
ICANN86 Seville | PF – Joint Session: CPH and CSG
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

NIKKI SCHULER

Hello, and welcome to the joint session of the CPH and CSG. 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 of this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Keith, Owen, and John.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Nikki. Hi, everyone. This is Owen Smigelski. Usually, when we have these types of joint meetings with multiple chairs sitting here, we decide who it is who is doing it. But Nikki said, "Owen, can we start?" So obviously, I'm the one who is starting off the lead here. But welcome, everyone, to the last and best session of the ICANN meeting. This apparently is a tradition since Kuala Lumpur,

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.

to put the CSG and CPH in the very last time slot. And while that might be inconvenient, I do find it very valuable, at least for myself, for us to get together and talk about mutual interests that we have in common, and how we can work together, and what to do, and things like that. So, welcome. Hopefully, we can have this be a very productive and not sleepy, and let's get the hell out of here kind of meeting. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK

Hi, everybody. Keith Drazek. Just for those who don't know, I am the current interim chair for the Registry Stakeholder Group. I'll be in this role for the next five months until the AGM in the fall. I'm essentially replacing Beth Bacon, who resigned due to taking a new job outside of our space or outside of the industry. I see Beth over here. Thank you, Beth. And so, I'm basically a placeholder until we get to the AGM and the normal transition of our leadership. So thanks. Thanks for being here. Looking forward to the conversation.

JOHN MCELWAINE

John McElwaine. I'm the president of the IPC, for those who don't know me. And the way the CSG works is that we rotate chairs every six months, and it's my honor and luck to be chair for a few more weeks here. But looking forward to a productive discussion. I will note that I have received at least two bribes to try to get this meeting done with early, which I accept. But ultimately, that's in your control. I do hope that there's some robust discussion,

though, that is pithy and quick. Thanks. Keep it tight. Yeah. Actually, so coincidentally, this one is mine. So we've kind of split up some of the topics to discuss here, and one of my thoughts was to discuss RDP implementation. So that's the Registration Data Policy, for those who don't know. Registrars will probably know better than I, but I believe it was enacted late last year and has some requirements, for instance, of putting a link on the homepage and then sort of a process to go through when making a registration data request directly. There'll be a little bit of overlap in that some of those policies are being talked about right now while we're going over the policy work with SSAD. But I thought I would just kind of throw it out to the group to see what type of implementation challenges have registrars faced with it. How are you getting some of the information of the requirements out to maybe registrars that don't attend frequently? Is Compliance the best way for us to go when we notice there is a missing link, for instance, on a website? So curious to get people's take on how the implementation of the RDP is going.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Hi, everyone. Owen Smigelski with Namecheap Registrar. For those who don't know, I also spent seven years at ICANN Compliance, so I can speak to a couple of those points, John. Yeah, I think ICANN has been informing registrars. There's a communication channel that goes to all of the primary contacts. So ICANN informs you when a policy is effective. Usually, they give you, I don't know, six or nine months heads-up. So they do send that out there. They don't use

that communication channel too much to not bury us in emails. So, all registrars should be informed. I know they have their stakeholder engagement team, so reaching out as well too if they notice any concerns. The last audit, I don't think included it, because it's just a newer thing. But I would expect that ICANN would build that into the next round of the audit there. I won't comment on any compliance cases that Namecheap may or may not have received, but I do know that Compliance is enforcing these requirements. There was a notice of breach published yesterday, which highlighted a registrar that did not have their adequate information link on their website with regards to how to do data disclosure requests. So I would recommend if you've got some problems with a registrar not either having the link, or not doing the appropriate response or responding, or giving you the reason for the denial or anything like that, to absolutely go to Compliance because that's something well within their remit. And I do know that they are able to handle and respond to those requests. Thanks.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Sarah, over to you.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. This is Sarah. There have been two themes that emerged from this conference. One was cautious optimism, but the second was the value of human conversation. So to your question or point about what to do if, for example, a registrar does not have

all the things on their website that the requirement says they should, I think start by just getting in touch with them. Have that conversation. Say, "Hey, I can't find it." Maybe it's just hard to find. Maybe it's not there. Maybe they fix it and we don't have to make more work for Compliance, and it gets done faster. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE

I'll just jump in here. Sarah, that's great to hear because I was wondering if that would be the suggestion. We could always go to Compliance with that, but really wanted to understand whether that would be appreciated, right? This is not a live-or-die sort of situation with respect to the links, but it is a good thing to have on the website. And so I'm glad to hear that just reaching out to registrars is something that would be welcome, so thank you for that. Crystal, over to you.

