

---

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

NIKKI SCHULER

Hello and welcome to the meeting of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

Only questions posted in the Zoom chat indicated 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 over to Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay, thank you very much, Nikki. Hi, everybody. Keith Drazek, your interim chair for the next five months. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group working session here in Seville for ICANN86. I'm getting into the Zoom room now.

We have the agenda on our screen. Just an administrative note, we're going to flip the Council update up. We already have. Okay, so just because Jen has to leave to go to a session that's taking

---

***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.***

---

place in the GAC rooms. We want to make sure that both Jen and Sam are here to be able to provide the council update and Nacho, of course. So, let's go ahead and kick it off. If anybody has any AOB, start thinking about what you'd like to suggest, but let's go ahead and get started with an update on the SCCI. So, I think I'm turning to Ajith and John.

AJITH FRANCIS

Thanks, Keith. Yeah, I'm happy to give an update on SCCI. We had a meeting yesterday and predominantly we looked at the different SG and Cs feedback to the criteria and indicators, and there was relatively large consensus on the changes to be made. There's one particular piece where there was reformulation that was suggested. ICANN staff is going to send that over and I will send that on the mailing list for feedback from the stakeholder group. And the deadline for that will be in two weeks. So, I will have that in an email in the coming days once staff sends us the actual language. Perfect. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you, Ajith. Any questions or anything else on the SCCI or SCCI? No, seeing none, I am in Zoom, I don't see any hands. Okay, thank you. That was brief, concise. Next item on the agenda then is the DNS abuse PDPs and the DNS abuse future work. So, with this, I'll turn, I think, to Dennis and to Chris and to Brian for any updates on the DNS abuse PDP.

---

DENNIS TAN

Thank you, Keith. This is Denni, Verisign. I'll keep it brief on the DNS abuse PDP update because it will sound repetitive to some of you. The working group is making good progress. By the end of the week, we'll have review and consider all nine charter questions on the PDP charter so that's good news. That's us. We're at good pace.

Most of the group, we have preliminary recommendation text for questions one through six. And eight and nine, we have some summarized discussion points, which the group finds agreeable, I mean, for the most part. If you notice, I missed number seven and that's on purpose because number seven, now it's been deferred to as not a recommendation because it is capturing ideas, thoughts about concept for future work.

So, the way the working group leadership has determined best way to address that is to have each of the groups coming up with these concepts or ideas, send those to Jen as our GNSO Council Liaison and she will funnel those ideas, concepts through the GNSO Council for review and consideration. So, again, good progress, but happy to take any questions if you need further detail into the substance of the PDP Working Group.

Okay, so seeing none, on future work I'm going to drop and you're going to use my previous slides from the recap of the CP Summit, I know Sue or Nikki can show those up there. I'll just use one slide. Yeah, that one. Thank you. So, just to ground us on the context, the GNSO issue report on DNS abuse mitigation solutions had a

number of topics or gaps as they consider. Many of which were flagged for potential policy work and these are the nine topics that were flagged for policy work.

As you see, the three topics, priority number one because they were considered as high priority topics for the GNSO Council to work on. And as a result, issue number one and issue number two were approved for PDP. So, PDP 1, associated domain check, that's the one that we are currently working on. And the GNSO Council is also doing some prep work in order to start discussing, deliberating the charter for PDP number 2.

On the potential PDP number 3 is the issue of lack of coordination on DGA botnet attacks. That's something that mainly is going to fall on us, registries, because it deals with unregistered domain names that might be used for malware attacks, phishing attacks, and whatnot. There is early groundwork on that one, but we need to refine it in order to set apart what could be policy solutions, what could be solved for best practices so that we can socialize among our contractor parties and as well as the community. So, that's work that we need to line up and prep.

And then we have other issues as well. And so, we have some, I don't know if we have Heather here with us today, but she's volunteered to champion from the register standpoint, the issue of the timing of verification. So, she's gathering some inputs, socializing some ideas in order to inform our position on that topic. We also are going to start, you know, we have set up a small group

---

within the registry to start working on the lack of recourse mechanism. So, I have Brian, David McAuley. We have our Owen Smigelski from the ratios as well.

So, we're going to start working on that and trying to inform what the position is going to be, the scope of that and whatnot. And we welcome, you know, volunteers to champion the other issues as well. But as far as future work, we pretty much have, you know, some work on the pipeline so looking forward to, you know, collaboration and, you know, further work on this one. And with that, Chris, Brian, anything else? All right. Back to you, Keith. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thanks very much, Dennis. So, just a couple of quick follow-ups. When we talk about, you know, the prioritization of these next topics under the DNS abuse mantle, obviously, we've got the three that are priority number one. Those have been identified currently underway with PDP number one.

