It is very easily done. Everyone knows I work for CleanDNS. We are a provider. We do it. It's solved. It's doable.

There's a number of providers around this table that send us reports, number of companies that we deal with. They're sending those sorts of things. It's all viable. It's all easily doable. I would really like this to get done this year. So yeah, I just think that we work however we can to do that. And any support to the team, I think we're willing to give that. It's a really good team. So, I'm really looking forward to what we can achieve. Thank you.

LUKE WOOD I think we can all agree the timeline is definitely way too long. Two years. I think everyone saw that and quickly disagreed with that. So, we all very well aligned on shortening that time frame. So, definitely well aligned to that.

MASON COLE Segunfunmi, and then we're going to cut the queue and move forward with the agenda.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Energy that BC members are putting on this. And you will all agree with me that our representatives are doing incredibly a very good job tackling this matter. One of the encouragements I will have for

every one of us is we have four persons on the on the front line, which we have two members, Luke and Ching. We have Lawrence and Vivek who are acting as participants and alternate. We still have an open opportunity for every one of us to sign up as observers, which we should do.

As regards to the input, Ching has drafted a position for the BC, which we need to clean up before we circulate to membership for review. So, within the next few days, we'll be circulating the BC input on the DNS Abuse mitigation PDP for every one of us to review. Hopefully we have the seven days window for everyone to go through this. Otherwise, we may have to ask for an expedited review process. Thank you for all you do.

CRYSTAL ONDO I just we talked about it maybe two meetings ago or last meeting. Who knows when where we were in the world when we got together last, but where we can build relationships with other members in the GSO. This provides a really unique opportunity for the BC IPC Registry Stakeholder Group to be really well aligned here.

Let's make friends. Let's win hearts and minds. Let's not just fight for the fighting's sake. I think this is this PDP specifically gives us all that opportunity. So, go meet your friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle and get to know them and work with them and ask them questions and let them do the same with you.

Have drinks with them, whatever it is in an ICANN meeting. I think this is a unique opportunity for the BC.

LUKE WOOD

I'll just jump in and say that's a very good observation. And for BC's awareness, it's important to also look at who's in the room. So, a very good observation I had and several others had was the registrars who were in that room during the PDP discussions. Some core registrars that don't tend to attend ICANN were in that room, including Gname. So, we're already getting observation from some key registrars with historically proven high abuse rates. So, we've already got their interest. So, I'm looking forward to seeing how this progresses.

MASON COLE

All right, thanks. We really do need to cut the queue, so it's going to be Vivek, Segunfunmi, and then that's it. But before we do that, I want to echo what Crystal just said. I mentioned this in the CSG meeting earlier today, and that is about the tone of the discussion on DNS Abuse.

At times, I'm encouraged by the tone. At times, I'm disappointed by the tone. Right now, we're on an encouraging upswing, and I'd certainly like to keep it that way because the BC has been on the forefront of DNS Abuse for several years now. Sometimes the discussion gets contentious, and that's not helpful. I would encourage BC members to make good representations in the

community about our intentions on DNS Abuse. And that is that we want to work with the community. We're not doing this to annoy contracted parties.

We're doing this because the people we represent are victimized by DNS Abuse financially, reputationally, operationally. So, our efforts are in good faith, and I'd like to hear that repeated while we're here in India. So, to the extent that BC members can help with that, speaking as chair, I would appreciate that. Okay, Vivek, and then Segunfunmi.

VIVEK GOYAL

To add to what Crystal said, one more thing that's going for us is a lot of registrars, they already do this, right? So, what we are trying to say, and I've said this in meeting yesterday, is that we're not trying to penalize the ones that are already doing it. You're already doing it.

We just want to put this in the contract so that the ones that are not doing it can be held accountable, and ICANN compliance can force them to do it, right? And because a lot of registrars who are already doing this are explaining to us how they do it and explaining to others how they do it. And we just want to work with them to put this in the contract. It's very simple. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE

Just to add up to that line of thought. Our last meeting in Dublin, we all had a discussion and we agreed that one channel for us to

influence ICANN's work is through Public Comment, while the other part is for each and every one of us to engage in other stakeholder groups of interest, especially the At-Large.