CRYSTAL ONDO

Crystal Ondo, Google Registry. I just want to point out that in the Registration Data Policy, registries are also required to have this. Many registries are now on the minimum data set, so just be aware we have this. A lot of us have this. And you can go on my form, you can ask for it. I'm going to give you what's in RDAP. I have nothing else. So as you're talking to the members of IPC and BC, just make them aware that just because it's available, because it's required, does not mean that that entity has the data.

JOHN MCELWAIN

Any other issues people want to raise? Okay. Keeping with keep it quick, pithy, we can probably go to the next part of the agenda. DNS abuse. Mason, I believe you are handling this one.

MASON COLE

Thank you, John. Before I kick this off, allow me to just take a moment to say thank you to John for his service as CSG chair. He's done a fantastic job. He's got two more weeks in it, so we're not letting you off the hook just yet. But thank you, John, for all your hard work. Much appreciated. Yeah, how about a- Okay, so, the CSG wanted to raise, obviously, the issue of DNS abuse because it's a perennial issue of interest to the CSG and to the broader community. So we worked up a couple of slides here just based on our previous conversations and how we might handle future abuse work because, speaking for the CSG, we're very encouraged by the conversations in the current PDP and the pace at which the PDP is progressing. It's all very encouraging, so we'd like to keep up that momentum. So, Devon, I think you have the slides, right? There we go. Okay. So, just quickly, progress to date, associated domain check, projected completion October 2027 is what initially we thought. Probably going to come in under that deadline, which is great news. Projected PDP number two, talking about DGAs and API access. Don't have a completion date on that, but we all understand that's the next one in the queue, so we'll be tackling that very soon. Go ahead, Devon.

The need for speed. So, obviously, this is going to be an issue. We had a session on Monday that the BC co-sponsored with the SSAC on AI and its potential impact on DNS abuse. It's certainly coming. AI is both good and bad, as we all know, and it could exacerbate what's happening with DNS abuse. We have a dichotomy in the community in that abuse takes place in hours, and ICANN processes take years, so as I say, we're making good strides towards speeding up policy development, which is good. And what the CSG would like to see is further cooperation between everybody, SGs, Cs, and ICANN work to evaluate trends that are going on in DNS abuse. And this relates to the idea that the CSG put forward about a potential standing committee on DNS abuse within the GNSO. And this is something the ICANN board has an abuse caucus. The ccNSO has a standing committee on abuse. The SSAC has a standing committee on abuse. We haven't formed this out in any really formalized way. It's just an idea that we wanted to propose to the community. But recognizing that, of course, there's demands on everybody's resources and time, this could be something that can inform the GNSO intelligently about where to take our next work relating to DNS abuse, just using current information and current trends. We haven't matured this idea. It's something for future discussion, but we wanted to highlight it. And then I'll raise this again. Back in 2021, when we did the second security and stability review here in the community, there was a recommendation that there be a continual evaluation, or at least a periodic evaluation of DNS abuse definitions. We haven't done that since. Since then, we did define abuse as it's understood in the

contracts, but we haven't done anything really beyond that, and that's something that the CSG may be interested in having a conversation with the community about. So we just wanted to raise those two issues proactively. Okay, Devon, go ahead. Thank you.

Obviously, we're interested in developing solutions inside the ICANN community because they're simpler to implement. When you get regulators involved or governments, then you have scattershot regulation that's harder to comply with. It's easier to have industry-driven solutions rather than having solutions imposed on you from outside the community. And, that's what the CSG is interested in having. Next slide, Devon, please. So, we have a couple of ideas about where we might take the work on abuse, but then we have a question for our colleagues in the Contracted Party House, and that is-- Well, first, functionally, again, the CSG is proposing the idea of a standing committee on abuse, and then the mechanism for definitional review of abuse. But then in terms of policy development, we all know the next PDP that's in line, but we're interested in collaborating with the CPH on identifying areas of mutual concern. We have the small group list that was developed in the GNSO when we first started this entire process. We have the CSG sort of wish list of where we could do further policy work. Or we could come up with this idea together. We could sit down together and come up with whatever it is that we think is most pressing about developing policy on DNS abuse. So I wanted to pose the question to the room about where can we collaboratively

go next. So looks like there's a queue developing here already. John, you want me to run the queue, or do you want me to?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Yeah.

