
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: SCCI Work Session
Monday, June 08, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

TERRI AGNEW

Hello and welcome to the SCCI Work Session. 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 the session. I will also post them in chat for your reference. Only questions posted in chat identified as a question will be read aloud during the session as time permits and 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 Manju Chen. Please begin.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Terri. Welcome no one. Welcome a handful of people to the SCCI session. It's been a long day, people are probably still taking their break in the coffee break somewhere, but they will slowly come in. But to respect the meeting schedule, we will start on time. And let's get started. This is the agenda for today.

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.

Is there any SOI update from anyone? We desperately need anyone who can be here. I don't see any hands for SOI updates. Let's go to the progress update. So, basically, we are going to share where we are, where we stand, and what is next. So, the red arrow is pointing at SG/C to confirm. Basically, it's the criteria. indicators that we have developed together. And we take that now we're not seeing a lot of comments, we there were a handful of comments, which we will go through later.

But we kind of take it as SG/Cs has confirmed that the indicators and criteria that has been developed by SCCI was okay. So, the next will be planning for the assessment and we will share a bit about how we're gonna develop the assessment plan and how we're gonna collect the data. And hopefully by the end of this year, we will collect the -- yes, we will already have collected the data and then we will have an improvement plan according to the data we collected and that will be our milestone by the end of this year.

Okay. Next slide, please. So, again, this is phase one. We have analyzed input which is few, but important, and we will go through them later here. And then we will start collecting the data and analyze the data we collected. And we will move to phase two tomorrow. Not tomorrow. Next year. It's a three-year time frame, not three days. But you know, we've been moving so fast, we might as well do it tomorrow.

So hopefully, by July 2028, we will already finish the implementation of the improvement recommendations we have

made according to the data we collected. Okay, next slide please. So, here we're gonna look at the feedback of the indicators and criteria that we developed. So, the first one at the left top cite the continued constituents to be changed to survey respondents.

Basically, if you guys remember, a lot of the indicators will be using survey data. And in the indicators, the wording was like something like more than 66% of the survey constituents agreed that GNSO is effective, those kinds of wording. And there were comments about it is confusing what constituents means. And there were suggestions to change it to survey respondents. And the leadership team thought it's a reasonable change.

So, we're going to go ahead and change all constituents to survey respondents. And another comment is about the survey should be designed in a flexible fashion to include respondents outside of GNSO. This one, I think can be put to discussion by whoever has an opinion about this. Personally, as a chair and as a person in GNSO, I think this CIP, Continuous Improvement Program, is supposed to be a self-assessment exercise.

So, I wouldn't feel comfortable to have people outside of GNSO to come in and take the survey and have their opinions inputted into this exercise, because it's supposed to be a self-assessment by GNSO and owned by GNSO. But I'm welcoming any other opinions or feedback on this, and I'll stop here for a second.

AJITH FRANCIS

Hi, this is Ajith for the transcript. Maybe just to provide a little bit of context on the first suggested change from constituents to survey respondents, because this came from the Registry Stakeholder Group predominantly, because there was a broader question of the administration of the survey, like what do we actually mean by, you know, constituents or even respondents for that matter?

Would this be to anybody who's a member of individuals that are part of the GNSO through the SG&Cs, or is this going to be at an SG&C level? So, there is that piece of ambiguity that I think we would have to address as we get into the assessment and design phase of the survey. So, just wanted to flag that.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Ajith. Do you have an opinion about the GNSO part? Okay. Do you agree to my comments? Okay. He secretly says he agreed. Didn't say on a mic.

AJITH FRANCIS

I agree.

MANJU CHEN

Yes. Let me give Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Manju. Jen for the record. I think given the context that you mentioned that it's supposed to be a self-survey, then it makes a lot of sense that we keep it that way. And I assume, well, I

shouldn't assume, but the other SO/AC, other structures will have their own processes that will do very similar things in their best interest and how they structure it. So, I think that's very reasonable for us to maintain it within the GNSO.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Jen. Asteway.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Thank you, Manju. This is Asteway Negash for the record. I basically understand the point where this is a self-assessment practice and should be contained within the GNSO. But as much as I do understand this, I also believe it might be important to include a couple of respondents probably from the wider community, because initially this is supposed to be a pilot for a wider Review of Reviews kind of exercise and this is supposed to be enlarged.