There's a further discussion on DNS Abuse on the At-Large group, which it's encouraged that every one of us go and engage them at that level as well to influence as much as possible our position in those parts.

So the point is, let's get back and represent the interest of our constituency within the other stakeholder group as much as possible. Thank you. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Segunfunmi. All right. The queue is closed on this issue, please. All right. Tola is not online. We're going to skip agenda item number three for now and move to the policy calendar review. So, second for me, are you are you prepared? Do you need a moment?

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Yes.

MASON COLE: All right, all right. Segunfunmi, the floor is yours when you're ready.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Segunfunmi Olajide, for the record, your vice chair for policy coordination. Happy to see every one of you again in Mumbai.

Today we have on our policy open BC meeting in Mumbai. Since the last time that we met, we've not filed any Public Comment. But we have a few opportunities for us to contribute and influence the ICANN process, which we have on the name coalition procedure documentations closes on the 16th of March, which is about six days from now. Vivek has volunteered to put a position together for us. And I'd like to ask if you've made significant progress to share with the BC members on this.

VIVEK GOYAL Hi. Short answer, no progress yet. ICANN really appreciate if there's somebody who can help on this, because with all the things going on in ICANN, it's very difficult to devote time to this. But if nothing, I'll find some time and work on this.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Thank you. So, we have about six days to these already, which means we're running behind schedule. Does anyone within the BC willing to look into this within the short time or we should let it pass? Okay, so I'll take that silence for letting it pass. Otherwise, Vivek, if you're able to, please let me know. I appreciate.

So moving on to the next one, which is fundamental bylaw amendment on IANA related reviews CSC. Ching has also volunteered to put a position together. I've not heard from him and we still have about 20 more days to this. So, we'll let that be there for now. Ching is not on this call if I'm right.

So, the new opportunity for us to put pen on paper is on the draft guidelines for advancing UA adoption. We have to 13th of April to put our position together. And I think we are seeking members who will work on this for the BC. And I'll throw this out. Do we have anyone who is willing to jump on this for the BC? 13th of April. Yes, I appreciate.

So, moving on to the next one is our council activities. On this, I will turn this session of the meeting to our councilors to walk us through the last council meeting and then the next one. What to expect, where we are and the positions we think we should look into from the BC perspective. And on this, I'll call our councilors, Lawrence Olawale-Roberts and Vivek Goyal.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS Hello. Great. So, I'll start off and I'm sure Vivek will pick it up, preferably from the point where we start talking about SPS. So, the focus will be on the upcoming council meeting, which will be taking place tomorrow at about 13:15 in this same room. So please, we can make room for that on our agenda.

And basically, the council has a full agenda, starting with a consent agenda for confirming the chair of the first PDP, who happens to be Paul McGrady. From what we see, or from what we can tell, this will most likely sell through without an issue, although we've been put on notice by the registrars that they have a small comment to make.

Leading to the Mumbai meeting, there were some concerns raised around the process for the selection of chair and also the fact, noting also the fact that the first four Working Group meetings of the PDP will have held before a chair is confirmed. And council will definitely take this to note to ensure that possibly subsequently such anomalies or discomforts are treated.

On the agenda of council for tomorrow also, council will be providing an update on a number of programs and initiatives that we've considered a success. The Latin Diacritics Working Group, DNS Abuse just kicked off. Latin Diacritics is doing great and moving beyond schedule, which is a positive. And also, there has been some work on SSAD, Continuous Improvements, and RDRS. So that's a focus for the meeting tomorrow, basically highlighting what has been done and taking feedback. In the course of this meeting, we had also received briefing from staff showing us as council the volume of work that staff needs to do to be able to support PDP. That is very well appreciated and will inform further discussions that will be ongoing.

On council's agenda also is an update on the proposed Un-Adoption of approved chair and also policy recommendations. We don't currently have a policy for Board to Un-Adopt a community work that has gone up to them for approval. And there now is a need to have such a mechanism in view. The last Public Comment, I guess, last time I reviewed, I think about 10 organizations and

individuals made comments, including the BC. And those public comments are not yet; they're still being processed.