MASON COLE

You want me to? Okay. Volker, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes. Thank you. Volker Greimann, speaking for the record, I guess. I was a bit puzzled by the topic two slides back when you said more efficient PDPs. I think we are already very efficient on the current abuse PDP, and it's very hard to imagine that unless you come with a predefined solution, with a fully explored text that has been pre-agreed, that we can be any faster than what we're currently doing. So, I'm a bit puzzled by that request. And the second part, at least from my perspective, we should be open to a discussion of relevant abuse topics. I think the abuse scenario is constantly evolving. And obviously, there should be a room for having a discussion, and it probably will make sense to have informal discussions on maybe an ExCom level or an informal level on a call between meetings to discuss what you would like to see and what we can deliver or what we would like to see and what you can agree to. So there is probably some mutual interest there that we can at least talk about stuff.

MASON COLE

I think the CSG appreciates that very much, Volker. That's exactly the direction we want to go. So thank you for bringing that up. Owen.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Hello? Somehow I unmuted myself, I'm not sure how I did that. Apologies, everyone. So, hi, everyone. Owen Smigelski, from the registrars. So I just wanted to just kind of throw a couple things out with those slides that I saw out there, and this is not really reacting necessarily to anything or thoughts forward, but just I see that there's a lot of claims about how much cybercrime there is out there, and I just want to flag to say that cybercrime is not DNS abuse. There's a lot of things that are outside of what necessarily can be done through a registrar or a registry. That's not to say that we don't want to take action and stop what we can. I have heard sometimes this week said that registrars want to have more domain names registered that do bad stuff because we make more money. That's not true. We actually lose money from DNS abuse. We have to combat it. It brings down our reputation. Our email servers get blocked, our hosts get blocked, and stuff like that. So we actually have a very strong incentive to stop DNS abuse and reduce it. Same thing with if there are other registrars that are not here, they give us a bad reputation, and that makes law enforcement or governments want to come after us. So we are certainly incentivized and want to do this. But if we're here at

ICANN, it has to be within the ICANN context. And so I'd strongly suggest looking at what has gone through the GNSO, what are the other things that came out of that report, how we can prioritize and work on them. I think we've got some good fast PDPs that are going forward, and we should focus on those, too. And then also just realize that we're doing more just outside of this. A lot of the registrars and registries I see in other groups and fora and in participations where we're doing things outside of the ICANN context to stop other online harms as well, too, things that may not necessarily be dealt with through ICANN. So we're certainly doing our part as well too inside and outside of ICANN. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Owen. Really appreciate that. Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Thanks, Mason. Hi, everyone. Brian Cimboric with PIR and the registries. Just want to have a couple points. First, I want to thank the CSG for its participation in the PDP. The reps have been really engaged, really helpful, and I specifically want to call out that as part of the exercise, there's a ranking of things that you're good with, have problems with, and can't live with. CSG had a couple can't-live-with items, but in engaging in the spirit of compromise, walked off of a few of those in a way that was really helpful, really showed the sort of communal spirit that we're working towards, and importantly, I think blazed a trail to make it more difficult for other people to stick with their can't-live-withs. So I really just

wanted to say thank you for all of your participation and everything you've done for the PDP.

Second, on the issue of AI. I can't imagine a world in which we have a PDP on AI abuse, but I do want to point out that the real-world impact of the first two PDPs that we're dealing with deal with what I think is the most predictable and scary use case of AI for DNS abuse, and that's campaigns. So with associated domain checks, we're going to have a policy in which a registrar is where previously it would be one, potentially if a registrar wasn't already doing associated domain checks, one domain report, one comes down. Now we could be one DNS abuse report, and 1,000 names come down as part of an AI campaign. So I just wanted to make sure everyone's aware that the existing identified policy work is really going to be significantly helpful in addressing some of the biggest problems that we're facing with the potential for AI-enabled DNS abuse.