I think we've talked about this before, but just want to tee up the possibility that we might be able to conduct PDPs two and three in parallel, or at least, you know, perhaps overlapping, rather than serially, rather than, you know, as, you know, one after the other. I think this has been mentioned before, but I think I mentioned it on one of our DNS Abuse working group calls is that because PDP 2 is focused on registrars and PDP 3 would be focused on registries,

---

that there may be an opportunity for us to propose to registrar colleagues and to other parts of the community.

That there may be an opportunity to accelerate some of the overall work plan on DNS abuse mitigation by conducting two and three in parallel, rather than waiting for two to conclude to start number three. So, I just want to tee that up. We don't need to, you know, come to any conclusions today, but I think I've said it before, but I wanted to offer that as a suggestion for us to consider.

Clearly, there would be, you know, staff support implications for running two PDPs in parallel. There could be bandwidth issues with other parts of the community, but from a contracted party house perspective, it seems like because one is focused on registrars, the other is on registries, that we might be able to suggest that and really telegraph and demonstrate our interest as contracted parties in accelerating the overall work, right?

And if other parts of the community push back on that, that's up to them. Or if ICANN org, you know, raises concerns about their ability to support, then that's another issue entirely, but I think that there could be an opportunity to do that. So, happy to take any questions or comments or thoughts or anything else on Dennis's very comprehensive update. And I see Sam in queue. Go ahead, Sam.

---

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Keith. This is Sam. To the last point you raised about potentially facing some resistance within the community on that, I think we've gotten some early indications, especially in council discussions, that one of the groups that may find challenges with having two PDPs operate simultaneously or overlapping, like you said, is going to be the NCSG. They've raised the issue on the mic before about having enough volunteers to staff concurrent PDPs. And as I'm looking at this list here, we also have heard from them in multiple forums that the dispute and recourse mechanisms for registrants is a big priority.

So, I'm just maybe suggesting some dedicated outreach. I know we had an NCSG and CPH meeting maybe like a month ago, right, before we came here, but intersessionally between this and the next ICANN meeting, a dedicated conversation, either in conjunction with the registrars or even just as registries, right, with our NCSG colleagues, like maybe try to build a little goodwill there and see if we can kind of bring them along with us.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thank you, Sam. Jen, go ahead.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Keith and thanks, Sam. Building on what Sam said about the outreach, it's really important as well, kind of giving us a heads up on what council will do with the remaining parts of all of these gaps as well. I think when we build that outreach, it actually gives

---

us kind of a groundswell from all the different SGs and Cs that will eventually vote in council when we look at prioritization. So, absolutely plus one to what that's going to happen.

The prioritization mechanism we're still finalizing in council, we will use it for this gap analysis as well. Well, not analysis, but prioritizing the rest of the gaps. So, we're going to do that for this and then we're going to do that in general for the projects coming down in council.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thanks very much, Jen, that's a really helpful context. So, let me just take a moment and I know we need to get to the council update before Jen has to leave, but this topic of the NCSG and their engagement in the DNS abuse PDP working group as well as you know the conversations that are starting to take place in SSAD SRT is a continual reference to human rights and the need to protect registrant interests. And the recourse mechanism is clearly a topic of great interest to the NCSG.

I also understand they have a fairly significant number of representatives and members in these groups so I understand the bandwidth concern. My question, sort of just off the cuff, is if we were to signal that the recourse mechanism PDP work could be elevated as a priority, would that provide some relief to them knowing that perhaps on PDP 2 and PDP 3 there really maybe aren't as significant concerns on that topic that they care so much about, because we're going to address that issue, the recourse

---

mechanism associated with human rights and registrant protections in its dedicated PDP.

So, again don't need any answers right now, but something to think about as we you know look to try to again achieve good work, accelerate the work, address the concerns of all parts of the community in a constructive way, so. Brian, I see your hand. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Thanks, Keith. Brian Cimboric, PIR. I think that's a good idea, though I think that that had basically been floated to the NCSG reps in the PDP and I think was found insufficient. I think, you know, if we were starting this process all over again, I would probably now move recourse mechanisms up even above access to bulk API.

The reason being is that we're going to keep running into this issue over and over where even though I think it's clear and I think the consensus of most of the participants in the PDP-1, there is very little human rights impact on registrants for simply conducting an associated domain check. The thrust of the concern over human rights impacts is over mitigation, which is actually outside the scope.

So, we're going to continue to run into these sort of little sectoral concerns over human rights as it relates to this issue, this issue, this issue. I think it's going to be important that we get that work done as soon as possible on a more comprehensive approach to

recourse mechanisms because I worry that it's going to be an impediment to future policy work, which is a shame because while it's an important issue, the biggest concerns around human rights as it relates to DNS abuse is mitigation. And so many of these PDPs relate to either prevention or searching for indicators.

