ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: RySG Membership Work Session (1 of 4)
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

NIKKI SCHULER

Hello and welcome to this meeting of the Registry Stakeholder Group. 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 in Zoom. 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

Hello, friends. This is Beth Bacon, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Welcome to the first of four of our Registry Stakeholder Group membership sessions. Hoping folks will filter in after lunch. I might have thought that this started at 13:30, so maybe other people do too.

Despite that, I also want to note we do have a slightly larger number than usual of online participants, and in our morning CPH session, I did ask if it was helpful for our online folks to feel a little more

connected. If you turn your camera on, if you are in the Zoom room and you feel comfortable, it makes them feel like part of the room. But if you're not, then live your life. All right. The agenda is up on the board.

We are going to start with a GNSO Council update. Then we are going to go through some of our usual policy updates and discussions, and hopefully we'll hear some nice updates from meetings that have gone on during this week so far already. And then we'll look through to some planning.

We're already talking about plenary topics for 1886, and then we can wrap up and cover any other business. Is there anything on this agenda that -- I'm sorry. Is there anything not on this agenda that you would like to see? Is there any other business? Jeff, did you want to raise your IRT update as part of our policy discussions, just in case these folks -- not everyone here made it to our registry one?

JEFFREY NEUMAN Sure, and I was kind of way too quick, trying to go too quick, so I'm not sure I even got the point across. But okay, yeah.

BETH BACON Okay, yeah, no, we were a little rushed at the end, so I wanted to make sure to give you time. All right, so I will add you to the end of the policy discussions. Okay, with that, our wonderful councilors, are you ready to give your update? I turn to Jen, Nacho, and Sam.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thank you. I think Sam and I are going to tag team, and Nacho's going to come in if we forgot stuff, and that's why we're the dream team. So, Sam, did you want to take it away, and we'll do the tag team?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Sure, happy to do that. You guys hear me okay?

BETH BACON Perfect.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU All right, thanks so much. All right, so we did put together a couple of slides for this update. We can jump right into the first one. This first topic here is the one that we really need some discussion on, and we need to get some input from membership on. The rest of the slides will be more of an update, so I really want to make sure we can spend kind of as much time on this particular topic as we need to.

So, this has to do with Urgent Requests. And specifically, it has to do with what comes next on this topic. And if any of you guys sat in or listened in on the session that the CPH just had with the ICANN Board before your lunch break, Greg laid out a really good overview of the different options for the path forward, and really what the

Board is thinking about in terms of kind of knitting this whole thing together.

And it really has to do with the introduction of the requirement that Urgent Requests be authenticated, the requesters who make Urgent Requests be authenticated in some way, and integrating that into the future policy. Because the original recommendation, and this goes all the way back to phase 1 of the EPDP on registration data, it talked about a timeline for responding to Urgent Requests, but it didn't contemplate any type of authentication.

For those keeping score at home, the topic of authentication and accreditation of users who are requesting access to data, that got handled in phase two of the EPDP, where there were recommendations to develop a standardized system for access and disclosure, or the SN.

That becomes relevant here as well, because as kind of a side update, those original policy recommendations have not yet been adopted by the ICANN Board. They went through an operational design assessment that led to the launching of the RDRS, the registration data request service, the pilot program, the standing committee on that pilot program submitted a report to the council, just kind of to understand the viability and feasibility of a centralized system going forward.

The reason I mention that is because council has already determined that it's going to recommend that the Board not adopt

the SN recommendations, so that will open a path to develop supplemental recommendations about those original policy recommendations. That becomes relevant here when we talk about option two that you see on the screen.

So Beth, I think, captured it really well in both the CPH and the session with the Board, this is a very complex matter where there is a web of a lot of, like, intertangled strings here. And what everyone is trying to do is just find a clear procedural path forward that meets everyone's needs, sticks to the processes that exist within the GNSO and within ICANN generally, but still results in an outcome that makes sense for everyone and is, like, operationally viable for registries and registrars, I mean, particularly registrars, but in some cases registries as well.

Okay, that's a lot of background. And I also am conscious that I, being remote, I'm just speaking into a void. I want to pause here and see if anyone has any questions about kind of the setup for this before we start diving into the options of what's in front of us for specifically our requests.

BETH BACON Sam, I'm not in the room because I apparently don't know how to work a computer. Hold on.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU It's okay. Beth, while you get dialed in, Jeff has a hand.

JEFFREY NEUMAN

Yeah, quick question. Wasn't authentication kind of a requirement for all users of the SSAD? Wasn't that in phase two? So, wouldn't it just naturally be read that, of course, even though it doesn't say authentication in the original recommendation for Urgent Requests, it was assumed to be in there because all, I mean, they didn't have to be authenticated in the same way as we're talking about with law enforcement, but there was some form of authentication that was required. Or am I totally misremembering that?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

No, Jeff, you're not misremembering it. So, the phase two recommendations did contemplate authentication for all users. I think the problem that we're running into here is the sequencing of all of this and the fact that the work has been divided into two phases. And specifically, because the phase 2 stuff is in kind of a procedural limbo, having not been adopted by the ICANN Board and therefore not implemented versus the Phase 1 recommendations, which include Recommendation 18 on Urgent Requests, they are basically implemented. There is a registration data policy.

Recommendation 18 is just the one piece that's still left hanging out in there. And I think that's where the schism is happening. Beth, I see your hand.

BETH BACON

Yeah. Thank you, Sam. Fine use of schism. So, I think that, thank you, A, for walking us through this. And we brought this up with the Board and we tried really hard, didn't always, doesn't always work out, but we tried really hard not to get into the actual discussion of authentication or the problems or any of the questions we're trying to answer. But really just the procedure to get us moving.

As we've discussed, there's just a lot of conversations happening all over the place. And I think that it just generally behooves us as folks that are going to have to rely upon any sort of authentication to be part of that process. And right now, that is pretty much not happening. And I think that, Sam, I was going to make the point of just recalling for folks that Recommendation 18 is specific to Urgent Requests.

