ICANN80 | PF – GNSO: RySG Membership Work Session
Tuesday, June 11, 2024 – 10:45 to 12:15 KGL

SUE SCHULER: Hello, and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group membership meeting. My name is Sue and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand on Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

I'll now hand the floor over to Samantha Demetriou.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Sue. This is Samantha Demetriou, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I want to thank everyone for being here today, and especially thanks to the folks who have joined remotely who aren't in attendance at the meeting here in Kigali.

If you're logged into the Zoom room (and I would encourage everyone to do that), you can see the agenda that we've put together for today. We're going to start out with our colleague Dennis Chang from ICANN Org. he is going to walk through some thinking about how registries can report their plans regarding their implementation of the registration data policy to ICANN. This is a topic that came up for discussion during

the contracted party summit about one month ago. So this is a follow-on to those discussions. We'll have an update from our councilors on relevant GNSO Council topics, including anything that they need the membership's input and guidance on. We'll have an update on the status of the ongoing data-processing specification negotiations. We have a few administrative items, and then the last thing (and we'll also have someone from ICANN Org joining us for this) is just thinking through the topic of cyber incident reporting for gTLD registries and whether that is something that we want to consider further and discuss further at future meetings.

So that's what we're looking at today. We have 90 minutes. Is there anything that we haven't put on the agenda today that folks who are here think we should cover during our time?

Okay, then with that, I think we can dive right in. And with that, I will turn it over to Dennis. Thank you for being here, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Sam. Hello, everyone. Let me see a show of hands of who was at the CP Summit, the last roundtable session. Let me see you raise your hand.

Okay, thank you. So for some, this may be a new topic. At the roundtable session where we sort of [have an unconference-like] methodology, we ask questions about, or we ask you to bring up, anything that you have in mind.

And one of the topics that came up was a registry operator transition plan, the plan which you use to communicate to the registrar. And there was a desire by some registry operators to submit that to ICANN Org. and the question was, we would like to send this to you. It's not obligated. There's no requirement to do so, but we would like to send it to you. How should we do? That was the question that was posed to me.

So I thought about ways that could be done. Now, keep in mind there is no requirement with consensus policy. Policy obligation has nothing about registry operators having to send their plans to the ICANN Org. of course you would need that plan and you have to communicate that to the registrars, but there is no obligation to send it to ICANN Org. so let's start there.

So knowing that, I want to ask a follow-up question. Who among you here can tell me why you feel the need to send this plan to ICANN Org? i know you're sending it to the registrar. That is a business need and that is a requirement, and you're doing that. And I've heard from registrars here that, "Yes, I'm getting those plans from the registry operator, their instructions to me, and that's going very well." And so my first question is, based on understanding the need from the registry operator side, maybe we can go further. You have a … Go ahead.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Dennis. Jeff has his hand up in Zoom. I think I expect to respond to this question. So, Jeff, over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. And sorry I can't be there in person. I think that the desire to send it to ICANN is … If we decide, for example, to go thin, then our reporting to ICANN, our monthly reports and things like that, are going to be different. And so it's just an understanding that we're not going to be out of compliance if we're no longer submitting the exact same data that we were submitting for the past ten years or whatever. So that was one of the thoughts that had occurred to me. And of course we're not going to be escrowing that data. So those are some of the things that, like, I said, had me thinking.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Jeff. Good point. Anybody else?

GORDON DICK: This is Gordon Dick from Nominet. With our EBERO provider hat on, one of the concerns we've got is looking at a scenario where you get escrow data and not knowing whether that data is fully complete because you don't know what the data policy is of the registry. You just EBERO it. And from that perspective, it's going to be quite critical to know how to then deal with placeholder data that you have to deal with under an EBERGO perspective as well.

DENNIS CHANG: Very good point. Thank you. Point number two. Go ahead, Beth.

BETH BACON: So I think from what we've heard from registrars is that this would be super valuable to them. And I think registries are … The driving motivation is to be helpful to them because they have to do a lot of work here. So I think whatever we can do to help the registrars make this smooth is in all of our best decisions. I think the best path forward is to identify with the registrars what information would be helpful, and then figure out the best way to collate that and share it.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Beth. Yeah, I plan to talk to the registrars also about what would be helpful and what their expectations may be. But I come here first to understand because it is your transition plan, registry operators' transition plan, which you are developing and conveying to the registrars in the first place.

So I think I heard two things: the compliance aspect (you want to make sure there's no surprise to Contractual Compliance), and, number two, from the EBERO service provider … And by the way, we have to work together, and we are, as part of this implementation activity, working with the EBERO and all the data escrows to get prepared.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks. And as we have Rick in the queue.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. I just wanted to clarify that what I would think would be submitted would not be so much the transition plan but the selected

data model that the registry operator was going to pick for a particular TLD, which is close to, but different than, the transition plan. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Rick. Yeah, I am thinking about it as a transition plan that includes everything that you would need to communicate to the registrars. And I think for me that is the important point. And if you know the policy, there is no set models, if you will, or manual models that have been predefined for you to choose from. It is up to the registry operators working with the registrars to define those cases where the ["mays'] occur and how you, based on your situation, can define that and go forward.

So I got a copy of the registration plan from someone so that I can look at it (what it is that you are communicating to the registrars, and I thought that was pretty well done and clear.

So number one, just to reiterate that ICANN Org has no expectation because it is not obligated to receive this transition plan. But if you did send it to us, yes, it would be interesting. And right now my current plan is sort of the minimum effort that may be required to facilitate submission of your transition plan.

So here's what I thought of. So what is the situation today? What are the process that you're using today, the tools that you're using today? And the answer is we have what we call name NSP. All registry operators have an account. And when you want to send us anything for the record … I mean, you are sending it to me individually, and I'm sure you're doing that with your account managers, having that exchange with the

ICANN Org or a normal course of business, but if you want it to send it over for ICANN Org, then you would be sending it through NSP.

So my thought was this: do that. Send it through the NSP. And how you do that is you would open a general inquiry case with a title registry operator transition plan, and attach your document. And I think the document that you would be attaching is the [go] document, finished and completed and that was sent to the registrar. So if you would like to attach it and send it through the NSP and our colleagues in the global support, we'll immediately acknowledge and close the case.