So, I think it's worth us reaching out. I think it's worth seeing if there is some, you know, perhaps it's a combination of noting the importance of this work and that we're willing to prioritize it immediately behind the issues that we've already identified. But in the meantime, working with the DNS abuse group, with the NCSG, can we have some sort of publication? Can we develop a best practice that certain registries and registrars are willing to implement even before we get to policy work? I think that that could give us some relief, but I'm admittedly a little skeptical.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah, thanks, Brian. Great points, great context. Anybody else would like to get in queue, please do, but I also want to take this opportunity on this specific topic to provide a brief update on my conversation yesterday with Tripti. So, as part of the regular engagement, you know, at the ICANN meetings, Tripti, in her role as Board Chair, reaches out to various stakeholder group and constituency SO and AC chairs. And the two of us met yesterday for about a half an hour, 25 minutes and one of the questions, one of the points that she made was expressing her awareness of the

---

challenges in the DNS abuse PDP as it relates to the engagement of the NCSG.

She has heard or been briefed that the NCSG on this topic has become a bit of an impediment to progress. I will say I have heard separately, not related to my conversation with Tripti, that there are governments in the GAC who have also noticed or recognized that this has become a challenge. It has become a problem.

And I think it's a problem that we need to be creative in trying to figure out how to solve and how to work with, you know, specific NCSG reps to try to figure out how we can advance our really important policy work and overcome sort of the repetition and, you know, sort of the continued resurfacing of the same topic over and over. We have to find a way to deal with that.

Brian, to your point, does that mean we consider reprioritizing to elevate a recourse mechanism discussion over some of the stuff that we've already got in queue? You know, so we don't have to discuss or decide that right now, but it's something that I think we should recognize as, not just a concern that we have, but it's a concern among others in the community. Okay, anything else on DNS abuse? Okay, let's move on to our council update. So, if I could turn to Jen and Sam, over to you.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Keith. This is Jen. One of your RySG councilors. I think we gave a comprehensive update, thankfully, in the week before, kind

of previewing what the council is going to look like, look like, yeah, exactly how we're going to look like, what we're going to look at this meeting.

We had a working session this morning. We talked a little bit about the extraordinary meeting that we had to do. Just an update back from there. GNSO is not joining the ALAC petition. All of the SG and Cs voted against joining. I know that the motion itself was structured in a language that was a bit confusing. So, I think a lot of us received a lot of questions on what the council voted for, what the result was.

I think this is a good lesson for us to learn that we can't just take the template that is presented to us because a template itself, the language is framed in a positive manner. So, we will take that into account. I guess maybe also a heads up as well, because we've noted that this timeline for the empowered community procedures is very tight. So, there might be some suggestion to re-look at it again in whatever shape that is appropriate so that was the discussion there.

The second update from this morning's working session is actually why I need to leave this session halfway. The GAC has invited certain participation from the council and I guess also from the CPH to give them information and specifically, there is the one that Mark Anderson is doing for the SSAD SRT. And when I leave, we will also do their information session on the 15-day verification timeline.

There was some indication that a lot of people thought this communication from GAC and also the length of time you were given to prepare was very short. I think there was recognition that we can improve this communication process in the ways that doesn't create misunderstanding of how formal or how informal it is and how we can move things through with our liaisons and our topic leads. Sam is one of our topic leads as well. So, we're trying to work that out.

Substance-wise, the information session will be simply that. We are going to try to level the understanding of the problem space. So, we actually start from that level before we go into a deeper dialogue. I think you all have seen that 11th of May letter from the GAC. And then there were two letters, one to council, one to the board and council about what they wanted to look at afterwards, whether it's a trilateral dialogue or not. So, having this information, this baseline understanding is important for when we decide what happens afterwards.

I think there was also discussion on the action items that came up of the council's strategic planning session. I always note with a little bit of a grin when Maxim and others have reminded us that we need to make sure the strategic planning session actually brings out action items and we action on them. So, happy to report we are actioning on those.

Specifically, there were two items that we did action on. It is more guidelines for the liaisons, the council liaisons to the PDP working

groups as well as the IRTs, kind of a baseline understanding of what the roles of these councilors who are liaisons do, how we can get this information to and from, and really just accelerating and streamlining efficiently how the council is progressing its policy development work.

The second item is a little bit around the principles of motions. I think if you've been listening to council for the past year, year and a half, you've noticed that there is some more contentious motions. There's been a flurry of activity right up until, you know, five minutes before we're supposed to look at a vote. And at the SPS, I think the councilors absolutely agreed around the table and said, you know, this is not sustainable for us going forward.

So, some guidelines and rules of engagement around what the council would expect for principles around that regarding, you know, submitting motions, submitting new information, not hindering or pushing back on voting on a particular motion if it's just one stakeholder group or constituency that has very strong dissenting voice. And rather using that dissenting statement when we're voting to express that and put that on the record.