It also helps to have the opinion of the wider community because we need to, at the end of the day, probably make sure these processes are efficient and effective for the wider ICANN community. So, I am on the plus side on having few respondents from the wider ICANN community. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Asteway. I understand that, like I guess, like Jen said, each structure within ICANN are supposed to be doing their own

Continuous Improvement Program. So, they will be doing this assessment of themselves.

Are you suggesting that actually we all can go to each other's kind of survey to respond to, for example, if GAC is doing their Continuous Improvement Program, we can all go to GAC and fill in their survey and express that we don't think GAC is working very well, and they can come to us and fill in the survey too?

Because for me, I feel like that's not the purpose of this program. That's why I have this opinion that we should limit the respondent to the survey to GNSO only. But I am willing to hear more thoughts on this. And I see a line up.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Sorry.

MANJU CHEN

Yeah, no worries.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Sorry to barge in. But if you could allow me to respond and kind of explain my idea. I'm not saying that other SOs and ACs should actually exercise assessment of their own ACs within what is actually supposed to be a GNSO-focused process. But my idea is this CIP is actually supposed to be part of a larger Review of Reviews.

At least that is my understanding. And it should be part of a larger Review of Reviews process and they are actually considering they are thinking very highly of what we are doing here because they are taking it as an input and for it to be as a pilot for their own process of CIP. So, what we're doing is actually something contained within GNSO, but the process is supposed to be community-wide.

The process needs to be adapted among the wider community and they're supposed to take some of the lessons in the process itself and actually practice it within their own consequences and advisory groups.

So, I think it would be important to have people from, for example, At-Large in GAC to review the process that we have followed to assess the GNSO and actually forward their inputs, and not actually indulge whatever they have or whatever process concerning their own resources. So, I think my idea is clear to everyone else. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much. I'm not sure if I understand this correctly. Can I say it as I understand it and you correct me if I'm wrong? You're saying that we are not actually letting them to participate in the survey, but we are sharing how we do it with each other.

For example, GAC will share with all the other communities of how they do their own CIP assessment and we can share with them too about how we do it and we learn from each other of how to do this

and to make it overall a community-wide exercise of we learn from each other how we do our own self-assessment instead of people taking part in their self-assessment like directly.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Yeah, thanks, Manju. I understand your point. Maybe it does not work in the sense where we actually forward the requests that looks like 60% of respondents actually believe the GNSO processes are effective, something like that. But having their inputs is going to be important at the end of the day, just as a collection of comments, probably. Nothing more than that, basically.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Asteway. I see a queue building, but I think Christian probably can help us to clarify how should we do here or is that expectation of how we do this here.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER

Thank you. Christian, ICANN Policy Staff. Yes, as you said, it is up to each SO and AC to develop their own indicators and to survey their own members, I would say, but if you were to ask the question more in line with like, what is GNSO's reputation out in the community, that would make probably more sense to seek outside input.

I would just like to pin, though, that the GNSO's CIP progress report is published for public comment. So, that is a good opportunity for other SOs and ACs to look at the work, look at the indicators and

say, hey, we don't agree with this, or we think that you should include something like this in the future.

So, I think that would be a good opportunity to kind of seek that input. But as far as putting it inside the report, I would just kind of caution about putting in indicators, the feedback of which is kind of outside of your control. So, if it's about GNSO's reputation, how well it gets things done, or if it's on specific issues, you might find from different SOs and ACs, they have various different opinions.

And you can explain how the GNSO process works, and I think that's always good, and I do completely agree. I think it would be a really good exercise for all the SOs and ACs to take a look at each other's frameworks, particularly in that public comment to see how did they get things done and then maybe adjust accordingly for next cycles.