So it's in the record, it's in the system. And you delivered it to us. But I wanted to make sure there's no expectation that there is a team at ICANN Org that are expecting this, reviewing this, or giving you advice, certainly not in terms of approval, because that's not our role. It's a communication between the registry operator and registrar that you're conducting business. And yes, it would be interesting to know, if I wanted to know, hey, there is some question came up about your organization, about the transition model, what data items, or whatnot. Then it may be convenient to see if there is a transition plan that was submitted and see what your thoughts were.

And as the plans go … And this is what I would expect too: that you don't have just, like, one plan when you're communicating with the registrars regularly, and you may have a preliminary plan that you communicated. You may have communication in phases, right? So it's multiple plans. And you may change that.

So let me make sure that everybody has the same understanding on the consensus policy from 21st of August, this year, 2024, to the 21st of August of 2025, next year. For that one-year duration, the policy requirement states you may be compliant to the new registration data policy, the new policy, or you may be compliant to the existing interim policy, or you may go ahead and perform in components of both in varying phases.

So it is very, very flexible to facilitate your way of doing business. And the implementation team with the support of the IRT have designed this purposely this way, recognizing that every business, every registry operator, and certainly registrars has a different way of doing business, and this is a significant transition and we wanted to make sure that we make it as easy as possible to fit your business model and your needs.

So in terms of compliance, if we hear that there is a question or issue about transition, then we will take the typical case. I mean, if somebody says, “Hey, why is this registry operator sending us this, sending us that?” or we hear from a registrar, “We are only getting this and that. Is that proper? Can you look into it?”, we would follow our normal process and perhaps have the account managers reach out to the registry operator and registrar to gain understanding and try to facilitate that conversation.

Now, if it comes in as a complaint in the Contractual Compliance case, then we would follow a normal case there too to see what's going on and see if we can help in the understanding. But compliance will, in terms of compliance, because we are in the middle of the twelve-month

period where you're being flexible on how you are getting there in one phase or different stages as the way you're doing … It is all up to you.

So right now that's what I'm thinking: that (I'm probably going to say to the registry operator) if you would like to (and it's completely optional), go ahead and open a general inquiry case. And you may submit it, but you don't have to.

And I've also heard this from some of the registry operators: "Well, we can do that now. Why do we need ICANN Org direction and facilitation? We don't need that." And also I've heard varying thoughts about "We will give it to ICANN Org. We do not want to share it with anyone else. We just want to keep it in the system, but I don't want it to be shared with anybody else." So that means that I may have to tell the registrars when I meet with them that because of that request from the registry operator, we will not be able to share it. And if the registrar needs to know that, I'm going to encourage them to contact the registry operator directly.

That's what I'm thinking. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Dennis. Okay, so as a registry operator, we have a contractual obligation to provide a capital-N Notice (and all y'all that are registry operators know this) to the registrars whenever we're making EPP changes. So we don't submit a transition plan to them. We provide a notice, a legal notice. And so they get that. But as Gordon was talking about, we also somehow are going to have to notify ICANN, presumably, because otherwise, how does ICANN Compliance know

what we're going to be doing so that we're not found to be out of compliance [,and] our escrow changes? So presumably one reason that we would provide this notice to ICANN Org is so that, when our escrow stuff comes in and changes, the escrow specification that we are checked against every day can change so that we don't get a failed escrow deposit notification, not to mention EBERO concerns from the EBERO providers that they know what's going on with the particular TLDs that they're notifying.

And then the question of whether or not ICANN serves as a repository for registrars to come check these things is an open question.

But let me ask a more pointed question. How, from a compliance standpoint, is ICANN desiring to get notified for registries that are going to change their data model? And I think that Jeff brought this up earlier for the escrow spec. How is ICANN desiring to get notified that our escrow is changing so that we don't get invalid escrow specification changes? Because during the May period after August 21 of 24, as soon as a registry, if it is going to the minimal data set, accepts one registration with the minimal data set, that data's escrow is going to have a registration that looks like that. And so therefore the escrow check on that particular registration for a full data, if it's thick, is going to fail. And so how does ICANN intend to get notified by the registries that a particular registry, dot-foo, is going to the minimal data set so that, [with] its escrows, we don't get a failure notice on the day after the first minimal data set registration comes through? Why don't we tackle that one first?

Then we've got Gordon's issue, then we've got the third question, which is, is ICANN going to serve as a point of access for a registrar that seeks to come and get a bunch of data about notices that it should have already gotten from all of the registries? . But let's try and tackle the escrow one first, which is, I think, a question that Jeff brought up. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, thank you. That's a good way to process because I think that trying to define this problem was not easy for me because I went into it thinking this is going to be simple, and then more and more I talked about it with the good intentions, people are beginning to design systems. And we need to be very careful, and as the project manager, it's my duty to contain the scope of the implementation. So anything that I see as out of scope is a red flag for me, and I have to make sure that I'm convinced that this is required for implementation.

So for the data escrow, yes, we are working on the data escrow and making sure that we avoid a situation of false positive or failure notice of that kind. So that's part of an implementation work that we're doing now.

Now in terms of what you said about required notification, I think that's a different thing because if it's a requirement and if it's a contractual requirement, of course you have to do that. I wouldn't be thinking about how not to do that. You just need to do that. But I can tell you right now that there is no advanced work by the compliance team to understand every registry operator's data model changing throughout the twelve-

month period proactively so they can anticipate what is and what is not compliant.

Go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Okay, sorry. Two fingers, Beth. So does that mean that they're going to suspend compliance or notice or escrow failure checks during this period?

DENNIS CHANG: It does not mean that. So I think maybe what the best thing to do is I would like to have a discussion of compliance with the Compliance team in the room because I came in here trying to facilitate your request to accept your transition plan. But now what we're talking about is something different. So let's take that offline and let's see if we can come together so that, Rick, you have an understand clearly of how the compliance will work throughout the twelve month period. That's what you're wondering right now.

RICK WILHELM: Specifically about escrow and about the operational workings, not about compliance. I should be more careful in my phrasing about the operational workings of the escrow checking process, because every day we may or may not get notices if our escrow deposits fail or work. And as those in the room and on online and listening recording note, those can happen for various reasons. Sometimes there's false alarms

on those and sometimes, obviously, our escrow deposits fail for various reasons on our end.

