ZOE BONYTHON

All right. We are going to get started shortly, not just yet. I hope that if you left the Zoom room, you have rejoined. We will get started shortly. All right. We are going to get started again. If we could just settle down, folks. Can we start the recording, please?

RECORDING VOICE

Recording in progress.

DEVAN REED

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the RrSG Membership Work Session 2 of 3. Please note 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. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session as time permits, when 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 back over to Owen Smigilski.

OWEN SMIGILSKI

Thank you, Devan, and welcome back, everyone, for session 2 of 3. Just to try and make up some time, we will just get right into it. We will go with Marika, who is here to talk about the next round. Marika.

MARIKA KONINGS

Thanks, Owen, and hi, everyone. My name is Marika Konings. I think most of you know me. I am the lead for the New gTLD Program. Actually, the title should be 2026 Round. That is our official rebranding. I am here as well with some colleagues in the audience because I think there was an interest in having a bit of an open Q&A, if I understood well. Hopefully they can help me answer any questions you may have.

Maybe to kick things off, I can put up on the screen the timeline that we are working against. I think I do need to be made a host. Oh, here we go. Send request. Hold on one second. I also need to share. Well, I will keep talking until that happens.

There are a number of sessions that we are running throughout this week, really focused on applicant readiness. We already did two plenary sessions, one yesterday and one just now. Yesterday was focused on the overall application process and what applicants need to be prepared for and think about. Today, we are really focused on the application system, TAMS. There were a number of demos that we played and questions that we have been trying to answer from potential applicants. If you are interested in applying or want to point people in the right direction, please make sure that they review these sessions. We are still having sessions every single day. I think at the end of today, it is geographic names and reserved names. I think tomorrow is community applications, or maybe the other way around. Then on Thursday, we still have an open Q&A as well in the morning.

There is a lot of time available for those interested to come and ask questions because we really want to do it in an open setting so everyone can benefit from the information provided as well as the questions being asked. Let me just pull this up. This is one of the slides that we presented in the sessions this week, which is really focused on the application submission and pre-evaluation timeline. We are planning to open the window for applications on the 30th of April. Applicants will then have 15 weeks to prepare and submit their applications and make a payment. Once that has happened and the application window closes on the 12th of August, we go into what we are calling the admin check period. There is still a small window to make payments, making sure we have all the information together and putting the lists together, because then we get to Reveal Day, which is the day where we will be publishing all the applications and their replacement strings for everyone to review. This is currently projected for early to mid-October.

Again, an important caveat here: these dates are all after the opening of the application window and the close of the application window. Those are all projected dates. These are on the assumption of receiving 2,000 applications. If that number is significantly different, we will, of course, need to update our planning and dates that we have anticipated. We expect to confirm shortly after the close of the application window, once we have confirmed paid applications, what the exact dates are for Reveal Day as well as String Confirmation Day.

Reveal Day then kicks off what we are calling the replacement period. That is the opportunity for applicants that either find themselves in contention or have a preference to change to the replacement string to be able to do so. That is a two-week period. I think then we need a little bit of time as well to make sure we update our lists and specifically contention sets, which then leads up to String Confirmation Day, which again is the final set of applied-for strings and related information. That kicks off the community comment period and the string evaluation process, as well as leading up to the prioritization draw event.

The timeline here only goes to January 2027 because it focuses on the initial steps, but obviously work continues beyond that. After string evaluation, we will also have contention set resolutions for those to whom it is applicable, and we will start applicant and application evaluations. For what we are calling "Happy Path" applicants—those that are not in contention, are not facing any objections, and do not face GAC early warning or GAC advice—they should flow through without any issues. We expect that a delegation would happen at the earliest in early 2028. Again, this is projected based on 2,000 applications.

I think that gives you a bit of an overview of what we expect to happen. As I think we stated in the Applicant Guidebook based on the 2012 experience, and again based on 2,000 applications, we do anticipate that we will be done or have completed processing of these applications by 2030. There may be some stragglers because, of course, there are certain processes with ICANN that are not within our control. As you may know, we still have a couple of applications from the 2012 round that are still in some accountability processes. But again, those are the minority of applications. That is where we are currently at and, at a high level, what is going to be happening next. There were a couple of questions that this group had. I may not be the expert on those, but there are some colleagues in the audience that may help with those, so I am happy to give it back to you.