Third, on what's next. And this is just me speaking for myself, not for the registries necessarily, but as a participant in that PDP, it became clearer and clearer the drive and focus in particular from the NCSG on registrant recourse mechanisms. And it's something that we ran into pretty regularly that everything kept getting brought back to that question, and I think that until and unless we can point to a commitment to have a full PDP on creating a floor for registrant recourse mechanisms, it's going to be an issue that is going to continue to come up over and over. So I think that it's clear what our next PDP is on friction before bulk API. But I think that

there would be a real benefit in prioritizing a PDP on recourse mechanisms. It seems as though the GAC is also particularly interested in this. So as far as identifying key next work, I think that that could be an important step. One, in its own right, I think it's worthwhile and valuable work. But two, to provide assurances to our friends in the NCSG that this work will get done and doesn't need to necessarily be addressed in each individual PDP that comes up before it.

MASON COLE

Thanks for that feedback, Brian, and thanks also for the suggestion on the next area of work. I think that's going to be a topic that CSG is going to take up immediately after this meeting, so thank you. Good suggestion. Okay. Ashley, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

I was struggling to unmute myself on Zoom, and then I realized I'm not supposed to do that anyway. So yeah. Thank you. Keith stole a little bit of my thunder. You are back to being a placeholder. Just kidding. You're more than a placeholder. But yeah, I just wanted to note that, and you noted as well, Mason, that I think just about every SO and AC has a standing committee on DNS abuse. So I think before we take that step to creating yet another standing committee on DNS abuse, that maybe we could just try and meet collectively, and see if we can achieve the same goals that way before creating a group within Council.

That being said, I also wanted to first express a little bit of disappointment that the registrars weren't part of the discussion in organizing the BC SSAC session on AI. But on a different note, I think it went really well. I think it was very even. I was afraid it was going to be a lot of hand-waving on AI is going to be the end of the world and everything's going to... But I think it raised a lot of really interesting points, and it actually showed real-time people's views on things shifting to a more kind of rational, in the real world sense of what the situation is. So I just wanted to thank you for that. And to touch on something that Brian said, the registrars, we actually have a document that talks about appeals mechanisms for registrants, and I can post that in the chat, but that might be something that we can build off of. And I'll say again, the registrars have a lot of really good information that nobody ever reads. So you guys might want to periodically check our information sheets because we have a lot of good resources. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks, Ashley, and thanks for the feedback on the AI session as well. Appreciate that. Okay, Sam.

JEN CHUNG

Sorry, I asked Sam to help me raise the hand because I can't do it on mobile for some reason. Jen Chung, for the record. Just a little bit of, I guess, carrying on from what Ashley just mentioned, I think it's a really good idea for CSG to work a little bit with what the CPH already has regarding the DNS abuse working groups that we

already have. I think that's a really good idea because I'd like to know a little bit more if that actually fills a gap, if there's a standing committee, it fills a gap. Because if we're looking at an output where we're trying to look at where we're looking at policy, that usually in the Council, it'll be a small team, like the small team that we reconstituted. So if we do see a real gap, then of course, finding a way to do this work makes a lot of sense. So I think that's the first step.

The second thing, I guess now putting my Council hat on, Council's going to do a prioritization exercise. It will be a test run because I've been told not to use the word pilot.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Vibe check.

JEN CHUNG

A vibe check.

UNKNOWN

Vibe check.

JEN CHUNG

A vibe check, and we will do that not only for the big pieces of work, the projects that are coming down, we will also do this for the remaining gaps and issues in the final issue report. So this is a really

good time for, I guess, all the SGs and Cs to talk about it some more, and then your Council will be doing this work. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks very much, Jen. Okay, back to the queue. Marie, please.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thanks, Mason. Marie from the BC. Picking up from what Ashley just said, in a totally non-ICANN context, a lot of companies here, the likes of Amazon and others, have a mechanism for consumers to have some form of mediation. "I don't agree with what you've sent me." So what I'm saying is there's a lot of stuff that a lot of people in this room already have. We don't need to start rebuilding the wheel from zero, and I'm sure that a lot of that could be very quickly and very easily repurposed. I understand the NCSG's concern, and it's something I think we can address quickly, and it won't take us years to get through. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU

Thanks, this one is for me. Marie, I appreciate that, and I think as we're looking at the next sets of work on DNS abuse, but really also the future work that Council takes on, right? I think looking at this first PDP and figuring out what lessons we can take from it is going to be a good move for those of us who are on Council. And I think

as an early reaction to this first one is, I think we need to continue to be better and keep improving ourselves on keeping our charters pretty tight. Right? I think we all thought we were keeping PDP 1 pretty narrowly focused, but I think there's even more room for efficiencies in that. And I think on the Council side, we should be thinking about and pushing ourselves to keep those charters very streamlined and really address very specific issues. If there's, for example, previous work that exists out there, looking to that, not starting from ground zero. And so I think that's probably an area where our house is quite aligned with the CSG, because I think we are all interested in seeing these things go efficiently.

