

---

ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GNSO: CPH Membership Meeting (1 of 2)  
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

SUE SCHULER: Hello, and welcome to the CPH Membership Meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat by CPH members will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat.

Taking part via audio for CPH members. If you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the main room, please raise your hand in Zoom and, when called upon, unmute your table mic. In the secondary room, please raise your hand in Zoom and go to the standalone mic when called upon.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I'll hand the floor over to Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Hello, everyone. This is Sam Demetriou. I'm the chair of the Registries Stakeholder Group. We have Ashley Heineman over at the other end of the table. She's the chair of the Registrar

---

**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.**

---

Stakeholder Group. This is, for both of us, our first time getting to chair a meeting in person. So, thank you. All right. We're pretty excited.

I want to thank everyone who's here in this room. I want to say hello to and thank everyone who is over in the [Yangtze] room just down the hall, and also extend a warm welcome to all the folks who have dialed in remotely. Thank you guys for being here.

As Sue mentioned, this is a session of the Registries and Registrars Stakeholder Groups, together known as the Contracted Party House. We're prioritizing contributions and discussions from members of the CPH, although these meetings are open to observers from the rest of the community. And if folks have questions, you are welcome to get in the queue. But just know that we're kind of prioritizing input from the CPH members first.

So just a couple of announcements to kick off, lay the rules of the road before we get underway. We have two hour-long meetings at this ICANN meeting. Today is the first one. We'll have another one tomorrow afternoon. And today we are going to start off with a discussion about some of the work that's being done by the GNSO Council Small Team on DNS Abuse.

So I think that's all I've got to open us up. I'll hand it over to Ashley for any opening remarks and so she can introduce our first speaker.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hello, everybody. Yeah, I cannot tell you how excited I am to be face to face with some of you guys. It was really weird for me coming into my job at GoDaddy not having met most of you, particularly in my own side of the house. So it's really awesome to meet you guys face to face for the first time. Not that I didn't get to know you all over the last two plus years.

Anyhoo, without further ado, we're going to talk a bit about the activities that are going on right now in the Council with respect to the Small Group on DNS Abuse. This is your opportunity to engage, ask questions. I encourage you highly to do so because I think this could have impact on our future work.

And not to put Greg on the hot seat, he is a member of this group, so he's going to brief us on what's going on. But I do encourage you all to ask as many questions as you can. And we'll go from there.

So Greg, over to you.

GREG DIBIASE: Hey, everyone. I'm Greg. I'm a Registrar GNSO councilor rep. I think, similar to Sam, I've been a rep for two years, but I think this might be the first time I'm speaking as a councilor rep in a meeting or in person.

---

So one of the things that's been on the GNSO Council's plate for a while is DNS abuse. There's been renewed calls for the GNSO to do something about DNS abuse. What that something is has changed over time. I think at some point, at least, the idea was that they should embark on this big PDP. They should define abuse. Things like that.

We had some reservations about that approach. Before jumping into a big PDP, we wanted to understand what is the problem we're trying to solve, what is in the remit of the GNS, and what would be effective.

So the approach the Council took to start this work off was to form a small team. And the small team had this task of soliciting feedback from the community. So went to the various SOs and ACs and interested parties around the community and just asked open-ended questions. How do you view this issue? What are potential solutions? What could the GNSO do? The first part of this exercise, we collected that feedback and just started analyzing it. Next slide.

Given the scope of the feedback, there was a lot of ideas but there was kind of a general consensus that the efforts should be focused and nimble. Right? We shouldn't engage in this very broad PDP that attempts to define abuse. No one suggested that, but an interesting focus that came up in a lot of these comments

---

was, if there's a PDP, it needs to be focused on a specific issue. We need to have a plan to move fast.

And I think that came from a couple of places. The first one, I think, is really encouraging from a contracted party perspective that there was a lot of hesitation to distract from other work that's going on in the community. Right? So a lot of this “input noted” thing, kind of voluntary efforts that a lot of contract parties have been doing outside the GNSO or in relation to the GNSO that's not strictly policy work. And the fear is if we do this massive PDP, maybe that could suck resources away from something that's been really productive.

And more directly, the DNS Abuse Institute submitted a comment kind of raising the prospect of what are called micro PDPs which are these tightly-scoped PDPs focused on a subject that is specific to something that we know is abuse.

Everyone agrees that malware is abuse. Right? So what if we started with that single subject, tried to tightly scope it, and the community worked on that? And that's something that a lot of people in the community are interested in, and something that has been discussed. So I think those are maybe the two big picture things that gain traction that might be new on people's radar from this group.

And then the second thing we did is that we asked for feedback from Compliance because there's this sense that no one really is

---

sure what is the scope of Compliance authority when it comes to DNS abuse. Right? So we asked this list of questions saying, basically, “Compliance, do you have the tools that you need? What do you think is the scope of your authority here?” Because that gives us a baseline. That helps. If we understand what Compliance can do, that informs what policies may be necessary.