And we are not trying to solve all of the authentication problems for everything. That's another thing we want to try and avoid here. Keep everything too tight to the Urgent Request. It's a small, small thing. And not try and fix everything while we do Urgent Requests. So, I think that's another, as we move forward, I think that's something to consider as we establish our position and make our choices here. But thank you, Sam, for walking everybody through that.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Sure thing, Beth. So, that kind of brings us to where we are and what question is ahead of the Council at this point. And that is, what should we do next to get from the IRT's proposed language on a timeline for Urgent Request and make that operational? So, back, I think it was in October of last year, the IRT finally reached agreement on a 24-hour timeline to respond to Urgent Requests so long as those requests are authenticated.

And that went out for Public Comment. And now it just still hasn't quite made it into official ICANN consensus policy because there needs to be this procedural step to kind of close the loop on that. So this is where Greg and Wes Hardaker, those are the two Board members who are from the Data Privacy and Protection Caucus on the Board, they came in and presented the three options that you see here on the screen to the GNSO Council.

Just right off the bat, I'm going to say option three of Un-Adopting a recommendation and then trying to develop new policy around it seems unpalatable to almost everyone. It creates, I think, even more uncertainty than exists in this already very uncertain situation. So, I'm not going to spend a lot of time on option three.

Options one and two, this kind of gets down into the weeds of is the authentication mechanism for Urgent Requests, is it a matter of implementation or is it a matter of policy? So, if it's a matter of implementation, then the GNSO Council could just write a communication saying, yes, that's just a matter of implementing Recommendation 18, even though Recommendation 18 didn't

originally contemplate authentication of requesters for Urgent Requests and that's that.

Option two, however, would kind of start to conflate and bring Urgent Requests back in line with all other requests and say that you could just deal with the authentication mechanism piece when the Council develops supplemental recommendations for the SSAD because authentication is going to be dealt with on a more general way. So, kind of what Jeff was mentioning in the question that he raised. These are the options ahead of us.

One of the things that I personally floated to the Council in our discussions was that it seems like we could kind of mix options one and two. Option one, just go ahead and implement Recommendation 18 per the proposed timeline document that went out for Public Comment. So, it would add a timeline to the registration data policy and also define what Urgent Requests, sorry, all the criteria for Urgent Requests and then finally it would note what authenticated user means.

In that proposed text, it references that the authenticated users would be authenticated pursuant to ICANN policy. That piece of language, I think, is what kind of opens the door for this to be enshrined or like formalized, if you will, through some kind of policy process.

And since we are opening a policy process to develop supplemental recommendations for the SSAD recommendations and since those SSAD recommendations cover authentication or accreditation

more broadly, to me this seems like a natural place to cover this. You would just cover it as kind of a subtopic of those two things. So, that's what has been put out for consideration.

The Council is very much still thinking about this. Everyone needed to go back and talk about it with their groups. This is the opportunity for us to get everyone's input on this matter. And again, sorry for all the really lengthy background and explanation. This is kind of thorny and I wanted to make sure I covered all the basics. Jeff?

JEFFREY NEUMAN Yeah, no, thank you for all that background. That really helps. Probably the best I've heard it explained in a while. So, good job. If we take your solution or your recommendation, which actually I think is good, how much time is it going to be before we have some resolution? And will that be something that the GAC will say we're delaying too much or will that be subject to complaints?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU So, that's a great question, Jeff. And I can't give you a hard and fast answer just yet. It really is going to be dependent on how long it takes to develop the supplemental recommendations for the SSAD.

That said, the Council has been very clear, including in our conversation with the GAC when we laid out this path, that because the supplemental recommendation development, because we're going to look to the RDRS Standing Committee's final report, which

did a breakdown of every single one of the SSAD recommendations and gave at least some guidance as to whether they should be revised or kept as is, we're not starting from scratch here.

So, the expectation is that we would be able to get through all of that work in a matter of months. So, what I think you could do, ICANN could do is, ICANN could update the registration data policy with the proposed text from the proposal in October. I think we've got an open line.

BETH BACON: Excuse me, you've got an open mic. I think it's Michael or Pat.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Okay. I think that took care of it. You could update the registration data policy language essentially right now. The enforcement of that aspect, of the Urgent Request aspect, obviously would remain outstanding until the authentication mechanism is formalized, hopefully through the SSAD supplemental recommendations process. But again, hopefully we'd be looking at a matter of months, not years, not even hopefully a full year, until that is fully up and running.

To your question about how the GAC would feel about this, considering that the PSWG, who is leading the effort on authenticating law enforcement agencies, is still very much in the weeds of doing its work, I would imagine that these timelines have the possibility of converging in a way that would not inflame the

GAC. But I can't pretend I know exactly what they're thinking or how they'll react to everything. Does that answer your question, Jeff?

JEFFREY NEUMAN Yeah, thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Okay. All right. I think it's Marc, then Beth, then Jen.

MARC ANDERSON Thanks. Marc Anderson for the transcript. I agree with Jeff. That was an excellent background, Sam. Thank you. I've spoken on this topic before. You've heard me talk about this in previous calls, so it should probably come as no surprise to anyone that I favor option two.

It seems like the path of least resistance, the most logical option. Jeff pointed out that Jeff's question at the beginning isn't authentication incorporated into the SSAD recommendations? Yes. I think that's part of what makes this kind of a natural fit. I don't want to say easy path forward, because that's probably going to jinx us, but I think it's the most logical path forward, perhaps the path of least resistance.

Jeff brings up a good point about how the GAC will view it. I think the GAC has come out on record as stating that they feel like this is an implementation issue and not a policy issue. And I think you

could make a fair argument either way. From an RySG perspective, what we're talking about is requiring contract parties to integrate with another system, with an ICANN-created or sponsored system.