MASON COLE

Thank you, Sam. Anyone else for the queue? Okay, John, Owen, Keith, back to you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Next slide, please. Oh, GAC accuracy. I thought it was SSAD, but I guess it'll be later. So just a little summary. The other day, I think that was Tuesday, the GNSO Council had been asked by the GAC to present some information. They'd sent a whole series of questions, wanting some information about where the 15-day verification window came from, what are the practicalities of changing it, what could be the impact, a whole bunch of things. We thought we got it kind of late. The GAC seems to think they sent it earlier, so we weren't really able to give a substantive response, checking within the contracted parties, primarily the registries, because this is a

registrar issue. But we were able to get some information together. Tucows had posted a blog with regards to some information about verification, which I see Sarah just put in the chat, and I'll put the one. Namecheap also did one as well too. And so we went and we presented that information showing statistics. Even though we had different sample sizes and looked at different things, we had some data that pretty much aligned, that the takeaway was that there was very low, less than 2% levels of DNS abuse. And those that were involved in DNS abuse did have email verified through one of the requirements are, so it didn't really seem to have a significant impact, at least. And then also from the Namecheap side, we did, actually, I had my team check for those domains involved in DNS abuse, if it was verified before registration, during the 15-day period, or after, what was the result? And statistically, it was the same.

So while we presented this information to the GAC, understand that that's a priority and something that the GAC wants to move ahead with, is either reducing or probably getting rid of that 15-day email verification period. Our concern is it's not that we don't want to do this, it's something that would be a low-ish technical effort in theory, but there could be a high impact to customers. There could be a high impact to customer support about people not knowing about this change. It's not the money. It's, is this going to be effective in reducing DNS abuse? We've got limited resources. We've got limited time dealing with these ICANN meetings and everything, and if we're going to be spending all of our time

working on removing the email or doing work, we want to make sure that it's going to get the most bang for our buck. We're committed to doing the ADC, and that will probably cost more money to implement that if you're a registrar that's not doing it. But the return for that could be a significant improvement for DNS abuse. So, this is a preliminary discussion with the GAC. There were some side conversations as well about wanting some more information about DNS abuse rates or email verification, things like that, which really have not been published or made public, just in general. And so, that came this week, so we're going to look into that within the Registrar Stakeholder Group, see what types of information we can provide, and see if we can have some evidence and facts to support going one way or another or how to move this discussion forward. I do know that when the GAC spoke with the board, the board said that they weren't willing to consider it through a request from the GAC and wanted to make sure that it was going through the proper processes because there are a bunch of efforts underway and prioritization and stuff like that. So, that's just a high-level overview on that, and certainly there's more to come out with this. This is just a very last-minute thing that we got pulled into. I see Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL

Thank you. Somehow, the ICANN community hates a gap. I have known this. So whenever in some conversation a data point is needed and there is no official data point available, they will grab the best option and then use that to beat everything down. So

you'll realize is during this whole meeting, I've heard the Interisle report so many times in every discussion regarding DNS abuse, right? I have not read it, but some people say it's great. Some people say the data is crap. I don't know. But when the data comes from you, from an authoritative source, that carries some weight. So I was really happy to know that you presented some data which was backed by your own research, and you made a point. So if we can have similar data points from registrars or registry about abuse and points, that will help carry the discussion and make the point more valid. Now, I know some people might have challenged you, said, "It's your data. I don't know how true or accurate it is." That's another bridge to cross, but at least you presented some data, and that was, I think, helpful, I would say.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Sure. Thanks, Vivek, and I agree that in an information vacuum coming from authoritative sources like that, there are a number of things out there that do look at it, whether it's Domain Metrica or a NetBeacon or Interisle, but those aren't necessarily querying and polling registrars and registries about what they're seeing. So I agree that there's that vacuum, and so then that noise is there. So we don't have that data because, first of all, it's not a contractual obligation, and creating and collecting that type of information can be costly. It's not just like you just go turn a faucet and data falls out and you get it. At least from our end, we had to set up a query and get business intelligence involved and get that data. But we felt it was important to do that. I obviously can't compel any registrar

to do that. But we have heard the feedback, and we do appreciate the need for that, so it's something we'll be taking back and discussing and see what we can do, what we can provide that could be beneficial to this discussion. Reg?