And they were pretty cooperative and gave us pretty clear answers, some of which are pretty interesting. So in response to the question of “do you have the tools you need to enforce the contract” they said, yes, they did. They can enforce the contract as written. However, they note that there are some limits on what the contract says and doesn't say.

For example, the clause in the 2013 RAA ... I'm going to look at my notes to say exactly. I guess I don't have my notes. “Registrars will respond promptly and appropriately to reports of abuse.”

So ICANN's response was, “Yes, it is within our authority to make sure that a response was given. We could even look at a registrar's terms of service. But we can't mandate that specific action be taken.” Right? They can ask contracted parties, “Did you respond and evaluate that response?” But their position was, “Beyond that, we can't say, ‘Okay, now you need to suspend this domain.’” Which I think was interesting and, perhaps, the first time that's been said so specifically.

---

So I think that's just something to consider about some people think that may be a gap in the existing contract. I think that view is reasonable. What to do about that is an open question, if anything. But that's, again, maybe a highlight of something interesting that's coming out of this group.,.

So we're continuing to evaluate the feedback and trying to categorize this feedback as what is within the GNSO's remit, what might make sense for a PDP, or what recommendations the group might make back to Council. So that work will ... Aiming for ICANN75, it may take slightly longer than that but that's the general idea.

But I think it's positive that, I think, we got a lot of feedback and it was across all the community. And there was some interesting ideas, and it wasn't the same old, let's jump into this huge PDP and try to define abuse which may not necessarily be fruitful.

So I think I'll stop there—I've been talking for a while now—and see if there are questions.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

So, my hand is raised in the Zoom. I'm not sure how we're doing this, if I'm managing queue, or who is. I just wanted to ask the question, what is the temperature in the room when you're having these discussions? Do you feel there's still a lot of remaining frustration? Are there folks ...

---

I get the impression that there's less insistence on a PDP. Where do you see the people in the room, anyway? Or even based on the feedback that you've received where folks seem to be putting most of their emphasis?

GREG DIBIASE:

So I would say, in terms of the temperature in the room, it's surprisingly mild. I think people appreciated the opportunity to be heard and discuss these ideas. And I think we've been able to have pretty frank and open conversations about ... And people have been receptive to contracted party concerns. We raised some drawbacks of a PDP, and at least for now I feel like they've been listened to.

So there's certainly interest in this idea of a micro PDP. I don't think anything is really set or defined, and we're going to continue to discuss. But in terms of tone, at least, I've been encouraged and cautiously optimistic that we're actually making some productive steps and not fighting each other yet.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

And in terms of the recommendations, what do you anticipate will be the outcome? A specific action to be taken? Is that your anticipation?



---

**GREG DIBIASE:** So, it'll still go back to the Council. Right? This is just a document for the Council to consider, and there'll be more discussion after that. So I would doubt there will be a very narrow specific recommendation that the Council should take steps. I would think it's going to be more along the lines of, "Here's feedback we received. Here are some interesting ideas. Here are some potential options that Council could pursue to make progress in this area" is my understanding about how ...

And at that point, I think that the broader Council will convene. Because this is still a small team. Right? We haven't heard the perspectives of most of the Council and reaction to what we've been discussing.

**ASHLEY HEINEMAN:** Any other questions? Comments? Thoughts? Sebastien, please go ahead.

**SEBASTIEN DUCOS:** Hi. With Greg, I also participate in that small team. I have to say I was, up until then, not a direct actor of the work that we're doing on DNS abuse. I was doing it from afar. I was following but not being an active part of it. And I have to say that I was very happily surprised to see that we're able to sit at the discussion table. It's only a small team. It's only a few people. But as Greg stated, with reasonable expectations.

---

Now, I think that we as CPH did extend an olive branch. Through the DNS Abuse Institute and the registry comments, at least, we extended a big olive branch and did open the possibility of a PDP, albeit a micro PDP.

But on the other side, too, I haven't heard anything that was immediately crazy. There's a few things that needed to be redirected and explained in more detail to explain why it wasn't immediately feasible. But I haven't heard anything in terms of definitions, in terms ...

So I think that it's a good time. It's a discussion that has taken a long time and a lot of effort. But we are finding a maturity as a community, and I think it's a good time to put an effort into it to actually discuss together, to decide [with this] and bring that together.

Again, this is from somebody who hasn't spent as much time as most of you have on it, but I was really encouraged. I was a bit fearful, but I was really encouraged [by the tone and] the depth of the conversation.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Seb. Sam.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Ashley. I just put my hand up to drive people's attention to something Brian Cimbolic has added to the chat. Just as we're having these conversations about what the small team is identifying. The Public Safety Working Group is ...