And I think we should, if we're going to take on the cost of integrating with a system like that, it should be very clearly articulated in policy. So, while I acknowledge you could make an argument either way, I think having that clearly spelled out in policy is probably a good practice and something that we maybe want to have a precedent set in that regard.

So, I would lean towards taking option two for those reasons. I guess I've probably talked enough, so I'll stop there and pass it over to Beth, I guess.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Marc. This is Beth. I think we can all see the merits of taking an implementation path versus a policy or vice versa policy path. I have less optimism that the GAC will understand or appreciate, not understand, but appreciate the difference between straight down path one or straight down path two.

And as soon as they hear the word policy, I think that we need to very, very much consider that we are going to have to explain this. If we went that way, we would have to explain this incredibly thoroughly. I think that we would absolutely need the GNSO to provide an immediate timeline of how this would go.

And so, I just think that that is one hurdle that it's not insignificant. And if kind of a hybrid approach is the way to go, and that's what the registries decide, sure. But I think with regards to kind of the tunnel vision on Urgent Requests, I think the GAC will be a challenge, and one that perhaps we can surmount.

But I do have some questions. I think if we go the route of kind of the hybrid between one and two, we would have to draft this. Tell me if I'm explaining this right. We would have to draft the supplemental recommendation and then kick off at least a partial policy development process, and we would have to build the authentication, and we would be building authentication for everyone and everything, not just law enforcement. Is that wrong?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Beth, it's Sam. Like, I don't know that that's wrong, specifically. I think we can be a little creative with how we do this. So, for example, okay. So, sorry. First of all, let me tackle question one. There isn't going to be another policy process around authentication. This is going to be handled in the supplemental policy recommendation development process. So, that part will be a single work stream, if you will.

Now, the question of does a whole authentication system need to be built, I can't really answer that at this point. I think it is a possible outcome of the supplemental process, supplemental recommendation process, that that recommendation as a whole gets pulled back, and that they wouldn't carry forward with a

recommendation that ICANN or a contractor, whoever, builds a whole system for authentication and accreditation of all users.

It could be that these recommendations just morph into, you know what, we're only going to talk about accrediting law enforcement, and it's only going to be for the topic of Urgent Requests. Other users will not necessarily need to be authenticated, because that works just fine in the pilot RDRS.

These are potential outcomes that are on the table. I can't predict at this point what direction it will or will not go in, but that's one thing that just can't really be answered right now.

BETH BACON Marc?

MARC ANDERSON Thanks. Marc Anderson. I think that's a great point, Beth. When it comes to how the work by the Small Team is crafted, I don't know if there's a formal charter. I don't know how that would be kicked off or implemented, but I think how that's kicked off will have lots of ramifications for how the work on authentication proceeds.

So, I think this is something we'll want to pay very close attention to. Beth asked if this would mean we'd have to build an authentication system for everything in order for this to be implemented for Urgent Requests, right, that would be a less than desirable outcome, right? We would, you know, and Sam said we can get creative and have a path forward with this deal specifically

with the Urgent Request question, which I think would be a much more desirable outcome.

So, I think how that work is like I said, I don't know if there's a charter, but I'm going to use that word anyway. How that work is chartered I think will be very important in shaping the outcome, because we do want flexibility. We want this to be able to proceed in a or with a reasonable time frame, and we don't want it unnecessarily coupled with the SSAD work.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Yeah, thanks, Marc. Like I said, I think there is potentially a path where the topic of authenticating law enforcement for Urgent Requests specifically gets like somewhat broken out, but again, it is all to be determined still. Jen?

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Sam. Just a quick response, because I heard this when Marc was mentioning how is council going to look at the SSAD next steps the phase two recs that will be Un-Adopted as a package, and then council itself hasn't really determined the final kind of steps on what that might look like. We're kind of converging around, and I hate to name something when we don't know what it might be yet.

Some councilors have mentioned Small Team plus, plus, plus, plus, plus, whatever that means. It just means the work of the standing committee would not go away. A lot of that will form the basis of

perhaps even the membership of this Small Team Plus, plus, plus, but the way that the council, and it's not a charter for small teams, it's an assignment form, but I would imagine, and again, I wasn't around when they did the Small Team Plus, the original Small Team Plus for SubPro, and I think Jeff was probably around then, and there's probably going to be some provisions for participation beyond just councilors.

So, I think, again, in our consideration of what the registries want, we need to be quite clear on how council is going to organize that work before we say, hey, let's fold that in there. Of course, nevertheless, there's also a possibility of what Sam was mentioning.

If that is split up into a different track or something that could be folded back into implementation once done, that also could be one way of looking at it, but it is going to be in the council meeting tomorrow, and we will start talking about SSAD next steps, and I expect this will touch on a little bit about the council's thinking towards option one, two, and three or hybrid of sorts. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Yeah, thanks very much for that, Jen. The council also has an additional meeting on Thursday morning to talk about the next steps on the SSAD recommendations specifically, so I'm expecting that council will settle on its path and have a decision made around that possibly this week. If not, then probably by the next council

meeting, which would bring us into April, so that's just a question on a timeline that Beth raised in the chat.

All right, I have Jeff and then Beth, and then I think at this point, understanding that this is not the last time we will talk about this, right? This is just an introduction to get some initial feedback. I think after Beth, it's probably a good time for us to move on because I'm conscious that we're using up a lot of the time on today's agenda. Jeff?

JEFFREY NEUMAN Yeah, just the Small Team Plus, I mean, it started out council was creating small teams for everything. The plus was there to basically say it should be others with experience or expertise, sorry, not experience, expertise in the area, and that became the Small Team Plus because it was, yeah, it could be a councilor or it could be someone else.

I strongly urge that they maintain the plus component. It's always best to have each stakeholder group, I mean, even limited in terms of numbers, but just make sure you have the right experts in the room rather than just the councilors, so I think smaller teams have its purpose and I think could be good here as long as we have the right people. Thanks.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks, Jeff. All really good input for us to take on Board. Beth?