REG LEVY

Thanks. Reg Levy from Tucows. I strongly sympathize with what you're saying, Vivek. We want data. We want our decisions to be data-driven. Is there any concern about who's giving you the data? So Tucows tries very hard to get a blog out the door in advance of every ICANN meeting that discusses data for a certain portion of what it is that we do. I think this one, we got it out pretty late. We were on planes by the time-- I was on a plane by the time it got published, but we try. Does that data feel tainted to you because I'm a registrar, and so therefore I have an agenda in a certain direction, or is it just data?

VIVEK GOYAL

I can answer and give you my personal opinion, absolutely. I appreciate the data, but when I use that data to make a point to somebody which does not align with their preconceived beliefs, their only reason for coming back and not agreeing with this is it's tainted. But I appreciate that there is data.

REG LEVY

Thank you. So that's useful. So how do we get you data that you think you can trust? Or that your colleagues, the people who consider it tainted, not you.

VIVEK GOYAL

If it was a perfect world, I would say ICANN Compliance should collect abuse data from all the registrars under their agreements, consolidate it, and put out annual reports. You can challenge that data for sure. But as of now, just like you do, and Owen does, if others also publish data, then as more and more data comes, it will be hard to deny it or say every data point is tainted.

REG LEVY

Thank you.

VIVEK GOYAL

Especially from those registrars that are considered to be not following any abuse practices. The bulletproof ones.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks for that, Reg. I appreciate getting that granularity. And I know some of the registrars in this room have been called good registrars this week in public, so hopefully we can get some more good registrar data. And if there are specific asks and granularity you want, because some of us, we all have different types of systems. We might have access to different types of data. So certainly, we'll circle back and see what we can get on our own.

Anyone else? Okay, seeing none, no more-- Oh, Volker's got a hand. Go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes, specifically with the 15-day lock or hold, that's a topic that's, for us at least, recently popped up again and made clear how much of a problem this is for many registrants. This may appear to be a solution for DNS abuse, even though the data seems to show it isn't. But on the other hand, a lot of legitimate registrants are being caught out by this. They transfer the domain name, the email that we send goes into spam, the reminder that we send goes into spam, and suddenly their business is offline. And similarly, when they change certain data in their registration data because maybe their CEO has changed, or they want to have a different email address in there, and they don't see that email coming in from us, their domain goes down. And, obviously, they're very peeved that they're not making any money during the time that the domain is down. We've recently experienced this entire wave anew because we decided to implement NIS2 in the way that we would apply the ICANN level verification, inclusive of the lock and suspension, to all TLDs, not just gTLDs, basically to make sure that there's one known process applying to all, and that allows us to comply with our verification requirements of NIS2. However, this caused a lot of customers and resellers as well to be basically restarted on the entire wave of "Why is my domain down?" that we already experienced once with the gTLD contract amendments back in the 2013 agreement. And any change to that will trigger that exact

process again. So "Why is my domain down?" is basically the most common customer complaint that we get, and usually these are accompanied with, "Who's going to pay for the money that I lost?"

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Volker, and thanks for doing the reminder that these types of changes can harm the innocent, and we don't want to come up with solutions that, while they may have an effect on the bad, the harm is more amplified to those that are innocent. The Namecheap data, we looked at 5.3 million domains over one year, and four domains suspended for the failed email verification. Almost 75% were not involved in DNS abuse or any type of suspension like that. So there was a lot of legitimate registrants being harmed by this who then have to, losing business, stuff like that, who then come to us to follow up, "What's going on with my email?" So there's an additional cost for that. Anyone else? Oh, and then just for people online, I just want to mention, in the room, Sarah put the Tucows article in there. I also put a link to the Namecheap one so you can read those at your leisure. Anyone else on this? Okay, next slide please.

