
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: RySG Membership Work Session (2 of 2)
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 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 this session as time permits and when directed by the chair. 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, interim chair. Welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting. This is the second of two, and our second-to-last session of the week here in Seville. So, glad everybody could make it. We have a relatively short agenda today with three topics, and if anybody would like to add anything or has AOB, feel free to get those ready for discussion.

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.

So let's just jump right into it. The first item is a wrap-up and next steps on the DNS Abuse PDP-1. And so I see, Brian, you're here, and maybe I can turn to you for any comments that you'd like to make on the PDP. But I'll just note that I've had the chance to observe most of the PDP sessions this week. It seems like great progress is being made, and it feels like that there's good camaraderie in the group. There's always going to be some sticking points and some areas of contention that need to be worked through. But overall, I feel that the chair and vice-chair and the group is doing good work and seems to be ahead of schedule. So maybe I could kick it to you, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Yeah, thanks, Keith. This is Brian with PIR. I think that's a good summary of where we're at. We had four meetings this week, and there were nine charter questions that the group was tasked with coming up with language for. We're really pretty much there on all nine. The last exercise we did today was something where every various group could provide the opportunity to say things that they could live with, with some changes, and things they can't live with. So today we walked through the "can't live with" exercise and found compromise, I think, on most items. I think there's two outstanding questions that the registrars and the IPC are looking at, as well as then the NCSG had some language that they're going to take back and see if they can modify. We're meeting again in two weeks, but it feels like we're pretty close to having the initial deliberations done and are basically on track to be several months

ahead of having an initial report. So I'm happy to take any questions, or if anyone has any questions on the substance of the PDP, happy to dig into that, too.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thanks very much, Brian. Yeah, I think it's pretty incredible that this narrowly scoped and targeted PDP working group appears to be well ahead of schedule, which is great. And that is even, I think, further ahead of schedule than the original timeline allowed for. The original timeline that was published by staff, I think was even longer than what we're tracking to now, and if we're even ahead of the closer timeline or the newer timeline, that's a really good sign for our new approach. So, any questions, comments?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Could I just add onto that a little, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Totally agreed that by keeping the scope tight from the beginning and everyone knew what they were getting into, we were able to sort of use that mantra. Anytime you're doing policy development, people kind of want to tie their pet projects to it, things that they really want to see done. Using that narrowly scoped PDP mantra was really helpful in saying, "Listen, it feels like we're veering into

territory where we're losing the scope being narrow," and people then sort of dropped it or compromised.

And in that vein, I just wanted to note, too, how productive and helpful most of the groups participating have been, but I want to specifically call out the CSG and the IPC. They had some fundamental issues that they were opposed to some language, ultimately got comfortable and dropped the "can't live with" in the spirit of moving things forward and compromising, which was really, really helpful, and also, frankly, helped put pressure on the other groups that might have had issues they couldn't live with when they saw the IPC and the CSG drop those, or BC and IPC drop those kind of fundamental objections so we could move forward. It kind of blazed the path for other people to follow suit. So I'm happy to say that when we meet with the CSG later, but really helpful contributions from them and really helpful, that sort of spirit of taking a good result in lieu of trying to fight for the perfect when that could delay things.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thanks very much, Brian. That sounds great. And positive reinforcement this afternoon with the CSG, I think, would be a good thing, especially as we look ahead. As we've noted, we may be ahead of schedule on this first PDP, which probably means we need to spend a little bit more earlier focus on what's to come, right, in terms of the prioritization work. We know what PDP-2 is likely to be. That's the API access for, I use the term bulk registration

carefully. But we know that's number two, but we need to start identifying the sequence for what's to come after that. We've had discussions about the DGA topic possibly being one of them, but there are some other topics out there that we might want to also revisit. So, any other comments on the DNS Abuse PDP-1? Oh, sorry. Oh, Crystal in the room. Okay. Thank you. Hi, Crystal. Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO

Thanks, Keith. Crystal Ondo with Google, and actually you teed me up perfectly. So what I was going to say is when we meet with the CSG, definitely bring up the timeline and the advancement of that. I think there's a lot of confusion on the CSG side about how long all of these PDPs will take and frustration about if we spread out all these PDPs, we're looking at five years before DNS abuse is tackled. And I think getting in front of the narrative that actually this is moving really quickly, it's working well, let's keep pushing, is a really strong message to the CSG, along with I have heard concerns that none of the PDPs address AI. And right, we see a lot of work in the community right now on AI and how bad it's going to make the scaling of abuse. In my understanding, and when you Google API and agents, to me, an agent uses an API to perform a bulk registration. It should be in the definition of the next PDP naturally without a change to the charter. So if we're talking about proactive prevention of abuse using agents, API access should address that concern, and it is the next PDP teed up. It's not an AI abuse PDP number eight in five years. So I think the CSG would kind of like to

hear a little bit about our position, if we have one, on whether agents should be included in the definition of APIs.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay, thanks, Crystal. That's a great point. And Brian, I'll come to you next, but I think when we first started talking about the PDP number two, the API issue, it was also sort of like, I think about automation, right? The automated access to. So it's not only about however you might define an API, but I think characterized in that way, it easily incorporates the agents and the AI sort of aspect of it. So I think that's a great point.