So this is a question because obviously we're going to keep doing escrows. I'm not asking on PIR's behalf to suspend doing escrows, and I don't think that the registries would be asking that either. But it's a question of how these checks are going to be made during the transition period of August 2[0]24 to August 2[0]25. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, Rick. It's like peeling the onion. But I think I'm really kind of getting to understanding what you're talking about. You as quote-unquote the engineers are more interested in the intricacies or the mechanism of how the data escrow will work during the transition period. And that is a technical discussion. Let's have that discussion now with my technical services team who's working on the data escrow implementation. And I think we should table that. So that's one issue.

And there were several other items that you brought up. The legal notification. I think we settled that. You just go ahead and do it. We're not changing any of the legal notification.

And then what was the third one? Oh, the expectation that registrars may have that ICANN Org is going to facilitate some sort of a coordination role. I think I have to make sure that I get to them and talk to them to reset that if they had such an expectation because, the more and more I thought about it, it's not easy. We actually have to dedicate resources [to those] who understand all these kind of data models and then try to make a tool system table, and it was getting out of hand, so

I stopped that. We just can't do it and it's not required. So I will talk to the registrars. And I think we talked about having me attend the closed session, the CPH registration data policy session, to talk to all of you together, and maybe we can tackle it there.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Dennis. I take your point well about that this is an onion. There are many layers to this to peel back and explore. And I totally agree that I think we probably should continue this conversation, including just at the very basic level about registry operator compliance with Compliance in the room. So we can absolutely plan on doing that.

We have a bit of a cue on this topic. I want to make sure we hear from those folks before we wrap up.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I want to hear from you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: So it's going to be Beth, then Maxim, and then Jeff.

BETH BACON: Thanks. So I think, apart from talking of compliance, we understand this is not an obligation, but as we are charged with coordinating between registries and registrars to make sure this is a smooth transition, I think that this a list would be a huge utility to registrars. It would be helpful to them. And my concern is that as we think about kind of the

operationalizing, whatever we do, registrars don't have access to the NSP or any of the information in there.

So what is more resource-heavy for ICANN and the team? Is it fielding every single request from registrars to get a notice from ICANN that we've already sent to them as registries? Or is it easier for ICANN to just keep a list? We can put it in NSP and then ICANN create an excel spreadsheet that says, "PIR, this is your data model. It starts now. Three data elements.["] And just make that available. If there are registries that say, "Hey, I don't want this to be public," then don't include them in the list. I'm just wondering what is more resource-heavy and what is ICANN's ability to facilitate this, other than us just sending a notice to ICANN through NSP that registrars are already getting from registries? Because it would be an identical thing.

DENNIS CHANG: I don't think I understand this list that you're talking about, because let's say we ask all the registry operators to "Go ahead and send it to us if you want to," and we don't look at it, but we just kind of check the mark. Now, you just said: which data model they're using? There's no such definition of model A, B, C or D. And then the question comes of, okay, "Which registration data elements are you submitting and not submitting? When? To what date?" Now the conversation becomes a whole project. And that's what I want to try to avoid if there's no real need.

But I do want to talk to the registrar who're asking for this directly so I understand their true needs before we go off and expand a lot of

resources or make decisions about what we are asking the registry operator to do. I'm being cautious.

BETH BACON: Sorry, just a follow-up. I think we're just using different terms. If we put in the NSP (whatever we send; our capital-N Notice, as Rick says) to registrars, they're going to have that information. Then we share it with ICANN as a nice thing to do—voluntarily because it's not a requirement. I think that you're talking about models and plans and things. You're going to list the data elements in your notice to registrars. So you could just cut and paste into a list and make that available. We can talk about it offline. I understand you're being cautious, but I just think that it's easier than we're maybe thinking about it. So we can talk about it offline.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. Apparently you have a design in your mind, and I would appreciate understanding this before I comment on it more.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks. Next we'll go to Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I think we also need to sort out situations where in the interim period, some registry has two models and allows two models of data, like the old model and new ones, to be sent to them by registrars. And in this period, escrow is going to be a huge issue because there should be only

one format actually of what you upload, because otherwise the escrow operator is going to be puzzled. I mean, the script just will tell you it's not a successful upload. That's it. And you have 23 hours to fix that.

So the policy, as I understand, envisions the station where some registries are going to be allowed to accept the new kind of data and the old kind of data. Even if they change one single field, it's an issue because in the script, the parser will not let you upload or the checker script will say that "No, it's not compliant with the format we have."

Also imagine how puzzled are going to be the escrow operators because now they know that very few registries have a special format of theme, and all others have a single prescribed format for all registries, maybe with few exceptions. And after August of this year, they're going to have 100 formats. And I'm sure since you have very few escrow operators, they're going to ask a lot of questions.

So I suggest there is some conversation, future conversation, of ICANN and [catch-ups], where the technical and operational people of registries and registrars get together, so we discuss it in full and understand how to survive this August. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks, Max. This is exactly actually what we expected would happen, and that's why I've been saying this implementation is complex, so we have to start early. And I'm so glad to get this feedback, because clearly you are working on it now. 100% agree. We need a focus session on data escrow, and I think we should conduct one and convene one either through the IRT or maybe the Tech Ops sessions or some other vehicle

that will work, get us together. Let's work on it together so that we can avoid the potential issues that you're all thinking about. We should work on that. I agree. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Dennis. Next, we have a hand from Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, thanks. I'm a little confused, because if we … Basically what I envision is I'm submitting notice to ICANN that we are no longer implementing certain provisions that are in our contract. It applies to escrow. It applies to schedule … I think it's six. I'm trying to remember which one. Or schedule four. Whichever. Oh, specification six, right, that these sections are no longer in our agreement. For example we are no longer going to be producing an RDRS or RDAP response that has the same information as what we used to put as our RDAP response. In addition, we are no longer accepting … I know that ICANN really has never asked us for this, but ICANN has the ability to ask us for all of the thick data on an exceptional circumstance. We are no longer doing that. So when we give notice to ICANN, it is both a notice of our data model but it is also notice to Legal and Compliance that certain contractual provisions no longer apply.

And so it puzzles me when I hear you say that you'll take these things, but you're not really going to send it to anyone or analyze it. It's my expectation that when I submit a notice, however it is, it is shared with anyone within ICANN that needs to know.