BETH BACON

Yeah, this is Beth. Thanks very much, Sam. I think this has been really helpful and again, as you say, this isn't the last time we're going to talk about this. I think this has been really good for just the foundational discussion so we can understand when after, at least tomorrow and then Thursday, when you guys come back to us with some options, it'll have some context.

And if councilors feel comfortable, I feel like we've settled around guidance towards saying one perhaps, I think one is where it's an easy one, but like the combo of one and two is perhaps a way forward, but getting more detail around what that might look like would really help inform the registry discussion.

So, whatever comes out of that, please feel free to just reach back at any time and I encourage folks to just stay on top of email and things so you can see the updates if we are going to be talking through the dedicated Thursday session, but if councilors feel comfortable, I feel like we have a good consensus around asking a couple more questions, getting a little more guidance around what this might look like as a path forward, that combo of one and two, and then we can be ready to provide you feedback and support, so much appreciation. I know this is a sticky one.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks very much, Beth. We do have a few more quick updates. Do we have time on the agenda?

BETH BACON You absolutely do.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Okay, then we can go to the next slide, and I'll cover this slide just because it does tie into the last topic and the next steps on SSAD, and then I will, Jen, if you don't mind, I'll hand it back over to you for the rest of the slides.

So, this slide covers the topics that we discussed in the council's bilateral meeting with the GAC. Since we covered it already, I will just mention that we teed up our thinking around the next steps for the SSAD recommendations and this process to develop supplemental recommendations.

GAC kind of took it all in. The response so far seems not negative, so that's great. That's great for us. We also talked a lot about DNS Abuse, about the PDPs that have kicked off. I would say the GAC's main response to that was generally one of support. They're happy that we're taking on this work, but they would like to see the timeline, especially for the first PDP on associated domains checks, be faster than what has originally been proposed.

I will leave that for the DNS Abuse update to discuss if the timeline has come up at all in those sessions since I haven't been able to attend them.

We also covered Urgent Requests. This update with the GAC and the, sorry, the discussion with the GAC was less about this path

forward. We didn't get into these details at all because it's still too early. Instead, this was really more of an update from Gabe Andrews of the FBI on the ongoing work that the Public Safety Working Group is doing on the authentication mechanism.

Lastly, we talked a bit about Human Rights impact assessments and how the GSO has been incorporating HRIAs into the charters for policy development processes, the idea being that there is an assessment about impacts on Human Rights that takes place as policy recommendations are getting developed.

The GAC shared some information from its side about how it incorporates assessments of Human Rights into its work, which is really to say that they mostly focus on their own kind of actions and policies. I'm sorry, not policies, processes. They weigh in when they're asked to weigh in on whether there's Human Rights assessments.

They don't necessarily do a proactive assessment when they're doing things like developing communiqué's or developing advice.

Any questions there? All right. With that, I'll hand it over to Jen to walk us through the rest of the slides. Thanks, everyone.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Sam. Jen Chung, for the record, tagging in. We can go to the next slide. Quickly running through some updates on the topics we had during our working sessions, we had a pretty comprehensive presentation from the Review of Reviews CCG.

We started looking at that lovely matrix that I think they've been circulating and socializing with all the different SOAC, NCSGs. Councilors very naturally had a lot of questions around the structural review, especially when we're looking at GNSO review and how that could be.

There was, of course, many questions about threshold, which I think is a next big topic there. I see our expert here in the room, Sophie, and also Chris. Council will probably talk a little bit more about that, but my expectation really is Council will be looking to the different SG&Cs and components of the GNSO to have a further, more detailed look at it. Not to say that Council itself won't have a response, but I think there will be interesting responses throughout.

We had an update from the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group. I think they're also coming to, wrapping up their work with a report at the end. I'm looking at Edmuon who's sitting over there contemplating, because I had to walk out of the end part of that update as well. I think we're looking at seeing where some GNSO work or some GNSO support could probably assist with implementing some of those topics or some work that is identified there. I'm just seeing, I'm just needing a nod or a shake. If I'm really okay, not really. Okay, if you really --

EDMON CHUNG Well, just one sentence. The recommendations are to for ICANN staff to talk to the Board or and the council to see if an issues report

should be created. And so, nothing in terms of policy for quite some time.

JENNIFER CHUNG That is music to my ears, because there's a lot of policy stuff coming down that will require a lot of resources. So, thank you very much Edmon.

Running through, we had a case study from the GDS liaisons on how Latin Diacritics PDP is going. My expectation is we can probably take a look at how they implemented quite a few different things that were done for the very first time, including the Human Rights impact assessment, the global public interest framework, and other things.

It's very comprehensive there. And then the last bit we touched on was topics that were brought in from the NCSG. They had some suggestions regarding, I guess, looking at improvements before we start the PDP initiation that includes independent studies. It also includes principles around the issues report.

And also, they had a topic on parity of membership representation. I think we can go to the next slide if there are no questions on this, but I'll pause briefly to see and check Zoom room.

I see there's a comment from Jeff. I will refrain from commenting from that comment. Let's go to the next one. So, we are yet to meet with the Board. We will be meeting with the Board tomorrow. And

of course, ICANN Board has sent the two questions to all the SOAC. And I guess CPH also looked at the same two questions.

Council is responding to the first one about the strategic plan. And really for Reviewer of Reviews, we have more of a response where we're really looking towards the different SGs and Cs to kind of have that fuller response as well.

In terms of looking at our own process, I guess council has been looking at a variety of ways to increase the effectiveness of policy development. Generally, that includes improvements to our own PDP process, includes improvements prior to the PDP process, and also afterwards, which kind of looking at the Board readiness, which really details a lot of how recommendations get put to the Board, get Un-Adopted, get thrown back out, how those things can also merge with the, I guess what Kurtis has mentioned in many several occasions, even in the previous meeting, where they are looking at increasing the effectiveness of policy implementation throughout the entire cycle. So I think there's a lot of discussion and good discussion there that's merging.