So, acknowledging that there is a lot of work coming down the pipeline for council, acknowledging that even with this we need to keep these things on record, and also acknowledging the courtesy that the councilors have to show to each other when we're looking at motions to vote, when we're looking at friendly amendments.

So, I think there was a suggestion from leadership that we have a 48-hour kind of timeline if there is very substantive changes to any motions to have that before that. Because a lot of councilors, well, not all of the councilors, a lot of councilors and their SG and Cs are directed to vote. So, we need to come back to our SGs. We need to come back to our constituencies to socialize what it is to actually align and get instructions on how to vote. So, this is something that I think is worthwhile.

A preview of what we are going to look at in our council meeting tomorrow, a number of items and I don't want to preempt the EPP spirit update, so I'm not going to go into the actual content of it, but there are two items. No, there's one item for vote, the council vote is the RSP issue and I think Sam has very articulately, eloquently mentioned this. I'm going to pass over to Sam to just recap a little bit on that, just to give an understanding and then go back to the rest of the slide.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Yeah, thanks, Jen. This is Sam. So, this matter is about the ability for new gTLD registry operators to use proprietary EPP extensions. The short version is that it is something that the registry stakeholder group provided feedback on in the base RA that will govern all of the new gTLDs that get applied for in 2026. We got a requirement removed from that.

However, during registry system testing and RSP, Registry Service Provider evaluation, applicants for that program need to attest

that they will only use EPP extensions that are in the IANA registry. And so, there's a mismatch here. And what we're asking SPIRT to do is, or what SPIRT is being asked to do is kind of resolve that conflict between those two items. It's the very short version, again, not wanting to step on the fact that we're going to talk about this in more detail later. At the council level, all we're doing tomorrow is voting to say that, yes, please go ahead and discuss this within the SPIRT.

I also want to report back that we got a little bit more clarity about this whole process of how things can get put in front of the SPIRT. And it basically boils down to this. A counselor has to bring it to counsel, present the issue, and then counsel has to vote. And then if the vote is affirmative, an issue can get sent to the SPIRT. So, we're giving that one a test today and tomorrow, right? We'll have the vote. If that vote goes through, I'm confident it will, that item will get sent over to the SPIRT. If in the future an issue bubbles up, it will have to come to the council through a counselor.

I think the process will be fairly smooth. We are also talking about the ability to use an email vote as opposed to having to wait all the way for another month for another council meeting if there's an issue that is particularly timely. So, I think we had some questions that bubbled up on the last RySG call about that so I just wanted to clear that up if anyone has any further questions.

---

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thanks, Sam. Sorry, let me just check Zoom. I don't see any hand. Just a quick follow-up question. My understanding at a high level is that the SPIRT action is required on a fairly tight timeline. It's very prescribed in terms of like when the SPIRT has to begin and conclude its work. Is the expectation that that trick, that clock would start at the council vote to approve referring something to the SPIRT if we know? I'm just not -- And Elaine's giving me a thumbs up.

Okay, so as soon as it's referred to the SPIRT officially by the council then that begins the clock, okay. Thank you. Okay, any questions? We'll talk a little bit more about this in a moment, but I want to kick it back over to Jen. If anybody has questions, please put your hand up in Zoom.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Sam. So, three more items of council discussion. So, there will be a funny one that we always do, I guess celebrating accomplishments between ICANN meetings. I'll leave that as is. You'll see what that we're celebrating.

The second item for council discussion is an update on the curative rights implementation review team. We'll get that from our liaison, Damon Ashcraft. I think I sent something over regarding the IGO and INGO update to the membership list earlier. I think Jeff also gave some context and color on this item so I'm not going to, you

know, belabor the point here. We're going to hear the update from Damon.

Another discussion item is talking about the board approval of the ICANN fundamental bylaws, amendments regarding the customer standing committee and the IANA naming function review. So, we're going to get a briefing from staff about what the council next steps need to be. It's teeing up for a council vote to kind of vote in favor of letting this pass.

Again, this is according to the timeline that is set out in the empowered community procedures, again, following a very strict, I think day 21, day 27. Don't quote me on these numbers because they might be wrong, but we have to action items right after that.

And the final item for council discussion is a prioritization of upcoming work. I mentioned a little earlier during our discussion with the DNS abuse work that council's trying very hard to finalize our prioritization mechanism. We will do this pilot as soon as we're able to finalize it and we'll be applying this on two levels.

First with the work that is coming up in the pipeline for council, so large pieces of work. And then the second level part of it is when we're looking at the DNS abuse remaining issues and gaps. We will also apply this pilot of prioritization as we look into the next series of, I guess, DNS abuse mitigation PDPs. Or if not PDPs, whatever format of work is most appropriate for that issue or gap. So, again, another, I guess, flag for all of us here in the registries to think about that. I know Dennis and Chris has been very good at, you know,

---

gathering all of this work and momentum so I think we're very prepared for this.