Well, in an, unfortunately, timing coincidence, the GAC right now is having a discussion on DNS abuse at this very same time. And the Public Safety Working Group has raised a similar observation about what feedback Compliance gave to you guys about there being a gap in the contracts, exactly as you described. So this is, I think the point here is that it's not isolated to just one discussion. It's now getting some play in other parts of the community as well.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Sam. Alan.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks very much. I suppose one of the things I just wanted to talk about was maybe the Registries Stakeholder Group's submission, specifically, to the GNSO Small Team as well. I think it's important that we are, #1, pointing that we love the concept of the targeted PDP—that is, the narrowly-scoped, properly-enforced—so that we have clear guidelines. I'm not going to go into, specifically, what Greg was talking about there, but I think it is important. We have a lot on our plates at the moment, and if

---

we're going to do this quickly and effectively, it needs to be properly scoped.

And I appreciate that the term micro PDP has been put out there at the moment, and I think we should definitely take a step back from using the term micro, as we know adding any words to PDPs in this day and age is not a good thing. So I think we just need to think of it as a clearly-scoped on a properly-enforced scope that is narrowly targeted to deal with a specific set of issues so that we can, all for the good of the community, work in good faith, but also quickly through that point.

So that was kind of the point of the Registry submission, that once it's properly scoped then, absolutely, we are fully supportive of the multistakeholder model and its ability to deal with this problem. So, I just wanted to get that on the record. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks. And that's interesting. I don't think we've yet had a conversation, as the Registrars, anyway, with respect to what the Registry submission was. So that was helpful to get some insight into that.

Next up is Greg. Please.

---

**GREG DIBIASE:** Real quick. I was just going to note this as an example. Sebastien mentioned that a lot of people in the group were maybe surprisingly receptive to some of the feedback that contracted parties gave. And just one example of this came into my head. I think it's worth mentioning.

Some of the submissions were framing bulk registrations as, like, this only abuse. If someone has bulk registrations, that's abuse. We brought back to the group, “No, here are the use cases in which bulk registrations are a part of our business model, and legitimate customers register domains in bulk quite often.” And I just think there was acceptance of that, and people understood and didn't just automatically push back. So, just giving some color, I guess, on what Sebastien was describing.

**ASHLEY HEINEMAN:** Thank you, Greg. Volker.

**VOLKER GREIMANN:** Yes, thank you. I'm still a little bit foggy about what the scope of the PDP will be. But I would be very cautious in framing that scope to make it as clear as possible to prevent any scope creep. And also, anything that seems innocent at the time when written into a PDP, or even as a result of the small team deliberations, can be used as a basis for something incredibly ludicrous down the road.

---

So we should be careful about what we as contracted parties agree to when we look at the results of the small team, and also on the scope of the potential PDP that's coming from that. And one of the barriers where we should always try to say “stop” is when it comes to any suggestions about content for contracts.

GREG DIBIASE:

And just real quick to give some background on the Registrar position. We still have reservations about even a micro PDP. We've seen, within the EPDP, for example, how something that's “tightly scoped” can expand. So, I think our position is, still, we have reservations and concerns about that approach. But we're willing to discuss and think about this further, I would say, is our position at the moment.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

And probably, even to add to that, consider the advantages of perhaps leading such a discussion so we're not constantly having to react to it.

I see a Greg ... I see a Volker hand. I'm assuming those are old. So Michele, you're up next. And I only see half of your face. Go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

There, you can see more of my face, Madam chair. I think, in common with a lot of you, I do share concerns about scope. And I

---

also would share some concerns around ICANN’s general ability to execute on pretty much anything. I mean, the timelines around PDPs have been notoriously slow. The EPDP dragged on for three to four times what it should have used in terms of time.

However, I do understand the frustration. The issue and one of the bigger issues is 3.18 in the 2013 RAA. The language there is very, very fluffy. It's open to a lot of different interpretations. So while I suspect that many of the participants in this call are those who are actively engaged in a lot of the DNS abuse or anti-DNS abuse efforts within ICANN and elsewhere, probably are trying their best to do the right thing.

The way it's worded at the moment, if somebody wants to basically ignore, whatever, all sorts of abuse on the Internet that's through the DNS, they can do so because there's nothing in the language there that forces them to do anything. It's very, very open to interpretation. As long as they respond appropriately, [it] is not defined. I see there are people talking about this in the chat.

So I think this is something that could be looked up. The problem, of course, is how on earth do you keep the scope narrow enough that you don't end up with a massive pile-on from all sorts of other interested parties? Things like, as Greg mentioned, this “bulk registration” which, to the best of my knowledge, has still to be defined. Thank you.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Michele. I'm going to do a quick pause on the queue because Zoe has some, maybe ... Zoe, do you have something or no?

ZOE BONYTHON: I just had a comment to read out from the chat. and that is from Brian. He said, "I would note that ICANN has recently been much clearer about content being outside of its remit. There's probably 3 blogs in the last 6 months that specifically points to the bylaws and says in no uncertain terms 'ICANN is not the content police.'" Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Zoe, in lieu of Brian. Back to the queue. Michele, I'm assuming that's old. Maxim, you're up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking as one of those who participates in that small group, I need to underline that constant, I'd say, speeches of no Compliance doesn't do a thing. We need more. And when I remind



---

them that the Compliance is just a binary option of following the text of contract or not following the text of contract, there is no grades in between. And that if you want Compliance to do more? To do what, exactly? Because Compliance is about following the text of contracts, not about following wishes.

