ICANN83 | PF – GNSO: RySG Membership Working Session
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:15 CEST

SUE SCHULER

Hello and welcome to the Registry Stakeholder Group Membership meeting. My name is Sue, and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in 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 will now hand the floor over to Beth Bacon.

BETH BACON

Hello, friends. This is Beth Bacon, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Welcome to our Policy Forum session. Because it is a Policy Forum, we just have this one stakeholder session as opposed to an entire day of trust, falls, and love between the Registry Stakeholder Group. So, let's make the most of it.

We have a good agenda. Lots of really important and substantive updates. We have lot of things have happened already on Monday, just one day into the week. We'll have a great presentation from IWF who have generously offered some time to us today and we will

go through our normal policy updates and then a few things on an admin business as well as just things that we can maybe do to procedurally or organizationally help registries do our work more efficiently and better. So, we will start immediately with our GNSO Council update. I'm looking this way but also this way. Nacho, Jen, Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks, Beth. This is Sam Demetriou. Good morning, everyone. I can maybe get us kicked off. So, during the last stakeholder group call, which was just before we departed for beautiful Prague, we talked about having a couple follow-up discussion items from each of the two small teams that are currently underway. So, Wim very helpfully put together a Google Doc for us to start consolidating our thoughts. Sue, I just emailed that over to you. Sorry to be a little late on that one. She's going to pull it up. She's got it up here for display.

Maybe we'll start. We can just kind of do a quick scroll and recap where we left off at the last discussion. So, first item is if anyone wanted to share thoughts on the Board's action on reviews, anything that they wanted to feed into the Council, there's still opportunity to do that here. You can please use this Google Doc and we'll send around the link. And then in just in keeping with the time that Beth's laid out on the agenda, we'll maybe jump next to the accuracy scoping. Sorry, that's not what we call it anymore. The Registration Data Accuracy Small Team and a couple of the

items that we're looking for input on there. And then we'll do a few minutes on the DNS Abuse small team as well if that's okay.

So, on the accuracy small team, there are three topics that staff in the small team leadership have identified as areas of agreement that have emerged from the input that each community group sent to the GNSO Council at the beginning of this year. You guys will recall the registries we put our input together. I think we submitted it in January. And those three things are written here. I'll briefly recap them and just try to get any initial reactions to what our members, what folks think about them.

And then I will also note that anything we don't cover today, you guys will have time to ruminate on them. We're really just looking for feedback and reactions by about June 18th, which is a week and a half, almost two weeks from now, in advance of the next time the small team gets together.

Okay. So, point of tentative convergence 1. This relates to a finding that came through the INFERMAL study that noticed a correlation. When the time to validate contact details of a registrant was shorter, that correlated with a significant decrease in malicious registrations overall. So, sorry, also you'll see the term golden nugget. That's what the small team is calling these. I refuse to use that term. It's bugging the crap out of me. That's why I keep saying points of convergence, but that's why you see the term golden nugget. That's from what staff put together for us.

So just to be very clear on this one, this isn't about identity verification. This is about the standard or, sorry, it's more in line with the standard data validation practices that exist in the existing Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And INFERMAL had just found that when it's not the maximum 15 days, if it's a shorter time period, those that tended to correlate with fewer instances of malicious AKA abusive registrations. So, that's point one.

Point two is that there could be value in creating very clear and also very user-friendly educational tools around the domain name registration process about the importance of registration data, how it's used, and why it's important to keep that accurate. To editorialize a bit, this is stuff that we often see in the very lengthy terms and conditions that go along with registering a domain name, as we see in terms and conditions with all kinds of online processes. The idea here is that there may be room to just make these a little bit more accessible so that registrants themselves understand the value of what they're putting this data in for.

And then the last item. This is a recommendation that came out of the last registration data service, AKA WHOIS review that was conducted a handful of years ago. The report, the final part of that group recommends that there should be a note or a notation included in the Registration Data Directory Service record, so the RDAP output in this case, when a domain name is suspended due to incorrect or inaccurate registration data. And that notation

should not be removed from the RDS record until the data is corrected.

So, this is an outstanding recommendation that that has not at this point been implemented because it would, we think, necessitate policy work. When we discussed it in the small team, we did mention that at this point in time, there's not an easy way to make a notation in an RDAP record. There's not a lot of room for free text here. So, there might be more technical work that would go into implementing this recommendation than initially envisioned by the review team.

But like I said that these are the three items, three initial items that have been identified that there is some general agreement on, and they may potentially, maybe, be a good basis for the small team to make some recommendations for future policy work or future action going forward. I'm going to stop here, see if anyone has initial responses to any of these items. If anything looks terrible, if you think anything looks kind of positive, we'd love to hear that. And if no one wants to jump in the queue this morning, we will take this to the Google Doc and we'll work on it over the next two weeks. But I see Rubens' hand in the queue. Please go ahead, Ruben.

