

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: RrSG Membership Work Session (1 of 2)  
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 11:45 to 13:15 CEST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello and welcome to the RrSG Membership Work Session 1 of 2. 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.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will 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 and when directed by the chair of this 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. And I will now hand the floor over to Owen. You may begin.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you, Andrea. Hello, everyone. Welcome to the Registrar Stakeholder Group first membership meeting of two today. The other one will be after lunchtime also in this room. So I just want to give a little heads up before we start the meeting that about a half hour from now, Sarah and I will be leaving you. We have been summoned by the GAC to go speak about verification and emails.

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

And so we have to go to that. Roger will end up chairing when Sarah and I have to leave. So just in case you're wondering why suddenly we leave, it's because of that. Next slide.

So let's move into the election and vote. Do we have Franciska here? We do not. I'm sorry. I apologize. I apologize. So just real quick before we go in here. Some people had asked me and I just want to clarify. Yes, there's a reason why I did not run for chair this time. Some people were a little surprised. A couple of years back, we had some issues with continuity. We had set up the ExCom as per our charter. We're required to do staggered things so that there isn't a turnover all at once. And we were running into that where everyone was terming out at the same time.

So I stepped down as vice chair early, agreed to run for one term, and then deferred to Sarah or anyone else who wanted to run for that. So that's why I am not doing another term. And I'm not going anywhere. We'll kind of step back and take a little breather. But I am certainly here and will continue to be deeply involved in the stakeholder group. So with that, I will turn it over to Franziska.

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA

Thank you, Owen. Hi, everyone. Franciska Iloezumma. So Zoe, can we have the next slide? Thank you. So we want to say very big congratulations to our newly elected candidates for the new positions that were opened. So congratulations to Sarah, Sebastian, Jody, Michael, Andrew, and Volker. Congratulations to you guys. So we now have new leaders joining us. Once it's

---

October, they will resume their office. So do you have anything to say to us, any of you? Sarah, do you have anything to say? Sebastian?

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. This is Sarah. I just want to say thank you. I'm so excited to continue working with you all in this new capacity. I think it'll be really exciting. I have tall shoes to fill, I guess, instead of big. And we'll certainly rely on the expertise of Owen and our past chairs to contribute to that. And I think we have some really fun places to go in the future. So thank you so much, everybody, for your confidence in me.

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA

Thank you very much, Sarah. We are very delighted to have you lead us. So Sebastian, do you have anything to say to us?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Let me just jump in real quick. I know Sarah's going to be great. I don't have tall shoes. I am tall. I have big shoes, though. They're size 14 US, 48 for EU. So yes, you do have big shoes to fill. But that's just literal, not figurative. But no, it worked well with Sarah. I was formerly Vice Chair of Policy. So we've been working on that. She's been a good contributor to the ExCom. And so I know the ExCom will be and the stakeholder group will be in good hands.

---

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA      Great. Thank you, Owen. So does any other person have anything to say amongst the newly elected members? Michael, are you here?

MICHAEL BAULAND      Michael here. Thanks for being re-elected. The last two years of Treasurer work was really interesting and good. And I'm looking forward to continuing this in the next two years. Thanks.

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA      Thank you very much, Michael. You are doing a very great work. Thank you so much. Do we have Andrew? Andrew, yeah. I saw your email, and I suspect you have something to say.

ANDREW BARRETT      Well, thank you so much for electing me. Very excited to work with all of you.

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA      Thank you, Andrew. Thank you, everyone, for voting. Thank you to everyone that participated as well to be elected. We do appreciate this. So we move on to the next slide. That's the budget election.

So for the budget update, the budget is still currently on the review by the ExCom. So we are hoping very soon, maybe this week or so, the ExCom will be done with the review, and it will be passed to the membership for review as well. So once the members review and give feedback, then we'll move on to the period of voting. And once

---

that is done, we'll have our results, and then we'll move to the next phase.

So what we have to do now is completion of the ExCom review. Once that is done, move to the membership for review. Then we move to vote. Then we finalize and implement the approved budget. So does anyone have any question regarding the budget or the election? The floor is open.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you, Francisca. So I think that we're done with the budget update, right? Yeah. Okay. And then next slide, please.

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA

Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

And for now, turn it to Zoe for update on our members portal.

ZOE BONYTHON

Thank you. Hi. So what we're just going to go through briefly today is the things that we are expecting will be happening in the next phase of the updates to the portal. So this is something that you'll see more information on when the budget eventually goes out to membership for full review.

Just to give you a bit of a sneak peek of what we're expecting to come soon. Perhaps one of the big things, or the biggest even, is

there's going to be a new library. What that means to be a library, it's going to be a document repository and it's going to have all finished work that is owned by the RrSG or where things where the RrSG has commented on external documents. But it's things that we hold ownership of. Yeah. So like it says here, so RrSG files or things that RrSG notes are put on.

Obviously, that will, once the actual thing is built, it might take a bit of time to actually build it up because we do have a sort of back catalogue of information. There is a possibility that we can, because as you may know, we have public things like our explainers and our guidance that currently lives on our website.

It is possible, if we choose to do it, to have an API which where we would have, where everything would live in the portal and the website would just point to that. But if that doesn't end up happening, the library will have everything that the RrSG, that belongs to the RrSG, is going to be in the library. So it'd be a one-stop shop for all of our documents, which should hopefully be very useful.

Next big thing is there's going to be a new section for specifically for RAA amendments. And when I say section, I mean that currently we have a section for, for example, subgroups, for members, for ICANN working groups. So there's going to be a new one for RAA amendments and sort of in the same way. So it is slightly separate from the library in that there will be a copy of the RAA amendments

that have access there, but not only that, it'll include what comments were made on final comments.

We won't include all the discussion that's happened, but sort of final comments and things that actually membership for, saw and were put, came out of the review team, that is going to be included in this section. So it'll be an easier way to sort of track going forward, be able to look back at what was done previously at other amendments.

The next thing is bookkeeping, bringing the invoicing and our expense account records in-house. Currently we use QuickBooks, as you know, that's where your invoices come from. So instead of coming from there, that's something that we currently pay an annual fee for that would transition into the portal. That will not be happening for the next fiscal year. When the new invoices go out after our budget is approved, etc., that's still going to be through QuickBooks, and then we'll have a period of transition. But certainly by next year it should be running through the portal.