And what I hear there is that somehow the methods are going to be created where some demand for putting sides down fast is going to demand. And when I asked, “Do we understand that the current set of requirements formally will require a registrar to shut down the social network because a single participant of that social network placed some piece of malware there. Or not necessarily the registrar, but maybe a registry forcing the registrar to follow the same policies,” there was no answer.

So I think we need to be cautious because on one hand, we need to show that we're doing the right thing. But only other, it looks like it's an attempt to put a leg into the closing door to have some more space to do things they want. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Maxim. And just my own individual perspective on that is that if we entertain any of these ideas, we would have to be very clear in saying that any changes to our contracts still wouldn't be an opportunity to tell us how to take action or disrupt or mitigate. That would still be up to us as companies.

---

Next in the queue is James.

JAMES BLADEL:

Hi, Ashley. It was actually your last point that I was going to build on. So first off, thanks to Greg and Sebastien for working on this group and for representing our interests there. I know this is one of those things where, personally, I agree in the broad strokes. But I get very concerned when we get into the details because what's being characterized as a flaw in 2013 RAA, for those who were there ...

Michele and Volker and some of the other folks remember that this was actually a very, very delicate compromise that we arrived at so that we could take something in the contract about abuse without getting overly prescriptive. And I think the concern then, and it is now, is that Compliance could put us in a position where Compliance believes that a registrar didn't take action when it should have, or a registrar took action X when it should have taken action Y.

And I think that sort of second guessing of anti-abuse procedures not only slows down the process and puts a lot of contractual obligations in the way, but also is kind of happening out in plain sight for bad actors to learn and to tweak their practices.

I'm encouraged by the progress that you've made to date. I'm a little skeptical about how we go from here. And even if we do

---

agree on the scope of a very narrow PDP ... And I agree with my friend Alan down there who spent three years with me on an expedited PDP that just putting “micro” in front of something doesn't necessarily make it so.

But even if we scope it correctly, we have to be very cognizant of the outcome. And it's going to be employed maybe in unanticipated ways.

Just a funny example. We thought it was very sensible to check WHOIS records against UPU postal standards for mailing addresses until we started getting flagged for people who were spelling out their state names—North Carolina, Arizona, New York—because the UPU for the United States only accepts two-letter abbreviations. So somebody, a very bored somebody, apparently flagged tens of thousands of records for us for ICANN Compliance that we had to go through and manually fix because the address said North Carolina instead of NC. It's kind of funny, but it's an example of how Compliance can take a nugget of a contract clause and just run off the field with it.

But again, I think the work should continue. I just want us to be very cognizant of those pitfalls. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, James.

---

JAMES BLADEL: It's good to see everybody.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah. I think you raise a good point, and I'm going to echo, I think it was Reg—perhaps many of you, if we had down any path, whether it's PDP or contractual changes, the intention here is to get at the bad actors, to get at those who are actually not doing their job. And we need to communicate somehow to ICANN that this is not an opportunity to nitpick everybody on ... Not to say silly.

I don't want to be pedantic here. But if this is intended to give ICANN the tools to go after the bad actors, that's how it should be used and not just ... I won't even say it because I'm getting on the borderline insulting.

So I'll stop there. I think the point was made. Next up is Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Hi. Thanks, everyone. I want to build on Volker's and others' concerns about the scope of the PDP. One of the reasons I think we might be willing to agree to this is to take some of the heat out of the discussion and work on a proposal, like you said, Ashley, that, "Here is some of the abuse."

And one of my concerns is that even if we succeed in narrowly tailoring the scope, that discussion in itself will be rancorous, and

---

IPC and BC and others might say, “Well, we were going to do this PDP but we didn't get the scope we wanted, so the whole thing is crap. And we're going to continue to have problems with it because the contracted parties wouldn't agree to a scope we want. So we'll go ahead with this, but we're not going to take any of the heat out of the conversation. And we're going to continue to go to governments and other parties.”

So I think my warning there is about managing expectations if we do go down this.

And the second point I wanted to make ... And I might have misunderstood Greg about something you said, that there was surprised that if ICANN Compliance said, “You should take down this name,” that contracted parties needn't to follow that. And I think we have to draw a distinction in Compliance's role. So, Compliance's role is not to combat DNS abuse. Compliance's role is to make sure, strictly, that we only we adhere to what's in our contract and not fight abuse.

So maybe someday ICANN would say, “Contracted parties, you must take down this name and take on the liability inherent with it.” But that wouldn't be a Compliance thing to do. Compliance is just, “Are you complying with the contract?” It's not, “What's happening with DNS abuse?” I hope that's helpful.

---

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah. Go ahead, Greg.