RUBENS KUHL Thank you. Rubens Kuhl, NIC.br. Just a small tale from the ccTLD side of the industry. We require registrants to validate their email before registration. And that works because it's a triggering factor that say, hey, if you don't do this, you won't get your domain. And

that's usually a good way to have validation. Not sure the gTLD side of the industry is willing to go there, just to share the positive experience in that.

One thing that regarding the RDAP flag for incorrect data. I'm not wary of the technical work that would be required, but I wonder if that exposes us to liability by saying public displaying something that will still be investigated. So, I wonder if we would look at that specific angle, not the implementation angle.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Rubens. This is Sam again. So yeah, to be very public, saying that we know this data is incorrect, there could be potential flow-down effects from that that I think are very important to keep in mind. So, a really good point there. Thank you for that. Anyone else? Oh, sorry, there it is. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON: First, I think I agree. We will not use the term golden nugget. Strong, strong, Registry Stakeholder Group position. I think this is good. I think there's been a lot of really good feedback that GNSO has been able to find some common areas of agreement and make a little bit of movement, even though it's incremental. And I think really good points have been made that accuracy and verification are not the same. And I think as long as we can move along in that sort of path, this is a good way to kind of inch along. So, thank you guys. I think it's good.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks, Beth. Really appreciate that. John.

JOHN MCCABE Thanks, Sam. I've been an advocate of the use of pending create as a tool to forestall registration process. And I wanted to ask Rubens if his register uses pending create for this purpose when people take a domain name or is it before they can even request one. Thanks.

RUBENS KUHL Rubens Kuhl here. In case of .br, before they can even request that, hey, you want to register it, please click on the email. Otherwise, we won't talk to you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Jeff? There's hands in the Zoom. I'm sorry about that. I did not have time to get into the Zoom, but we'll go to Rick and then we'll go over to Jeff.

BETH BACON Just nudging in, if folks could use the Zoom room, that would be great. So, we're in the same queue and that all of our remote friends have the same visibility. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Thanks, Sam. Rick Wilhelm, PIR. I'd like to echo the point that Rubens' made. I've got some misgivings about Rec 3, well, number 3 on the screen. In addition to the point that Rubens' made about just the potential liability, putting a recommendation into the RDDS that a name is suspended could have some unintended consequences for various reasons because you don't always know. A recommendation annotation can go into the RDDS. It can get put there by either the registry or the registrar, and either party could do the registration. And so, the data there could be out of date and out of sync with actually what is happening in the DNS. And so, there's nothing necessarily to keep it in sync.

And so, people that are picking up on this and relying upon it and then could be making decisions based on that. There's nothing that would require the RDDS data to stay in sync. And so, I would be cautious against folks looking at the RDDS as an authoritative of bit of data for something about that. I understand where folks are trying to get to here, and I respect that, but I think that there's a lot to be worked out before this is taken as something that could be relied upon, and I would urge a ton of caution here. Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU

Thanks very much, Rick. I'm capturing these in the doc. Jeff?

JEFF NEUMAN

Yeah, I guess my first question is do we know the registrar position on all of these? And then the second one is look, let's stay away

from discussions of liability, especially when-- Unless you're an attorney, I think there are ways that-- Like if this concept, the concept of identifying names that are suspended because of suspected, there are certainly wording-- If we were in favor of implementing something like this, there are ways to do it with a little bit different wording that we could do it that wouldn't have liability consequences. And I think as registries, we can make the point that we're okay with the concept but not-- We would want to tweak the wording hurting, but for us--

I want to make progress, and we all do. It always reflects poorly on us, or what's the word? Whatever word I'm looking for. There are ways we can deal with that. There are ways that lawyers can work on that. I think let's, in this group, decide if we're okay with a concept of identifying names that have been suspended because of suspected data, incorrect data, and then not pushed back so much on liability, because that's something we can easily tweak. But my first question really is are the registrars okay with this? Because they're the ones that will end up doing all the work.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks, Jeff. This is Sam again. I have not had a chance to get the registrar's views on this because I imagine they're having these conversations last week into this week as well. We should know more the next time the small team gets together. So, I'm happy to report that back.

And then just to follow up on your point, I hear you about the liability piece. And I think for us as a stakeholder group, we should really focus on your second point there, which is like, do we support this idea, this concept as a whole? Do we think it would provide benefit? And that's probably where we should start our thinking on that. So, point well taken. Appreciate it.

Okay. Anyone else want to get in the queue on this one? I'm going a little bit over the time and I want to make sure we get to DNS Abuse and then open for reviews if we need to. Rick, one more hand.