But I think that for this particular cycle, it would probably be best, as it is a pilot, to start with things that are within your control, the things that you can work on to change. Reputation is obviously really important, but it is much more of a long-term something that you would work on. And it's a little bit harder to quantify, I would say. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Christian. I think this is extremely helpful, definitely. In a sense, I think it satisfies what Asteway was asking because they do have -- well, outside of GNSO, the community

actually have a way to kind of have feedback to this, but not, like I said, directly participate in the surveys. And Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS

Thanks, Manju. Thanks, Asteway, for a pretty good conversation. Three things I want to point out. One, I think in the context of Review of Reviews, CIP, well, in the context of Review of Reviews, there's a lot of questions on how to sort of structure different tiers of reviews and there's a very particular focus for what the CIP is intended to do.

As Manju said, it's supposed to be a self-assessment and it's not intended to sort of replace or provide additional context to structural reviews or other forms of reviews. So, the CIP is really inward looking, right?

And the reason also that why it's inward looking is also how we've designed the criteria and the indicators, because if we start surveying constituents or respondents that are outside of the GNSO, we get into the realm of perception, and perception is not a healthy and relevant indicator to actually define continuous improvement and define the work that we need to particularly do.

So, I think that's also the additional piece where the indicators have not been designed in a way that they would be accounting to take into account feedback from other SOs and ACs. The third thing is, and I think this is also part of what you're hinting at, Asteway, I think there's a lot of value given the exercise of actually doing the criteria

and indicators being the first SO that's actually doing the criteria indicators.

This has been a very interesting exercise. And I think a lot of other SOs and ACs might actually sort of struggle. And there's a value in us sort of documenting our learnings on how we've approached this and make that accessible as well alongside as well sort of the public comment in terms of the operational pieces that we've done.

So, I think those three things play well into each other and I think that kind of answers that we should keep this relatively within as a self-assessment and looking inwards and not looking at perceptions. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Ajith. I agree. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Yeah, having looked at the comments that was actually forwarded previous to this one, I would resort to what has been said about allowing the other SOs and ACs to forward as sort of a public comment rather than participate as survey respondents. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Asteway. Jen, please.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Manju, and thanks for the, I guess now it's a conversation clarification. I just want to make it clear or if I'm incorrect, please correct me, that the CIP results isn't part of the Review of Reviews. Okay. All right. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

So, just to answer on the mic.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER

I believe that at least is my current understanding, that there will be like a one-time review of the CIP more as a whole to see how well the pilot has been working, determine if it should continue, recommend changes, but they're basically going to be evaluated. There'll be like a one-time review evaluating the effectiveness of the pilot. I don't think that they'll be going through specific indicators and things like that, but that hasn't happened yet. So, we'll see.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Christian, for the explanation. Jim. Jim, you can speak if you want. We're not hearing you if you're speaking already. Maybe he accidentally raised his hand. Well, if we hear him, we will stop talking. But for now, we're not hearing Jim, so we will continue.

Okay, I guess it was an accident. And so, for the meaningful activity, for principle one, criteria four indicated one, we said that the GNSO has demonstrated meaningful activity towards mitigating domain name security threats.

So, this is about whether GNSO is putting its effort into mitigating DNS abuse. And there were comments about the activity should be changed to results. But the way, I guess we're trying to provide the rationale behind why we say meaningful activities instead of meaningful result is because in the criteria, it already says activities or GNSO taking actions to mitigate DNS abuse.

So, it makes more sense to stick with activities instead of saying results. And also, this is from my personal view, result is subjective, it's not objective, and easily evaluated factual kind of data. So, I think activity will be making more sense instead of results.

So, we are sticking with activity and we're not changing into results. But I welcome any comments on this. And Jim if you are okay to speak now, please. We also cannot hear you. You don't even have a mic next to the camera icon. I don't know what's happening.

TERRI AGNEW

He's in the wrong room. He sent me a private chat. He just let me know.