GREG DIBIASE: Yeah. Maybe the hypothetical that was raised would help explain what Compliance’s position was. So, the hypothetical was raised: you receive an abuse report. The contracted party responds and then says, “Okay, I see this is malware but I’m not going to do anything about it.” Can Compliance do anything? And the answer from Compliance was, “No, we can't do anything.”

So I think it was specific to where ... I don't think the idea was that Compliance gets a new power to just go out and pick [inaudible] at random. But in these investigations where they receive a report and they’re analyzing this response, they could close the loop with regards to that specific complaint if everyone agreed, which is a different topic. It is difficult, but if somehow everyone agreed this is malware, there would be an obligation to mitigate that however the registrar chooses.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Greg. I’m assuming old hand from Kurt. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much, Ashley. Just a very brief point. I see Brian has actually made a similar point in the chat. And, Ashley,

---

somewhat echoing what you said earlier, as well. I'm going to use something that I've said once or twice in the past few days. And that is, when we are going through this process, we must think of ICANN like the bouncer at the door to the club. They set the rules for entry, but they also set the rules of good conduct within.

It is not a best practice. It is the minimum standard that they need to focus on. And that is the thing that we need to be talking about. ICANN, to get the bad the bad actors that we keep talking about, to ensure that they have the power to do something about that, we set the minimum rule for entry, not the maxim best practice.

And that is one of those key things in the scoping of this particular matter. And I think that is a very important line that we as contracted parties would look to. So I just wanted to echo that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Alan. Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Ashley. As we're discussing scope, I wanted to delve into something you had mentioned, Greg, and get your views about this. You mentioned that there had been some comments received about, in lieu of a big PDP, about doing some work on specific items. And I think we—many of us in this room and many of us who've been following this conversation—read the submission by the DNS Abuse Institute. And that envisioned

---

individual work efforts on a topic like malware, a topic like phishing.

So I was just wondering if the small team has started to discuss whether they think that is a good approach or not, if they've talked about maybe what some of those topics might be, if that's gotten any traction. Or if it's just one of the ideas that's swirling around.

GREG DIBIASE:

I would say that approach that the DNS Abuse outlines, starting with these malware/pharming/phishing something like that—starting with malware—the things that are clearly labeled as security threats is the default things they're considering. There hasn't been, really, a specific alternative subject that could be narrowly scoped that's gained traction other than just general feedback from pretty much everyone that whatever we do, it needs to be tightly scoped enough to be able to move forward and we don't get bogged down in some unless PDP.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks. Volker, please.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Thank you. Two small points. With regard to the floor, I generally agree that I think a floor of things that a registrant should be



---

expected to take care of is probably not a bad idea. However, from recent experiences, we know that reporters tend to mislabel their reports by whatever seems to suit their purposes.

For example, a fake shop started being labeled as phishing with no evidence that actual phishing is going on, simply because we say that phishing is part of the DNS abuse and, therefore, we'd better take care of that.

And as soon as we define a floor, certain things that have to be done and have to be taken care of, we can expect hundreds of thousands of the complaints to Compliance telling them that we're not doing what [the floor is simply] because they start misidentifying or relabeling their complaints as what we have agreed to as the floor. That's one point.

The other point is, with regards to other venues and pleasing the IPC and BC by agreeing to their scope, we should not be delusional in expecting that they won't do that anyway. They will use every venue available to them to get what they want, regardless of what we do, regardless of what we agree to. We could give them the entire arm and they will ask for the other arm on the next day.

So we should not be influenced by any promises or expectations that if we just give them enough, they will say, "Finally, you have done everything we wanted. Now we will go away." This is wishful thinking. It will never happen. There will never be an end to it, and

---

we should only agree to that which we feel we can agree to because that's something that makes sense to us, not because we feel it's politically expedient or helpful to the cause, or whatever. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

I think that's a fair point, Volker. And I think that's what we're trying to ascertain at this point. But that's a very good point to be made. And I think it's fair to say, at least based on experience, that we are not going to ever satiate some communities. That's just a fact.

But at the end of the day, I think if we identify a problem ourselves or an area that we can shore up a bit without making things overly complex and difficult for ourselves but will have some value, why not give it a go?

Reg, you're up.

REG LEVY:

Thanks. This is Reg Levy from Tucows. I like the idea of keeping this out of a PDP because it means that we get to control it a bit better and harder. But I want to make sure that whatever reasonable action ends up being ... However it gets defined is ... I haven't decided whether it should be broadly or narrowly focused, but very carefully, regardless, so that it allows for the

---

right kinds of actions and not the wrong kinds of actions, which I know is stupid and circular.

But for example, as a reseller model registrar, I might not suspend the domain but rather work with a reseller to mitigate a larger issue. So, if their account has been compromised and there's a number of compromised domains, I'm not going to just spend a bunch of old domains that are otherwise good. I'm going to work with the reseller to resolve it.