Okay. These next ones are more updates. So the work tracker exists already. The work tracker is something that exists in our subgroups and it's only viewable and usable by subgroup members. But we're going to update it to make it a bit more user-friendly. Right now we don't have a separate archive section for when tasks are complete, so that is going to be built into it. And we're going to be able to reorder actions if they want to prioritize them higher or lower up the list, etc.

Similarly, that's going to be happening, I know it's not mentioned on here, but that sort of drag-and-drop functionality is also going to be on resources and other pages. For the calendar, it's going to be updated to include automated event reminders. That is going to be something that you can choose to have on or off. You don't have to get that, but it'll be built in, and you'll be able to just resend meeting invitations.

And then finally, the other thing of note is meeting notes. So this is something that will be built into our subgroup pages. Within a subgroup page, there'll be a new little part of it where myself, or if it's someone else doing that, will be able to put in the notes. And once they've saved it, it would then send an email to group members with the notes, but the notes would also be stored within the subgroup so they can be referred to in the portal as well.

So that's it. Because we're still working through things and figuring out details, we don't have a timeline or anything on these. It's just to let you know that these are the things that we are looking to do in the next phase of updates to the portal. So are there any questions? If not, sorry, I wasn't looking in the room, but I do not see anything. Oh, I do see a hand. Eric.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks Zoe. This is Eric Rokobauer. Not questions really just comments. This is great. I think seeing this all these updates getting made is awesome. Being one of the subgroup chairs, it's, it's been a helpful resource to have all of this stuff available in the

---

portal. So again, support that we've been doing this, making the change. Well, maybe I do have one question. We can still, if there's more feedback, more ideas, this is not the end. Like we'll be able to keep asking for some changes if that's possible. Thanks.

ZOE BONYTHON

Yes, absolutely. You know, normally, we've built a portal for how we work now, but we don't know if that may change in the future. And obviously there should always be some agility, but obviously the nature of this sort of thing, it's not something that we think of today and do tomorrow. But yes, a hundred percent, always open to hear suggestions, concerns, whatever it is to do with a portal. You should always let us know. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Zoe. And then also I think the plan is to have another strategy session around the CP summit next year. And so bring those ideas to that. Let's see, next is the ADC PDP working group. And for that, I'll turn it over to Eric and Natalie, our reps and team co-chairs.

NATALIE HOWATSON

Thanks for that Owen. Natalie Howatson, for the record. So we'll go ahead and kick things off with the associated domain check PDP working group, summarization of what we've been up to. Can we go to the next slide please?

Okay, so we have a timeline of what got us here and where we're going. Starting in August 2025, as most of you know, there was an issues report on DNS abuse mitigation. and it kind of started us along this path and there's some couple of PDPs in the mix and we've started with the associated domain checks PDP. So the timeline here we started in March is the official date and the plan is to hopefully send it off to council by May of 2027.

And I will say right now, we are definitely on track for that. Things seem to be going at a fast pace. Of course we're keeping time in the working group to make sure that everyone is heard and we're addressing any issues that are coming up, but cautiously optimistic that things are going well and we will keep to the timeline. Can we go to the next slide please?

So for everyone that isn't aware these are the dedicated ADC PDP reps within the RrSG. So we've got Volker, Carlos, Eric, myself, Reg, and then Theo is our alternate. We also have others in the Registrar Stakeholder Group that helps support us in some of our weekly meetings and in a back channel to help make sure that we're including all of the feedback and concerns and ideas from the entire stakeholder group. Can we go to the next slide please?

So just so you all are aware, we have two meetings a week. We have the full working group call with all constituencies that takes place on Mondays and then we have our internal Registrar Stakeholder Group ADC PDP call and that takes place on Fridays. So during those calls, we do try to make sure that we take a look at what's

coming up in the Monday calls and we work together, not just with the reps, but like I was saying, we have other members in the group that are interested in the DNS abuse. Some people that are just observers on the PDP. And so we all work together to make sure that we're aligned and getting done what we need to get done. Can we go to the next slide please?

Okay, so Eric and I wanted to give an overview of the charter questions where we are at in the working group right now in terms of preliminary recommendations and proposed texts and things like that. Do keep in mind that this is a fluid document still. We are making changes. Yesterday in some of our PDP meetings, we've had some changes to some wordings and so keep in mind this is more of a high level summary versus exact wording at this moment.

So for charter question number one, it is what triggers the requirement to investigate associated domain names and what we have currently, again, with potential changes as we continue our PDP sessions this week is up here on the screen. So I won't fully read through it, but we just wanted to make sure that you guys have access to this after the presentation, we'll send out the slides too. So if there are any additional questions or thoughts from the stakeholder group, do make sure to let us know. Can we go to the second slide or the next slide, Zoe? Cool, thank you.

And then we have charter question number two, which is what criteria should be used to define association between domain names? What elements can be considered to establish such

---

association? So this one concerns the associated domain check investigation and here this is nice and short. So we've got currently a registrar must perform a reasonable investigation in order to determine whether or not associated domains are engaging in DNS abuse per 3.18.2 of the RAA. So this one's short and sweet and to the point. So we'll go ahead and go to the next slide.

So for charter question number three, this is on defining investigation. So what constitutes, there we go, a reasonable investigation by a registrar? What investigation steps are required or recommended? And then what's the criteria for investigation for that is proportionate and necessary? And then what is the impact of that investigation on domain name registrants? So this one, I believe yesterday in our session, we had a little bit of wording change. And it's concerning what constitutes a reasonable investigation.

So we have the text up here on the screen. And again, it's a fluid document. So things are definitely changing wording wise. But I will hand it over to Eric to kind of go over some of the charter questions have recommendation guidance and implementation guidance. So I'll hand it over to him to explain the next slide.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Natalie. It's Eric Rookbauer again. So yeah, just to reinforce that it's been excellent collaboration with the RrSG members working in the working group. We just had two meetings yesterday. You probably, if you were in the session with the

registries earlier, our CPH Plus session, there was quick dialogue of how well the working group has been going through these charter questions.

So one of the things we want to do here today with you is talk about the implementation guidance that's being included with some of these charter questions. Part of the work that we've been striving to accomplish is that whatever policy language gets put in is broad to allow our business models to be able to accommodate to the language. And so the guidance is going to be designed to help illustrate to the community some differences or examples to go more detailed.