Oh, although before we get to AOB, we did, I think, at one point have the SSAD SRT on there. We've got a number of the participants in the room, including me, but I noticed that Marc anderson was lurking behind me, so I summoned him to the table. Because he's a lot more prepped on this than I am. So I'll pass this over to Marc to just give a high-level overview on this. Marc?

MARC ANDERSON

Thanks, Owen. It's Marc anderson, and, if you don't know, I'm the lead of the SSAD Supplemental Recommendations Team. It's a team that's been tasked to review the original SSAD recommendations and, based on the learnings of the RDRS pilot, produce supplemental recommendations for a system for standardized access and disclosure of non-public gTLD registration data. That's a big mouthful with a lot of acronyms. I'm going to guess most people in the room are familiar with those, but if you're not, feel free to speak up and ask. Where we are, we had three meetings here at ICANN86, and in addition to that, we had a Day Zero all-day event on Sunday with a facilitator that ICANN org provided for us. So we're very early in the process, but we've already had a chance to meet face-to-face and work through some of the bigger issues that are in front of us. It's a great opportunity for a group. As a lead, this is a wonderful advantage, having people able to meet, talk to each other in person instead of over Zoom, and get those initial group-forming stages out of the way in a face-to-face environment hopefully sets us up for success. We have a really aggressive timeframe. Council has given us a target of February 2027 to finish our work in producing supplemental recommendations. If you do the math on 18 recommendations between now and then, as well as all the other hurdles that we're going to get through, that's not a lot of time. So the group, there's about 38 of us, have a real challenge to get through those recommendations and produce a report.

Before I wrap, I just want to say we have principles that we're trying to adhere to in establishing these supplemental recommendations. The first is that the recommendations have to work for the three main stakeholder groups involved. You have the requesters, the data subjects, and the data controllers. I used the example in today's session that in compromise, it's said that if everybody's unhappy, then you've succeeded. But with the SSAD, we made everybody unhappy, and we didn't succeed. And so what we're trying to do is make sure we produce policy that actually works for each of those three groups, the requesters, the data subjects, and the data controllers. Each of those are well-represented in the group, and so hopefully we get there. The other things we're trying to do is produce implementable recommendations. The SSAD recommendations certainly had their flaws, but perhaps the deal breaker on them ultimately was that they were not implementable. So that's underscoring our efforts, producing implementable recommendations. And finally, we want to make sure, a phrase we hear a lot in GNSO land is we want to make sure the recommendations are board-ready. I'm also reminding people in the group that they have to be council-ready. So we need to produce recommendations that each of our stakeholder groups will support at Council, and that when the recommendations get to the board, that the board will feel they're in a position to adopt them. And so that's sort of my quick spiel. I'm happy to answer any questions if anyone has them. Also note

there's a whole lot of other SSAD representatives in the room, so if anybody else wants to jump in, I'd welcome it.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Marc. Does anybody have any questions, comments? Want to raise their hand? Oh, go ahead, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks. John McElwaine, for the record. So I really wanted to commend the job that Marc's doing and staff. And what has really been clear to me, and I want to encourage that the SRT continues to use, is the whole straw man concept. I noted that when we're working through the straw man, it seems to go very collaboratively. It's very smooth, and people have the ability to prepare in advance. The one time we went a little bit off and skipped, we started spinning our wheels until we decided, "Hey, let's put a straw man together on that." So I just think that's a great way to handle it. I think we've seen it work very well in the ADC PDP, and in fact, was talking to ICANN staff today and really complimenting them on that. I hadn't been involved in a PDP in a while, but the one that I was didn't work that way, and I think it took three years. If not longer. So I think it's a great way to work, and would encourage it to continue. So thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, John. I'll call on myself. This is Owen Smigelski. Just one thing I'd like to say, Marc talked about being board-ready and