And so I do think that for me as a lawyer, not as a techie, that this is important for me. Again, it is not asking permission, it is not asking to negotiate. It is telling ICANN that these provisions either apply differently or no longer apply to us.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that clarification I understand now what you're talking about. So I think for those of you who're listening for the first time about this topic, be aware there's some previous conversation that started in the CP Summit last month, and I've been talking to individuals. The request was: we have this transition plan, data model or whatever, and we would like to send it to ICANN Org, recognizing it's not an obligation. There's no requirement to do so. That's the subject here.

We're not talking about the legal notice that you are required to send, which has no change. You have to do that per your contract, and we're not telling you to do anything different. And on the ICANN side, we will not change anything we do for those. That's not the subject of the discussion that I came here for.

So I want to make sure that Jeff and everyone here listening separates those two things, and I want to stay on the topic of the quote-unquote registry operator transition plan. Thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Dennis. And the queue is clear. So I think we're kind of naturally wrapping this topic.

I'll just reiterate what I've been hearing from other registries, and especially what Jeff articulated, I think, very well in that last intervention, which is we're trying to make everything a little bit easier on the ICANN side, as well as our own side, including whatever a future compliance process looks like, understanding that this is not something that Compliance has begun to tackle yet.

So I think I heard a few action items, follow-ups from the discussion here today. One is a dedicated meeting, perhaps a joint meeting, of the IRT and Tech Ops, or perhaps convened by Tech Ops (we'll sort those details out offline) about data escrow changes, specifically. That we can do.

Secondly is a follow-up conversation to this one, perhaps with the Compliance team present, about how, if we do pursue this task of alerts to ICANN (I don't want to use “notification”; that's obviously a loaded word here) via the portal, that could facilitate compliance as processes.

So I think there's two work streams here that we can pursue that are interrelated, but we'll attempt to follow up on those before the next ICANN meeting through calls, if you're amenable, because I think we really do need to keep the pace of this work going.

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely. And third (I mentioned it earlier at the closed session for the CPH dedicated on registration data policy implementation session), I want to talk to all of us together, quote-unquote, and make sure that we're separating the issues to talk about the request or expectation of the list, whatever that is, and letting them know that between us we

committed to do the data escrow spec implementation meeting to figure that out, and then, on the Compliance plan for the duration of the twelve months, figure that out. That is a separate topic. Okay, thank you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah, and just to put up one final cap on that, I think there's using the closed meeting this week to get input from registrars without promising registrars what the outcome is going to look like because we're still working on it.

DENNIS CHANG: Perfect.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Dennis, thank you for being here. Thanks, everyone, for the really good input. Obviously this is a conversation that we're going to need to continue, so please keep those thinking caps on.

In the interest of time, I think it makes sense to move to the next item on the agenda, which is the council update, any discussion of open items that our councilors need input on.

Before I do move on, do we have any other questions, or anyone else want to make any last statements about the last topic?

Okay, excellent. Stay tuned for more info on that. Am I turning it over to Kurt, Nacho or Jen for this update? Kurt, over to you.

KURT PRITZ: Hi, Sam. Hi, everyone. I hope you're doing well there. I miss you all. I'm going to get us caught up on the schedule. I'm going to give us a briefing on the council agenda for this meeting and then just leave a two-minute blank space to see if anyone wants to provide updates on the work that the small group is doing on the next round of gTLDs.

On the votes that are occurring in this council meeting, one is a council aspirational statement, so-called. So, coming out of the last strategic planning set session, it was determined that there should be some sort of a joint agreement on the council getting behind and supporting policy recommendations that are made by the working groups that are chartered by the council. So this aspirational statement has been developed to say just that. And it's a little bit sophomore to me, but it's not controversial and if it comes to a vote, I think we should look for it, and I've already talked too much about it.

Secondly, there'll be a vote on starting a policy status report on the two domain name expiration policies. The council has been talking about this for quite some time, as you'll probably recall from past presentation on council meeting agendas. At first we were going to delay this policy status report five years and then two years in the interest of level-loading our work and more importantly the staff work. But as I reported a month ago, the IPC has suggested that this PSR go ahead, that there's considerable confusion that exists regarding the path of an expired domain name. Rick and others during the last meeting suggested that the IPC is looking to investigate some registrar business models maybe, or has an alternate agenda here.

Anyway, this motion launches the policy status report that are usually done in fairly short order, but given the workload, I think the resolution itself says that this PSR would be completed in a year, or I believe the wording even gives an outlet to that it may take more than a year.

So we haven't had a chance to check with our registrar buddies who would be more affected by a policy development in this area than us. And in the past we've recognized that there are really no operational issues with any of these policies, that they're operating cleanly.

Nonetheless, I think if there's a vote for a PSR it's sort of hard to vote against it. And once in reading the PSR, I think if we wanted to assert that we shouldn't do the additional "revisit this policy," and we should assert that then.

So given all that, I'll just pause for a second and say if this does come to a vote at this meeting, I think we should support it. It's hard to vote against a PSR and then it can only inform our decision whether or not to take on additional policy work. So I'm pausing for a second.

All right, so I'm going to go ahead. The rest of the meeting agenda is our discussion item. So it's kind of a thin agenda. The SPIRT … Jeff can describe what the SPIRT is better than I, but it's a standing group that will determine if changes to the Applicant Guidebook are needed in midstream, whether that is in fact the change in policy, and whether it needs community input or not. So we're getting a briefing on the draft charter of the SPIRT. Anne Aikman-Scalise is giving that presentation.

We'll receive a briefing from ICANN staff on the Internet Governance Forum Support Association.

We're also getting a briefing from ICANN on the release of IGO names. ICANN has released a schedule that says IGO names will be released for registration late in the second quarter of 2026 according to the schedule, coincident with the launch of the next round. This on the critical path[, for] this is a notification mechanism that IGO name has been registered and some other operational things that ICANN is undertaking. So a mere 14 years after the launch of the first round, we will have this question settled, I think.

And then finally there's a discussion, data accuracy check-in. It was paused for six months, five months ago or so because, well, you might remember that the data accuracy team made two recommendations to either audit or survey registrars in order to get a sense of the degree of data accuracy in some way. And then that work was paused or pended for either the completion of a data processing agreement so ICANN could actually handle the data, the implementation of the NIS 2 directive, or (that's an "or") publication of the infernal …. I'm not even going to say that whole thing.