RICK WILHELM

Yeah. And to Jeff's point, I understand Jeff's point entirely. I think that maybe a question we should be asking is, since the name is going to-- A name is being suspended and we should be asking ourselves, what is the question, what is the goal, what is the end that we're trying to achieve with a name is being suspended, and that's being broadcast in the DNS because the name is being removed from the DNS. The name clearly exists because it exists in the RDDS, and the fact that it's missing in the DNS and is present in the RDDS as being registered indicates that it's being suspended, right, because you can see the serial hold flag.

I think that one of the questions we would need to answer for ourselves is what's the difference as to the reason? If it's been suspended for inaccurate data, some violation of other policy. I think that we would need to answer for ourselves, what does it

matter, the granularity of which exact portion of the registration policy by either the registrar or the registry? Do we need to get into the claws of the registration policy by either the registrar or the registry that is being violated, and so what? It's out. It doesn't matter why to anybody.

It's rhetorical, but I think that's the question we should be answering here. This is going to a specific clause about accuracy, apparently. But there's a bunch of other things, including non-payment, including not having some other logo present on your side or all sorts of other things. I happen to be looking at Craig. He has a lot of other-- .bank and .insurance have a lot of other things that they could be. So, what is the next thing? Is Craig going to be required to list all the things in his and the flag for all of the violations and that stuff? Where does it end? So, that would be the question. What is the goal of this? Thank you.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thanks very much, Rick. Way to keep it really targeted. Nacho?

NACHO AMADOZ I'll try to keep it short, but what you said, Rick, I totally agree with that. I'm thinking about this from the registry perspective in Europe with GDPR in mind. We sometimes do suspension from .cat, mostly for policy reasons. But it doesn't matter that we know that publicly. And when you were speaking, I thought it may create a problem for us that we indicate that we have suspended this

domain name for inaccurate data. The public doesn't need to know, and we are not the body to determine that this is something we have to communicate publicly.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU All right. Thank you all for the discussion so far. Like I said, we'll keep-- the google doc will be open. We'll send the link around so folks can continue to share thoughts there and I think we'll tag this also for follow-up on the next Registry Stakeholder Group meeting that we have between now and the 18th. With that I will hand it back.

BETH BACON All right. Thank you, friends. We will have a little, hopefully, a few minutes at the end also just to loop back if we have more discussion or questions for GNSO as you doodle. Remember, the document is open. Wim has put it just underneath where our public comments normally are. So, what was the deadline, Sam, for that? When do you need that by?

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU June 18th, please and thank you.

BETH BACON So just absolutely oodles of time. Scats a bunch. Do it maybe this week. All right. So, we have special guests with us today from the IWF. So, we're going to turn it over to Will. Yes, or both of you?

Okay. We have Will, and he's going to walk us through some of the work that IWF has done and why we love them so much.

DEREK DAY-HILL

Hi, everyone. My name is Derek Ray-Hill. I'm the Interim Chief Executive at the Internet Watch Foundation. It's a pleasure to be here with all of you. I did miss my first flight to Prague, so I arrived late last night, which means actually as it happens, I'm the freshest person in the room this morning for those of you joining online. Obviously, a lot of hard work late into the evenings here at these ICANN convenings, so a pleasure to be with all of you.

The Internet Watch Foundation is an international charity funded primarily by the online sector to identify, prevent, and remove the distribution of child sexual abuse material, otherwise known as CSAM. We have been around for the better part of 30 years, and we're created by the sector at the very advent of the online universe, when, of course, very few people could have imagined where we've become.

We are one of three organizations in the world of our stature and of our volume of data. The other two are our longstanding partners in the United States, NCMEC, and we work very closely with the team there and C3P in Canada. Between us, we have identified most of the known CSAM in the universe. We create and combine data sets to help organizations embed prevention and removal tools of one kind or another.

And before I hand over to my learned colleague and friend, Will Few, to run through a few more of the slides, I just think it's worth pausing to reflect on the nature of this online crime. You may be a child. You may be the victim of sexual abuse. That sexual abuse may be recorded, often for commercial gain. Law enforcement may become aware of this crime, may find the perpetrator and may punish them. And the perpetrator may serve their punishment, which can be harsh and long, and yet still long afterwards, you as a victim are being re-victimized incessantly by the distribution of that child's sexual abuse on online channels.

That is the horrific crime we work very actively in the United Kingdom and around the world to prevent. And the statistics are absolutely chilling. So, we come here to today to listen, to learn, to share, and to encourage all of us to go to the fullest extent possible to prevent this illegal content. On that note, let me hand over to my colleague, Will.