council-ready. I know that there are two board participants in the SRT. And they're not just being passive. They're actually active and engaging and asking questions or aligning with things that are in the board. So I think that I'm cautiously optimistic that whatever comes forward is something that the board will be ready to implement and not wait a year and a half. I won't complain about the transfer policy or IDNs, but certainly think it's good that they're involved. Anyone else? Okay, seeing none, we'll now officially move on to AOB. Thank you, Marc. Does anybody have anything for AOB? Go ahead, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, and this is Philippe Fouquart with the ISPCP. On a totally different topic, as you would remember, the UA expert group, within a couple of weeks probably, or anyway by the end of the summer, will be producing their recommendations, having incorporated the comments that they received. And within the ISPCP, we've been thinking about how those recommendations will be treated within the SOACs. Seems that the ccNSO and the GAC are well-equipped in that regard in terms of coordinating the review. Well, not the review. It's not the right term, but you see what I mean. In terms of disseminating these recommendations, and in our case, that would be within the industry, and I mean industry broadly. By nature of the topic, it goes beyond the domain name industry. So we've been thinking about proposing a, and I'm hesitant calling it a standing committee, bear with me. Maybe we need to work on the term. But something of that nature, transverse

across SGs and Cs. And unless you say that between now and the AGM, that it is a really bad idea, we may work on a draft for this. We'd be welcoming your inputs at this stage or later on, on the text. But I thought I'd just float the idea, and for you to consider within the next few weeks. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Okay, great. Thanks, Philippe. We'll certainly take that back. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK

Okay. Thank you, Owen. It's not AOB, but maybe just a little bit of wrap-up, and going back to the discussion we had earlier about the DNS abuse PDP work and prioritization. I'd just like to circle back to the suggestion that perhaps, and Mason, I think this was your comment, that there's a way for us to work together to work on that prioritization for the future work. As I noted in chat and Ashley mentioned, the contracted parties have our respective Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Group DNS abuse working groups. We've got a joint CPH working group. We have started our conversation about what we think the next set of priorities should be. Those conversations really began in earnest at the Contracted Party Summit that took place recently. We certainly have not reached any conclusions, but those conversations have begun. So I think that this is a perfect opportunity for us to put an action item to set up some time in the near future for our groups to come together to share information, share views on what we think the next set of priorities might be. The co-chairs of the contracted party

groups are Reg Levy and Luke Sufor, Chris Disspain and Dennis Tan. So I'm not going to speak for them, but I think that there would be a strong willingness for the contracted parties to engage with the CSG in exactly this topic.

Secondly, I think we should also talk a little bit about, we've got the first three priorities have been identified by the Council, right? We have, obviously, the ADC work. We've got the API/automation/bulk registration topic. We've also got the topic focused on DGAs, right, which is really more of a registry focus. The API topic or PDP would be more focused on registrars. The DGA topic would be more focused on registries. And we haven't had any conclusions to this, but there's been some thought that perhaps instead of doing those two serially or sequenced, that there might be an opportunity to do some staggering or to run those two in parallel, because at least from a contracted party perspective, it's focused on two separate groups. But that raises a resourcing question for other parts of the community. Would there be the capability or capacity to accelerate the overall work of the PDPs to very targeted and narrowly focused, appropriately chartered PDPs, but perhaps to start doing a little bit more work at the same time? Registries on one, registrars on the other, but that does raise questions of staffing, ICANN org resources, resourcing from other parts of the community. Could you potentially run or participate in a couple of PDPs in parallel? That's not a question for today, but it's something that I think we'd like to tease out a little bit. And by doing that, we might be able to get more quickly to some of the future prioritization work. So just

some topics I think that we should pursue a little bit as we get our DNS abuse working groups together at some point in the hopefully near future. Thanks.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thank you, Keith. Do we have anyone else? No other, any other business? Anything for a wrap-up other than thanking everyone? I'm looking forward to continued dialogue and our meeting, which will obviously be the last session of the last day in Bali. Oh, on the beach. I like that. Well, it'll also be Keith and myself stepping down as chair. That'll be our last official function. So yes, on the beach sounds great.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Keith and I will bring the beverages or something.

KEITH DRAZEK

Sounds good, man.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

We'll figure it out.

KEITH DRAZEK

Beer.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Anything else? Oh, Lori, go ahead.

LORI SCHULMAN

I was told that the way to expense it is ICANN87 Asia region meeting, just so you know. Okay? That's been the advice that's been passed on. There you go. I've been here overlapping with your chairmanship, and I think you both did a really admirable job, and I just wanted to say thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Oh, and don't forget Beth as well, too.

KEITH DRAZEK

Yeah.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Even though she's gone to the dark side.

LORI SCHULMAN

We don't talk to Beth anymore.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

All right. Thank you everyone. Unless we have anything else, I think we can go ahead and end this session. And I think some people owe bribes over here to John. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]