So the six months is coming to a close in a month or two, and it's come up for discussion. ICANN's going to propose in this discussion two sort of intermediate steps to get ready for these things: providing historical data via ICANN's existing audit program and engaging with contracted parties on current [cc]TLD identification practices. So those are the discussion items.

And finally, we're going to discuss certain—Jeff, go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: On the SPIRT team (I did submit this by email), one of the things the council is going to hear is that there's a recommendation from the SPIRT team that statements of interest, that, or statements of participation for being on the SPIRT team will require disclosure of what clients you are working on behalf of. More specifically, if you are working in any capacity on any applications, you have to disclose which applications. Well, I should go back a step. Prior to the reveal day, you just have to disclose that you are working with applications. Once all the applications are revealed, at that point, you have to reveal which applications you are actually working on. Of course, the IPC reps are not thrilled with that, and they're going to bring that to the council as an issue to discuss. I know our council reps are very much knowledgeable of this issue and hopefully will use this as an opportunity to convey our views on transparency. So thanks.

KURT PRITZ: Yup, maybe the GNSO Council will get a little win for transparency instead of being dinged for it lately. Thanks very much, Jeff.

And finally, we're going to talk about some of our ongoing efforts that came out of the strategic planning session back in December or January. I forget which. We're investigating possible changes to the council liaison role. So the council provides a liaison to each of the PDP working groups. How can the council liaison help manage the PDP, be timely and effective and gather input when required in those sorts of things. So it's on sort of strengthening that role.

There's discussion in different reporting formats. There's a recommendation report and a working group final report, and sometimes they clash. So we don't want that to happen anymore.

And then there was a discussion about how public comment is considered by PDPs. There's always some criticism of that, no matter what the PDP is. I think I would suggest during that discussion that the council hear from the chairs of all the recent PDPs and get an understanding of how each one handled it and try to take what's best from all of them and try to standardize it.

So that's all I have for the council meeting. Like I said, it's not a really heavy agenda.

There's a small team also talking about one of the last remaining issues, the singular/plural discussion and how we can avoid user confusion. So that work has become really complicated as the new members of the small team are seeking exceptions at every turn to the singular/plural rule. But I'll let that go.

So I'll just pause for a second and see if anybody has anything else.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks so much, Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Jennifer? Go ahead, Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Thanks, Kurt. Just two small AOB items on the council agenda. I think we have the call for volunteers for the PPSAI. I think Sam already sent that to the list, and Rubens has already said something about that and confirmed.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah—

KURT PRITZ: Yeah, I think the RySG has already approached that. So I kind of left that one on the cutting room floor. What's the other one?

JENNIFER CHUNG: There was one more. The GNSO has a scheduled meeting with the ccNSO on the 11 July. Just letting you know this. I think there was a willingness between the two councils to have a more regular touching of base. I think it's a good thing.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Jennifer. That's it for us, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much, Kurt and Jen. To just go back to the question about the PPSAI implementation review team, I will just confirm John McCabe from Who's Who has volunteered to be the registry representative. Rubens will be the alternate.

And then just a reminder for everyone that the IRT is a hybrid representational and open model. So if anyone is interested in getting involved in that IRT in an individual capacity, there is still the opportunity to do that. I think the team is meeting here in Kigali and then will start a more regular cadence. following this meeting.

I had one quick question for our councilors, and it regards what your expectations are for the discussion on the data accuracy work. And you might not have the answer to this. This might be what is up for discussion. But has the council thought at all about whether that is going to be a reinitiation of the prior and previously existing accuracy scoping team or if this is a chance to look at the topic of data accuracy with a different or fresh approach?

KURT PRITZ: I think it's to pursue the two recommendations of the small team some time ago once the way has been cleared for that survey or audit to take place. But I'm really, really happy to see that Jeff and Beth have raised their hands.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Perfect. Jeff, over to you.

JEFF NEUMAN: So I think we've gotten this accuracy thing delayed a bunch of times, primarily because we were waiting for (and Beth will probably talk to this, and I know we're going to address this next) the specification to be finalized. We'll find out where we are on that, but there's an expectation

that it's close to final and that the WHOIS accuracy work from before can then move forward.

But I'll stop now because Beth has her hand raised. So. Thanks.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Jeff. Thanks, folks. I think I'm going to ruin everyone's day. I don't know how we've gone down this path. It is a kind of a false narrative that has come out of the accuracy working group, which I was part of. The problem was that there was no data evidencing a problem with accuracy. And then there was the discussion of how do you get that data? And now there was a discussion of, okay, well, ICANN was not comfortable proactively requesting that. The DPS that we are crafting—that is an agreement between registrars in ICANN and registries in ICANN—does not fix that problem. It doesn't create a purpose for ICANN to then proactively ask for data that they still don't feel that they have a purpose to have. What was going to happen was that ICANN was going to reach out to data protection authorities (similar acronyms, which is super unhelpful).

So I think that (and I heard this said in the GAC and GNSO as well) this is something that we've tried to make really clear but is not translating. I don't think the DPA is going to solve this problem. I also don't know that delaying a question that is not answerable with the data we have is a good use of our time.

I think the beauty of a scoping team is that you can say, “Okay, well, maybe there's no “there” there. Let's ask a different question.” So maybe we want to think about if there's a different question we can ask

where we can actually see if there's an issue and narrow that down because I think that one of the problems as a member of that accuracy working group was that it was not specific, it was not targeted, it was just like, Accuracy seems bad. We would like access to data." And that again was that the desire to get a path into data requests. I'm not saying accuracy is not a problem. I'm saying that we couldn't evidence it. And I don't think the DPA between ICANN and registries and ICANN registrars is going to solve that problem because it doesn't create a legal purpose for ICANN. It doesn't fix the I can problem, which was that they didn't feel they had the rights to proactively request that data.

So I'm happy to discuss that further, but I think it's maybe a little bit of a larger question of what's next for accuracy.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Beth. Apologies, I was just catching up with a question in the chat. Any other questions on the council topics before I have Beth just jump right into the broader data processing specification update?