JOTHAN FRAKES

Yeah, I do. Thank you, Marika. That is really helpful, and the way this is presented is really good. The majority of the registrars were watching for what comes out of the sausage factory on the other side. If I heard you correctly, the initial delegations we should be ramping towards are sometime around early 2028. From what I understand, some of the trademark and rights protection stuff is a little bit different. I think there are going to be components of it that we need to be thinking about to be prepared and in alignment with that. Obviously, it is a couple of years out, so it is no big deal, but those are going to be the things on our radar or the things that will be of most keen interest to us. I do not necessarily want to ask about the trademark thing or other things like that. I see Francisco is here, but we have other things and a tight timeline. I just wanted to say thank you for that. That is really what is on the minds of registrars mostly. Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS

Thanks, Jothan. If at any point it is helpful for further engagement, especially as we go further into the process, you already mentioned the Trademark Clearinghouse. If you have seen on the sourcing timeline, that is an RFP process that we expect to start later this year. There may already be information coming out of that. You already pointed to Francisco, who is indeed the expert on that. We are happy to come and talk when the time is ripe or when there are specific questions around that. Thanks for that.

ZOE BONYTHON

Anyone else? Michele, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Thanks. Good afternoon. Hi, Marika. Where did you get the 2,000 number from?

MARIKA KONINGS

The 2012 round. We had to pick a number on which to base our assumptions. We received a little bit less than 2,000 applications in the 2012 round, so we have used that same number and made the assumption that we are getting a similar number of applications in this round. That is the source.

MICHELE NEYLON

So if you were to get, say, 500 or 4,000, how are you going to handle that from a budgetary perspective?

MARIKA KONINGS

The program is cost recovery. We have factored that in and made our assumptions based on 2,000 applications, but each application in principle pays for its own costs. I think there will be a factor of multitude, of course. The more that you get, there may be better prices we can get with vendors. But we are making certain assumptions about what we are receiving. There is also a risk involved in that. We will need to do a bit of a pause, especially if we get 5,000 or higher, and say, "Okay, now we need to make sure that we are ready for that."

But we are preparing for either scaling up or down because we know there is uncertainty around the number. We needed to pick a number, and the only data point we have is the 2012 round, so that is what we are using. Obviously, our arrangements with vendors are set up in a way that they are able to scale. We are setting up tiered pricing so that they have the ability to prepare and be ready if we go well above what we originally estimated.

JOTHAN FRAKES

This is a new item. I was trying to think really quickly about things that might be of interest to us as registrars. We talked a little bit, and Michael Bauland was talking about IDN variants and how that works. I understand that somebody can apply for variants at a discount or for free. Is that restricted to existing strings from prior rounds? Can you tell us a little bit about that? As we evaluate what we are going to do with handling variants, that might be helpful data.

MARIKA KONINGS

The discount is for both. It is for applicants from the 2012 round who can apply for up to four variants for free, as well as new applicants who also have the ability to include up to four variants as part of the gTLD evaluation fee.

JOTHAN FRAKES

These would be non-ASCII, like non-LDI or whatever. These would be in Chinese or Japanese or in other languages, not in English, correct?

MARIKA KONINGS	That is my understanding. I am looking at Pitinan because I think in Latin script, there are no variants currently recognized. Please correct me.
PITINAN KOOARMORNPATANA	We do have allocatable variants in Latin script, but none of the existing TLDs have any variants.
OWEN SMIGILSKI	Thank you for that. Thank you. Okay, and Jothan, I am guessing that is a leftover hand? Anyone else? All right. Well, thank you to Marika and your team. Do keep in mind as this moves forward that these things are just more informational, but if you see things that would pop up and have a registrar impact, such as you are going to change the way that TMCH works or something like that, that would certainly be good for us to be able to know ahead of time. Not all of us here are monitoring those things, and those are things we will have to do down the road. If you can just keep that in the back of your mind and bring those forth to us when you have those kinds of things, that would be great.
MARIKA KONINGS	Thanks, Owen. We will definitely do that. Thanks for your time.

OWEN SMIGILSKI

Thank you. Next, we will be moving on to our GNSO Council and policy discussion. Who is going to jump in first?

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

I am happy to start things, and my colleagues can correct me if I am wrong or add on. There are a number of things that are being discussed in Council, some of which might easily duplicate some of our other conversations, so I am going to try not to go too far into things where it is going to be discussed later. Michele, please?

MICHELE NEYLON

Sorry, I am going to have to step out for a few minutes. I just wanted to say thanks for all your work on this, but I hope that you guys are pushing back a little on some of these things regarding making this all happen as quickly as possible. You need to do things properly rather than quickly. I have already voiced several of my concerns around some of the proposals and also just the way some of these things have played out, where they seem to come from out of nowhere as if they were prepackaged. Thanks.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Thank you, Michele. Going on to DNS Abuse Mitigation PDPs, we just heard Michele's concerns. We are going to be voting on the chair. As you may know, the SCC had the job of looking at the candidates, ranking them, and putting forward their preferred candidate. Thank you, Jothan. What came out of that process was a recommendation of Paul McGrady. We will be doing a vote tomorrow, or whenever we next meet, and it is anticipated that he will move forward as chair. He has already taken on some responsibilities in that respect as chair-elect. I know there have been some concerns over that process, and I will hold off because I am sure I have other colleagues who are going to be happy to talk about that.