MANJU CHEN

Okay. Okay, let's go to Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

I'm trying to remind myself of the context of why this change was suggested. Was this a suggestion from? No, it was not. So, good it was added afterwards. I think this significantly changes what we're trying to measure here, right? Because results to me right now, if it's about mitigating these threats, we're looking at abuse statistics, we're looking at compliance statistics. It's another layer beyond the GNSO control.

What the GNSO can control is the policy development and looking at how we're looking at these things. So, I really caution us if we want to change that to results, because it completely changes the kind of data we're looking at and changes the meaning of what we're trying to measure. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Jen. Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT

Maybe to Jen point, maybe we can say meaningful policy work that would not require a result necessarily. But I was thinking the term domain name security threats. We had a discussion around this in the PDP1 on Associated Domain Checks that we want to, or that our mandate is limited to maliciously registered domain names and not compromised domain names.

So, if we just say domain name security threats, that may suggest to the reader that ICANN find solution for everything related to

security threats involving a domain name. So, maybe we need to sharpen our axe on that as well and limit it to maliciously registered domain names or more broadly DNS abuse because that's in scope for ICANN as well.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Thomas. I personally will prefer if we change it to DNS abuse instead of a more narrow malicious domain, whatever that was, malicious register domain. But I see a few hints for policy work, but there are other activities than policy work within GNSO, because Contracted Party House has been publishing a lot of their best practice, their white papers, also others, and that will be good to be included when we're collecting the data.

So, I would feel it will be more beneficial for collection of data in the next stage if we keep it as activity. And also, we have been telling the community that it's not only policy that we can do within GNSO in the sense that all survey groups and contingencies within GNSO can publish their own kind of research or contributions, feedbacks about how they plan to meaningfully contribute to mitigating DNS abuse.

So, I feel like maybe activity will be a better wording still and also it's aligned with the criteria. And now all of the hands has disappeared. Okay. So, are we cool with not changing activity to results and just keeping the wording as they are? Waiting five seconds for the separate objections. Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS

Sorry, no, just a clarification. So, where do we land on domain name security threats? We leave that as is or change that to mitigating DNS abuse? Given that this is not policy work, this is a self-assessment, I would prefer to keep it broader because this doesn't go into any of the work that we're doing on the policy level.

So, just generally wondering whether there's value in keeping this broader, not opposed to DNS abuse threats, but I just wonder, because this is not policy work, is there space for us to sort of evaluate also potentially other vectors of threats in the future?

THOMAS RICKERT

Which do you have in mind?

AJITH FRANCIS

Well, I'm out of my depth here, but I can throw out things pertaining to maybe not necessarily security threats, but unified root. And I know SSAC and other SOs and ACs are working on that. Does that fit into security threats? Not necessarily, but there is a broader element than just DNS abuse. And I'm just throwing a half-baked, completely random example here.

MANJU CHEN

We have a queue building, so I'll come back to Thomas later. Asteway, please.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Yeah, I sort of do not have an idea how we actually ended up into this conversation, because I do not see this conversation actually being raised in the document that we have shared, the criteria and indicators documents, I don't see being comments being suggested in the document. So, I probably have not been following that much, so I apologize.

But to me, domain name security threats is a much broader concept that is compared to DNS abuse, because DNS abuse has to do with something that is malicious acts of offenders actually, and DNA security threats are actually a lot wider in concept. So, I don't think these two concepts actually come hand in hand and I don't think they're interchangeable at all. So, I'm not up for any replacement of that wording, thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you, Asteway. Tom.

HONG-FU MENG

Hong-Fu speaking for the record I'm just going to caution on the use of the word results because I feel that that word has action that's been taken within the word, but then if you look at the word results, if we want to involve the action involved, a lot of it comes down to contracted parties, I'm not sure I'm comfortable to change the word to results. Just want to flag that. Thank you.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Thank you very much, Tom. Hong-Fu, sorry. Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT

I sympathize with your point, Ajith, to make this future-proof. I'm just concerned that we should manage expectations of the outside world, that we can do more than is in scope for the GNSO, because we have this issue already that governments are trying to shoehorn solution finding into the ICANN ecosystem that ICANN just can't help with.