Another part is we are going to be doing a small update to the Board regarding the PDP and GGP manual red lines. I think that has gone out for Public Comment. Council hasn't had a chance to go through the Public Comments in detail, but the expectation is we will be doing that during our meeting and there will be some edits and improvements done to that, but it's generally thought to be pretty stable at this point.

I think this morning in the CPH meeting with the Board registries, we didn't really have a particular opinion on this, but the registrar said so. I think that is also going to be, of course, looked at during council. Any questions on this? Marc.

MARC ANDERSON

Thanks, Jen. Marc Anderson. I can't help but ask a question about the Board readiness work. It's something you and I have talked about. I know I've contributed to that and I think the council is doing great work in this area. So, I really, really commend the council on that one.

But in light of our session with the Board and what we heard about the Board how the Board's ability to move forward on some recommendations, including the two we talked about today, like how is there anything the council can do or how does that impact the council's assessment of its Board readiness work?

I'm not necessarily trying to knock over an anthill or whatever the colloquialism here is, but it just strikes me that council could do all the work in the world to produce Board ready recommendations, but if it takes months or years for the Board to act on them, then I think we still have a problem.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Marc, for that really important comment. In fact, the way we call it, I mean, there's a little certain sense of irony in calling it Board readiness, right? Because we're talking about the Board

readiness of our recommendations to the Board, but is the Board ready to act on them? That's always the big question.

I think for council, I mean, we went through in quite a lot of detail during our Strategic Planning Session, which I don't think was open, but there will be a kind of a readout of the outcomes of that. And we went into quite a lot of detail on what of those learnings from this Board readiness work is already in the council's tool arsenal that we need to improve.

Anything that is new that we need to look to implement and probably look at prioritization as well. But it really doesn't touch on too much on when it gets to the Board, what the Board will do. And I don't think it's in the council's remit to be able to tell the Board that they need to do what they need to do.

But there is certainly a sense where if we try to make our policy development, the recommendations as ready as possible for them to act on, there should be less of a stall or less of a, I guess, bottleneck on their part, even though again, we can't be going towards over that wall to say, Board, you must accept all of these and adopt all of these because they're now ready for you, even though that's kind of what we're trying to say without saying it. I hope that helps.

MARC ANDERSON

It does. Thanks, Jen. I know I was asking a little bit of a loaded question there, so sorry to dump that on you, but that is helpful. Thank you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Not at all. I think that's something we're all thinking about, but just not articulating it publicly too many times.

I think this is the end of this slide. I have the next, and it really is a run through of what the council meeting will be. It's a whole long list of things. I will point to the previous update slide that I did on the RySG call if you want something a little more detailed. I have that all on the slides and all the links and the background documents on that.

It is a whole long list of things, but the only voting item is our consent agenda vote to confirm the ADC PDP Working Group chair for Paul McGrady. I don't expect that there will be any problems confirming him, but there will definitely be some comments that will be raised before the consent agenda vote and signaled from different councilors, so there will be that.

There is that feel good second bullet about celebrating achievements. I think we're pointing towards the closing or the final parts of the work from the Latin Diacritics PDP. There're several other things that I'm not going to go into detail because I'm kind of running through this pretty quickly, and then also there will be, again, I think I mentioned a little earlier, the council discussion

on how are we going to update the proposal to Un-Adopt approved GNSO policy recommendations.

I think we're looking going into detail about that. There will, again, be the next steps for the SSAD recommendations. This is part of the council agenda, but we still have that Thursday dedicated session that's going to go into greater detail, I think, with not just a council session, but with the GNSO community as well.

There will be a recap of our strategic planning session outcomes. I think we did quite a lot of good work there, and I think I remember some comments from registries before, especially those who've been on the council, to really keep council honest when we do have these intensive planning sessions that we make sure we implement outcomes, and I think that's an important thing.

There will be a discussion on a proposed council prioritization methodology. There has been a straw person that's been circulated. It's a draft that I hope that council will really chew on, digest, kind of spit out with a lot of good ideas. I think it's just a definitely not the end. I think those, especially kudos to staff who did some research on that and also talked with leadership.

We're not prioritization experts, and we're hoping that this will kind of spur some discussion on how council will be able to prioritize. Apparently, prior councils have tried to do so and have not succeeded, so I hope very much that this council will succeed, but maybe I'm very optimistic here.

There will be a follow-up on the accuracy spotting recommendations. I think it's one of them, and the detail is in my previous slide deck, and it's escaping my mind right now, but if anyone wants to ask about this, oh no, I remember. It is the education materials to kind of educate, I guess, ourselves in the wider community on the policy development path.

I think the Z diagram and other things, the differentiation between certain things as well. If I'm really talking out of thin air, please someone stop me, and then there's the Open Mic. I think I've run through all the slides here, and I'll stop finally for any questions and hand back to Beth.

BETH BACON I don't see any hands. Anyone else with questions for, oh, Maxim, thanks.

MAXIM ALZOBA Maxim Alzoba, for the record, do you hear me?

BETH BACON Yes, we do. We see you also.

MAXIM ALZOBA I suggest asking ICANN staff to create a table which contains ideas brought during SPS sessions in different years, so it will be possible

to see which issues are just stuck in limbo and not being resolved. It's not a lot of work, but it might help improve visibility. Thanks.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Maxim. Really good suggestion.

BETH BACON Thanks, Maxim, and again, thanks, Jen, Sam, and Nacho for all the work you do on the council and all the updates. Really appreciate it. You're so thorough, and we are very lucky in our representatives, so thank you. Do you have one more? Because you can't stop, won't stop.

JENNIFER CHUNG This is actually an answer to your question, Beth, on the chat, so hopefully this is helpful. The question was what's the GNSO timeline on deciding between the three options about that, and the response is the aim is to close at the April council meeting, so quite soon.