There have also been some conversations put forward by Thomas Rickert. It was kind of an impromptu open mic session, since he is no longer on the Council. He raised some concerns about the timeframe and how he thinks the current proposed date of April 2027 is when we should be wrapping up the first PDP. Thomas was concerned that this should be narrowly scoped, based on current practice, and should not take very long. He felt that allowing this much time would only work to foster mischief and would encourage the potential for going outside of scope. If we have so much time involved, it would just allow for that kind of activity to happen. Also, if you give that much time, human nature is that you will take that much time.

It was left at that. I do not believe, and Sebastien might correct me if I am wrong, where things stand on that because I do not know if that is really something that Council can act upon or if that is something that should be handled directly through the PDP. But I am letting you know that the conversation has happened, and they are looking for people's thoughts on that. We have not had a chance to discuss this as a RrSG. Volker did identify his concern with changing the timeline, and I will let him speak to that.

I will stop after this third bullet and give a pause for people to respond, but also there was a desire by many in the room to start now with PDP2 preparations. That is not to say that we would start PDP2, but that we could start sooner rather than later in the development of the charter for PDP2. As a reminder, Council has already said that there will be two PDPs, but that second PDP will not start until Council says so. I think there is some desire to avoid what happened with the drafting of the PDP1 charter, which happened very quickly over the holidays. There is a desire to do it a little bit more methodically this time around. There seemed to be support around the room to do that. There was one call to go ahead and start PDP2 because things are going so well with PDP1, but there was no support for that comment. I will pause there. I invite Volker and Hongfu to please supplement as you would like, but I see Sebastien has his hand up.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

This is Sebastien Ducos, and not as a counselor. I am present in the conversations because I am the GAC liaison, but I am obviously not a counselor. This morning, instead of joining you to prep for the Board discussion, I sat with the Commercial Stakeholder Group where Thomas actually gave a bit more details on this. It is good that he did because that comment really irked me. He was talking about finding time in the delays that we have given the Board and the Council to review, not for the work. If the current timeline is 18 months, he is talking about cutting a month here and a month there to come up with something that might be 15 instead of 18 months. First of all, it is not like we are going to revolutionize calendars. We are just trying to find efficiencies and not in the work itself.

If one of the chocolate boxes is left, I can use it as a soapbox to stand on. I do not want to hear people repeating that the PDP process is not going fast enough. We are volunteers. We are all spending hours. One of the first things that Paul did was, instead of having four hours a week to get this working, we are just going to do an hour and a half, which is a reasonable amount of time. We all have day jobs; we are not paid to do this. It takes time to make decisions. It takes time to prepare for those calls. It takes time to know what you are talking about. We need to keep repeating all these things.

The process is there for a reason. There is another way to go about it, which is to elect a dictator here who will take all the decisions in 20 minutes. That is much better, but it is not the way we work. I hear it from the GAC and from everybody that we are all too slow. I understand we are slow, but this is a process that is there to make decisions collegially for them to last over a long time for an industry. We need to defend that position and stop smiling when people say that we are too slow. Thanks.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Thanks, Sebastien. Just one note: I think there is a difference between saying we have to rush and getting the job done effectively and efficiently. I think we can do this, and I am concerned that if we push too hard against moving expeditiously, we look like we are disrupting the process. Saying that we are here to work efficiently is fine, but I do not think there is any value in coming at people hard when they say we should move quickly.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

I did not suggest moving slowly. That is not what I am saying. I am just saying there is a process, and that is what we are doing.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Fair enough. I like it spoken in those terms better than some of the other things that I have heard. Anyway, it does not matter what I think. Owen, please go ahead.

OWEN SMIGILSKI

Thanks, Ashley. This is Owen Smigilski. Expediting for the sake of expediting is not what we want to do. It should be okay because it is a narrowly scoped PDP with a very tiny focus. I think a lot of the concerns stem from people having the mindset of all the other PDPs we have ever done that take two or three hundred hours worth of meetings. This could be accomplished in a couple of sentences. It does not have to be this massive thing.