I think that is it. I will mention one more thing. There is a council informal meeting today, which I think Keith and other SG and C leadership chairs will be there. I think there will be a frank discussion there about the empowered community timelines amongst other things, but just looking forward to that as well. Well, back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you very much, Jen. Any questions or comments for our counselors? Okay, seeing none, thank you very much, appreciate that update. And let's now move to a discussion of the EPP extension registry SPIRT update and I'm going to turn to Elaine, Jeff that had a conflict during this session for the IGO, INGO issue. So, Elaine, I'm going to turn to you. Thanks.

ELAINE PRUIS

Thank you, Keith. It's Elaine Pruis for the transcript. So, Jen and Sam, both introduced the EPP topic card so I won't rehash that. Essentially, the GNSO Council will vote tomorrow to send it to SPIRT. The SPIRT is meeting on Thursday and our first step will be to consider what the GNSO Council has sent to us.

Obviously, at the SPIRT level, we've already talked through this so we'll do a short introduction to the topic. And then at that point, we should have some communication with ICANN, and ICANN

---

needs to confirm that they agree that a change to the program is needed. We expect that to be pretty seamless since we've been talking with ICANN about this since November. And at the CPH Summit, which several of you attended that meeting, we met with ICANN to talk through the issue and they had asked us to take it to the SPIRT as the registry stakeholder group. So, hopefully that should be pretty seamless.

And once ICANN agrees a change is needed, then that 30 days kicks off. So, my thumbs up was, I think we're going to get there pretty seamlessly and at that point, we'll have 30 days to work with ICANN to come up with a solution. And if we cannot agree on a solution at the end of those 30 days, then ICANN needs to put in place an interim solution. So, that's the process. And if you're interested in how the SPIRT is working or more on this topic, SPIRT is meeting at 4:15 on Thursday afternoon. Any questions about that?

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you, Elaine. Any questions? Any follow-up? 4:15 on a Thursday afternoon, that's prime time for an ICANN meeting.

ELAINE PRUIS

There's always the recording.

KEITH DRAZEK

Right, but no, look, that's really important work. This is, you know, early days of the SPIRT and so, you know, as the process works through and precedents are being set so I think this has been

---

important work. I'm not sure what that was. Okay, hold on one sec. All right. That's better. Okay, so any questions on SPIRT EPP extension registry update? Okay, seeing none.

Okay, any other business? We can move on through our agenda, we're making good time, would anybody like to add anything to the agenda? Anything else that we'd like to discuss today during this working session? Yes, Chris. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks very much, Keith, and apologies for imposing everybody, but the Review of Reviews draft document is likely to be out for public. There's a current version of it out now, which we've been discussing at this meeting, but the formal public comment document is likely to be out in a couple of weeks' time.

It would be really fantastic if we could have the registries read it and comment and we can have a discussion maybe about it, maybe that's whatever, meeting, and then get some public comments in and hopefully being relatively supportive. Thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thanks, Chris. If anybody would like to comment on Review of Reviews, feel free to get in queue, but I would like to say I attended the session yesterday, I thought it was very well done. I thought the presentation was very clear for someone who had not followed or has not followed sort of the minutia of the ongoing work, I found it to be very informative.

---

And, you know, even with the discussion in the room and sort of the input and feedback that was received, I think, you know, helped to, you know, clarify the discussion. And so, I just want to say kudos to you and Aubrey and Manal as the chairs of the effort and the co-chairs and overall, I thought it was a good session yesterday. People who weren't able to attend it's, you know, a good one to review if you'd like a primer. I don't see any hands.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just a couple of points if i could. If i could just point you as we're in the room, leaving aside any kind of wild card issues that we don't know about yet, what we do know is that there's some concern in some parts of the GNSO IPC, I think, and ISPCP as well, we're currently suggesting that the full-blown holistic ICANN structural review should be at a cadence of every 15 years.

We think it's a two-year exercise as a cross-community working group. In other words, there's no review team, it's everybody in leadership like we did the transition. And we think that that's the right cadence, but we know that ISPCP for a start thinks that it should be 10, in fact, possibly seven. And I would strongly encourage people to read and understand what we mean by the full-blown structural review. It is a complicated process that is intended to look at all of the ICANN structures, each SO and AC, as it operates individually and across SOs and ACs, and the board and everything so it is a fairly large undertaking.

That's distinct from an accountability and transparency review, which is very kind of picking topics up one at a time and looking at them. It could have an effect on structure, but accountability, transparency is much more to do with reflecting back on the mission and so on and so forth. That's one.