BETH BACON We love a real-time update. Awesome. All right, well, thank you, friends. Does anyone have last questions for our councilors? And on the SPS, I will say you guys gave us a really great update of what you guys discussed during that, and that was very helpful, and I think that's something we haven't been good about before. We

sort of forget you're doing it, and then you do it in the real time, so I think that's really helpful and can help contribute to this.

All right, so let's move on. We have about 30 minutes left. Some of these agenda items are already planned to move to different sections simply for availability of our experts, but we will start with the DNS Abuse PDP update, and I think we are turning to Dennis for that. Yes?

DENNIS TAN

Yes, Beth. Thank you. Dennis Tan, very sound here with a quick update on the DNS Abuse PDP on balance. Good kickoff meeting. We have four sessions, and I'll go into three items specifically starting from a few highlights and then next steps.

So, the first one, and Sam touched on it, the timeline. Yes, the timeline is long. We've had brief conversations about the timeline and how that's too long.

There are certain PDP required blocks that need to be built in into the process, mainly the Public Comment periods, both collection and processing the Public Comments, as well as preparing the, I don't know if there is a name for it, but I'm taking this as the GNSO council package, a review package, and what have you. But between those two, with the bulk being in the Public Comments, we're talking about between eight to nine months that need to be included.

So, the staff and leadership heard this is something that they need to take back. And I think as we go back to our first call in the week of the 23rd March, we're going to be looking at a revised working plan. And so hopefully it's going to be much, much reduced. So, there's on the timeline.

And so just so you are aware, the proposed timeline, the original one had the initial report by February 2027 and GNSO council approval or view by Q4 2027. So, that's just for reference as to where it stands now.

In terms of substance, we in the last session on Monday, we look at chart question number one, we basically ask what's the trigger to require ADC. And I think we got to a good start between Brian and Reg propose a straw man language that is based on the RAA language, specifically section 3.18. So, when there is a verify actionable DNS Abuse report, that's where ADC requirement is trigger. And I think for the most part, it was well received.

There's I want to say is a good baseline. There are a couple of items that other Working Group members raised. One being the standard of is being used as in compared to was used for DNS Abuse or might be used for DNS Abuse, meaning the domain name, right? It's because of certain cases where the report, when the report gets into the hands of the registrar, it's likely that the abusive hero has been already mitigated, maybe hosting provider or someone by someone else.

And does that fit the definition or is being used? And others raised the issue about it's likely to be used. So, what about those cases? So, right now we are clear. And I think Brian did a good job in explaining why the standard of that is already in the contrast consider is being used because that's a conservative approach, right?

It defines the minimum standard, but allows the registrar to take a more liberal approach if they want to. So, I think that's where we stand now. I think the Working Group, the staff and leadership will take have taken the proper proposes strongman and will give time for the Working Group to chime in in that way. That's in substance. Brian, anything to add there before moving on to next steps?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC No, I think that was a great summary, Dennis, and thank you for doing it where I'm sure it is very, very late or very, very early. So, the only other thing I would note on this is being used for abuse was being used for abuse might be used for abuse.

I really view it as pretty it's out of scope from the charter as written. The charter really does contemplate the scenario or registrar acts on DNS Abuse. And then from there, what does the associated domain check look like? And I think it's pretty clear in the charter that that is the specific fact pattern that we're talking about.

And so, one of the ways that we can try and take that sort of overblown, overly long timeline and shorten it considerably is

making sure we stay on task, making sure we stay within scope of the charter. So, I'll be continuing to watch if we deviate from that and to try and bring things back to the what was contemplated in the charter.

DENNIS TAN

Thank you, Brian. Yes, I agree. And as far as next steps. So, the Working Group will reconvene on the week of thirty third on Monday. And so that's just two weeks away. And we registry stakeholder group, we have a DNS Abuse call on the 19th. So, that's a Thursday, the 19th. So, next week where we can.

I think one is to have guidance from these stakeholder group on the selection for the vice chair. And because as we reconvene on the 23rd, that's when the voting is going to happen. At least that's what we have been told on the week of 23rd, the Working Group will vote to select the vice chair. So, we need the guidance for the group.

So, as far as action item, I will write a note to the group, to the wider registry stakeholder group with the five nominees and hopefully have a conversation and get the guidance that we need. We the reps we need. In order to do the voting. Again, registry stakeholder group, DNS Abuse Working Group Thursday, the 19th of March, and then the PDP Working Group will meet the following Monday. So, it's just a few days. So, not much time for to turn around that.

Also, a reminder, early input. We have a choice to submit early input in writing on by the 20th. So, there's that. Brian, anything else to add?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

No, thanks. I say no, and then I start to add things. I will note that, so you pointed out, Reg submitted, and I helped to start to put the pieces together, a Strawman for consideration. And just to note that really the idea of what problem we're trying to solve is pretty simple in that the PDP is set up to basically, it's almost a binary, like should registrars conduct associated domain checks upon stopping or otherwise disrupting DNS Abuse pursuant to 3.18.2 of the RAA. That's the entirety of the work that we really have to do.

And so, while the charter questions are really helpful, I'm really hopeful that whatever the language ultimately ends up being, that we can have a very, very tight policy that isn't overengineered. Because we all understand the assignment. This isn't all that overly complicated. So, I think that that notion seems to be being embraced by the PDP participants.

And so hopefully that thought process can carry the day and we can end up with a shorter PDP that really has still very meaningful, but in a much shorter period of time.

DENNIS TAN

Yes. Crystal?

CRYSTAL ONDO

Thanks, Dennis and Brian. Crystal with Google Registry. I wanted to follow up on your staying within scope. I've heard that some other members of the PDP want things like, if a registrar takes action, takes one domain, goes and looks at the accounts, sees a campaign of a thousand domains, then they have an obligation to tell the reporter what action they took and to include all the domains.