Let us look at the ADP limits policy or AGP limits policy as a potential model. It can be short, sweet, and easy, and accomplish something in a very quick amount of time. Those long timelines exist just to allow for that regular PDP mentality, but I think with this micro or targeted PDP, things will go a lot faster. We do not need to change or adjust deadlines, but the work should get done a lot quicker just because it is not rocket surgery. Thank you. Yes, I am mixing my metaphors on purpose.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN Okay. Before I continue on the queue, I want to make sure we keep this to the Council conversation because we still have the PDP working group update, which will go into what they are actually doing. Volker, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN I wanted to talk about the PDP, so go ahead.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN Okay. Glad I reminded everybody. Reg, please go ahead.

REG LEVY Thanks. This is Reg Levy from Tucows. I want to underscore what Sebastien said. I would much rather get this right than go fast.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN I think I have heard that before. Anyway, are there any other questions on the Council part before I turn it over for the PDP working group conversation? A bunch of hands just went up. Reg, I am guessing that is an old one?

REG LEVY

Yeah.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Jothan, please go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES

Yeah, thank you. I am a registrar, and I am sitting in this room, but I was selected on the SSAC side, so I have some perspective into what we are discussing there. Without divulging a lot of that, based on the discussions that I am seeing right now, I would really strongly encourage that we complete PDP1 before we get into PDP2. That is a bag of cats. A lot of focus is just on the word "bulk" rather than anything else, and I think that is going to be rather contentious with other groups. I would recommend that we complete one and then move to the other. Thank you.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Thanks, Jothan. We will do our best to hold that line. I think that is generally the assumption, but there are always going to be those voices in the room who think we should start doing it now. Thank you. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON

Thanks, Ashley. Michele is still here. I am about to leave. At the Council level, I know there has been a lot of chatter about this, but I think it is important that as it goes to a vote on the chair, I am wholly supportive of you voting in favor of Mr. McGrady as chair. I have no issue with that. However, I think it is important that Council be more transparent around that entire selection process. I have seen a lot of commentary from Jeff Newman and a few other people about how that entire thing played out, both on various back channels and on the Council list. It is not a great look, and the timing of pushing really hard to do that over the Christmas break seemed very strange.

I 100% agree with the way some people have articulated this regarding efficiency. I am totally down with that. I also want to be clear that doing something quickly just for the sake of doing it quickly is not going to lead to a good outcome. Doing it efficiently and trying not to make it last longer than is needed is obviously not good either. The other thing that is slightly more concerning is that if the ICANN Board is failing to implement the outcome of PDPs, especially PDPs that impact actual real registrants who have domain names now on the internet, why are we bothering to do any of this in an expedited fashion? I am just asking. Thanks.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Noted. Any other questions? No, you are leaving. Any other questions or comments on the Council component? If not, I am not sure if we have a spokesperson for the PDP working group or if you all just want to chime in.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS Eric.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN Eric, please go ahead.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Hi, this is Eric, one of your members for the PDP working group. High level, we met four times this week. For the takeaways, there is going to be a vote on the vice chair. There are five people who have offered to stand for vice chair. A few of them provided their reasons for doing so. I will ask other members if there are any other comments they want to make on that. I will stop there for a second. I do not have the names with me, but I know Nick Wenban-Smith is one. There were a few others, but he was the one that stood out the most in some of our discussions. I will stop there. Does anyone want to add? I see there is a queue. Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN No, I was waiting for you to nod to this. I am just raising my hand for after.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Ashley?

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN

Yes. It would be good to know from you lovely PDP members and participants what your thoughts are on who this person should be. I know I have my favorite on this list, but I am just curious.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Ashley. I will jump in real quick. Initially, we have an interest in Nick. A couple of the vice chair candidates did not even provide any commentary as to why they should be selected when they were requested to do so during our session. Based on Nick's experience with Nominet and the ccNSO, I think he could be helpful for us in that sense. He is also neutral, which is great. I will stop there and ask if any other of our members or alternate participants want to add comments.

REG LEVY

Thanks. I am not sure if I am jumping the queue ahead of Sebastien. I think that the only candidate that we should really be considering is Nick. Having an IPC chair and a BC vice chair does us absolutely no favors. I had Ching reach out to me via email earlier today to tell me how much he had dedicated his life and career to DNS Abuse Mitigation and was super stoked to represent me as vice chair. I told him that was news to me and that I was pleased to hear it. We do not need one more roadblock.

Anil seems very confident, but I am unfamiliar with his work to the extent that I would feel uncomfortable voting for him. I am not familiar at all with Farzaneh or Cristobal. From my standpoint, those are not real candidates. I am happy to re-evaluate it if people here in this group make that recommendation to me, but I really think that Nick is our man.