WILL FEW Thanks very much, Derek. So yeah, Will Few from the IWF. So, I think this slide kind of demonstrates what our hotline has to deal with. So, our hotline is made up of a team of analysts and they take reports from the public and they're also able to proactively search the internet for child sexual abuse material as well. One of the only non-law enforcement organizations in the world legally able to do so.

And these are the stats that they see. In 2024, 424,000 reports that they assessed, of which it was confirmed that 291,000 contained at least one image of child sexual abuse material. But that doesn't quite tell the full picture. 291,000 reports, as I say, one might contain one image of child sexual abuse, others might contain thousands of images and videos of child sexual abuse and of the very, very worst, most severe forms of it. bit.

Now one thing we do once we've actioned something for removal is we collect an awful lot of data surrounding it. So, one of the things we'll look at is the gender. So, 97% of all action reports last year were of girls. And unfortunately, something we've seen massively growing really since the pandemic though before as well is the growth of what's called self-generated child sexual abuse material. It's not a great term. It's the accepted worldwide one at the moment. But that's where the child is in a safe place, their own bedroom, their own bathroom at home, maybe their parents are downstairs and they're online. They're being groomed, tricked, coerced into performing sexual acts on themselves.

Now, one of the first things we do to action the removal is find the location of the content, find where it's hosted. So, that is very much the gold standard for removing content is with the host. And that's what we do. We find where it's hosted and then we work through an organization called INHOPE, of which we are one of the founding members, to remove that content. And that's what we do on every single report that we get. All of those 291 000 reports, we find where the content's hosted and we work directly with that host

directly through INHOPE with Interpol as well to get that content removed. And that's what we will always do. It's always with the host. That is, as I say, the gold standard.

Just to give you an idea of the UK figure, when we started it was 18%. We were founded in 1996. Fortunately, we've had very good relations with governments, with law enforcement, with other charities, other NGOs, and with industry as well. And we've got now a very successful picture in the UK. Now, obviously, that's great, but the internet knows no boundaries. And so, that's something we need to repeat worldwide to meet our vision.

And how do we meet this vision? Well, that's by working with industry. I mean, we're a fairly small organization taking on quite a significant problem. Trying to rid the internet of child sexual abuse material is a massive, massive thing. That's why we need our members. We need people like Apple, Amazon, Google, Microsoft playing their part. And we touch on all different types of sectors and, of course, we do touch on registries as well. And so, we do work with plenty of them, so from VeriSign, from GoDaddy registry as well as to PIR, to Identity Digital, to Nominet.

Now, just to give you a bit of an idea of something that we are seeing quite a bit more of as well is AI-faked blackmail imagery. And it's sort of sextortion in effect. So, it's something we're seeing growing really sort of, I guess, month on month. Just to give you a bit of an idea of some of the comments that we see surrounding that. It's all up there.

So how do we work with registry operators? Well, currently we work with 37 as I say. Now plenty of those are members but we're also very, very proud to be working with PIR. They have sponsored us, which we're very grateful. Thank you again, Brian.

DEREK RAY-HILL It's particularly impressive that team are here this morning, isn't it? Don't you think?

WILL FEW What's that? Sorry?

DEREK RAY-HILL It's particularly impressive that team are here in Forest, don't you think? After celebrating their anniversary last night. Going the extra mile in that celebration. Great to see you, Brian and team.

WILL FEW Looking great the full team. So, yeah, we're very, very proud to have sponsorship and work quite so closely with PIR. And they allow for all registries to sign up to our key domain services for nothing. So completely free. You can get what are called our domain alerts and our top-level domain hopping list. And as a result, we now do cover quite a good selection of the gTLD registries, which is fantastic. But as you saw, I mean, the statistics are still very much there. We do want to cover the sector. So, we do want to be working with all gTLDs and with all the CCs as well.

It's one of our key things. And yeah, John gave us a very nice little reference there, which I like. It's a good one.

So, the first one that we provide is domain alerts. So, every time we see every content, we action it through the host. As I said, that's what we do every time to get the content removed. But if you're signed up to take our domain alerts, every time we see something on, say, .org, just to go on PIR, if we see something on .org, we'll send that alert directly to the team, to the team at PIR. It's essentially an FYI. We're working in the background to remove this content with the host, but just to be aware, we have seen this.

Now, it's great. It's sort of a great due diligence on the overall state of the TLD for the registries. But it might be that they start to see slightly more abuse on that domain. And certainly, it might be that we send across saying, this is a dedicated domain. There is nothing on this domain except child sexual material. It might also be commercial in aspect as well. And at that point, our recommendation would be to suspend. Now it's our recommendation, we can't mandate it, but that would be our strong recommendation that it be suspended.