All right, let me just double check on Zoom. Okay, great. Clear queue. I'm on an iPad today. I'm having laptop issues. All right. I'm also doing a quick time check. We have 30 minutes left for this meeting. We're going to do a bit of an agenda restructuring. We'll do the update on the DPS now, which I expect will be somewhat brief, but Beth will lead us through that. And then after that we'll go on to topic six because Jamie has joined us and I want to take advantage of having Jamie here with us. If we need to go on to the administrative items at our next call, that

biweekly call will be taking place one week from tomorrow. So we'll get to those then. Beth, I'll hand it over to you.

BETH BACON: Thank you. It will be zippy. So first, I'll start with a big thank you for everyone. When we brought the DPS draft, the final agreed draft, to the team, there was a lot of really good input. You guys clearly took it in, digested it, and we had a few items where there was a proposal for a different fee structure with regards to the $5 million liability cap and a few other proposals. We did present those. I think we sent it around and folks saw what we did send. We did present those as the negotiating team to ICANN staff.

I think the second point, which was also echoed by the registrars, was some concerns around phrasing in one of the sections about what constitutes the scope of a data breach. So it was that coupled with the liability issues.

And unfortunately, we did let you guys know that we had discussed those issues at length already in the negotiating team, and we were not super optimistic that ICANN would make changes. And unfortunately, they have responded and they've said that at this point, they think that this is the most reasonable language that we can come to satisfying both sides. We have a little more rationale around those decisions that we're happy to share, but at this point, ICANN is not willing to make any more changes to those particular pieces of language. So the next steps would be for us to either to say, “Okay, this is what we have, this is the draft.[” …] And just as a reminder, you don't have to sign the DPA. You

can elect to use it or not use it based upon your business needs. But at this point, it seems negotiating team has made its absolute best efforts. We've gotten the best middle ground that we can get, and ICANN is finito.

So we can share those around. I'm happy to take some questions, but next steps will just be to formally close that and accept the text. And thank you. Sam reminded me that once that's accepted, it will go to public comment, as it always has had that plan. So we are able to make comments again at that, if you like, as individuals or registries, and then it will be finished. Finally. Happy to take questions now or offline since we are tight on the schedule.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much, Beth. Anything for Beth?

Okay, I got a question in the chat from Kurt asking, "There will not be a vote on the DPA? Is that correct? It's just up to each registry whether or not to accept"—or I'll maybe finesse that a bit. Kurt: "'choose to integrate' it into their registry agreement." Yes?

BETH BACON: Yes, correct.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Confirmed, Kurt. You got it correct. Thank you for the question.

Okay, we'll close this topic out and move on to item number six—sorry?

[UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sue already switched it for me.]

SAM DEMETRIOU: The new item number five on our agenda. This is another follow-up conversation that we began during the Contracted Party Summit one month ago. It is on the somewhat broad topic of cyber incident reporting, and Jamie had kind of introduced this idea through the context of some of the legislative and regulatory updates that he and others within ICANN Org are tracking. So we've asked Jamie to join us here today to kind of refresh our memories about this conversation about maybe the broader climate that this is a question for us to consider within. And then once Jamie kind of sets the stage for us a bit, I would like us to just have an open conversation about whether this is something that we should be considering or thinking about within the Registry Stakeholder Group.

So this is a very exploratory conversation. I don't expect us to make any hard-and-fast decisions here today. I just want to set those expectations up front with that. Jamie, thank you so much for being here.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks. It's good to be here with you all. Just to recap what we talked about in Paris and then, I think, in Puerto Rico, the US Congress passed, in 2022, something called CIRCIA, which is the Cyber Incident Reporting for Critical Infrastructure Act. And at a very, very high level, what it

requires is that owners/operators of covered entities, which are essentially entities within critical infrastructure sectors, that experience significant cyber incidents would be required to report those incidents to the Cybersecurity and Information Security Agency, which is part of the US Department of Homeland Security.

Part of the law required implementation or a notice of a proposed rulemaking which CIRCIA has put out. Comments are due July 3rd, and relevant to this conversation, there is an exception in the law from the requirement to do reporting that applies to … Let me get the exact language. "The requirements shall not apply to a covered entity or the functions of a covered entity that the Director of CIRCIA determines constitute critical infrastructure owned, operated or governed by multistakeholder organizations that develop, implement and enforce policies concerning the domain name system, such as ICANN and IANA." So based on that language, CIRCIA proposes to create an exception from the requirements that would apply to ICANN, ARIN, and affiliates of those entities, as well as to the RSOs to the extent that they are performing root server operation functions.

The NPRM asks a number of questions, including how the US government's traditional support for the multistakeholder approach and Internet governance should inform how CIRCIA should interpret this exception. And it also asks a question about whether the exception should apply to registries and registrars, which is, I think, probably the biggest issue for this group. My understanding is that in the interagency process that went on to develop the notice, there was a lot of back and forth on whether it should even be a question or whether they should

just tentatively conclude that it does not apply to registries and registrars.

Our concern with this legislation (ICANN Org's concern with this legislation) was particularly for PTI, that it would create the possibility of something looking a little like the IANA contract before the transition. It would literally be looked at as the US government, even for something as benign and laudable as cyber incident reporting, as getting back in the business of regulating or having oversight authority over ICANN, which would be a great excuse for other governments to do the same, particularly for the IANA functions, for root server operators, for RIRS.

We did not want that precedent to be recreated again. We didn't want to go back to those, to that sort of regime. So we're happy with the language as far as it goes and with the NPRM's sort of tentative conclusion that it shouldn't apply to the entities that it listed.

Whether or not it should apply to registries and registrars is a more complicated question. Within ICANN and the RSSAC, as many of you know, there are ongoing efforts to develop a reporting mechanism. IANA already does report [on the] IMRS or the L- root. We do reporting. So there's an argument that we don't need additional reporting because we're already doing it.

I think the question for registries and registrars is do you want, within ICANN, to set up some sort of reporting mechanism? And when I mentioned this before, I tried to be clear that ICANN Org is not pushing for that, ICANN Org is not specifically recommending that ICANN Org play a particular role or require in the agreements that registries and

registrars would report to ICANN any significant cyber incidents like the ones described in the NPRM.