So, maybe we can find middle ground by specifying DNS abuse and security threats relating to domain names that are in scope of the GNSO. I know that is not nice. I see you're smiling. But at least it would be accurate in terms of what we can do and what the limitations are.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Thank you, Thomas. Wow, we have a huge long queue. Steve, please.

STEVE CHAN

Thanks, Manju. This is Steve from staff. And I don't know if I really want to wait in here, but I can think of an example where the broader definition of actively combating domain name security threats could pertain to something like IDN variance. IDN variance could be something that could be leveraged to create a domain

name security threat, and that's broader, and this allows the GNSO to be able to take credit for the work that they're doing in that space, as well as DNS abuses also. So, an example. Thanks.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

Thank you very much. Thomas, do you have a direct response?

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, but I guess, the language I suggested would cover that. So, we would have DNS abuse and security threats relating to domain names that are in scope for the GNSO. That would be the work on variants and stuff like that, hemoglobs, and what have you. It doesn't sound nice. I accept that.

ASTEWAY NEGASH

No, it sounds absolutely fine. Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS

One, Thomas, can you put that language in the chat? Okay. I haven't seen, sorry. The other thing is, I think as you were speaking, and I think you're right, because there's also a temporal aspect to this that this is a CIP for now, this is a pilot we will evaluate.

So, I do think that there's value in keeping this relevant to the current context. And so, I agree with that idea and I do think you're absolutely right to sort of call that out, and I'm completely fine with

the with the suggestion that you're making of DNS abuse and security threats. So, that makes sense.

MANJU CHEN

Agree. So, actually, I think the wording are, like I said, absolutely fine. So, do we agree now to, are the hints all hints? And so, do we agree now that this indicator will not be changed to the GNSO has demonstrated meaningful activities towards DNS abuse and security threats relating to domain names that are in scope of the GNSO? I'm leaving five seconds for desperate or passionate objections?

STEVE CHAN

Sorry, just to clarify, you said indicator? Or do you mean criteria or both?

MANJU CHEN

So, we will have to change the criteria for this one too. It was domain name security threats. Can we have the text on screen so we know what is the original criteria? Let's allow time for our extremely helpful staff to show us the original language. Yes, so the criteria says the GNSO actively combats domain name security threats.

So, I think now we are suggesting, because this is not the most accurate wording, we probably can change this to DNS abuse and security threats relating to domain names that are in scope of the GNSO. I see in chat that there are people feeling that this is a

change that maybe they have to sleep on for a while, and we definitely can do that. I'm not sure the -- Okay, Steve, is that your hand? Okay, Ajith, please.

AJITH FRANCIS

Yeah, I think, thanks, Steve, for pointing out that we should look at the criteria and the indicator. And I wonder now if there's a way to sort of thread this needle by leaving the criteria as is and the indicators on DNS abuse.

Because the criteria is intended to be a broader sort of thread, whereas as I completely agree with Thomas, that we should probably be looking at what we're doing at the moment, and indicator one and two could be sort of more targeted towards DNS abuse, and that would sort of help us bridge both.

That is just a suggestion, but I'm also happy to change the criteria and the indicators, but just wanted to suggest a proactive way forward, potentially, that encompasses both approaches.

MANJU CHEN

So, I guess the point of discussion here is that, do we give people time to bring this back to your sales group to discuss this? And do we expect any kind of feedback from the stakeholder group if you bring it back? Because we were not seeing a lot of feedback when we were given time to people to go back and socialize the whole documents.

If yes, definitely, we can do that. We give people time to socialize this idea to their stakeholder groups and constituencies. And we come back in two weeks. We look at it again and see what wording we're most comfortable with. And Christian, is that like a kind of clarification?