So I don't know how long that's going to take, but it's not going to be within an hour of receipt of the report. And there will be action. I am working. I'm not doing nothing. But it's not necessarily action I can show or prove in any grand gesture to ICANN. And, as far as the reporter is concerned, "Well, the abuse is still up." Yeah, it is. We're working on it.

So, I just want to make sure that our definitions are carefully drafted. Otherwise, I support this wholeheartedly.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Reg. And I'm cutting the queue at Alan. So, Maxim and Alan, if we could keep our remarks on the shorter side so we can move on. Thank you.

---

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Another thing I forgot to mention to add to the situation. IPC/BC, they don't want the process. They want the results. And also, they want it fast.

And when I mention that your expectations, that the legal decisions and decisions to kill the domain or not illegal because there are consequences and liability are made by legal advisors. And expectation to have online legal advisors available in the midnight of the [inaudible] is a bit too far and it costs a fortune.

So we need to ensure that whatever we speak about, it first has safeguards to prevent a situation where mass extortion is going to be held like someone's website is broken in, someone puts there a single page with a link to malware and the total business is destroyed. Yeah, because formally it's malware. Yeah, why don't we kill with the domain? They're selling notebooks or boots. Who cares?

And the second thing, we need to understand that whatever we agree to, it's going to stay in our contracts forever. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Okay, thank you very much, Maxim. Alan, you're up. And you're last.

---

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you very much. Apologies if I end this on a bit of an Evita moment. But I've heard it a lot in the last while where people are saying and referring to other stakeholder groups, to other people expecting this of us. And to be perfectly honest, I'd like us to think a little bit more on what we expect of ourselves as the Contracted Party House.

A lot of this conversation is based on—and this is me personally speaking—based on doing what is right. And that, I think, is something that we as a Contracted Party House should wholeheartedly get behind. It's not because we're being told or being pressurized to do these things. It's because we believe that we should be doing these things.

And I think that's super, super important for us to understand. If we are in this process, we talk about it amongst ourselves and we do it with our motives in mind for the right reasons, not because we're reacting to other people. Yes, we will absolutely involve them, and we will seek to get input. But us, as a Contracted Parties House, should be doing this.

And as I said, that's my personal view. I would implore people to think of it from that point of view at this point. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you very much, Alan. I think those were good closing words for this conversation. And just to note that this is just the ... Well,

---

I won't say it's the beginning of the conversation. This is a continuation of a conversation.

And thank you very much, Greg, for giving us an update on the status of what's happening in the small group. We will continue to follow and monitor, as well as continue our conversations on this in general, whether it's as the Registrar Stakeholder Group sub-team on DNS abuse, the Registry subgroup, or the collective CPH subgroup on DNS abuse.

So I will shut up and turn it back over to Sam, I believe, for the next agenda item.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

All right. Thanks very much, Ashley. And just to add my thanks as well, both to Greg and also to the other folks who are doing the hard work on the small team—Maxim, Seb, everyone who's been involved in that. Thank you guys for all the work there. And thanks for keeping us apprised.

All right, before we dive into the next item, we do have a bit of a programming shift for you. Sebastien has noted that he'd like us to spend a couple minutes talking about the SSAD prioritization.

So since we don't really need to go into much detail about prepping for the PSWG meeting—we can touch on that in five minutes during tomorrow's call—I'm going to spend maybe five minutes teeing up the GDS Summit updates. And then we'll save

---

the last portion of the call for Seb, and we'll turn it over to him to lead that discussion. All right.

So Zoe, if you'll go to that slide. Apologies if this is repetitive for some folks. I know we covered it in the Registries on one of our recent bi-weekly calls, but I do just want to remind folks about where we are at this point in the process of planning for a GDS Global Domains and Strategy Summit for 2022. ICANN staff is working on finding both a date and a location for that. And right now, they're targeting the end of October, maybe beginning of November time frame.

As a reminder, the ICANN75 meeting is early in the year. It's going to be in the middle of September. So this would take place after that.

What we need from CPH members at this point. We need volunteers to work on building the agenda for that summit. It's likely going to be a two-and-a-half-day event. It'll open with a social cocktail hour on one evening, two full days of discussion sessions, and then maybe a half-day either of meetings or carryover from the agenda that we have.

So we need folks to join in the Planning Team. The Planning Team builds the agenda. We get input from the different stakeholder groups. We come up with the topics that we want to cover and we want to dive into, just as CPH along with ICANN staff. So we've

---

sent out that call for volunteers to everyone who's previously been involved on the Planning Team that we're firing it up again.

If anyone hasn't previously been involved in that work, this is a great way if you're new to the ICANN space ... Or if you only casually do policy stuff but you're interested in Registry and Registrar operations, this a great opportunity to get involved in some of the work that our stakeholder groups do. So let us know—myself, Ashley, Zoe, and Sue—if you're interested in getting involved in that work.

We're going to be targeting the first or second week, probably—I think it's the second week in July for the kickoff call of that Planning Committee. So we'll get that scheduled, and just hoping to get some more folks involved in that process.