And so while what you see on screen here, I just want to call out, yeah, if you look at the under reasonable investigation, that first bullet, one of the first sentence, a reasonable investigation by a registrar must consist of reviewing information reasonably available to the registrar.

We, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, put in a request yesterday that instead of reasonably available, it should be reasonably accessible. And that's to account for some of our wholesale registrars to make sure sometimes they use resellers and they may not have all the data. And so now they have the ability to get that data from their resellers. And there was alignment. There was some back and forth discussion with some of the working group members to explain that, but overall ended up being positive. And

so that's going to be a change going in there. If we go to the next slide, please.

And so what we want to do here for the next few, the charter questions three through seven, there's going to be some implementation guidance language. And so what we want to do here today with those in the meeting is we'll just take a look at the guidance, how it is written now, and just try to get a level set from those here. If you're in agreement, in support, yes or no of what we're having captured here. So we have the honor of continuing tradition of having some polling questions.

So before we jump to the first polling question here about this guidance, again, just calling out reasonably available. We want that to say reasonably accessible. But again, if you look at what's captured, it's keeping the language broad, but making sure that the investigation must consist of what's already available to a registrar during its normal course of operations. And we should not require a registrar to have to generate any data that's not already accessible to them. But I'll just take one more, like 30 more seconds to let you just kind of take in what you see on the slide. And then we'll set up the first polling question for today.

All right, I think we're good. If we can do the next slide. So if you can memorize what you saw there. Are you in support of the implementation guidance as written? Yes or no? That's a good idea. That'd be great. Thank you.

---

All right. Oh, I should probably also answer this. I'll give everyone five more seconds. And I should add to, and hopefully I waited to see if anyone's going to put a no in there. But through these questions, if we see if there's a no that comes from the group, we'd be curious to understand why that is. And hopefully, and learn, get some input from you, because that's what we can take back into the working group and make sure we're capturing that if there's some call outs we want to make.

All right. Let's see the results, please. Oh, there we go. Yay. Oh, this is nice. This is great. Okay, thank you.

And we hope that, again, this shouldn't be too much of surprises here. We've definitely, as Natalie hinted, we meet Fridays, not just the working group members for the RrSG, but we have additional RrSG members that are supporting us in the PDP work. And if you're not in those and you want to join, we'd like to hear from you. Reg, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

REG LEVY

Thank you. Is it possible to tell how many people actually participated in the poll? Or was that just me?

ZOE BONYTHON

21.

---

ERIC ROKOBAUER

You're the only one that can see that. Zoe, can I see that? Right? Only you can see that, yeah. Can you see that? Okay. And thank you, I see the consensus. I appreciate that. All right.

Let's go on to the next slide, which goes into charter question 4, which, what data access and privacy safeguards are necessary to protect both registrants and registrars during associated domain checks? And so we had some, you can see on screen, preliminary recommendation language when we were trying to determine what makes the association. In the discussions, there was agreement that an associated domain check must be adhered to applicable laws and data privacy safeguards. And there was broad consensus for it has to have targeted evidence-based investigations. And so overall, again, a positive. This led to implementation guidance, which you'll see on the next slide, please.

So we'll see real quick here, when defining association, there was an ask from other members in the working group in the community to see a lot more detail, to see a lot more specifics to force registrars to take into account. And so we wanted to stress back, then strive to make sure that it had to be broad because we didn't want to reveal, it's not to give those bad actors or anyone doing abuse to see what are things that are associated when doing these checks.

So what you see on screen here is to really just do high level, like looking for common patterns, but leaving it up to the registrar and

---

their discretion in order to how they will associate when they do their checks.

So I'll leave that on screen. I see we have a hand from Michele, but just get you prepared for a polling question on this language. Michele, please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks, Eric. Michele here. Oh, God, I mean, some of this stuff, it just really hurts my head to thinking about what some people might expect us to “conclude” based on some BS report from some idiots who may be well-meaning or not. But we need to have as much leeway as possible. I mean, I think we have to be very, very, very careful about what language is used to articulate what we will or won't look at. So the kind of high level stuff, I think, is fine. But once you start getting into any specifics, it's opening up a massive can of worms. Not because of anything you guys might do. It's just I know damn well that it will be used against us.

I'm currently arguing with various people about a report that was put out, and it's like, okay, just because a domain name is on a list does not mean it was registered to end up on a list, to do something that would get it onto a list. One and one is not two. There's grey areas. There's a lot of these things. I mean, look, I'm delighted that there are people who still have the energy to deal with this insanity.

But I do think that this PDP is still repeated. I keep saying it, and I know you're all sick of me saying it. This PDP is a massive waste of

---

time, and they could just have issued a bloody advisory, and we could all move on with our lives. But as somebody said to me last night, some lawyers are using this as a wonderful way to get billable hours for their clients. Sad, but that's the reality.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Michele. Yeah, this is Eric again. I completely agree. I think we even, during some of the earlier working group calls, there was asked to have some of the language include even for domains doing abuse that may not even have happened yet, a pre-crime almost of being ready to look for those when that's just not even how this was written as far as the charter itself. So it has been an enduring exercise. But yeah, understood, noted. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks, Eric. When you started discussion on number three, I think you mentioned that you've asked for updated terminology from available to accessible. Does that include in the guidance and then question four here, are we going to be changing available to accessible? Thank you.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Great call out, Roger. Yeah, so and forgive us. Yeah, when we had put these slides together, this was before yesterday's meeting, and so this was a lot of the language just kept preceding each charter question. So where you saw reasonably available, which we want

---

to change, that will flow through the other remaining guidance for the other charter questions. Thanks. Reg?

REG LEVY

Thanks. So to Michele's point, we are trying very hard to make sure that this is not prescriptive. There are some constituencies who have said something along the lines of we will accept nothing less than confirming like searching for the register specifically, which is not actually a very good way or even analog of determining associations for a lot of these domains. So we've managed to get this, which we think is better than some of the other options. I think I lost Michele, but to his point, and anybody who agrees with him, including me, we think that this will accomplish that in the best possible way.

And as to accessible versus available, there are constituencies that are interested in making sure that we can use, for example, retail block lists. There are others that are interested in making sure that we are forced to check a retail block list. And what we're trying to do is thread the line of, look, if you've got it, fine. If you don't, you don't have to sign up for specifically X-branded retail block lists. And the available versus accessible is also partially to allow resellers to do their own checks, because currently the registrar has the responsibility for everything that's in the contract. It can be delegated as long as it is completed.