CRYSTAL ONDO

And I think if someone from our side said that to them, they would feel much more comfortable in that position.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Great. Thank you. All right, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Thanks. And that's a great point from Crystal. And I think that we also shouldn't be afraid to tie to the benefits of PDP number one as it relates to AI, because in the same way, deploying an agent for abuse, one of the best use cases would be campaigns. So, the associated domain check will end up, sure, we don't actually explicitly say AI is a factor in campaigns, but the end result is the same, is that the associated domain check should lead to the

ultimate takedown of hundreds or thousands of domains at a time, which again lends itself to a mitigation for AI agentic abuse of the DNS at scale.

I did also want to point out, Keith, if it's okay to talk about future topics too.

KEITH DRAZEK

Of course.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

The notion of recourse mechanisms. It came up quite a bit in the PDP number one, as it seemed as though there was a desire to sort of take the first PDP on associated domain checks and build in a recourse mechanism for all DNS abuse. So while that's a laudable goal, it wasn't really within scope. And so I think that we're likely to kind of have to revisit this question on recourse for mitigation of DNS abuse in each PDP, unless we have a clear path for a PDP on recourse mechanisms. And so that's something that we've talked about, but I wonder if we might want to think about rejiggering, or pushing, I know it's not something the registries can unilaterally do, but pushing to sort of rejigger the order to have bulk access second, I agree with that, but then saying let's prioritize that recourse mechanism as the next teed-up PDP.

At the same time, I don't want to push to the side the work on DGAs. So that's something that the registries previously worked with the PSWG to put out a publication on dealing with DGAs. That might be

something that we can assure the community is going to receive attention. We can start working on that now in parallel to PDPs. Ultimately, maybe that work could end up being a policy itself, but there's no reason to delay having those conversations now while other PDPs proceed.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thanks very much, Brian. Great points all. And I would also note in support of a focus on the DGA topic, but perhaps not leading it into a PDP immediately, is that could be an opportunity for us to engage the ccTLD registries in conversations that wouldn't force them into a GNSO PDP on a topic that impacts all of us as registries. And during the Registry Stakeholder Group session with the ccNSO yesterday, we went over some of the DNS Abuse PDP discussions, including flagging that this DGA topic was one that is on the roadmap and is ahead of us, and that we would be looking to work with the ccTLDs on that one, particularly because it's focused on registries. So I fully support consideration or recommending we elevate the focus on the recourse mechanism, at least signaling to NCSG and others that the registries would support that, and obviously it's a Council decision in terms of prioritization and chartering and all of that. But I think optically, there's benefit to telegraphing that we would support that while not deferring the work on DGAs, but maybe starting it on a slightly different best-practices track. So, fully support.

Okay. Any other discussion, any input, any thoughts or questions on the DNS Abuse PDP work? Okay, I don't see any hands, so we can then move on to agenda item number two, which is the SSAD/SRT wrap-up and next steps. We happen to be conflicted with the SSAD/SRT meeting three of three, which is actually their fourth session of this week. They had the full Day Zero event, and now this is the third of three formal sessions. And so, we don't have anybody here to give us an update because they're actually having one of their own meetings. But I will say that in my observation of this kickoff work of the SRT, I think it's going quite well. I think from what I understood in my observation of the Day Zero event, the help of the facilitator that ICANN org brought in was constructive. It got the group sort of engaging and heading in the right direction. And overall, I think the feedback I've received has been quite positive. So I don't know if anybody else has any observations on that. We can always get a follow-up update next week during our stakeholder group call. Okay. Anyone? Going once, going twice. Okay. So we'll look to get a more substantive update from Mark, and from our representatives in the SSAD/SRT when we have a call next week.

With that, next week is the election on Wednesday. So next Wednesday is the election for our officer slate for heading into the AGM this year. So I'm going to turn to Sue here in a moment to give us some particulars. If my recollection is correct, proxy votes are due by Monday, and the election is to take place on Wednesday, and we need to make sure we make quorum. It was pretty close last

Wednesday for the interim chair election, so we want to just make sure that we get as many people as possible in the voting process. So Sue, can I turn to you? Nikki, over to you.