I see him from Jim. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Sam. I believe the call for volunteers that went out was actually an opt-out option. It was the existing mailing list from last time. So if you got that e-mail and you don't want to participate, you opt out. Otherwise, I think you're automatically in again.

SAM DEMETRIOU: But don't opt out.



**JEFF NEUMAN:** Hi, a question. So in the past, the GDD Summit was usually around, like, an ICANN Board retreat or something where ICANN Board members were able to come. Do we know, are they trying to plan something like that as well?

**SAM DEMETRIOU:** Thanks, Jeff. That's a really great question. I know Andee is in the Zoom room. Andee Hill from ICANN staff. She's the leader planning the summit, so I'm basically just buying time to see if she can respond right now and put it into the chat for us. So she's confirming that, yes, they are trying to get Board members to join, given their availability and ability to travel at that point in time.

**JEFF NEUMAN:** Okay, thanks. And if people want to talk about subsequent rounds or whatever, if that's an agenda item, I'll put my name down. But if not, then, no. I'm just kidding. I'll put my name down. That's fine.

**SAM DEMETRIOU:** Awesome. I appreciate that, Jeff. Michele.

---

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. My simple query is, for those of us who would be looking at traveling from overseas, we'd need to know in advance whether ICANN will require us to waive all our rights, yet again, and force us to sign a ridiculous waiver to attend the event in person. Because I could just save my company money now if I knew in advance. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right. Thanks, Michele. I think the message was delivered loud and clear on that one.

All right, does anyone have any other questions on GDS Summit planning? We'll have a really great discussion getting started on planning some of those topics, like I said, maybe the second week in July. We already got one volunteer from today. So thanks, Catherine Merdinger.

And like I said, if anyone's interested in getting involved, please just let us know. The more the merrier. Thanks for your time. All right. Jeff included.

All right. With that, the last item—the last 11 minutes by my clock—Sebastien, I will hand it over to you.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you, Sam. So, this is Sebastien Ducos who's been leading the small team on the SSAD ODA review. Tomorrow at the GNSO

---

Council meeting, or during the GNSO Council meeting, we will be discussing prioritization of that work.

And for full context, we are asking staff to help us scope the SSAD Light or a light version of the SSAD recommendation or the tool that they designed around the recommendations for the ODA. That work is scheduled, at this stage, to take about six weeks. And that work comes in conflict against work that was scheduled for the CZDS work that was scheduled for enhancements in the EBERO tool and the SubPro ODP work .

Now, after discussing this with staff in more details, they suggested to puts the CZDS and the EBERO work on ice in order to be able to move staff and work on the SSAD with some disruption to—I have to be clear— some disruption to the SubPro ODP the sense that, particularly on the technical team, some of the people that are working with the SubPro ODP might have to be moved to the SSAD, at least partially. I’m thinking Ashwin, for example, who presented yesterday the solution that they're looking into.

But I understand, also, that that should be minimal impact. And in particular, they shouldn't disrupt what is planned for between now and ICANN75 in terms of discussion, etc.

Now, our position up until that negotiation was had was to say it's not for us to decide priorities. I say our position as Registries. I’m not quite sure where the Registrars were sitting there. But was to

---

say it's not for us to decide on priorities. That's for staff and the Board to figure out, even if they reached out to the Council to have our opinion on it.

I just want to make sure that we are okay with the current thinking, again putting on ice those two projects that are less in our purview anyway, and going on with then the SSAD Light scoping, keeping the SubPro ODP going as much as possible.

Sorry. I can't put it in any better context. I'm happy to field any questions if anybody has any. But I just wanted to make sure that I had the temperature of the room for us to be able to go with that tomorrow. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks so much so, Seb. We have a hand from Jeff. Go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Seb. A lot of us weren't able to hear that presentation, so I've heard conflicting things on this. Sorry, my name is Jeff Neuman. I'm in the Registries Stakeholder Group and represent certain people in the Registrars. But I also happen to be the ODP liaison for SubPro from the GNSO.

I think ICANN's being a little evasive on the answers that they're giving with respect to the delays in SubPro. They use terms like

---

“we're not putting our pens down on SubPro.” But to me that doesn't tell us whether there is going to be a delay or not. Personally and on behalf of the Registry I represent, I think we need a bit more certainty as to what exactly will be the impact on the SubPro ODP. That's number one.

And then number two, okay, great, we get a design. And let's say there's minimal impact. What then? Because you know the next thing they're going to do is say, “Okay now. To build it, we need X amount of dollars and Y amount of time. And then that's going to have Z effect on SubPro.” So I think we need to ...

If we have an opinion—I know I personally do—but if we as a group have an opinion as to what the longer-term priorities are, we need to make those known. For example, if we feel like I feel, and we may not, I feel like SubPro should then, once the ODP is done, go to the Board. The Board should vote on it as soon as it can. And it should go immediately to implementation.