I shut that down in the BC earlier today and made it very clear that that is completely outside the scope. A registrar would never be required to tell a third party who's not a party to their contract with their customer what action they took. But to really, really, really engage with each PDP member that's not a registrar or a registry, to make them understand that there are hard no's here. And you're just going to waste time and we're going to spend two years doing this if they actually follow through on those topics. So, thank you.

I know Brian and Dennis will do this, but go meet the other people. Go meet the BC reps. They're here to help. Luke is a net craft. He knows this stuff. And he is definitely aligned with our positions here. So, just a shout out to make the effort, do it, but definitely keep it within scope.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

So, I'll just jump in and say yes, plus one. And thank you for flagging, Crystal. And I'm very happy to keep trying to be the sort

of a charter police and making sure that everything that we stay in scope, we stay in scope, we stay in scope so we can get and get this done. Because I don't mean in a bad way.

Let's get it done because the community is clamoring for this to get done. So, as my sleeves are literally rolled out, let's get to work.

DENNIS TAN Yeah, well said. That's it from us. Back to you, Beth. Thank you.

BETH BACON All right. Thanks, Dennis. So, that's it. It seems like plenty. Thank you guys. It's a lot of work to get one of these going, especially when it's contentious. And you really do need to keep gently and firmly reiterating scope. And I think that's the key to this one.

So, really appreciate everyone diving in on that. And then also all the outreach and all the, as Crystal says, talking to the other groups, our PDP reps have certainly done that. And I really appreciate it. Okay, let's go to Jeff, if you are ready for an SSC update.

JEFFREY NEUMAN Yes, although I have to admit, I can't remember what the last update I gave was on this. But the SSC, Standing Selection Committee, we are basically there to select appointees to several different positions. Recently, however, the SSC has been used to

select PDP chairs, although that's not certainly required, nor is it something that was envisioned, I guess, when the SSC was started.

So, yeah, I mean, there's going to be, as Jennifer said, there's going to be a discussion at the council level, probably on how this group operated. Technically, we are supposed to operate all in the open when there is a selection that needs to be made. So, all the emails are open, all the calls are recorded.

The group is just called up Ad Hoc or as needed when there is an opening that we need to appoint someone. The group, as I said, operates completely in the open, but this selection, for whatever reason, better or worse, the council had approved in their charter, and I think it was an old template form that basically said that council leadership and the SSC will choose the leader of the PDP group that Dennis and Brian have been talking about.

And for whatever reason, it was also put out there that the expressions of interest would be confidential as well. I think there was a few meetings back where I talked about how it was a little frustrating to have everything be confidential and tough to get feedback from the stakeholder group when the stakeholder group couldn't actually see the expressions of interest. At the end of the day, everything was made open, all of our surveys that we take.

Essentially, when there's a candidate, the SSC writes up a survey or answers certain questions on a survey as to whether we think the candidates are qualified and then ranking them in order of how we would pick them. And then the group sees the surveys, then we get

together on a call, and ultimately, by consensus, pick a recommendation. And that's what happened this time.

The call was recorded, so it's out there. There were three candidates, and we recommended Paul as the nominee, and of course, he's been serving as the interim. And I don't know because I haven't been in the council discussions. Jennifer could probably weigh in. I'm not sure what other comments are going to be made at that level, but it was a process that was more difficult than it had to be, and I actually sent a request to Jennifer and to Susan.

I don't know if that ever got circulated, but if the SSC is involved, how it should be done, and that ICANN should probably be updating its template for its PDP charters because I think this provision of the council leadership and SSC selecting the leader came from an old template from 10 years ago, and so I think that just needs to be updated, but I'll defer to Jennifer.

JENNIFER CHUNG Thanks, Jeff. I'm sure there will be some articulation during council meeting. I think the high-level gist that we are taking away from this is very clear and consistent communications, both towards the SSC when we decide to use the SSC for any selection of any process, and also communication of the said same process to council, and I think that communication will go a long way in demystifying a lot of things, and separately, of course, the SSC charter has been there for several years.

I don't know where it might fit on the council timeline, but certainly if that is something that we need to take a look at, including updating, that will definitely go on the very long list of our to-dos. Thank you, Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN

Yeah, thanks, Jennifer, and it's not the SSC charter that needs updating. It's the PDP charter template, right, because it's the last section of how the leader is selected. I think that's staff is using as their old template from 10 years ago, so that's just the next PDP that comes down the road. Just don't use that 10-year-old template, and I think we'll be better off.

The other recommendation I would have is I totally agree with you on communication is going to be key, but communication between the leadership and the SSC and not having staff be in the middle, I think will go a long way, and it's not faulting staff or saying that they're not doing this well.

It's just the leaders themselves communicating it would allow for questions, and you won't get answers from staff going, well, that's just what they wanted, right? I mean, communication is best with the people that are actually set the rules than kind of having an intermediary. Thanks.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Jeff. We will look to you if there's any movement there, and we will regroup as an SG to give any guidance should there be

SSC thoughts. Appreciate it. Our next update, just time check, we have about 10 minutes, and just a reminder, the last two updates, the NomCom update is, please read Karen's email. It was going to be me, but Karen sent a great email with a blog.

It was very transparent. It got some traffic and some conversation on the list, so if you do want to engage there, please let us know for the NomCom, but she did share the most recent blog, and it was, I would say, more information than is usual, so that was nice, and then we will, we are moving just for availability. Aline is available at the next session, so we're going to do the base RA update then, so with that, we just have PPSAI and Review of Reviews, so we'll turn to John Energet for PPSAI.

JOHN MCCABE

Thank you, Beth. Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation is in the requirement flow stage, and the policy binding on all defined as the policy binding on contracted parties, providers added to ICANN's full list of accredited Privacy Proxy Provider Service Providers based on RIS information. Sorry, it's blue and black, I think.