CHRISTIAN WHEELER

Just a suggestion. If you were to keep the indicator one specific to DNS abuse and you feel comfortable that that is something that the GNSO definitely does and can point to specific items for data to back that up, there's also nothing preventing you from adding additional information to additional activities that the GNSO is also participating in to assist in security threats more generally as the criteria provides.

So, I don't think that the indicators necessarily need to -- that you're limited to the amount of evidence that you can bring to support that you can add in additional evidence that further supports it, even if it's not in the exact wording of that indicator. It's just whatever you think supports it.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you very much, Christian. Can I understand that it's like a soft endorsement of keeping criteria and changing the indicator to just DNS abuse or like it's a suggestion to maybe that's a good idea.

CHRISTIAN WHEELER

My suggestion would be to keep it as DNS abuse in the indicator or changing it to DNS abuse in the indicator, keeping security threats in the criteria and then always providing more information. Because that way, if let's say you included it more broadly to additional security threats and you, I don't know, kept it for the next cycle, of course, you could always change these indicators from the next cycle.

But if you find that GNSO didn't do those kinds of additional activities, participating with other groups to combat those other security threats, does it now look like GNSO is not completing those indicators. So, it's not meeting that criteria because it's not doing those other things.

So, my suggestion would be to keep it as DNS abuse. And then you can always provide supplemental evidence to that. We're also doing additional things like this and this, even though it's not necessarily DNS abuse. That way you're kind of still safe.

HONG-FU MENG

Hello. Hong-Fu speaking again for the record. First, going on to Christian's idea, I like the idea where it's heading and being able to add on -- Hello, who's mic. Okay. Sorry about that. Let me continue. Being able to add on to the DNS abuse is always a nice positive item so that we can be open and be constantly adding and updating or removing where necessary and available.

Going back to Manju's point about SOs and Cs being given a bit more time, I would like to ask a bit more time to look at it. I apologize on my end personally that I might need a bit more time to get things through to the Registrars Stakeholder Group to get them more understanding and get feedback from them if that's a good option that's available. Thank you.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you Hong-Fu. John, please.

JOHN

Thank you, Manju. I just would say that indicator two seems like it's a lot more um forceful than you would expect to have based on indicator one to say that the GNSO actively combats domain name security threats based on the fact that indicator one is that they have meaningful activity towards -- like it's a very soft indicator one to come up with an indicator two that's so powerful. Like they're doing this, and I don't know whether that's good. It might look good, but it doesn't make sense to me so much. Thanks.

MANJU CHEN

Okay, thank you. Thank you for bringing our attention to indicator two, because now I think do we need to change both one and two of the domain name security threats to DNS abuse? Can I see a nod or thumbs up in the room to see if that's where we're going?

Okay. So, our newest, I guess, result is that we keep the criteria as it is and we change the domain name security threats in both

indicator one and two under criteria four to DNS abuse. That way we cover and we make it still narrow, but at the same time we can still demonstrate that we are doing more than our narrow mandates.

And I think there are suggestions that this new change might need more time for people to bring back and socialize. May I suggest you guys do that in the coming two weeks because we are scheduling a meeting and after two weeks and come back with your stakeholder groups ideas about this and we can confirm by them. Does that sound okay? Cool. Can we go back to the slide then?

AJITH FRANCIS

Sorry, staff, would you mind sharing the screen once again with the criteria indicators on DNS abuse? I'm sorry. Just following up on John's point, now if we do change indicator to it reads 66% of surveyed constituents agreed that the GNSO actively combats DNS abuse. Just wanted to get the read of the room, right?

Actively combats DNS abuse going out on limb, but does that imply that the GNSO is actively combating DNS abuse versus we have policy work? Is there a distinction there? Is there a distinction? I just wanted to highlight that that is a legitimate question that John raises. It's to you, Steve.

STEVE CHAN

Sure, I can try. Thanks. This is Steve from Staff. Trying to interpret what John was asking, I think what you could do is match up the

language, which is, I think what your point was, John, was that the standard is a little bit different between 1 and 2. And so, I think the way that you could address that is that 2 says something to the effect that the GNSO has demonstrated meaningful activity, and then the words actually line up between the two. So, you're testing in two is actually consistent with one. Am I capturing your point, John?