But most of the time, as I said, it's an FYI. It's just to let you know we have seen CSAM. We are actioning it. And oftentimes we don't want action being done. If it's just one image on a much larger domain, that's only going to cause a bit more damage for the whole domain to be suspended. We're fully aware of that. So, that's our first one.

Our second one that we're providing free of charge via the PIR service, via PIR sponsorship, is the top-level domain hopping list. So, this is just again four commercial, four dedicated domains and that's where we see them jumping from TLD to TLD. So, we've got there, as the example, Watch Foundation. Going from .uk to .org to .wales, it's the exact same site. The only thing that's changing is the TLD. We add that string to a list, and we provide that first and third Friday of each month. And it's not a long list. I checked yesterday. It's 109 strings at the moment. So, it's not too long. It's just purely dedicated and/or commercial strings. And it has to be the exact match. So, not watch foundation 1 or watch foundation with the 0 in its place. So, it has to be an exact match.

And yeah, how you want to take it, is we provide the list. How you guys want to take it is up to you. It's just potentially reserving it. It's 109 strings, but at the same time we know some people like to just do a quick check through their platform just to see if any of them have been registered. They then send them to us to get the full 100% confirmation, which we're happy to do. So, that's just the top-level domain list. I think then I'm going to pass back over to Derek to talk about our final thing.

DEREK RAY-HILL

Thank you very much, Will. Thank you. What you always are the most concerned about if you work at the Internet Watch Foundation is are you doing as much as humanly and technically possible to identify and remove CSAM from the online universe.

And then are you using that data to work with law enforcement towards some kind of outcome.

And one of the things that we are absolutely aware of, that I'm sure this group is also particularly aware of, is the smaller the platform, the more vulnerable to abuse by and large. And we always encounter evidence and notions of CSAM on small platforms that have no intent to be malevolent in any way and have just been used by predators via some weakness and have this horrific content uploaded onto their domains and sites.

And so, the Image Intercept tool is designed to be a free at-point-of-use service to identify any known CSAM and screen to prevent its distribution or uploading onto platforms. And it is designed for all of those well-intentions, but very, for want of a better term, folksy platforms that may not have any actual employees and may be absolutely a labor of love, but are absolute sitting ducks online for criminal networks that perpetuate this material.

So, we have just launched this tool. We are in discussions with various people about how to embed it throughout the ecosystem, so that there's not just one point of evasion that a criminal gang operating online needs to circumvent. There are multiple. And the web is so much broader, so much more comprehensive to trap them and to remove this horrific content. Thank you very much for your time and look forward to however the discussion progresses over the next few minutes, days, and meetings to come. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Thank you guys for giving us all the time and coming to share all this with us. Does anyone have any questions? Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ

I have one. Thank you very much for the presentation. I work with a small registry, small in standards of domain management, .cat. We've learned the hard way not to interfere with law enforcement and not to adopt unilateral decisions on suspension of domain names in serious situations such as this.

So, one thing is policy enforcement of our registration agreement, which is not using the language or inaccurate data, whatever, we suspend without a problem. But whenever we found some of these situations, our natural impulse is to contact directly the police and say, hey, you tell us what to do. We don't want to interfere. We don't want to create any problems for you by adopting the decision to suspend. How can we work with you guys and our Catalan police to make this more efficient?

DEREK RAY-HILL

So, I think it's important to have very clear boundaries and assessment criteria. So just for the avoidance of doubt, every single hash data point in our data set is absolutely criminal content by the laws of the United Kingdom. That is the absolute threshold at which we set any inclusion into an Internet Watch Foundation data

set. I did not go into how our data is collected, but just for the avoidance of doubt I will now, if that's helpful.

We collect data from public reports. We are the largest hotline in Europe, top three largest hotlines in the world. And one of our big emphases is on being efficient with public reports because the public will, of course, and I think most of us would agree, think a lot of content they find online on the clear web should be illegal content, should be removed. But by the letter of the law, it isn't. So, we filter through all of that. So, those reports, about 16% to 17% of public reports we receive, actually result in one of our highly trained analysts judging it to be criminal online content and CSAM in nature.

The second bit of our data acquisition, which is the most productive, is that we have a special set of powers with the Crown Prosecution Service in the United Kingdom to be allowed to proactively seek child sexual abuse material online. So, that is by far the greatest source of CSAM data. But once again, it's all illegal content.

And then the third set is that we work very actively on the criminal image database in the United Kingdom and we cross-reference data points between the two. And where that helps us is because we set the threshold absolutely at it is a criminal image or piece of content by the laws of the United Kingdom, we are very precise about age, particularly. If we know that image is of a victim that was subject to some form of investigation, we know they were a

minor at the time. Therefore, we can extrapolate back to images we have of that victim and be certain. that it is a criminal act and a criminal image as a result.