We then need to think down the road. Okay, we have this design document. Fantastic. What do we as the Contracted Party House want the priority to be, not just with this design document but for the build out? Because that's the next question. And I think we should be upfront. If we have a feeling on this, we should be upfront about it because, once this is done, that's when the Non-Contracted Parties House is going to go, “Okay, now let's build it.” So we need to be prepared for that.

---

I think it's not sufficient to just look at this issue as only being the design document. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Sam, can I answer that before the other hands? Just a couple of the points that Jeff raised.

On how much disruption to the ODP, I agree with you fully. I certainly don't have the details. I understand from Karen Lentz—but it's only through the rest of the team, I haven't spoken to Karen directly—that in her assessment, the disruption will be minimum. For you to have that discussion with her and get those details as liaison, because I wasn't able, it's a fair enough point.

In terms of future scheduling, it's also a fair enough point. But let's keep the scope to what we're doing right now. All we're trying to figure out between now and ICANN75, if possible, is if we were to reduce the scope of the SSAD into this lighter version, what it would mean in terms of cost, etc., in order to give the tools for other decision points at that point to be taken.

This doesn't mean that there is immediately the rest of the work to be done. I fully agree, in any case, if anything happens, the future steps on it. If any, it won't be before 2023 after the SubPro ODP is completed.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Seb. We have a bit of a queue. I see Maxim, Kurt, and Jeff. But this is the three-minute warning—not for this topic, but for the whole session. So keep it tight, folks.

Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we need to remind that for the last year's GNSO Council constantly sent comments on financial plans that, “Please, properly staff policy support.” Actually, making decisions of how many persons to hire, etc., are obligations of the CEO of ICANN. And we ask the managerial decisions to be made, but someone is paid for that. It's Göran. And just to hear excuse next time that, “Oh, you did the wrong choice.” And that's why we just slipped another half a year. It's not very nice. Thanks.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Maxim. Kurt and then Jeff.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Sam. I'll probably say this inartfully. I wrote a letter to Philippe stating our position on this and, at that time, thought I spent too many hours on this task. And I'm amazed at the amount of oxygen that this issue has taken up in this meeting, whether this will cause a six-week disruption or an eight-week disruption. And what is the next ... And all sorts of speculation.

---

This is ICANN's and the Board's business to manage their workload. And should they build this SSAD Light? Sure they should, but they shouldn't slip any other schedules, and they shouldn't come to the community for permission to slip other schedules in order to build this. So if they slip the ODP schedule, they can explain that to the Board and the community. This really isn't an excuse.

So go ahead and do the work you're supposed to do, but let's not noodle on six-week delay. Just do the work you're supposed to do. So I would ...

I didn't put that well, but I would urge us to try to drop this issue and just get on with life and another important work.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Kurt. Jeff, last word on this.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks. And I want to take that last part that Kurt said, and I think that is our point. That it's your job to manage your priorities and by us telling you that we want you to move forward with SSAD Light, it's not appropriate to ask us to delay other things. It's our expectation that you move on SubPro and figure out how to do that and SSAD Light. It's not appropriate for you to ask us to delay anything else. That's our point, and I'm good if we say that.



---

SAM DEMETRIOU:

All right. Thanks, everyone, for the input on this. We are just at time. I want to just close with a couple of quick, again, programming notes for the rest of this week.

Immediately following this session, in 30 minutes' time at the next session block, the folks on the contracted party side who have been working on the amendments to the Registry Agreement and the registrar Accreditation Agreement to do with RDAP SLAs. We're going to hold a meeting of the Negotiating Team. ICANN staff is not going to be there. As the Negotiating Team, we're going to be ironing out two remaining outstanding items and what we want to propose back to ICANN.

But then the rest of that session is going to be open to any of the other Contracted Party House members who want to dial in. If anyone has questions, if anyone wants updates on the process and the timeline, we're going to have all of our folks who've been on the Negotiating Team available to take those questions, to provide updates, to get folks up to speed as you guys would like to.

It's in a pretty small room downstairs, so if you're not on the Negotiating Team, please feel free to dial in over Zoom and ask any questions or bring anything to those discussions that you'd like. So we want to extend that welcome to the other CPH members.

---

And then, like we said, the second part of this session tomorrow, we're going to be covering a number of the other policy topics that are going on, including Transfer Policy PDP. Donna and Jeff are going to give an update on this RDAP Amendment. For anyone who can't make the call today, we'll cover it then. We're also going to talk about it IDNs and a handful of other things. So we hope to see you all back here or in the other rooms and on the Zoom rooms.

Again tomorrow, we're also going to have our CPH Abuse Outreach Session tomorrow, which I think is going to be a really great one. So I hope to see a lot of you there.

And before we close, I just want to wish Owen a happy belated birthday, and extend a warm congratulations to Tony Award Winner, Jeff Neuman. Pretty cool, pretty cool.

All right. Thanks so much, folks. We'll see you soon.

ZOE BONYTHON: This session is now closed. You can stop the recording. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**