So accessible means, in this conception, that a reseller can perform the check and has complied. And to the extent that ICANN audit

---

that check, the registrar can go to the reseller and say, okay, you're the one who did the check. So give me the information. It is accessible to me, but it's not available in the sense of, I have all of that at my fingertips. So it may be a distinction without a difference, but it's kind of what we got to.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Reg. Appreciate your comments and articulating that so well. Natalie, go ahead.

NATALIE HOWATSON

Thanks, Eric. Natalie, for the record. And just to kind of build on what Reg was saying, we've really been trying to make a group effort within the working group, as all of us as registrars, on educating and pushing for the most broad terminology possible so that we're not limited, because we are all different business models. And we will do things differently when it comes to ADC checks. So like Reg and Volker have been really great about educating other members in the working group, even on legal terms, about explaining what does reasonable mean? So there's been a group effort to really try and make sure that everyone's on board and that we're getting what we want out of the PDP.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Natalie. This is Eric again. All right. So let's move on, unless there's any more questions or comments. Okay. Let's go to our next polling question for charter question 4, implementation

---

guidance. So do you want to see more example scenarios listed to help explain association? I'm hoping these are like easy polling questions for y'all, based on the conversations we just had. But for association, do you want to see more examples? Or no, what's listed already is fine. And also, or no, prefer to see changes made to what is listed, which you see on screen. Yeah.

Let's give about 30 seconds. And again, in our mind, if we see some no's we'd be curious to understand what that might be. All right. Let's go ahead and close up the polling question and get those results. Sure. I got a finger from Zoe to hold on real quick. The magic is happening in the background. All right. So we had 26% seeing more examples. And for those that did be curious to understand what that might be. So we are accounting for what you're looking to see more here. And then the majority, we had no, what's already captured is going to be fine at 58%. And then there was a no, prefer to see some changes made.

So I'll take a moment there. And if anyone has comments they'd like to add as to why they answered the yes or the no, wanting to see changes made, we'd like to hear that from you now. Michele, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks. I was the awkward one, because of course I was. No, it just been, as I'd already said -- and I've no problem with the examples as illustrative when we are discussing the topic. I am just very paranoid about articulating them as part of any policy further

---

down the line. Because as I've already said, I can see them being used against us. And from a more practical perspective, we A, don't want to give the scumbags a roadmap. And B, we don't want to give the registrars who aren't going to do any of this anyway, a way to kind of finesse their ways out of doing anything.

And I was looking at some data that Netcraft is presenting to groups this week. And the number of registrars, the concentration of issues that they're looking at is in a very, very, very small number of registrars. And my problem is always the same. It's like, why the hell are our clients suffering because of the sins of others? It's exhausting.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Michele. Andrew, go ahead.

ANDREW MERRIAM

This is Andrew Merriam from Porkbun. I voted for the last option, and I should have spoken up before the vote, because it might have clarified for me. But if I've seen anything that made me uncomfortable so far today or in this session, it was the language on the second bullet of common patterns, I think it said. And to me, it was just like this idea of hindsight where it's like, oh, that was a nine character domain. And eight of those characters were consonants. And that's a common pattern.

And it may be some of the tools that we and others use are going to be able to pick up on those patterns and all of the great AI tooling

---

that's happening. We'll be able to pick on some of these patterns. But what may seem like a common pattern to us now in this room might not be apparent when it's being registered 24 hours ago, coming in and how we're analyzing that and what time frame we're taking to analyze that. But that was my concern with this slide.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Andrew. That's a good observation. I think in that we, the working group members have really pushed to make sure, bringing that type of scenario up and explaining that there are going to be times where we don't want this policy to be so prescriptive, so specific, where, yeah, there could be a change months, years down the road where this will be relevant if we had it in that specific pattern in that way.

So I will look to other ADC PDP members here if they want to add any more comment. But, yeah, I think this has been one of those compromises in a way of trying to get some language to show that, give them something. But we don't want, we definitely want to avoid having anything like those unique, specific points.

ANDREW MERRIAM

And I noticed, to jump back in, they may include language right before voting. And that's, again, why I probably should have spoken up before we voted. And I think then I would have been in the yes. But I just kind of wanted to raise that point.

---

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Great, thank you. Reg, your hand's up.

REG LEVY

Thanks. So Michele indicated that he didn't want examples in the policy. Would you be okay with them in the implementation guidance? Okay.

MICHELE NEYLON

Sorry, since nodding won't go into the transcript.

REG LEVY

He nodded. And with regard to Andrew's concern about common patterns, that is, we're working very hard, again, to thread the needle between, look, if you don't find it, the point is that you looked. And so, like, yes, it could be that there is a common pattern. We saw this with the winter fuel of, like, as you say, three consonants, or three letters, four numbers. That is an extremely common pattern.

That doesn't necessarily mean that every domain that fits that pattern is associated. So, again, as long as you're looking for something, something relevant, something reasonable, then you should be fine, even if there were domains on your system that you missed that might have fit a different category or even the same one, and it just wasn't there.

---

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you, Reg. All right, I think we can go ahead and move on to the next slide. Go to Charter Question 5. Thank you. So for Charter Question 5, to remind everyone, if the associated domain checks have an adverse impact on domain name registrants, are there corresponding remedies?

And so going into this little background, for the working group, there was a call out to all working group constituencies to provide any language that could be reviewed by the working group. And so the Registered Stakeholder Group, we actually did our homework ahead of others, and we provided some language that ended up being the basis for what you're seeing on screen that led to the recommendation. It's pretty lengthy, a lot of material there on screen on the slide, but ultimately, we wanted to recognize that should be some considerations that get led to future PDP work and suggest that that could be a case.

We acknowledge that there's a potential harm for registrants, but wider variation in the remedies. We believe that in the RAA, specifically at the registrant rights, there is very broad language that says that there is a remedy for registrants to contest the domains that may get taken down for abuse, but understand that there could be more done to that. There could be improvements made to what's currently written.

The NCSG was one group that really wanted to see more done within this PDP to address some of these remedies, but we felt that's not the most appropriate place here. And so that's kind of

---

where we ended up with this language, leaving it broad, suggesting there could be some work done at a later PDP. Yeah, Michele, please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks, Eric. Just as a question. I've sort of ticked this thing out, half of Ireland has decided that today is the day to ring me, because of course they do. One of the things that I know has come up in previous interactions with the NCSG and others is concerns around protection for registrants and our customers and various things like that.