ERIC ROKOBAUER	Thank you, Reg. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS	I am not going to say anything bad about other candidates, but I am familiar with a few of them and, indeed, Nick is really our only man. I would only strongly encourage having a discussion with him to remind him that we work in an international environment. He is very used to working with British law and everything else. I have heard him on these topics talking about contract amendments and those sorts of things.

OWEN SMIGILSKI	He lives a different life. He knows the subject really well. We just need to remind him that we have multiple jurisdictions to deal with and very different levels of standards of behavior.

ERIC ROKOBAUER	Thank you very much. Those are really good points. We will take that back. Reg, is that a new hand? Okay. Excellent. I will move on to the proposed straw man. Your DNS Abuse PDP working group members worked feverishly during the sessions to get in front of the work going on with the PDP and showcase how important this is for registrars. We wanted to come to the table and provide some language that could be used for consideration by the working group. That was given during the third or fourth session. Zoe, thank you for putting the language proposal in the chat. We dropped that for the rest of the working group, and it was received positively. I think... that is a great idea. Thank you, Zoe. Let me read it out loud for those who are listening.

The proposed language is: "When a registrar takes action under Section 3.18 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the registrar shall promptly review other domains that are reasonably associated with that domain when there are clear indicators that other domains registered by the same customer may be involved in the same abusive activity, using information reasonably available to the registrar at the time of review, and take action against those domains where appropriate." That was the language we came up with as a group, and it seemed at initial glance to be positively received. There are folks in the working group who are happy to work with that. It was a good start for us. I see a queue growing, so I will go to Sebastien. No, legacy hand. Reg, please go ahead.

REG LEVY

Thank you. This was developed based on some hallway conversations over the last three days. It might have been presented prematurely because there is definitely some tweaking needed, but some of us felt that we needed to get ahead of any other draft. This is absolutely a proposal. We expect and welcome modifications. Having something short and sweet like this is what we are going for, and then we can niggle about the implementation notes.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Thank you, Reg. Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN Yes. This was also an attempt to take back ownership of the process with regard to the outcome. I was a little bit disheartened by the comment from our chair that it would not be the eventual outcome. That showed that he had already made up his mind that this will not be enough, which is not a position a chair should take. We might be able to push back on that. There is another initiative going that we all supported. We are trying to look at this from a more holistic perspective, and we have encouraged all other parties to come up with straw men themselves, but only to the effect of what they could contribute with their groups.

Instead of coming up with a list of demands, we asked all participants to come up with a list of offers. Our offer is now the first on the table, which leads the way and shows that we are leading by example. Instead of having other groups coax out offers or negotiate outcomes, we are leading with what we are prepared to offer and where we see this going. Hopefully, we will be able to save some time with that approach as well. We show that we are engaged and positively minded and that we want this to be successful and speedy. Good work so far.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Volker. I agree with your observation regarding how Paul initially seemed to squash it. At the same time, he appreciated the effort to move this along and our desire to contribute. I think our getting ahead of that was well received by the other members of the working group, so that was a good overall process. Owen?

OWEN SMIGILSKI

Thanks, Eric. This is Owen Smigilski. Maybe Paul is just stuck in that old regular PDP mentality where it has to be 17 paragraphs of stuff, whereas this one sentence can work. The DNS Abuse amendments in the RAA are one sentence. I think it is very good for us to have something short and sweet out there. It is good to get ahead of the others, and I appreciate the work of the team. This week has been a blur to me. I have had a couple of people come up to me and raise concerns about using the word "customer" because that is a term used in the RAA. It might not be a single customer; it might be multiple accounts or something.

If there is a way to make it more broad, that might be better so it is not just a "customer" doing that, as there could be ways to connect domain names that might appear to be different customers. That is the only feedback I heard. I do not remember who it was, but a couple of people told me that. They might share it on the PDP as well, but I wanted to share that now with you guys. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Owen. The working group members will definitely take that back. To go back to a comment Reg made, we got this together quickly. If there is feedback or comments on what we should have, as we will probably tinker with it in the working group, let us know what thoughts you want us to take back to the sessions. Jothan?

JOTHAN FRAKES

Thank you. I want to point out that it was a strong and bold move for the registrars to come out in front of it with proposed verbiage. That was not lost on the room. We are probably going to wordsmith that just a little bit. There was talk of "party" versus "registrant" or "domain holder," which are little tweaks. One of the other comments from someone in the room was to box this into being at the sponsored registrar. It did not mean that you were going to take a look at things beyond your registrar. I think there were some pieces there regarding how we would constrain this. Anyway, I really appreciated that session.