So, the reason why I go on about the rigidness and the comprehensiveness of our data is that if, for instance, you were to decide to take the bold move to embed something like Image Intercept in however your ecosystem works, and forgive me, we would, of course, need to understand that a lot better, you could be absolutely certain that no one would ever say you made a subjective moral decision to remove this content. As long as you said the images we prevent are known criminal content by the laws of the United Kingdom, then it eliminates a bunch of other risks for platforms who want to be--

And I believe it is true that subjective decisions are absolutely to be avoided at all costs. But I also don't sit in a room like this and think these are a bunch of people that want to create backdoors for the distribution of child sexual abuse material. I believe that everybody here in this room and online wants to do their utmost to prevent child sexual abuse and the proceeds of child sexual abuse. And there are ways. There are imperfect ways, but one way is absolutely to use our data, one way or another, because you can always defend its use because it's absolutely illegal content. And I think that's a huge point of reassurance, hopefully. I hope that's helpful.

BETH BACON

All right. Thanks. So, if we could go to the room first, Brian's had his hand up. And if you can try and get in the room, that would be great.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC

Thanks, Beth. And thank you, Derek. Thank you, Will. Brian Cimbolic, PIR. So first, I wanted to thank IWF for coming here. Great presentation. And also, thanks to Identity Digital, who sponsored them to come here. So, thanks ID. I did, obviously, want to give kudos to IWF. This is real. We're very proud of our partnership with them. We've worked with them as a trusted notifier since 2018, and it's been an excellent partnership.

I wanted to touch on Nacho's question because I think for purposes of scale, at least for us in org, it's basically like a 99 to 1 ratio of non-dedicated to dedicated. So, that means that generally when we get referrals, we're not talking about a whole list of domains that are dedicated to child sexual abuse material. And so, with that universe, the overwhelming majority of referrals that come in from IWF, at least for us, the goal isn't to suspend the domain name. You wouldn't be interfering with an investigation. The goal is that you actually work with the registrar. You pass it down. You say you get defanged URLs. You're not disseminating child sexual abuse materials. And you ask that they work with the registrant to get the content removed.

So, that's, at least for us, the way that we implement this, the goal is to get the content removed. In the rare cases in which it is a

dedicated domain, we do immediately suspend. And in my various conversations with different law enforcement agencies, I kind of posed that question to them. Like there's a danger that I'd be interfering. And unanimously, the answer was, oh, my gosh, no. If you're in a position that you can get this offline, get it offline. And so, you talk to your local authorities, of course. But the notion that we would wait until we get confirmation if we're in a position to do something about it, what's been articulated to me is to do something about it.

Finally, I did just want to remind the group about the sponsorship. If anyone does want to take advantage of these services from IWF, it's free. And to be clear, PIR is not part of that relationship. We wouldn't receive any data. We would not be made aware of any notification that goes to you as a registry. So, thank you again, IWF. I think it's excellent and encourage any registry that isn't already an IWF member—and there are several in the room like Verisign, like ID and others and Jeff—to sign up for the sponsorship.

BETH BACON Thanks, Brian. So, I'll go to John and then we're going to draw a line under the queue and I'll throw it to Will to close it out and then we'll move along.

JOHN MCCABE: Just a quick question. I noticed that there was nothing in Latin America. Is that because of non-participation? Are they doing something right or they're doing something wrong?

DEREK RAY-HILL: I think that's a very good point. I mean, one of the things that we think is absolutely the case is, and if you look at Will stats, we're often asked like in the EU-- So, we obviously don't know how much quantum of CSAM there is in the universe. No one really does. Between us NCMEC, C3P, INHOPE, we can guess it's getting worse and multiplying despite our best efforts. But the truth is there are huge gaps in prevention and identification around the world. The reason why in the United Kingdom we have a small percentage of new instances of known CSAM versus EU countries.

So, of the 292,000 images, which could be multiple images as part of that cluster, of course, our analysts identified last year 60% were hosted inside the boundaries of an EU country. And the reason why that comparison is true, we think, is because by hook or crook in the United Kingdom you have a robust hotline with strong relationships with law enforcement able to navigate the choppy waters of morality and legality or what have you that influences policymakers and lawmakers to implement laws.

We've recently made it, for instance, illegal in the United Kingdom to own a manual to train AI in the creation of CSAM and to own the models to train AI in the creation of CSAM. And to the best of my

knowledge, we're the first country to make that an explicit illegal act, and that's because of IWF's relationship and lobbying, etc.

In a place like Latin America, almost none of that actually exists. There are organizations trying their hardest to move the needle, but they are literally staring a tidal wave in the face, and they just don't have the capacity. So, if we could do one thing that's outside our purview, we would absolutely invest in core infrastructure to expand the provision of services to prevent and remove child sexual abuse material around the world, and then also to offer various levels of victim support.