What we did say was that if there is an effort within the ICANN structure to develop that, we would, in our comments, point … And we are likely to follow comments, particularly just on the issue of how the US government's traditional support for the multistakeholder model should confirm the exceptions that they've listed. But, if there are efforts that are happening within ICANN, we would point to that as an example of the multistakeholder model potentially yielding a better and more global solution for cyber incident reporting for registries and registrars than separate national regimes with conflicting requirements.

The other complication, of course, is that my understanding is that registries and registrars are already regulated in some jurisdictions or required in some jurisdictions to report.

So I guess if there is an interest among the contracted parties to come together and develop something, we would facilitate that. We have no recommendation on what that would look like. We would simply play a facilitating role and do what we can to help you all come to whatever sort of regime you think is most appropriate.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thank you very much. Jamie. I think we have two questions in the queue, Rick, just confirming about your specific remarks, and then we'll kind of transition into how we convene this discussion within the

stakeholder group. So Sue, I think you have a remote question that you're going to read out?

SUE SCHULER: We have a question from Maxim Alzoba. "Jamie, do you expect the same kind of exception for the incoming FCC regulation where parts of the Internet are going to be regulated like broadband?"

JAMIE HEDLUND: So that's a very timely question because the FCC has just approved notice, a proposed rulemaking, on requiring certain entities (basically large ISPs, but almost all ISPs; just the level of obligation is higher for the large ones) basically to submit reports to the FCC documenting what they are doing to secure their BGP routes. And they're specifically looking for information about deployment of RPKI.

The original draft had a proposal to what looked like potentially get into regulating the policies of ARIN. The final version looks like it doesn't go that far and simply points to policy development for within ARIN where they're looking at their policies related to RPKI.

Similarly, there was some interest in the draft about looking at path validation and how the FCC could help with path validation and gathering data on it. That's also been weakened. So it now just asks for whether anyone has any interesting information they can share on developments of path validation.

So right now if they adopt rules, it looks like it would apply to ISPs. They ask the question whether other entities should report. They don't carve

out an exception for any of these entities, but they only ask the question about whether they should report and then raise the question about whether the FCC has jurisdiction over entities like ARIN.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jamie. We have Rick and then Keith.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Sam. Are we kind of pivoting into discussion or is this still in pre-discussion? I'm not sure what our protocol is here. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Oh, good. Clarifying—

RICK WILHELM: It's your meeting.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Does anyone have follow-ups for Jamie's presentation? Any questions about that, or … I'm happy to move into discussion if everyone's ready to.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Maxim, actually, is right. In the net neutrality order, they do say this would give them the authority to address threats to the DNS. They aren't identified. They haven't done anything yet. And so it's unclear what they mean by that, but we are obviously watching that.

SAM DEMETRIOU: All right, thanks for the follow-up. So as we move into the discussion here … Is that what we're doing? Keith, you have a question. Go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, thanks very much, Sam. Hi, everybody. So, Jamie, thank you. I just wanted to say thank you for coming here and joining us today and sort of reiterating some of what was discussed during the Contracted Party Summit. And I'll just note that while what you've raised here is specifically about CIRCIA and the sort of the US perspective, I think this is a broader topic that we should be considering. So I think this is one example. But security incident reporting is not just a US issue. Obviously, we have obligations under new EU regulation and likely will in other jurisdictions as well, if we don't already.

So I think as we talk about this and as we move into whether this makes sense from a Contracted Party House or stakeholder group engagement, this is being able to point to a multistakeholder-developed or something-within-the-multi-stakeholder-space-developed effort or framework or structure or something like that could be quite helpful, at least being able to point to an effort that's ongoing in this particular instance. So thanks, Sam. Back to you.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Keith. So a lot of the points that I had and notes that I had written down for myself to tee off the discussion portion of this have been well covered by Jamie and Keith. So thank you guys for reading my mind on that one.

So I think what we'd like to do here is open up the floor for a bit of discussion. We have about eleven minutes left in this meeting. This certainly will not be the last time that we address this topic if there is a desire or some indication that it is worth further consideration. But I'd love to hear thoughts. And also I think one way that we can think about approaching this conversation is through questions that we should be asking ourselves as a stakeholder group to focus further discussions. And I'm happy to kind of take us through some ideas that I have on that but, Rick, over to you first.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Sam. I would sort of pivot off of Keith's point and offer, in a statement of the positive, that we within the Registry Stakeholder Group, as participants in the multistakeholder model, should look upon this as an opportunity to avoid, as one might say, missing the moment in terms of security incident reporting, and maybe look to try and get out in front of some of these requirements (and one could argue that we might even be a little bit late in this context here, given that there are already some regulations around security and certain reporting coming from various quarters) or at least not fall further behind in this context and, in cooperation with ICANN and perhaps the registries and probably even needing to work with some of the registrars, given their important stake in these kinds of things, work on a Contracted Party House security incident reporting mechanism we work and develop with ICANN Org, patterning ourselves maybe perhaps on some of the work that the root server operators are doing. That would be a good way to sort of show some good faith to the international government

community, in particular United States, which at least has a stated public policy position in support of the multistakeholder model and would do a good service to try and get some daylight here.

As far as for those that are not familiar with the CIRCIA NPRM notice of proposed rulemaking, if you have any ambivalence about this concept, if you're a registry operator, of cooperating with ICANN and your partners in the Registry Stakeholder Group to do some sort of thing, I would encourage you to take a look at the NPRM and see what it could obligate you as a registry operator to do. I think that might provide a little bit of motivation for you to maybe get involved in this, because the requirements are as manifold as they are ambiguous. And there have been some hearings that are recorded and available where you can find various people throughout industry, not just the technical industry, but the infrastructure industry (not the Internet infrastructure industry, but infrastructure industry) that are talking about their obligations underneath this thing. They are not happy. And so I would encourage you to get educated about this, and it might help you find some motivation to participate and engage on this. Thank you, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much. Rick. Does anyone else want to jump in and share any thoughts about this topic broadly? Keith, is that a new hand? Anyone else here in the room or on the Zoom? Beth, over to you.