The session before it was actually fantastic because there was a lot of open awareness suddenly after seeing Theo give a presentation on what this looks like when we start looking for these patterns. It really looks different. We are caught between Scylla and Charybdis on that. On one hand, we are educating people in other SOACs about what this associated domain check means and what it looks like. We want to show them that, but I do not think that we want to show them too much publicly because we do not want to show the bad guys how to evade our detection. Those were my two comments on this. Thank you very much.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Thank you very much, Jothan. I had a comment, and I have forgotten, so I am going to try and think of it while I let Sarah have the mic.

SARAH WYLD Thank you. This is Sarah with a question. Do we need it to be the same customer, or is it just that it needs to be involved in the same abusive activity? I am imagining a scenario where somebody registers multiple domains to use for abuse, and they all have the same email address but a different name and postal address on them. Are those the same customer? Do we need them to be? Does it help us in this PDP to limit it in that way? I do not know. Thank you.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Thank you, Sarah. All very good observations that I think we should take back. Volker, you have the answer, I think, maybe.

VOLKER GREIMANN I think that is something that we would probably see going into the advisory regarding what we mean by "customer" and what that would entail. It gives us enough flexibility to say that a customer who has multiple accounts is still the same customer, or a reseller might be a customer, or the beneficial owner might be a customer ultimately. We have a little bit of flexibility there, and that can be interpreted by the individual registrar. It can also be subject to an advisory that ICANN issues at a later stage that we would then have the ability to influence. If we try to cram everything into the wording of a contractual clause, this will be a multiple-page document instead of what we are aiming for.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Thank you, Volker. Are there any other comments on that? Owen, your hand is up.

OWEN SMIGILSKI Thanks, Eric. I just wanted to raise that before the ICANN meeting, literally the week before, Susan from the GAC, who is on the GAC DNS Abuse Small Team, reached out to me and Beth as chairs of the registries and registrars to coordinate. They wanted to learn a little bit more in a super informal way because the registries are very hesitant to start talking beforehand. We had a very informal meeting. Eric and Reg were there. They wanted to know a little bit more about business models, and most of it was focused on what a reseller is.

We explained that to them. Reg walked through how Tucows as a wholesale registrar has different models, and explained that to them. We also explained how Namecheap goes through them, so we are also a reseller via them. I think it was very eye-opening for them to get that understanding. There was definitely some appetite to learn more and to educate them. What happened at session three the other day was also good. Perhaps it was not as in-depth as what we were able to do with the small team, so I think a takeaway is for us to do something more for our messaging for the RrSG and the outreach team. We can share that and maybe train the GAC and others who might be interested. It was a very good thing for them to have an understanding, and hopefully they will take that forward with the PDP.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Owen, for bringing that up. I will add two things. First, regarding the outreach team, we currently have the RrSG one-pager that makes a very high-level reference to the different registrar business models. There is some room there to do something a little more specific. My other comment is regarding work session three. The presentations we had from Theo, Natalie, and Carlos were excellent. I think it really showcased how there are different models.

Even for myself, learning about corporate registrars was eye-opening as I did not really know how those were structured. Seeing that and other registrar learning is huge. We just need to make sure in the PDP we keep reinforcing that there are a lot of different registrar models and that not all wholesale types are the same. I am being told about the timing, so I will try to move this quickly. I see we have Jody, Reg, and Roger, and then we will stop the queue. Go ahead, Jody. Jody, you may be muted.

JODY KOLKER

Hi. Can you guys hear me now? Sorry, I was on double mute. Owen has mentioned this many times, and I think other people have too. Once this gets to the PDP stage, I am curious how much discussion or how much written detail there will be on how we are supposed to do these associated domain checks. As someone stated in the chat, are we supposed to tie together payment methods, email, the registrant, or the account holder? What I am worried about is putting so much stuff in a detailed view that the fraudsters or malicious people can just read that and say, "All right, here is what we have to do to avoid detection." I am just curious what the implementation group looks like. It is a genuine question and a caution to say: how much are we going to discuss how we tie these together, and how much is going to be written down? Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Jothan. Those are absolutely valid observations. One of the things the working group and our PDP members want is to keep the language broad. We do not want to dictate or have it so outlined that malicious actors can then just take advantage of it. We want to avoid that as best we can. I do not know about the implementation part of it, but at least we know going into the PDP development that we will want to avoid that. I see Roger. Please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks, everybody. This is Roger. I am just going to follow up on some of the things Sarah threw in the chat and what Jody just brought up. I think that we will be better off if we make it a more narrow requirement, which would allow registrars to do more than that. If we make it a big requirement, then all registrars have to do all of that. I think we need to stay in a smaller, focused area.