But you're absolutely right to identify that in Latin America it's out there. And it's because we proactively most of the material everyone finds is either proactively reported by platforms to NCMEC, or the result of a proactive technological tool, which is the C3P Arachne, or us proactively searching for it. And if you're not doing that, you're not going to find it.

JOHN MCCABE: You may find an ally in the new pope who's an American but also a Peruvian citizen, and I'm sure he'd be very interested in working with you on that in Latin America.

DEREK RAY-HILL: Thank you very much. Sorry, Will, did you want to come in? By the way, I should just explain, Will was invited by Identity Digital, but

they got me as well as an added bonus they didn't count on. So anyway, go ahead, Will.

WILL FEW

No, yeah, I just wanted to say that's very much the hosting figures for it. I mean, the UK is very low. That doesn't mean that there aren't offenders here viewing the content. Yeah, I guess it kind of goes with that saying, which I think is probably going to be true of Latin America. Just because the hosting isn't quite there, it doesn't mean there isn't an issue there. It doesn't mean that the victims in it aren't Latin American. It doesn't mean the offenders viewing the content aren't Latin American either. And yeah, the other thing I just wanted to say is, for the record, thank you very, very much to Identity Digital for inviting us along.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Jose. So, this has been time well spent on a very important issue. So, this time I really mean it where this is the end of the queue. Rubens.

RUBEN KUHL

Rubens Kuhl, .br. Just to mention that there is a factor that will make Latin America show less in everything that is hosted, regardless of being criminal or not. Because hosting prices in Latin America are higher, so people just host their operations outside Latin America because it's cheaper. So, you won't see that being from an IP address in Latin America, but it will be possibly targeted

or operated by someone in the country. Our federal police routinely raids and arrests people. A minor was arrested last week because he operated a CSAM network as a business. So, it's just a matter of people spending less money to run their criminal operations.

BETH BACON

All right. Thank you, guys, very much. I think just something to keep in mind is there's some chitter chatter in the room of we do this already. Sometimes it's you don't know what you don't know. So, if you have an expert who is dedicated to do this, want to learn how to do these things better, reach out to us we can connect you with IWF. And you guys can either learn more, ask questions, but this is an important thing that we can do a lot of good things that works, got a lot of good work on. And with that, huge thank you to Will and Derek and the IWF. Thanks.

DEREK RAY-HILL

Thank you very much, everyone. Yeah, thank you very much.

BETH BACON

Everybody was sort of clapping but then not clapping, so claps. All right. We're going to do a bit of an audible. Again, I think it was time well spent on an important issue, so we're going to do a bit of an audible on the schedule. We will do public comments as an email update, not because we don't want to hear from Catherine, but sort of because we don't want to hear from Catherine. But also,

because we can very effectively do that on email. And we don't have anything that is absolutely pending this week to go over.

So, we will move into our policy work and discussion. There's a few of these that I recognize are just updates. We had meetings. We're moving along. But I want to give everyone a chance because we don't always have this face-to-face time. So, we will power through our policy updates and hopefully only eat into our-- We have some admin discussions that we should have, so only eat about five minutes of that as well. So, we will start with the PPSAI with John. Thanks. We can come back to John. All right. Chris, are you prepared to chit-chat about SubPro?

CHRIS DISSPAIN I don't have much time. I mean, I can talk on this for a week.

BETH BACON Sorry?

CHRIS DISSPAIN I said I can talk on this for a week.

BETH BACON Time's up, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Well, I want to, but we have to sort of think about what our position is. But let me just level set and then we can maybe take it online.

So, those of you who are watching the SubPro will know that there is an issue running in respect to a recommendation from the PDP that in essence says ICANN should act on fraud and deceptive practices. It is a very, very straightforward recommendation. In fact, I think it just says ICANN should act on fraud and deceptive practices. And I think therein lies perhaps the challenge.

ICANN is suggesting that to implement that as it's written would be challenging and probably out of scope and against ICANN's bylaws and have put forward some suggested wording of how you could implement that recommendation. Some on the SubPro have taken a perfectly legitimate view, which is that, yes, but that's what the recommendation says, and if your wording doesn't actually implement the recommendation, then there is a process that you should go through to deal with that.

Part of the challenge with this is that, and I was chatting to a couple of people about this earlier, part of the challenge with this is that often with recommendations from PDPs, they are written in a way that allows you to have some sort of nuance about how they might be implemented. The challenge with this recommendation is this has got absolutely no nuance at all. And so, therefore, even though you might agree that if it was implemented as it is written, it is in fact probably is beyond challenging for ICANN and so on and so forth. Well, you might not, but you might agree that it is.