SUE SCHULER

Yeah. Basically, the proxy ballot is the big reminder right now. After these meetings, I will be sending it in a fresh email, so it's at the top of your inbox, and in case it gets buried over the weekend, I'll probably send it again Monday when it's due. But we do want to meet proxy, so if you will not be at that meeting Wednesday, please be sure to get that in on Monday. That is all.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you. And just as a reminder, we do have one contested seat, and so we need to make sure that we focus on this and get those proxies in, make sure that we reach quorum, and set ourselves up for success heading into the AGM.

Okay. With that, let me turn to AOB. Is there any other business? Anything, anyone else? Yeah, Sue has some information to share about looking ahead to establishing and relaunching NTAG. So Sue, go right ahead.

SUE SCHULER

Yeah. I'll do a quick update. We had a lot of response at the table, so that was great. It's been slowly picking up from the last meeting. I had a meeting with Andy, and I was asking her how we could connect with the applicants after Reveal Day so that we can

actually send information out to them, invite them into NTAG and all. So, she sent something back to me yesterday, because she wasn't sure. She had to check with people in LA how much they were actually going to publish. But she said, "We got the answer to the published info question. We'll publish the applicant, the organizational details marked for public posting. We'll publish the phone, email, and address of the applying entity." So we should be able to actually reach out individually to everybody that's applying, and send them an invite.

NTAG, we are planning right now for the first meeting of NTAG to happen in Lisbon. There won't be time after Reveal Day to put anything together for Bali. But Lisbon will be the first. I've invited the ombuds to come to that meeting, and the GOs and the brands will do something. We'll have something from the registries as far as the generics, just to get people's feet wet into the community and know what's going on. And so it should be good. So look for the first meeting of NTAG in spring. Oh, go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO

Yeah, just to follow up an announcement, for those considering applying in the next round, I know there were a lot of complaints from various folks, and we share that as well, that Global Support is not very quick at answering questions, and they're not always on time. They are publishing, or they have published, but I haven't been able to find it, but they said they would share it with Sue, hopefully by the end of the week, and she can share it with all of us.

A Google Doc or Google Sheet, it's unclear which, that has all of the questions that have been asked. And so that you can go and check there before you ask your question so that they're not bogged down with duplicative questions, and so that we can self-serve as applicants. So at least for those of us that are applying as well and part of the Registry Stakeholder Group, it should be a very good resource that they're finally publishing it.

SUE SCHULER

I did ask Andy if ICANN was planning to do some type of a session in Bali for answering questions. They didn't even set up their next round booth here. And I'm like, "That didn't stop the people from having questions. They just came to our table." So the applicants do have questions, and if they can do something, then we'll try and piggyback on that with something for NTAG to let them know that there is something out there that they can join.

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thanks, Sue, for the update. I've got a couple other things to touch on, but just following on the point about the NTAG, the publication of all of the contact information and whatever from the applicants, and the idea that applicants, post-Reveal Day, prior to delegation, are going to potentially be in the NTAG together, where they may have applicants for the same string, multiple applicants for the same string, at a time when they are prohibited from speaking to one another for contention resolution. Right? We're going to need to think through that and the dynamics. We don't

want to put anybody in a bad spot, because that's a different dynamic than last cycle. So I'm just literally thinking out loud here. But I'm sure we'll find a way to work through that.

Okay, anything else on next round issues? I want to just touch on the fact related to the EPP registry extensions--sorry, EPP extensions registry issue, just to provide a brief update. Yesterday, the GNSO Council did vote to refer this issue to the SPIRT. So that step has now officially been taken. For those not following it closely, there were a whole bunch of cycles about how to refer this issue to the SPIRT, and the Council and SPIRT got sort of wrapped around the axle a little bit in terms of trying to ensure that everybody understood the process. This is sort of one of the earlier first times that SPIRT has been engaged in this way. So now the process has been clarified. It has been followed. The Council voted. It is now with SPIRT. SPIRT is meeting today. I don't remember exactly if it's this hour or next hour or next block, but the SPIRT is meeting today, presumably to debate and make the decision to refer it back to ICANN org. And earlier today, at a request from ICANN org, Elaine, Sam, and myself met with Theresa Swinehart and Amanda Fessenden to answer some questions on this issue of the EPP extensions registry. Some clarifying questions. It was me in my capacity as interim chair, Sam as the person on Council who is sort of helping to shepherd this, and Elaine, who's our subject matter expert, sort of helping to focus on this along with Gordon and a few others on this issue.