Even what Sarah is suggesting broadens it more than I am comfortable with. Not that we are not doing those things, but I am just thinking that if we say it is a domain and then we have to search across the 90 million domains we have to see the commonalities, it is going to be a bit of a hassle. If we say "this domain by this customer" or "this registrar," whatever that final language is, I think that is better than removing that association to a customer. Again, registrars can always do more than that. People are talking about payment ideas and things like that. Registrars can do that if they want to; there is nothing that stops them. But I do not think it should be required. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Good point. Thank you, Roger. Jothan, the last.

JOTHAN FRAKES New hand, too. I got an opportunity to talk with Mason Cole a little bit about how this is actually documenting some stuff we already kind of do. We are financially motivated to look at credit card fraud and other things like that. We are already taking advantage of practices we are already doing, but it is going to vary widely from registrar to registrar as far as what we can and will be able to do.

Putting my hat on for the SSAC role, one of the things I think the SSAC could really weigh in on that could be helpful is to just offer ideas about different sort of forensic signals, different fields, or things that might be helpful or suggested to use for this, but not to come down with something really heavy-handed. I, of course, have to weigh that in with the group and let them come up with it, but that is the area that I want to drive inside of the SSAC. Thank you.

ERIC ROKOBAUER Thank you, Jothan. It escapes me right now, but for the timeline, are we talking about the planned completion or the schedule for the meeting cadence?

JOTHAN FRAKES I think we have covered both of them actually already, so I think it is good. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER	All right. Thank you. We are all set. Of course, if you have more questions, you know the members, so we are happy to take those into consideration. Thank you.
ASHLEY HHEINEMAN	This is quick and easy. We have not talked about it in Council, but I am going to turn it over to Roger to talk about the PPSAI IRT and the meeting of the group.
ROGER CARNEY	Thanks, Ashley, and this will be quick and simple. We did approve the requirements visual flow, or whatever they are calling it, with some significant changes that Reg has been pounding on for almost two months now. I think finally staff understood the reasoning behind it. That is good, and I think others in the group actually picked up on that. I think we are moving in a good spot there. The IRT is pausing. We will not meet again until April 9th. This gives staff time to actually start the policy language. They are going to draft policy language and bring it to the IRT so that we can work it from there. Again, the IRT will not meet until April 9th. That is it.
ASHLEY HHEINEMAN	I was trying to respond to folks on Signal. Sorry. All right. System for Standardized Access Disclosure, SSAD. This is where I am going to start having to be careful because I am going to run into other issues. As we have discussed in previous membership meetings, when it comes to SSAD, the idea is that we are going to be moving

towards non-adoption. Basically, what that means is that the Board is going to push all the recommendations back to Council, and Council is going to work on some supplemental recommendations.

The current thinking is that there would be a small group plus that will look at this, and they will use the report that came out of Sebastien's group as the basis for how they move forward. The hope is that this would be a relatively short process. That is that. I think I put these notes on this slide. I do not remember what they were. For SSAD recommendations, I guess that is what I just talked about there.

Regarding the urgent request timeline publication, there has also been some conversation that we go ahead and move forward with the publication of this timeline. It is what it is. I think it would be a bit of a release valve if we just go ahead and get that published and show some progress there. Next is the question of the authentication system. We had Wes Hardaker from the Board and our beloved Greg come and speak to us about what their current thinking is in terms of how to proceed there.

They gave us a number of different ways to handle authentication. According to Greg, the preferred approach by the Board is to deal with authentication through the implementation process, as that would be the most efficient approach to this. Another way to deal with that and any concerns that there might be a need for additional policy work is to handle it when the SSAD recommendations are sent back to Council and deal with the situation of authentication through that process. That would be a small group plus dealing with it that way.

The other option is to basically unadopt Recommendation 18 and start over. That is the least preferred approach by the Board, and I think we probably would share that perspective. It has pretty much been put to Council now: what do we prefer? The way things are leaning in Council—no decision has been made because we need to get back to them with our thoughts—is to go ahead and publish a timeline and then deal with any potential policy when the SSAD recommendations come back to Council.

Hopefully, that is clear. It is a lot of different stuff. We talked about this a bit with the GAC and said that was where we were leaning, and they seemed okay with that. I am surprised because they have been really strong in saying that they do not think any additional policy work needs to be done and that this should just be handled through implementation. I think it is good to know that they are a little bit flexible there, as long as they are participating in that small group plus, which is what people were thinking anyway. I will pause there and see if anybody has any questions, but I know we are going to talk about it more in-depth when we get to Sarah's section specifically on this issue. Roger, please.

ROGER CARNEY

Great. Thanks, Ashley. This is Roger. I would say that I think Greg really did set it up well during the Board meeting. He broke it into three parts: the urgent language, figuring out how authentication fits into Recommendation 18—because Recommendation 18 says nothing about authentication—and finally, how we right-size the current Law Enforcement authentication working group to be more in line with ICANN policy.