The second is that some folks are uncomfortable that we are suggesting that some of the existing mandated reviews, security, stability, resiliency, CCT, are no longer maintained in the cadence reviews, but come out and are dealt with on a sort of on-demand basis. Albeit lifted to a status of being special topics where ICANN would proactively reach out to the community every three years or so and say, "Are there any security, stability, and resiliency issues that you think we should review?"

The idea is that instead of having a broad-brush security and stability review hoisted on the community every five years where you put a bunch of people in a room and say, "Figure out what the scope is," the idea is that the community itself would actually, after a prompt or without a prompt, choose, see if there were any security and stability topics that it thought were worthy of review.

So, if that's the sort of thing that people accept, again, there's likely to be some pushback on that from people who just think, well, if you don't mandate the review, it'll never happen. Whereas what I've been saying is actually, it's for the community to decide. It shouldn't be mandated for the sake of it. It should be for us to decide. And if we don't trust each other as a community, we might

---

as well all go home because it's ridiculous. Actually, maybe we should. So, that's the other one I think is the major one. Have I missed any? Go ahead. Yeah.

BECKY BURR

Just to add, just to reinforce what Chris said, the bucket A, ATR, the scope of the bucket A, ATR includes anything that's in ICANN's mission and its compliance with its commitments, core values, and Article 3 transparency obligations. So, stability, security, and resilience is squarely within the scope of the bucket A review. It can come up any time. We're not eliminating it. We're saying it's part of the core and I think people are concerned that they're not seeing the words. There's a specific review for this or that.

The whole point of this exercise was to say, we're going to scope the reviews in advance, narrowly in a way that they can produce results that are able to be affected and are useful, but there's nothing, there is no current review that is taken off the table by this process and I think that's just what people are missing.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you, Becky. Thank you, Chris. Any questions or comments on the Review of Reviews? Don't see any hands in Zoom. Okay, thank you very much for that. Is there any other business before we move on to the final agenda item, which is our thank you to Beth Bacon? Yes. Go right ahead.

---

ARNAUD WITTERSHEIM

Hello. Arnaud Wittersheim for the record. One additional point, but it's not sure it's relevant or maybe point has already been raised, it's regarding the application window for the next round. We're halfway there and to be honest, this window isn't the best spot. We consider as it's ending in the middle of August and the summer is more a time to settle into deck chairs, I think, than in office chairs. And we operate in the corporate business, in the corporate sector where the decision-making process is very long in large companies. So, we especially work with brand TLDs and potential applicants.

And until the decision goes to COMEX for brand TLD project, goes down to the relevant interlocutors, it takes some time. And the thing is that what I'm concerned is that we may end up with last minute applications that we will not be able to process successfully. And speaking with other stakeholders here, I can see that this situation appears to be encountered also by other people. So, I would like to know if the registry stakeholder group might, if necessary, support the idea of asking an extension of the application window, as there is no other ICANN meeting before the window closes. I take the opportunity to raise this point.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you very much for the intervention and identifying the concern that you did about timing for the application window for the next round, particularly in light of the northern hemisphere summer and the potential difficulties particularly for corporate and

---

.brand clients or customers being able to, you know, secure their approval to proceed in a timely fashion. So, I would open the floor to see if anybody has any reaction.

I seem to recall that This issue may have been raised previously, and ICANN, and through the subsequent procedures work and the finalization of the timeline and the applicant guidebook was reluctant to consider an extension or an expansion of the application window.

But I will admit, I have not been very close to that conversation personally. So, I'm looking for anybody else who would like to, you know, provide some thoughts or feedback in terms of, you know, is this, you know, an opportunity? Is there any opportunity for it to be successful? And is it something that the registry stakeholder group would want to take up as a topic? Becky, I see your hand. Go ahead.

BECKY BURR

So, I don't recall the issue about the length of the window coming up. The one thing I will say is that having announced it quite a while ago opened the window at this point in time. And in a world in which we're still in rounds as opposed to the steady state, I think it will be very difficult to convince ICANN to do that because people will cry foul that, you know, the rules have been changed and we're extending the process and there may be more applications for the strings that they brought in. That's without any view at all on the

---

merit or not merit of this, but I would say realistically, it's going to be quite hard to convince ICANN to do that.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you, Becky. Would anybody else like to get in queue? Oh, yes, Elaine. Thanks.

ELAINE PRUIS

Thanks, Keith. It's Elaine Pruis for the transcript. So, as a member of the SubPro working group and having worked on these recommendations, there was a recommendation that the window be 12 to 15 weeks and the adopted recommendation was for a 15-week window. I don't know about the opportunity to extend it, but it would be more interesting to consider if we knew how long that extension would be requested. Are you talking about another like two weeks or a month or?