So, the outcomes will be reviewed in the near future. But of exciting notice, if I may put it that way, is the IPC's position saying that an un-adoption of such recommendations should go through the empowered community before the Board un-adopts it. The BC's position has been some careful analysis has to be done.

The concern here is that recommendations are always packed together. Sorry, such recommendations to the Board are always packed together and where one aspect needs to have further work done, there might be some unintended impact on other recommendations that also go with the pack. But this is still work in view. And I believe that we will keep, as a BC, we will continue to keep our eyes on that process. After that, we will be looking at the next steps on SSAD recommendations.

In this particular meeting week, we heard from representatives of the Board on the topic of Urgent Request. The SSAD recommendations were extensively discussed, has been extensively discussed at council. And council's decision is encouraging the Board to Un-Adopt those recommendations so that supplementary recommendations can be developed by whichever means the council will adopt to get that done.

But we've heard from a Board caucus in the course of this week that there is also a desire for recommendation eight, I guess it is of 18.

Thank you. Recommendation 18 of the policy work done on Urgent Request needing some further work also.

There were a number of options, about three options presented to council. But from our discussions, council is strongly leaning towards imputing the timeframe, which is now agreed at 24, not more than 24 hours into the box where that has served as a placeholder for this. And where the council advises the IRT with that timeline, we are hoping that that closes that portion of the work on Urgent Request and supplemental work required around authentication can then happen when we are working on the SSAD supplementary recommendations.

That also will receive some final discussion at this meeting happening tomorrow. And yes, Vivek, I'll turn it over to you for strategic planning sessions and others. Yeah.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you, Lawrence. As always, fantastic coverage. One of the biggest discussions we had in SPS was prioritization of work in GNSO council. As you know, there is always a lot of work that GNSO council needs to do and how do we prioritize what gets done and what gets pushed back to other meetings and all. And they have a few tools where they keep a track of what all work is coming up or needs to be done by GNSO council, but there isn't a mechanism wherein all the councilors can decide on what needs to be prioritized or not.

So, there was a little back and forth on this and it has been decided a proper prioritization methodology will be put in place so that it's not only about the one who shouts the most or talks the loudest, it's a more defined methodology where everybody's inputs can be taken, all the constituencies, and then properly decided which work needs to get done or not. There is some work that will happen on that and we are very looking forward to providing our inputs on that.

One thing I forgot to mention, I would like to add is that on the feedback to this whole process of un-adopting a policy to the ICANN, BC had submitted a very strong comment, which was led by Segunfunmi and supported by Dr. Crocker and myself. So, we hope that it is taken into consideration and something positive comes out of it. Like Lawrence said, the next meeting is tomorrow and we will provide more updates on that after the meeting. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Thank you for your active work on the council, both of you. Are there questions for Vivek or Lawrence as regards the council activities? Is there a raise of hand? Okay, great. All right, so moving on to other GNSO council activities.

Once again, the early input on DNS Abuse mitigation PDP is going to be shared with us as soon as we clean it up. That closes on the 20th of March, and so we'll expect feedback from every one of you. On other activities, I'd like to ask, Nenad is here. Any updates as regards the CIP? Nothing, I appreciate. RDRS, we've gotten an

update already. Ching Chiao is not here. Imran Hossain, do we have any updates as regarding the subsequent round? Nothing, okay, good. Just a consideration, some of these items missing, you may want to guide me or any other person. Do we need to pull some of these things out or they are still all?

MASON COLE: Probably, yeah.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE: Okay. Yeah, go ahead. All right, thank you for those feedbacks. Yeah, please go ahead, Lawrence.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yeah, okay, so just wanted to add that one interesting development in the community right now is around the Review of Reviews and how the GNSO continues to evolve as one of the entities within the ecosystem. I think where we have continuous improvement and the others, we should also have our representatives on the Review of Reviews possibly provide some updates and guidance.