Now, those conversations have been linked very closely to the series of PDPs around abuse, but why don't we suggest potentially that there be a separate PDP for that specific topic? Because it would be so nice for the community to work on something positive that wasn't about abuse for a change. I mean, I don't know, maybe you all enjoy doing abuse. I certainly don't. And that's just me. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks, Michele. And I think that's what we kind of, we did strive to do is like, yes, let's send this back, part of the process, send it back to the GNSO Council to consider. And this should be one of those things, is that maybe there should be a PDP for that very topic.

All right. So let's go on to the next slide, which is the implementation guidance for this question. So yeah, so a real high level, just read the first bullet there. Working group recommends that a registrar conducting ADC should limit access to in correlation of data to what is reasonably appropriate for the investigation, taking account for the purpose of the check. The policy should avoid creating a prescriptive or obligation heavy price framework instead relying on high-level safeguards that can operate across different jurisdictions, business models, and technical environments.

And then going into that second bullet, high level, you've got, there was, I want to call out that last sentence, lawful sharing of relevant information should be permitted when necessary to effective abuse mitigation or compliance with applicable law contractual obligations. This particular area, I think this is one that was asked by others in the working group outside the RrSG. They wanted to make sure that they weren't so prescriptive that they couldn't be additional investigations outside of what may occur from what's written or what gets written the policy or the advisory.

Any questions on this? Because if not, we can move on to the next polling question for this language. I will go ahead and pull up our polling question. So there's a lot on screen on slide, excuse me. But do you find the implementation guidance as written for charter question 5 helpful or not? Yes or no.

Okay, let's go ahead and close the poll. Oh, Reg, please go ahead. Nope. Okay. Just taking a few seconds here. Thank you very much. Overwhelmingly, we're okay with how it's written as is and to note too, like this is how it's written now is not the final language. I think there's still like in deliberations, but we just want to make sure to get a level set of registrar members if there's any concerns. And so we want to understand that as we go back into the working group deliberations. But I did see we had one no. So I'll pause there for any comments. And I see Reg, I believe your hand is ready now.

REG LEVY

Yeah, so that was my no. I want to make very sure that we don't have to create new documentation. And I know that that's understood by everyone in this room. But I also kind of want to say it on the record for as much record as this is. I said no, because I'm not positive that this does that. The first paragraph can kind of be interpreted and by interpreted, I mean, by ICANN compliance as saying that we do have to track certain things. There may not be logs for some of what we do.

Volker has mentioned that we may have a policy written and point to the policy that says like, hey, every time we do X, we do Y. And so X was done, therefore Y got done. We don't have a log of it, but we don't need it. Anyway, I just kind of want to thread that needle. Apparently, I'm threading a lot of needles today. That was the reason for my no. I could be happy with it, but I could also like some changes.

ERIC ROKOBAUER                      Thanks, Reg. I think that's a good observation, good call out. And I think, I mean, that's part of why we do our deliberations when we meet. And so, yeah, that's something we can take back. Maybe we'll even change this up a little bit more to push that in the working group. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON                      Yeah, Michele again. I mean, this is probably a really, really dumb question. Sorry, I have been dragged in and out of the room as my phone keeps ringing. What's the timeline look like in terms of a report of some kind on this?

ERIC ROKOBAUER                      Apologies, Michele, a report on what specifically?

MICHELE NEYLON                      Sorry, the PDP.

NATALIE HOWATSON                      Yeah, Michele. So the plan is, Natalie, for the record, May 2027 to have it finalized and sent to council. If that's what you mean.

MICHELE NEYLON                      Well, just being an older dude sitting in the corner, often there was like an initial report at some point, or interim report of what the hell the damn thing was called. Just trying to understand what the

---

timeline was really. Because once this PDP finishes, there's another one that kicks off.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Yeah, this is Eric. Yeah, so we tried to hint at it in the earlier slides. So the initial report, I believe, is going to go for in February of 2027. I think is when we're going to try and get the first initial report out. Yeah, we got on screen slides. That help answer?

MICHELE NEYLON

That's beautiful. And congratulations to you both. You're doing a lovely job.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you so much, Michele. That's on the record. That's great. Okay, let's go jump all the way back to, I think we're going to move on to six. Charter question 6. Thank you very much.

Yes, this question, as short and sweet as it is, it's one of the most contested ones. What are appropriate timelines and thresholds for initiating conducting the associated domain check? If you weren't in our earlier discussion, didn't attend the working calls yesterday, or were in the CPH meeting, Volker brought the update that we saw a great positive response where the BC initially, within the earlier discussions, had pushed to see some threshold of time. I think it was 24 hours, if I'm remembering right, 24 hours from the initiation of the investigation to see some action done, which was against what we had been pushing this entire time in the working group

---

that we need to keep this broad. It also aligns to the current DNS abuse amendments that were put in the RAA in 2024.

We wanted to have it promptly, leave it broad, because there could be a variety of reasons going to all of our investigations that we have to account for our own registrar models and businesses. So yesterday, the BC rescinded. They pushed it down. They decided, nope, we approve the prompt language. And so we have consensus within the working group to keep promptly, which I think is a win for us. So that's great.

I'll take a moment if there's any other ADC PDP members that want to add any comments there. If not, so hopefully this is going to be a quick one, but we're really excited that we're kind of, because there's a big win, a big compromise to have this staying with promptly. So if you go to the next slide with the guidance.

We had to provide some things to help the community understand, but again, keeping it as broad as possible. And so we tried to educate by suggesting again, maize, we didn't want any musk because then we don't want to get stuck in a trap of these are certain things that have to happen. But these were just some of the points we wanted to raise that would be considered when we are doing our investigating, completing it promptly. Michele .

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks; Michele again. I suppose the only concern I would have is again, it's how all of these perfectly reasonable, sane and

logical proposals will be turned on their head and used to make our lives miserable. That's just my only concern. Because severity and immediacy of DNS abuse, okay, give an example.

Right now, there's a few of these vibe coding platforms that are being used and being weaponized on a constant basis. If I'm the target of a phishing campaign, I want it down as quickly as possible. And I consider it to be the most important and serious and severe press on the DNS right now. And I'm sure the other reporters feel the same way.