ARNAUD WITTERSHEIM

I cannot say exactly, but what is sure is that middle of August is not really appropriate. I think the application window in 2012 was more appropriate because it was during January to April. Here it's coming to July. We know that we have still customers where the decision is staying at the COMIX and I think it will just not be possible to make a successful application if you get the elements one week before the application window closes. But maybe end of August or I cannot say would be maybe better or beginning of September. I cannot say exactly.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay, thank you. I see Alexandra in the queue.

ALEX DANS

Thank you, Alex Dans from FairWinds. I would agree that it's unlikely that an extension would be feasible at this point. I will say that something that could enable all applicants, including .brands, is some sped up timelines in terms of responses to questions, the updating of the FAQs.

We're finding a lot of kind of in-flight updates coming out of staff supporting the next round. We just got this like payment test thing last week that they've set up, you know, a month into the round where, you know, applicants could have already tried to pay and found issues. And so, like the last updates to the AGB were right before the round started. We got access to TAMS right as the round started, and we're all exploring it and finding little things that are causing issues as we're trying to submit.

We're also finding that some of these questions we're sending into global support are going to what seems like a black hole and not a lot of confidence that some of those answers are sticky. Some things are changing in flight and we're getting these changes, you know, over webinars but not published. And so, we're still kind of finding that certain things are shifting around clarification with the requirements and things like that as we're going and it's June.

So, it seems to be some shifting sands, I would say, as we're navigating this, which is making it even more difficult to provide the certainty for the applicants to feel like they're ready to submit. And then that invoice is due upon receipt and the deadline is August 19th. And so, sending in that payment, you know, with companies that are used to net 30 and net 60 is difficult. So, we're trying to get them as much runway as possible, knowing that the requirements while still having, you know, I'm waiting a week or two to get an answer off of global support. And then that answer usually requires multiple follow ups to actually get to the root of it.

So, applicants do not have a lot of representation, let's say, in terms of being able to advocate for themselves before the end tag gets spun up later, right? And so, everyone's going at it alone and trying to attack it from all angles. And we're being directed to global support and back channeling isn't really helping much. So, that can be a way to tackle some of this uncertainty right now that people are running into that's giving issues, even if timeline can't be really addressed at this point.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thanks very much, Alex. Any other thoughts or questions? And sort of as you're speaking, again, not being close to this process myself, you know, it raises the question, is there an opportunity for the registry stakeholder group? I mean, we are a policy body within the ICANN construct, but we don't have the end tag set up yet. Is there an opportunity for us to sort of bring, you

---

know, applicants together to coordinate on sharing some of these concerns? And is there an opportunity for us to communicate to ICANN directly, you know, in the spirit of collaboration and, you know, advising that we applicants are experiencing concerns or challenges that are have the potential to impact the timeline?

And perhaps there's also an opportunity to indicate that there are concerns about the timeline because of the seasonality, but, you know, I'm really wondering, is there a chance for, you know, applicants to come together and for us to help communicate with ICANN? Go ahead, Alex. Thanks.

ALEX DANS

I think that'd be a good opportunity if possible. I know Jennifer Gore from the brand registry group has been trying to kind of lead some using her ability to meet with folks to try and lead those things and gather questions coming out of that group, but I know that it extends past that group so you know, it's kind of tricky. Applicants don't want to show their cards. Right?

I'm in consulting firm. I can kind of speak broadly across what we're seeing across all of them. Other folks might not want to put their face forward to say, "Oh, I'm an applicant and I'm having this problem." So, you're kind of facing that as well. So, if the registries or a certain group of applicants can come together to bring these things forward, I think it would help the ones that can't necessarily put their name on it, if that makes sense.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah, thanks, Alex. I mean, you know, there's a little voice in the back of my head saying, "Be careful, make sure that this is appropriate for the registry stakeholder group to do," right? But acknowledging that, you know, perhaps there's an opportunity for us to make some space and time during one of our drop-in calls for interested parties, applicants, you know, consultants who are supporting applicants, you know, to come together and have some coordinated time to try to identify, you know, a tick list of concerns that have been identified. Okay, I see Maxim and Sam, and then we'll probably move to wrap up.

MAXIM ALZOBA

Maxim Alzoba for the record. I think this round is organized a bit better than the previous one because the previous one was almost a disaster. And the issue with the current round is that the full set of documents, you need to analyze if you can participate in it or you shouldn't. We're already right before the window so basically not much time to analyze and given that, for example, in geoTLD's average mayor office has an annual structural funding, obviously they were not able mostly to participate because they need to know the rules before they fund something and not this time.

And for many corporate potential applicants it was the same. Like the window of making decision is quite short, you have to analyze a lot of things and it's a bit uncertain. So, I doubt that ICANN is

---

going to extend the window and I really hope that it's not be lost around [inaudible - 00:51:36].