I know that is Asteway and Arinola. Possibly you can help with some reviews, I mean some updates on what's going on in that space, especially as it regards to the GNSO. We're told that for, or rather the understanding right now is for anything to happen within the GNSO, it has to be called up or brought up from the GNSO itself. So, in terms of how we remain relevant and effective,

and if we have any proposals in that regard, we might need to keep a closer eye on those developments. Thank you.

ASTEWAY NEGASH Thank you, Lawrence. I have been a member of the SSI, the continuous improvement, I mean working, not working group, but standing committee for Continuous Improvement. And that cohort has already developed its final report and has submitted, we have all agreed on it. And I guess the GNSO Council has approved our Final Report. I have not been following the Review of Reviews. I'm sure there is a lot of development on that respect, but I have not been part of it. I'm an observer, but I have not been following that. So, thanks.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Marie, please go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO Thanks, gents. Marie again. If I can pick up on Lawrence's point, there was a conversation on, I'm sorry, I don't remember, a day, it might have been Saturday, it might have been Sunday, about the Review of Reviews. And I think I know where Lawrence is going here. And the co-chairs had a great presentation, and they explained that they're looking at various options that may or may not include structure. Now this sounds very dull. It's not.

For those of you who are following it, you will know that within the structure of the GNSO, there are two houses. We are half of one

house, the CSG, which lives with our friends and colleagues from the non-commercial side under the banner of the Non-Contracted Party sales.

Now, sometimes that structure works really well, and we've got some great friends. And sometimes it doesn't. This is not us saying we're better than them, they're better than us. It's just practical and realistic. And we have been asking, only to my knowledge, for 15 years for that structure to be looked at again. And that's only what I know.

We were told by ICANN, no. And then we were told in the last review of the GNSO, which used to be mandated under the bylaws in 2014, a lot of people made comments about the structure. And we were told by the independent consultant that ICANN appointed that, no. And now we're being told, and this was, I forget, sorry, if it was Saturday or Sunday, that it's up to the GNSO itself to save the GNSO.

Unfortunately, that's not the way it happens. In reality, I'm not in any way saying anyone is misrepresenting anything. With a record. I'm just saying that it is true that if we want to be efficient and effective and practical and work in the global public interest and serve all of our consumers and everything that you can put within the we are good, decent human beings bucket.

We do need to realize that sometimes things that were put in place in around 2008 might need looking at in around 2026. And if anyone wants to continue that conversation, come and talk to me

when we're not in this room and all falling asleep on my time. Thank you.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Thank you, Marie, for that perspective and also Lawrence. Next step of actions for me will be to contact representative in each of these existing working groups to know which of them we need to clear up and to add up new or emerging discussions. One of my positions as your vice chair for policy is to listen to you and then be able to coordinate your views into one that we can all agree on. Moving on to the next item is channel number three, which is CSG activities. And on this, I will turn this to Marie and Mason.

MARIE PATTULLO Thank you. Marie, for the record. First up, thank you to all of you who were in the CSG session this morning. Very briefly, because we all have lives. The most important thing for the CSG at the moment is, of course, who is going to be the Board representative for the NCPH as of the AGM.

In other words, Board reps have a mandate. The time mandate runs out of the AGM, which is October. Please don't ask me where that meeting is going to be because I will not answer. And we redid the process as to how we work with our friends in the non-commercial side to agree on and appoint a Board member. That process is now being worked through.

There was a public call for does anyone want to be a Board member? Some people responded. We had what we call a selection committee. This doesn't mean they chose. It means they checked that they weren't axe murderers and they came from the right geographic region and they knew how to spell ICANN. Yes, I'm being facetious, but. And then it came down to the two SGs and we've had some interviews. Thank you so much to all of you who came to them.

Our colleagues in the NCSG are following their own process. And now what's happening is the current chair of CSG, John IPC, and the current chair of NCSG, Rafik, are starting to have a conversation as to who we can agree on.

Now, you will understand that we're not going to start chucking around names in a public forum. We have every intention of ensuring that this is collegiate, friendly, put forward in the best interests of the world at large. Because please remember that the appointed Board member for our house doesn't do what we tell them to do. That's not the job.