BETH BACON: Just to follow up on what Rick was saying, if you are trying to kind of get smart on this, I know that there are several registries and several

registrars that have already been thinking about this ([PRA] being one of them; about comments), so if you have questions, talk amongst ourselves so we can help move this along.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks for that, Beth. I think it bears repeating that while the CIRCIA development is a great jumping-off point to start this conversation, this is not limited to the context of the US government or operations in the US. This is a topic that is broader. I would say it's on a global scale at this point. And so I think that is a great motivating factor for why this is something that we should at least be asking and considering within the Registry Stakeholder Group and whether there's an opportunity here to live up to some of the commitments that we made, for example, in the statement that we developed and the conversations that we had during the Contracted Party Summit, which is looking for ways to use the multistakeholder model to achieve some similar goals to what global governments are doing, but in a way that is multistakeholder and fit for purpose for our industry, our operations, our businesses. I think this is a good opportunity to not necessarily be at odds with what's happening in the governmental or regulatory space but really kind of work towards similar goals. So that's why I think it was a good topic to table.

Seeing that we are running a bit short on time, I think that we're going to need to carry this over. I'm going to leave you with a couple of questions, maybe to take back as homework to think about, to help us have this conversation move forward in the future if folks are interested. If folks are not interested, obviously that's valid feedback and you should please pass that along to me. So it's some of the ones that have

even been mentioned in the room so far today: what are existing reporting requirements that our different companies face, both from a registry perspective, but also from a business perspective? Some of us are publicly traded companies. They're reporting requirements that are associated with things like that.

What are the different business and operational models of gTLD registries that exist even within our own members—and if and how that should be taken into account. What questions might we have for ICANN, if ICANN is going to be the entity to whom we report? And also there's things like, how would we go about defining things like what qualifies as a cyber incident, what thresholds we may set, and things like that.

So these are just some things to go back and think about within your own internal organizations for the next time we have a dedicated conversation about this within the Registry Stakeholder Group. Please and thank you.

Any questions or anyone want to add anything further to that list? Yes, thank you.

[PAUL]: As a total outsider, there's an additional dynamic, though, to this, which is [that] the start of the discussion relates to development from the United States that speaks to cyber reporting requirements. Almost every jurisdiction in the world that has active legislators have at some point or another passed some form of active legislation that affects how companies that do business in that country do business in that country concerning the Internet. And one of the things that's inevitable is that

a gTLD operator, any registry operator, is going to be based in a jurisdiction. The jurisdiction in which you are based is going to impose an impact on your operations. And if certain implications and so on are brought about, one of the first things that an operator is going to do is they're going to relocate. They're going to go, “Let's move. Let's do a little bit of jurisdiction-hopping.”

Now, with the 2012 round for additional registries, there was no real appetite for people to sort of find a cushy jurisdiction in which to commence their registry operations. I think that is likely to change as this exercise moves along.

And so I think what would be very helpful to sort of try to get a multistakeholder a consensus on is both a maximum level of acceptable government interference in registry operations, because even if that is achieved by consensus and isn't multilaterally endorsed, it at least gives you the moral argument against some of the big stupidities that can come about.

But secondly is an understanding as to how ICANN would respond to a jurisdiction making an adverse finding or taking action concerning a registry operator that is within their jurisdiction. Now, I don't want to go into that too much, but there was a similar discussion yesterday about the content about voluntary content implications. And the point is that ICANN should, should never, ever, ever want to be dealing with a question of content regulation, not just because of its bylaws, not just because it's incorporated in the US, but because that moves it out of the technical function that it performs. But the question emerges as to if ICANN receives a court order saying that a particular registry operator

that is not incorporated (or is incorporated in the assets; it doesn't matter where it's incorporated) is insolvent, that it is bankrupt, that it ceases to exist, that triggers things within the ICANN context. I mean, that would result in that operator no longer being the operator because it doesn't exist. It's dead.

As a similar implication, what will happen when ICANN is informed by a competent authority that a particular registry operator has, by a court with jurisdiction over that registry operator, made whatever findings elsewhere?

So I think what is really needed (and this is a general comment and I'm pontificating a little bit) is a little bit of thought into this matter of where should registry operators incorporate, what should they set as their domicile, what the implications of that is, and how much room would the jurisdiction in which a registry operator is domiciled legitimately exercise over that registry operator? And it would mean then that if the United States were to, in its wisdom, decide not to be a particularly friendly jurisdiction, the registry operator operators will move out of the United States, and ICANN may have to develop a policy to address the relocating or the redomiciling of registry operators. But that's a longer issue.

I hope I made some sense.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks very much. I'm just double-checking. We are right at the very end of time for this meeting. We can go two minutes if we need to, if anyone else wants to jump in on this topic. But thank you for the

intervention so far. And like I said, we will revisit it. We will make sure that this stays as an item for consideration. We won't lose momentum on this.

Jamie, thank you very much for being here. Thanks for setting the stage. I think that really teed us up very well. I appreciate it and also appreciate the invitation that ICANN Org has extended in terms of acting in a facilitative capacity, should this be something we choose to pursue. So we'll keep in touch.

JAMIE HEDLUND: That's great. And I should have clarified from the beginning that my interest in this, my involvement in this, is not as in my role in Compliance, but as my role as US government engagement. So I'm not looking for more work for Compliance. Thanks.

SAM DEMETRIOU: This reminds me of all the comments about, like, the different hats. You clearly forgot your USG hat today.

All right, folks, we have a number of administrative items that we will follow up with during our next biweekly call. That call will be taking place on the 18th … No, the 19th of June? That's a drop-in call, actually. I'm sorry, I got my dates mixed up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SAM DEMETRIOU: Yeah. So I would say that the two very timely items are the fact that we are in the election cycle for the Registry Stakeholder Group. The nomination period for all the different executive committee positions is open now. It will remain open until June 17, which is this coming Monday. So please just be mindful of those dates. The election itself will take place during our biweekly call on June 26. We will also be voting on the budget for that. The budget has been shared over the mailing list. If you have any questions about the budget before the vote takes place, please reach out directly to our treasurer, Karen Day. She's on this meeting. You all know her email address. If you have trouble getting in touch with her, just reach out to myself or Sue, and we'll get that done.

So with that, I think we're okay to draw today's meeting to a close. We will see folks at a few other sessions this week, including the joint CPH membership meeting, which is taking place on Thursday. Thanks very much for being here. Thanks for the great discussion and enjoy the rest of your time in Kigali. And folks who are on the Zoom, thanks for being here. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]