So I suppose the problem is going to be, how do you articulate that, okay, somebody who is running some kind of campaign against the root servers versus somebody who's attacking a corner shop in a village in the back of beyond. Because there's a huge difference between the two or somebody who's doing something that's knocking out critical national infrastructure versus somebody who's taken down Jean-Christophe's photo collection. Sorry, Jean-Christophe, you were in my line of sight, you got picked on.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks Michele . Noted. And I think one of the pieces, this also is going to lead to making advisory language. So this was one of the things we're going to need to really work hard to push and provide a variety of examples that will help kind of educate the community about what the variety of things that could happen as a result. And so those examples you gave, maybe we can take some of that feedback and we can make sure when we work on the advisory that

---

would go into this to educate, that can be part of those examples we use real time.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks. I think the reality is that the bigger players aren't the ones I'd be concerned about. They really aren't. It's these ones who feel that everything is, it's my problem and you have to fix it and you have to fix it now. What do you mean you didn't fix it already? Look at me, I'm the most important person in the world. And then it's like this entire thing. I mean, it's that kind of craziness and it burns so much time and energy. It's just so annoying. Thanks.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks Michele. Noted. Okay, any other comments, questions? All right. If not, we can go to our last slide we want to talk about with you all today. And that's updating you. Oh, we still do the poll. I'm sorry. We did not get to that. Yeah, we do the charter. Thank you.

So for the guidance language to help support the use of promptly, which again, we had a compromise in the working group. Everyone's in agreement and consensus. What you saw there, should there be anything else to help define it? Yes or no? We have 10 more seconds while we're answering it. How are we doing on time check? Am I good? Okay.

All right. Let's go ahead and close that question, please. Hooray. Okay, excellent. Thank you very much. That is a big win. That's

great to see. And just for those, yeah, there was 100% no. We are good with how it's written as is. Promptly is for the win.

All right. Let's go on to the next slide for charter question 7. So this is hot off the presses. We had, we did have some updates here and even our Registrar Stakeholder Group representatives made some requests to change what's here. And so the question is about what are topics for consideration to go back to the GNSO council outside of this PDP. That again, should be discussed. That was a result of the deliberations during the working group.

And so what you see those two bullets at the bottom, we made a request to change that first bullet, the limited transparency and DNS abuse mitigation actions taken. We requested that that be removed and we replace it with quote, lack of registry level abuse pattern investigation and mitigation requirements and development of framework of cross CP information sharing regarding detected abuse patterns. That was a mouthful.

I'll look to our ADC members. If anyone wants to speak to that, add a little color, but otherwise, I mean, the thought was, is we want to illustrate that it's not just registrars that are seeing abuse. I think we want to color that, identify that registries also have their own obligations to make sure that they're monitoring for abuse. And so there should be a need that we also take that into account and look into what they're doing. And so that could be something for discussion. Reg, I see your hands up. Please go ahead.

---

REG LEVY

Thanks. There's a big call in some areas of the community for potentially an update to EPP that would include a flag. This domain has been suspended for abuse. There's a lot of issues with that, but a lot of people are saying that they want confirmation that something got done. And there are also conversations outside of ICANN about how hosting companies and registrars can work better together to mitigate abuse on an ongoing basis. If a host has suspended it, should the registrar still also suspend it, for example, or is that sufficient?

So the limited transparency is coming from a lot of groups who, both human rights organizations who want to make sure that we are held to account and from IP enforcement groups who want to make sure that something got done and at what level so that they can track it better. I'm broadly against telling the reporter anything because as soon as I get into, yes, we took action or no, we didn't take action, it becomes a debate. Well, why did you do X and not Y? Why didn't you do X? I don't ever want to get into anything that requires us to report back to the reporter about what we did.

So from my perspective, I'm looking at transparency and I do support transparency broadly, but I get squirrely when it comes down to this. So I think that's part of why we wanted it to go back to council rather than in the ADC for this, in the PDP for the ADC, trying to hammer this out because this is a much broader conversation.

---

And I do strongly support an update to the registrant rights and responsibilities, firstly, including to change the name to rights and responsibilities because right now it's benefits, I think, which is just weirdly worded in the first place. ICANN is weird. But I really support updating that because it is a bit outdated and things have changed. And maybe that's a good place for us to say, look, these are the recourse mechanisms that you have to a registrar.

P.S., they're in the terms of service. And to sort of articulate better that if your name is in the WHOIS, you're the registrant and you accept responsibility for what happens on your domain, which is another thing that is coming up, both in this PDP as well as in the implementation review group for the PPSAI, that that's a place where we can have that done.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thank you very much, Reg. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks. So first off, I definitely agreeing mostly with what Reg was saying around the transparency and for the same reasons and others. The DSA does cover some of this and that's something that I think for those of us who are covered by that, that's what we should be looking at. Why on earth would we want to invent another wheel? You know, there's DSA reporting obligations, there's various other things there. In terms of the dispute recourse mechanism, I do disagree with the thing about it's in the terms of

service. That's not very customer friendly. Terms of service are for lawyers in many respects.

How many of you around this table have an Apple device of some kind? How many of you have actually read the iOS terms of service? Okay, now for the record, I'll note that the answers to that were not in the least bit surprising, but no, but generally speaking, and I mean, okay, I'm being a little bit facetious, but I'm not at the same time, in that I don't think it's unreasonable that a customer have some idea of this is what we do, this is how we do it, this is why we do it. That doesn't mean I'm going to give you a roadmap onto how to abuse my platform, but if you buy services from us, you're going to get a certain level of level of service in return.

Now, obviously, I'm going to look at that as being a way of competing, and ultimately, if you buy a .com from you guys, from me, or from her, it's still the same bloody .com, so we obviously have to compete on service, and I'm not suggesting that we don't, but I think it's a little bit disingenuous to say to people, oh, go read the terms of service. I think we can do better than that, because my thing is that I'm sick to my teeth of all these ridiculous arguments around abuse, because you're giving hammers, and if I've got a hammer, I'm looking for a nail.

When I bought my power drill, when I bought my house, I then spent the following week wandering around the house with a power drill going, where's the screw that I can turn? Because I've got this really cool tool that I want to use. Whereas if you're able to

---

turn and flip it on its head a bit and go, right. We are here to serve the global internet, we are providing services to enable individuals and small businesses to set up businesses, to do things online, to thrive, to reach all of those positive things, which I think is why a lot of us engage in this. That's a positive message. And I know Reg feels this way. She might not admit it, but she does.