The job is to ensure that they speak with us, all of us, and that our views, issues, concerns are surfaced. But it doesn't mean we can tell them what to do. And for the Board to go forward properly and do its job properly, we need a good person. We will keep you posted on that.

Other things on the CSG agenda, as usual, is making sure that we work together collegiately and what have you. Part of which, as

those of you who are in the session this morning will know, we have the honor to be talking to the ICANN Board between 4:30 and 5:30 p.m. this afternoon. Please come. I know it's a long day. I know you've all got really important things to do. But please do come because Mason and I will be really lonely if you don't. As ever, if anybody has any questions, you know where to find us. Back to Mason.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Thank you once again, Marie, for that report on CSG activities. Okay. Yes, Chris Lewis-Evans. Please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS First of all, thank you for those taking part in the Board seat interviews and everything else that's going on, on that. My question from last time still stands. Considering the process last time, are we still looking to be on time to get them in place at the right point?

MARIE PATTULLO Thank you so much for your question, Chris. Two years ago, three years ago, whenever it was, I'm sorry. We had an agreement within. There was a Board member. The process is either you reappoint the Board member or you pick a new one. For a number of reasons, there could not be an agreement between CSG and NCSG. As CSG, we then put forward to their top of head. I think it might have been

six or it might have been seven potential candidates. All of whom, unfortunately, CSG decided didn't meet that criteria.

We came down to the wire where we actually and quite understandably started getting letters from Tripti. Slapping our hands going. And she was right. And so, the NCSG put forward Chris, who is our current Board member. You will know Chris Buckridge. We had a conversation. We said, yes, okay, fine. He's got a lot of experience and we really need to get this over the line.

That was the whole reason why we did this whole Board seat 14 review, whatever we used to call it committee thing. So to fast forward to where you are now, I can tell you on behalf of the commercial stakeholder group, we have an agreed agreement between the three constituencies as to the person that we believe would best serve the interests of the entire and CPH. I cannot answer for the NCSG. But I can tell you that we are ready.

We have been ready for some time that we are doing our utmost to ensure that we do meet the deadline, which is March 25, which is not very far away. And we will continue to operate in good faith, in transparency. And I can tell you, Chris, if it was down to the CSG, we're ready. I wish I could say more.

SEGUNFUNMI OLAJIDE Thank you, Marie. Chris, does that…? Great. So, last on our list is channel number four, which is an executive policy impact report for 2025 that we circulated sometimes ago. This is our effort to capture

our work as a constituency highlighting on a single page your contributions, the impact we made, the progress we made in 2025.

I encourage you all to look through this. Feel free to circulate it for external use. And what else? Okay. So on that, I think I'll turn this back to the BC Chair, Mason Cole.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Secretary. Good report. And I do encourage you to take a look at what Segunfunmi put together under channel four. It's very well done. All right. Tola is still not here, so we are going to skip the Finance and Operations update. We are now in AOB. Any other business for the BC today? Zak.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH

Thank you, Mason. Just wanted to let everyone know about a couple sessions that are coming up in case your dance card isn't full. There's at 1:15 p.m. today, if you're not going to the TLD application management system introduction demo, which is taking place, then there's another session. That's the NCSG constituencies work session at 1:15. They've requested a report from the IGO IRT, which I've been on.

And so, Brian Beckham and I will be having the privilege of presenting to them a briefing on the status of the IGO IRT. And it could be an interesting session for you to join in later. Thank you.

Another session that's happening that you may want to drop by is tomorrow, Wednesday at 10:30 a.m. It's emerging topics for GAC

discussion. And the GAC has requested a briefing from WIPO and Brian Beckham and myself on the status of the UDRP review report that WIPO and ICA both independently did. And so, we'll be presenting that to them at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Well, identified, Zak. Thank you for raising those. And good luck in your presentations. All right. Other business for the BC? Queue is clear. I'm going to give everybody a 10-minute head jump on lunch. Thanks, everyone. Good meeting. BC is adjourned.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. You can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**