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you very much, Maxim. Sam, over to you, and then we'll move to wrap this section up.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks, Keith. Just putting a bit of thought to what the registry stakeholder group could do, what kind of concrete action we could take, understanding especially that the timeline here is extremely tight, maybe a productive use of our group would be to send a formal request to ICANN staff to convene an applicant forum of some sort.

We know they've done some webinar FAQ sessions, right, Alex? That they could run something similar, right? Like we're obviously not going to be able to get anything done here in Seville. We don't have another public ICANN meeting, but something that is done virtually over Zoom that could just open the door for applicants or perhaps more appropriately, representatives of applicants to raise some issues.

Maybe there's a way to pull some of those together to send them over to ICANN in advance, but I think maybe if the ask from the stakeholder group is for ICANN to open up a setting where applicants can raise issues, that might be a good use of our time

---

that kind of relieves some of the quandaries of like what the role of the stakeholder group should be.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah, thanks, Sam. That sounds like a constructive suggestion. All right, well, maybe we can have some hallway conversations about like next steps on this question because, I mean, clearly, look, you know, we're part of the ICANN community. Many of us are going to be applicants or supporting applicants. We want this process to be successful and to the extent that we can communicate or help communicate challenges or concerns that put that at risk, I think that's an appropriate thing for us to be doing. So, let's figure out what the right approach would be. Thank you, Sam, for the concrete suggestion, but let's maybe take this offline and think this through.

So, with that, any other business? Okay, then we get to the fun part of our, well, fun and a little sad. So, look, I'm going to kick this off by saying we are here to thank Beth Bacon for her years of service to the stakeholder group, to the contracted party house, to the GNSO, and to this community. And so, you know, having had the pleasure of working with Beth for many, many years, Beth, we're here to say thank you for your service, thank you for your commitment, thank you for your friendship, and thank you for the excellent work that you've done on our behalf for many, many years.

As your interim chair, as the interim chair, you've set me up and set us up for ongoing future success and kudos to all the work and professionalism and everything that you put into it. So, I just wanted to say that. I'm going to hand it over to Sue at this point and then, you know, we can open it up for anything that anybody else would like to contribute.

SUE SCHULER

You can thank Ajith for that one. So, I'm going to send Nikki around with some chocolate and we can all toast Beth with some chocolate. I'll warn you right now, all the Twix have been taken because those are Beth's.

Just to let you know, Beth started actually serving on the XCOM back in 2019. She was our vice chair of administration. She moved up into vice chair of policy and now she's served two years as our chair. And we need to really thank you for all of the years that you've put in with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

BETH BACON

This is Beth Bacon. This is entirely too much and you're all very, very kind. I'm not dying. You're still going to see me, but these are all very sweet words and it's been an incredible pleasure so thank you. I don't know what else to say. It's too much. Thanks for all the Twix, really.

---

KEITH DRAZEK

So, would anybody else like to say anything at this point? I mean, you know, Beth, collectively, we are all excited for your next opportunity. As I said on our previous calls, you know, we're sad to see you go and leave our mix, but very glad that you're still going to be involved in the ICANN space and that we'll be able to continue to work together. So, if anybody else would like to weigh in and say anything, now's your opportunity. Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Hey, Keith. Hi, Beth. So, speaking for PIR, we're particularly sad to see you go, but so glad to see you stay in the space. You've accomplished so much for us, for the stakeholder group. Thank you for everything and we're so glad that we get to continue to see you here at ICANN. And you're going to do amazing things, as you've already done amazing things. So, thank you so much, Beth.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay, anyone else? Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Hey, Beth. I just want to say thank you. I think everybody knows what a gracious and kind person you are, but from a personal experience, having turned up here having, you know, been in the ccNSO forever and the board forever, I just want to say thank you for the extraordinarily welcome that you provided and actually, you know, letting me arrive and become part of the GNSO. So, personally, thank you very much.

AMANDA FESSENDEN

This is Amanda Fessenden from ICANN guest team. We wanted to thank Beth on behalf of ICANN. You've been wonderful to collaborate with. It's been great to be able to work with you over the last year and a half and wishing you all good things to come. Thank you. The best.

BETH BACON

Every time I'm going to say thank you so much. You're all very kind. PIR, the entire team, oh, man. I thought this was going to do it. Okay. All right, I'll save my PIR thank yous, but I love you all very much.

ELAINE PRUIS

So, I am going to miss your kind request of friends for thoughts and feelings and I hope you'll let me continue to share them with you going forward.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Raise your chocolates.

KEITH DRAZEK

Raise your chocolates. Huzzah.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

To Beth.

KEITH DRAZEK

To Beth. All right. Well, with that, I think we can bring this session to a close on a happy note. Beth, we look forward to continuing to work with you here in this ICANN space and elsewhere so great stuff. Thanks, everybody. We can close the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**