I made it very clear in that this is not a Verisign issue. It's not a Verisign-only issue to the extent that you've got three Verisign people sitting at the table. This is a registry issue. This is an applicant issue. What we're trying to avoid is a situation where applicants who have attested to only using the extensions in the IANA database, in the IANA registry, are not disadvantaged by the removal of the requirement in the base RA for that, and being put in a disadvantage for those now moving forward who don't have to attest to. So anyway, not to get into much more detail than that. We provided some additional justification or information about why this is an issue, why it's important to registries, both to registry operators and registry service providers, and tried to make sure they understood all the justification and the dynamics. So what that means is, assuming SPIRT approves today, it will go to ICANN. They will be on the clock, presumably, to accept it. And once they accept the referral, they will have 30 days to come up with a solution to the problem. Not necessarily to implement the solution, but at least to identify a solution. And I'm seeing Heather has said here, Maxim and Heather have said that they're meeting in the next block, so in one and a half hours' time.

Any questions on that? I just wanted to be fully transparent and keep people up to date on this issue and make sure that you know that we had had a request from ICANN org to help provide some clarity around sort of the importance of this or why it's a priority topic. Because it's going to require some system changes to the testing program that they've got. So they're concerned about

timing and probably expense and whatever to make those changes. But they were just asking for a little bit more information. So, Gordon, would you like to say anything on this topic? I know that you've been interested in this as well. Sorry to put you on the spot.

GORDON DICK

That's okay. Obviously those applicants that have already gone through it have already attested. So obviously this process will need to work its way through, and a tidy-up aspect of that as well. But I'm glad it's moving forward, because otherwise we've got potential differential scenarios for different RSPs.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah. Thank you. And in addition to whatever changes ICANN would need to make to the testing system, there's probably three different components that would require changes at various stages of the process to come, including needing to ensure those who have attested in the testing process that they won't be held to that. Right? We reinforced with Theresa and Amanda that the simple near-term solution to this is to issue an advisory, essentially indicating that they won't be held to that attestation, and that you have plenty of time to work through the system updates. But at least that type of a statement would go a long way to sort of relieving some of the concern and pressure about next steps. So, okay. Any other questions or comments on that? No. Okay. I'm

trying to think if there was anything else. I think, Wim, please go right ahead.

WIM DEGEZELLE

Well, I can do a very brief comments update in our AOB. Thank you, Sue. There is one topic up for comment: additional reference Label Generation Rules. I think there are two new ones and then a couple of updates that are published for public comment. I haven't received any indication that there is an issue with one of these so that we really have to comment. But our internal deadline for comment is the end of next week, next Friday. Friday next week, sorry. So we still have time, but ideally by Wednesday's call, we know if you reply, if you're supportive, if we submit a supportive comment, or we just don't comment on this one. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thank you, Wim. All right. We have plenty of time left. If anybody has anything else they'd like to discuss. Any observations, thoughts, reactions from the week? All right. I don't see any hands.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Keith, maybe I'll just take the opportunity--

KEITH DRAZEK

Thank you, Brian. Go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

I'll save you for five seconds. But just to say thank you again for stepping in. Obviously well-experienced chair, and we're in safe hands, and we really appreciate you taking the time to guide us through the next few months. So, thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK

Thanks, Brian. So, happy to do it. I think this is an important time for all of us, the ICANN community broadly. Obviously, lots going on with the next round coming, and it was just important to make sure that we had some stability and continuity in all of that. So I'm happy to do it. Five months will be plenty. And then we'll be looking ahead to Catherine taking over since she's running unopposed as the chair candidate.

So, okay. Hey, I wanted to take an opportunity to acknowledge Sue, because this is her last face-to-face meeting in her current role as our Secretariat.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

She heard we were going to Bali and was like, "No."

KEITH DRAZEK

No, you're going to be there.

SUE SCHULER

Yeah. No.

KEITH DRAZEK

I know you're going to be there, but you're switching roles.

SUE SCHULER

I'll be here through Lisbon, but we're switching roles.

KEITH DRAZEK

So that's what I was going to speak to, if I may. Thank you. You didn't let me finish my sentence. So, this is Sue's last face-to-face meeting in her current role as our Secretariat. And, yes, Sue is going to continue on attending the next couple of ICANN meetings in a support capacity, working to support NTAG, and doing all the things that will be so important over the next year. So I did want to take this opportunity, though, to thank you, Sue, for everything that you've done for us over however many years it is. Fourteen years. And we would be remiss if we didn't take an opportunity to thank you for your service to us and to this community, to our stakeholder group, and the contracted parties. So, thank you very much. Would anybody else like to say anything at this moment?

All right. I think we can call this meeting to a close. Thank you all very much. We do have one more stakeholder group meeting. It's actually the CPH and CSG meeting that starts at 04:30 PM in this room. So we'll see you back here before too long, but you get a little bit extra time this afternoon. Thanks.

SUE SCHULER

We can end the recording. Thank you.

NIKKI SCHULER

Recording stopped.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]