ERIC ROKOBAUER

Thanks. Thank you, Michele. And I think, yeah, that's absolutely some of the things that could be considered in a future work that we're proposing to go back to the GNSO Council. And then also a comment, I think helpful to understand, yeah, how much of us have read the terms with our Apple devices? Maybe that'll be a future polling question for our members later, but something to think about.

Any other comments or questions? I think we have a question for this particular, the language that you're seeing on screen for charter question 7, but because there's been so much changes, I think we're just going to ex-ene that. We're just going to pass over that. So just look for more to come.

I think that's the end for our presentation today on the ADC work so far. We'll take any last questions you have for myself, Natalie, or other ADC PDP members, but more to come. Appreciate all your help and input as we work to represent you in the PDP. All right, pass it off. Thank you.

---

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks, Eric. Thanks, Natalie, for that update. That's a great update. And hopefully even those that aren't paying that much attention now have a good grasp of what's going on.

So all right, I think that we can move ahead and we will jump to the next topic, which I think is my topic. So privacy. So next slide, please. And we'll make this pretty quick. There is a meeting this week on privacy. There's really two big topics left to cover. I think a lot of the things have been generally agreed upon by the IRT, but maybe I'll look at Luke and Reg to hit on a couple of these real quick.

The two big things left is this concept of labeling in the RDDS some way of showing that, hey, this is a privacy proxy service record. This was shot down in the PDP, but is now bubbling back up. So we'll see where that goes. And the other big topic is how to treat resellers. And more specifically, if a reseller is, in air quotes here, providing a proxy service or privacy service of their own and not the registrars.

Again, I think that most of us know that means they are the registrant and they are responsible. But there is a lot of pushback from other communities on trying to make the reseller responsible as a privacy proxy provider. So I don't know, Reg or Luke, if you have anything to add. I know you both add a lot during our conversation. So, Reg, go ahead.



---

Because they don't understand how the internet and reality work? Question mark. Anyway, so that's where we are. That's what seems to be driving a lot of this. And again, from my standpoint, if you are the RNH, if you're in the WHOIS, your data is escrowed and you are the party that can be sued or arrested. And if you're not the one who did it, then that's between you and whoever sues you and whoever arrests you or shows up at your door.

ROGER CARNEY

Thanks, Reg. So I do think this will continue for a bit. And maybe I'm going to preempt a little bit of what Michele is going to say. But the fact is, is they have choices. They can choose to go where they want to go. And if they want to use an accredited proxy service, they can. And their data will be escrowed and they will be safe in ALAC's terms. And I think that that's kind of a sort of a, I don't know, a rainbow idea and an ALAC's idea too. But anyway, Kaylee, go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks. It's Michele. And the first one on the RTTS labeling, if the proposals that we're pushing forward that only privacy proxy services that are linked directly, owned, controlled, whatever term you're happy with, with an ICANN accredited registrar can provide a privacy proxy service, then why would we have a problem with adding that field? Okay, I don't see this as being an issue. We operate WHOIS Privacy. So WHOIS Privacy Limited is an Irish company that is a wholly owned subsidiary of Avalon Internet

Holdings, which I currently own 50%. I don't have a problem with that. I don't see why anybody would have a problem with that.

Now, if, however, we entertain this, I have to be careful the language I use, because I'm going to get into trouble with the ombudsman. But let's go with crazy, insane, unworkable rubbish that's being pushed by certain other parties, then the importance of this RTTS thing becomes a whole other thing. Because as far as I'm concerned, if a reseller, next door neighbor, person who owns a cast that I happen to like, registered a domain name with us for the usage of enabling their IoT-enabled whatever to connect to the internet and do whatever the hell it's doing, I frankly don't give a damn.

The registration is going to be to the person, entity, whatever, that is paying me the money. And if they happen to be letting it be used because here's the problem. You take, say, for example, facebook.com, fb.com. Facebook.com is a massive online marketplace. There are literally millions of businesses operating off facebook.com. If you follow this logic through to its logical end, then Facebook should somehow be operating some kind of public register where they actually kind of say that facebook.com/John is registered to.

I mean, where does this end? I mean, no. If the issue that NTIA has is that they're trying to get bad things taken off the internet, then the registries and the registrars, we have the ability to do that. DNS providers have the ability to do that and all of those things. But I

---

would like them to articulate clearly what is the actual issue that they're trying to address. Not some fluffy, nefarious, kind of, I don't know, really weird, convoluted thing, but the actual clear issue that they're trying to address. And also, it's a bit rich coming from NTIA considering they control the contract for .us and won't allow privacy proxy.

ROGER CARNEY

Great. Thanks, Michele. And I actually think that the labeling issue is probably the easier one. And I don't think that that's far off because the last time we did talk about it, ICANN is going to publish a list of accredited privacy proxy services. So, if you want to know if it's a proxy service, all you have to do is look at that list. And it's fairly simple and it's not a heavy lift. So, I think that we can get around the labeling part. It just hasn't been done yet.

But anyway, any other questions or anything on this? Okay, great. The last thing I'm going to leave with is we need a new representative for this group as I will be stepping down from this group. So, someone will need to --

MICHELE NEYLON

Congratulations on your new gig. They're a lovely company.

ROGER CARNEY

Thank you. Thank you. So, we'll need to find somebody for that role. And I think that we can move on from that then. And we will

---

turn this over to the wonderful leader of the gang of governance here. So, Prudence, please go ahead.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Hi, Prudence for the record. I'm acutely aware that I'm the thing that's standing between you and your lunch. So, I'm going to make this really quick. And I just want to go on the record and say, I was booing you. I was, I'm aware. But I'm only booing you because I'm so happy for you. And I'm absolutely devastated. And it's a huge loss to our stakeholder group. Thank you, Roger, for your service, for all that you've done. And you're irreplaceable. So, they don't deserve you, frankly. And I'm a Brit saying that. So, there you go.

Right. So, review of reviews. I tried to make this interactive by adding questions and things. I'm just going to give you the synopsis. And then we should just go eat and try and get some sunshine and live our lives, right? Because let's face it, this is like a certain type of punishment, being locked in rooms when the sun is shining. And it's so good. And there's so much amazing food outside. So, let's quickly whiz through this.