This now, of course, flows down to registrars who may only accept registrations from Privacy and Proxy Services that are operated in compliance with the privacy proxy consensus policy. Splits from there based on citations to resellers who, resellers must ensure it is resellers, if they offer a Privacy Proxy Service, comply with privacy proxy consensus policy, and affiliates, registrars must ensure its

affiliates if offer, these offer a Privacy Proxy Service, comply with the privacy proxy's consensus policies.

There was rather a lengthy discussion about concern from the registries that, sorry, the registrars that the, that the resellers are not affiliates, and there was a, I guess, a misapplication of the word affiliates, and so that was something that became contentious through many of the discussions. They are not, and that was clarified in these documents.

So, there's also provision to, for registrars who want to withdraw from the program to, with, with remove their information from the RIS, and also that once they have done so, they're not permitted to offer any privacy or proxy services.

One of the bugs that, the issues that's outstanding currently is that, is the knowingly issue, and that is that comes out in that second point I mentioned there. Registrars must not permit renewal of registrations protected by any known prior Privacy Proxy Service. Privacy proxy service must be removed. Okay, so knowingly issue will be explored further with the IRT through Q1 2026, which I believe ends at the end of this month, and that's it. If you have any questions, please, and of course, then we'd like to hear from Ajith.

AJITH FRANCIS Just very briefly, thank you, John, for that. To just pull this back a little bit, that's very dense, so I just wanted to give a quick update on where we are. In general, PPSA IRT is focusing on three buckets,

one where it's registrations from Privacy Proxy Service providers that are affiliated with Registrars, the second bucket being known Privacy Proxy Service providers that would be available to ICANN through a list through the RIS, and the third bucket being just any, any other proxy service, and so we're really identifying within the first bucket whether resellers are within scope.

Registrars strongly believe that that shouldn't be within scope because it would be, it would be about the affiliates, so that's one piece of tension, and the other one, as John mentioned, is really within the GNSO guidance that we had, we received from the GNSO on how to address the recommendations.

The scope was identified as registrars knowingly accept registrations from affiliated proxy service providers, and we're expecting to get guidance from ICANN Org on how to address this question of knowingly by the next meeting in April. So, PPSAI will not be meeting till April when we will get guidance from ICANN Org. Thank you.

BETH BACON Thanks, Ajith. Thanks, John. So, right now there's no ask of us for registries. You guys are just considering the proposal and waiting on ICANN. Okay, that's really helpful. Thanks very much.

Any other questions or comments? Okay, John, would you mind? Thanks, I didn't want there to be feedback. Thank you. Okay, moving on, we'll hear from Sophie on Review of Reviews.

SOPHIE HEY

Okay, thank you very much. I'm going to do this at lightning speed. Can we skip forward two slides, please? And another one, please? Yeah, this one here.

Okay, so you may or may not have heard this week, there's a proposal out from the Review of Reviews cross community group on what could be a potential map for the new reviews program. So, what we've done is we've got five different reviews that we're currently proposing, or at least five different buckets of reviews. And we've set those out very nicely in a table, which we'll be running through on Thursday morning in a working session to get input from the whole community.

So, in the table, we set out what's the focus of these reviews, the methodology and intended outcomes, how often they'll be conducted, what would prompt it, how you would initiate the review, what would the scope look like, would it be preset or would it be something that would be agreed by the community in the initiation process, who would be doing the work, who would receive it, and that really goes to also who would be responsible for implementing it.

And to the extent it's applicable, we've also got a notes and origin story for each of the reviews. So, where did these reviews or the concept of them come from? Are they currently set out under the ICANN bylaws? Were they suggested by a previous review, or were

they what we ourselves consider to be a genius idea? I've covered this in a lot of our regular bi-weeklies, but next slide, please.

So, a quick recap of the five different buckets. So, the assessment of Continuous Improvement and structural review are relatively self-explanatory. For that, we've also got this idea until very recently, accountability and transparency, that was referred to lovingly, begrudgingly, as bucket A. So, the idea is that that would be a more refined version of the current ATR review.

Moving down, there's also a suggestion of whether there should be a standing Review of Reviews to make sure that the program is fit for purpose. My personal view is that that fits very tidily into bucket E, or the Ad Hoc on demand reviews. So, an emerging topic that cannot be otherwise dealt with in other forums. Again, very conscious of time. I think I've done a big, a quick run through, but questions?

BETH BACON

Thanks, Sophie. And I think this is obviously, there's plenty of time, there's other time during other sessions. If you do want to take a look at the slides that she's provided, we can send those, make sure we send those to the list. That'd be great. And we can always have some time during our other sessions. And Chris is going to bring it home.

CHRIS DISSPAIN I just want to say one thing, which is if you really want to look at the thing, the thing to look at is the table. The table is really what provides the detail, and that's what you need to look at. Thanks.

BETH BACON That's great. Very clear, very helpful. I appreciate it. Okay, so we have three minutes. Jeff is going to email around an update on, I believe the IDN, not the IDN, the IRT. He's going to complete the IRT update that he sent around, or that he started during the CPH call, or sorry, the CPH meeting this morning. And it is, I've lost it. It's the IGO IRT, guys. I knew there was another one on the IGO IRT.

So, he'll keep an eye on that. It's a question about posting things for policies for Public Comment. We will rearrange a little bit on discussing plenary topics. We always build in a little squish for just this reason, but I'm really glad that we had really, really comprehensive discussions during our council update on Urgent Requests, and we have a nice path forward there. Again, big thanks on all of the dedication and time to explaining all of that, and for folks keeping an eye on it.

I think we can call for last call for any other business, any other thoughts, and we will move to our next session, and we'll rearrange a couple of things. All right. Thank you all very much. Let's call it. Wait. Oh, we're taking a picture. Don't leave. Don't leave. We're taking a picture.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER	Okay. If everybody can kind of maybe move over to the side where Edmon's moving. Don't move, Edmon. We're coming up right over. Right. So, we're going to gather over there, and we're going to take a picture. Thanks.
NIKKI SCHULER	We can end the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]