It is more of an ad hoc design team than it is a policy-generating team. I think those three things are perfectly aligned from Greg's perspective. I think whatever comes from how Council decides to get authentication into it will lead to solving the problem with the current LEA authentication team, and that will basically grow up and be a real team. Those are my thoughts. Thanks.

ASHLEY HHEINEMAN It is all grown up. Thank you, Roger. Sarah.

SARAH WYLD Thank you. This is Sarah. I like the last part of what you said, Ashley. I like the whole thing, but the last thing you said was to go ahead and publish the timeline. If we do need more policy work, we can address it with the SSAD recommendations, which is a policy space. The reason why I lean that way is just that I am not really sure how this authentication process will work because it is being developed by an ad hoc group that should have broader registrar participation in it.

I do not know that we can yet know if we need more formal policy or if it is okay for this to be something else. This way, we do not have to decide just yet, and yet the work can progress. As Ashley said, we have a whole section on this coming up in the next segment. Keep that in mind, and we will get into depth with it. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGILSKI

Thank you, Sarah. Any other thoughts before we go to the next slide? Is that it? All right. Seeing nothing here, we will give Zoe a couple of minutes to talk about a strategy planning update.

ZOE BONYTHON

Okay. Very quickly then. What have we been doing with our strategy planning actions? We have been actioning them. Since the last time I did this update at ICANN 84, we have, of course, launched RrSG1, our members' portal. If anyone has taken a look at the spreadsheet—and I am not sharing this here today because it is an open meeting—that has taken out a whole lot of actions that were on it. They are now complete.

One of those that is aligned is that we have now moved our informal communications to Signal from Slack. In the portal, you can see a lovely list of what they all are, and you can request to join if you would like to. We continue to do new messaging documents and guidance. The latest guidance, which itself was an action from the strategy planning meeting, is to have guidance for registrar participation in policy. There were messaging documents that were put out just before this meeting regarding PPSAI and associated domain checks. That is what comes to mind.

The participation survey, which at the last meeting we had only partially done, has now been fully completed, as we went through today. We have, of course, introduced this new, excellent membership fee discount program, which is for accredited registrars who, due to financial barriers mostly related to their country's economy, would otherwise be unable to be members of the RrSG. There is now a program that allows them to gain a 75% discount. Hopefully, that will be able to encourage and allow folks that are in that position to be a part of the RrSG.

The outreach team actually went through and reviewed our welcome email. Whenever there is a new member registrar, we have this lovely long welcome email that provides all the information. That has been reviewed and updated to make sure that it is fitting now with how things are done because it was quite an old email. That is what we have done.

So what are we working on? This is an ongoing thing regarding outreach to non-member registrars. Obviously, that is going to be a standing thing that the outreach team will be doing. We have an RrSG outreach session tomorrow. The hope is that if that goes well, it will be the first of other such meetings that would most likely be held when an ICANN meeting is held in a region that is less represented. The participation guide was on this slide the last time we did this, and it is still ongoing.

Hopefully, by the next meeting, it will be something that actually exists, but it is going to be a more general guide on how you can best participate in the RrSG. There are a couple of things that ExComm is going to be taking on, which we will be picking up not long after ICANN 85. They will be doing an annual strategic plan, which will be aligned with their fiscal year budget. That budget is typically prepared in May in order to be voted on by June.

Secondly, another action was to be tracking the risk levels of topics. That is something that is going to be looked at, possibly being incorporated into the portal. We have started this already, but it is still in its infancy in terms of increased engagement with ccNSO and GAC. We have a session tomorrow that is the RrSG ccNSO session, and I believe there is interest in doing that for the GAC as well. The session they planned for the Contracted Party Summit about GAC engagement has the potential for something similar specifically for them, but flipping it to focus on engagement with registrars or contracted parties. There are things in the tunnel. Anyway, that is it. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGILSKI

All right. Thank you, Zoe. If anyone has any questions, feel free to bring them up because we have to close here, but do bring them up to ExComm. We will close out this session and take a 30-minute break. What time will we be back? It says 04:30 PM local time, but I was trying to look for the UTC time. There we go, 21:30 UTC for those playing at home. All right. Thank you very much. You can end the recording. Sorry. That is the wrong one on there, so apologies. Go with 16:30 India time.

ZOE BONYTHON	It is 11:00 UTC. Sorry.
OWEN SMIGILSKI	Eleven.
ZOE BONYTHON	Oh, eleven.
OWEN SMIGILSKI	Eleven UTC.
ZOE BONYTHON	No, you are right. Five and a half minus. Yeah.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]