There's been two sessions on review of reviews already. We're going to have continued sessions of the governance gang. So, if this is the thing that makes you excited and gets you up in the morning, I'm not judging you. Everyone's got their own thing. And I support this. But come to a governance gang session, you can find out a bit more. But yes, let's go to the next slide.

This is the latest slide because there's new slides since the last governance gang session last week. And it's kind of, again, breaking out the two types of, or two kind of types or categories of review that they're planning to do. And so, to those who have been roughly following, this will come as no surprise, but I'll just reiterate what these slides mean. And then give you a bit more of a kind of context as to what it means with regards to all of the reviews because on the next slide.

So, we have your accountability and transparency review. This one will have a period of every five years you do this review. And it can be deferred, right? And the whole idea is that there's going to be a scoping process with the scoping process team, which will be comprised of various different SOs and ACs, blah, blah, blah. And it's going to be based in the charter and we'll make changes to the charter, etc.

Now, the structural review, which again, is the one that will be able to impact the structure of the organizations in GNSO, for example, as one element. That one's proposed to be every 15 years. So, it's worth noting that this is what the proposal is. I don't think it's actually agreed. I think there's still members of the group that don't want it to be every 15 years. I think during the last meeting, someone suggested 18 months, which I was just like, wow, optimism. I love this, I love this. Let's go. I love how efficient they think we can be with these things.

There's not going to be a scoping process for the structural review as per the slides. You can see that there. And again, it's going to be based in charter and we'll make potential changes to the charter and be rooted in the charter. That was something that Avri was very passionate about. Must be rooted in the charter. That wasn't an Avri impression. That was just me being passionate. Just need to go on record to say that.

And then we have the on-demand reviews. Now, these are the more ad hoc ones for, do we need a review? Yes, can we do it? Let's do it. An on-demand one. So again, special topics and things that kind of fall a little bit out of scope. Or one of the things that Chris Disspain said recently, which was really interesting, was we compose ourselves the question of, is there a topic that's coming up that we need to look into that people are talking about in our organization?

And if everyone's like, yes, web3. That's again, an example. Again, you can start using that as something to be reviewed, right? And that would be a good example as to when you'd be looking at this type of on-demand special ad hoc review. And again, it's one that's emerging topics. You can see in the middle there.

And then there was a talk about the consequential effects and having a review to see about the impact of the effects and stuff, which is quite interesting there, that you can see all of this information here and the timings around. I mean, the timings seem

---

pretty reasonable at this moment in time. But yeah, just making sure that you guys have visibility there.

Also as well, as I keep saying, for those of you who are really passionate, there was a draft report that is out that you can read at your leisure. It has all of the words, all of the things, but you can read that. It will be open for public comments later this month. And the public comment will close on the, I think it's the 29th of July. So I think my gang is going to come up with some words, but the idea is if you do want to know more, the documents are there for you to just have a read and have a look and learn a bit more. Okay, so let's go to the next slide. And then I'm just going to -- oh, yes, sorry, Reg, question.

REG LEVY

Sorry, going back to the last slide. What do you mean by deferrable? How long can it be deferred for? What is the, not what is the process, but like who can defer it? Why would it be deferred, etc., etc. That sounds like a way of avoiding accountability.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Okay, so this is a very valid point. There have been concerns raised relating to this, like kicking the can down the road indefinitely. I don't have the granular as to the process, but I can obtain that for you. And I'll share that with the group a bit later offline about exactly how the deferring process works. But the whole idea is you're not supposed to be able to indefinitely defer and defer it.

---

But the granular, let me get that for you. Okay, let's bring to the next slide.

I'm not looking at the queue. I'm just looking at your beautiful faces. So the orange areas or the orange sections are the ones that are the on-demand reviews. And then you can see the other different types of views. And this is the categorization and the holistic look at all of the different reviews when put together. So there is that slide there. So what you're looking at is all of the different types of reviews and exactly the types of things looking and going to those as well.

I don't know if it's been posted into the chat, but I wanted to make sure that you have copies of the draft report that's out. So let me see if I can drop that into the chat in a second. And obviously, I know this is very close to lunch. So I just want to throw up and see if there's any questions. And then I just want to wrap up and see if anyone has any burning questions. Any thoughts? Any questions? Any queries? Oh, Michele, your hand's raised.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah, thanks; Michele. So I brought two people with me to this meeting who normally don't attend ICANN meetings. And when they heard about anything involving the review of reviews, they thought it was the most hilarious thing they'd ever heard of in their lives. Just thought I'd share that with you. I just wish they'd renamed it and called it something else.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

I quite like the roar.

MICHELE NEYLON

So there's an Indian or something other film which has got a great soundtrack. Jokes aside, I think the governance stuff, I think there's some interesting stuff coming through there. I unfortunately haven't been as engaged as I would have liked due to other circumstances outside my control. But I think it's important that we are keeping track of some of the things that are going on, especially when we move a little bit outside the ICANN, the core ICANN bubble and keeping track of things like what's been going on with the numbers community. Thanks.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Thanks, Michele. And if there's no burning questions, we can skip the quiz. We'll skip the quiz and I'll let you guys have a lunch. Oh, well, there was a couple of questions to see if you were paying attention. Do you want to do the quiz?

FRANCISCA ILOEZUMMA

I'm sorry. I'm not burning.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

I don't want to deny you of a quiz, but essentially in a nutshell, that is where we are with the review of reviews. You've got your dates, you have your breakdowns of the different types of reviews and

---

categories of reviews, and the team are doing pretty great work. So guys, I think we're good to wrap up. I mean, I don't think we need to go into any granular. And again, we will have additional sessions with members and participants from CCG. So if you do want to join the Governance Gang sessions, feel free and find out more. Thanks, everyone.

REG LEVY

I don't think we have a real chair. So like, go eat.

ROGER CARNEY

I am.

REG LEVY

Oh, I'm sorry.

ROGER CARNEY

That's okay, that's all right. Thank you. I don't think we're doing the polling questions. No, okay. And I don't think we have any other business for this session. The one thing I will mention is the next session after lunch is in Madrid, not here. So just recognize the location change, and so you'll send out a note as well. All right. Well, thanks, everybody. Head to lunch and have a good lunch, and we'll see you in an hour and a half or so. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON

Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]