JOHN

Yes, I believe so. But do you want it to mimic exactly the same? That's the question. Or we might be able to tweak the words a bit.

MANJU CHEN

I personally am fine with just exactly the same wording. And since this is something we agree for people to take back to their stakeholder groups to consider, we can still, because we are way ahead of our scheduled whatsoever, so we have plenty of time to dwell on this if we want. So, I think let's keep the change now on the screen and please go back to your stakeholder group and consider to see if that's that sits okay with everyone, and in two weeks we can come back to this and discuss again.

That sounds good for everyone? Not seeing any violent objections. Are we okay to leave this page for this session now? Yes. Let's move back to the slides. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. So, we have talked through the very important comments and we had a very fruitful discussion. Thank you everyone about that.

Let's move on to the next slide. So, the action plan. This is how we're going to develop our assessment plan.

So, in order to collect data, we have to have a plan of how to collect data. I'm not going to read all of the text on the slides because it's a lot of text and it's been shared with people ahead of this meeting. So, the first step, we will have to identify appropriate data source for each indicator. And second, we will identify data collection plan for each data source. So, I might as well say that these steps will majorly be carried out by our extremely helpful and wonderful staff.

So, basically, we will identify these, and then we will come back to the team with the things we identified and ask for your comments. Next slide, please. So, this is kind of an example of how we're going to identify the data we needed and how do we determine whether they are relevant?

And do we need an explanation of each role of this form, or are we okay to just look at it and think it's fine? I think people are okay with just looking at it and they think they're beautifully fine. Okay. So, let's move on to the next slide. It's another example of how we're going to do this. For example, for this indicator, it says the GNSO has one or more mechanism in place that governs the GNSO's processes to allow it to fulfill its purpose as described in the ICANN bylaw.

So, the target value of this indicator is, of course, yes. And by collecting data, we will know if the actual value is yes or no. And

we are expecting the source of this data is qualitative, which means that it's not numbers, statistics. And the method we're going to use to collect the data for this indicator is to review all the documents. This is within ICANN and GNSO processes.

And when we're going to do it, it's Q4 of this year, and it's going to only be done once because this is a pilot. And who's going to be responsible to kind of collect this, which means reviewing the documents to find the relevant answers, is our wonderful SCCI support staff. And there's no notes for this. Do they sound like the right way to do this? That sounds like a plan of what we're all okay with. Nothing any hands. I think we're all okay with his plan since it's not us who are going to do this work. Sorry.

And thank you very much to staff. Let's go to the next slide. Next steps. So, the next meeting will be scheduled to the 1st of July on Wednesday, the ordinary time, common time that we usually meet. Apparently, there's an AI, Action Item for this meeting, which is to go back to your stakeholder group and show them the text about the DNS abuse criteria indicator and see if they're happy with it.

And be ready to share on 1st of July whether your group is happy with the edits. If yes, we will move on to the next steps, which is developing the assessment plan. And when it's done, we'll come back to you and share the plan. Does that sound good for everyone? Yes. Cool. Any other things that people want to say? I don't even know when the session is supposed to end, but I think we've reached the end of the session.

So, I'm happily giving you back whatever time we are giving you back to and you can enjoy the sun in Seville now. Oh, okay. Sorry. Not yet. We're just reminding you guys about the project plan for CIP. So, we thought we're going to reach this milestone of we all confirm the criteria information, no, indicator, sorry, in June. But gladly, we found out about this particular item that's very important about DNS abuse.

So, that will be slightly moved to July. But still, we are going to develop the assessment plan in July. So, those are the milestones we are planning to reach and we will reach in July. And is there still a next slide? This is the end. We are ready now to give back your time to enjoy sun's drying in Seville.

Thank you very much for joining this meeting. Thank you for those who joined online. Thank you for the very fruitful discussion which I didn't anticipate and I was happily enjoying them. And thank you very much all. I'll see you in July online. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]