It begs the question, well, okay, then, so how do you fix it? Because there isn't really a way of nuancing it that isn't effectively rewriting

it. So, where we're at at the moment is possibly at a point where staff needs to come back to the GNSO and say, we don't think we can implement this recommendation in the way that it's written. And then the question becomes whether the GNSO-- And I may be slightly wrong about this because I don't know this well enough, but I think the answer is the GNSO could say, okay, we'll look at reinterpreting the recommendation or rewriting the recommendation. But the ultimate end game is it goes to the Board for them to-- Because they've accepted this recommendation.

So, that's where we are. The question for the registries is whether we should, whether we want to have a position. The current situation, I think, is that some members of the IR or the SubPro IRT very firmly have the view that the process means you have to go through this. Others probably don't care. But the question is what should we be doing. And I know we're not going to answer that question now best but that's the baseline for you.

BETH BACON Thanks, Chris. So, I think at this point, some of us is looking gently at our counselors to see what they would need if the IRT is going to send us to the GNSO. So, I imagine there'll be some discussion in the IRT. I don't think that this was-- The issue was discussed in the SubPro IRT yesterday, but not the next steps of sending it to the GNSO and ultimately the Board. So, I imagine the IRT will discuss that. If we have thoughts and feelings around how to direct Chris

as our registry rep to engage there, then that is something we can do. Do you think the next meeting-- Is the next meeting next week, or is it? Looks like Carla. Two weeks?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Yeah, Thursday's a different agenda, though. We'll get it sorted. We'll come back.

BETH BACON: So, there will be a meeting in the next few weeks, guys. Smooth as silk, per usual. So, we will have a meeting of the IRT in the next few weeks, so we'll have some time. We can also talk about this on our call next week if folks have thoughts and feelings. If anyone has any feelings now for Chris. Jeff has feelings but first Catherine because she's in the room like I've requested

CATHERINE PALETTA: Thanks, guys. I think in response to this, we've heard from our non-IRT reps who are members of the stakeholder group that are not representing the stakeholder group but are on the IRT. And those are different people than Chris Disspain now that we figured that out. Anyway, I think we've heard--

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I always knew they were different, just in case you were wondering.

CATHERINE PALETTA

I believe you. I didn't know. Anyway, I think what I'm trying to say is that we've heard-- I felt we've heard kind of the same thing from them, which is, as you said, this needs to go through the process. You can't implement it this way. You need to go to the Board. You need to go to the GNSO Council. And I think your question is, do we need the Registry Stakeholder Group position to be that?

And I think even if we as a stakeholder group can't align on a specific position to give Chris instructions, that they're hearing that message from other registries that are in the IRT. I don't think that's bad. But if that's an issue where we can't come up with the registry position though the outspoken voices have generally been aligned, I do think there's enough noise in that group right now to potentially get this across the line without having the registry have to come in with its registry flag or stakeholder group flag, I should say, to push that through. So, thanks

BETH BACON

Jeff

JEFF NEUMAN

Thanks, Beth. Yeah, so Anne Aikman-Scalese and Susan Payne are the Council liaisons to the SubPro IRT. It's my understanding that they may already or Anne may bring it up at today's informal Council session or closed meeting. So, I think we may want to give some guidance. Or do they have guidance? I'm not 100% sure that this is not already at the Council level. And I'm also not sure

whether this is really for the IRT, because the scope of the IRT is very limited as the question of is what ICANN proposed consistent with the policy recommendations. And so, I think the IRT liaisons have heard what they needed to hear so far. So, I'm not 100% sure it's going to be a discussion within the IRT again without already going to the Council, if that makes sense. I just thought I would add that.

BETH BACON

Thanks, Jeff. So, I'm not sure. It sounds like nobody was actually in this meeting, so you're all like I don't know what's happening. So, I think that one of the things is that as we are discussing this issue, this is new information. They didn't discuss sending it to the Board or GNSO in the IRT meeting, to my understanding. So, you either need to have follow-up or you need to coordinate with the IRT reps.

I think that the IRT would and has in the past developed a little bit of information to share with the GNSO if they are going to refer something. And I believe our counselors are very well able to say we haven't really discussed this. We don't have a registry position yet. Because we are not going to develop one in the next maybe like eight minutes. So, anything that we can do to help you counselors, let us know. Should that pop up in conversation, that would be great.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU Thank you, Chris, for seating the physical microphone. Just to clarify that yes, it has not been officially brought to Council. It would theoretically be the role of the liaison to the IRT to flag to Council if there is an implementation challenge between what ICANN org believes should be implemented and what the IRT believes the intent of the recommendation is. I don't know if it will come up during the Council informal today. Those things don't have agendas in advance. It's a real fly-by-night situation. But even if it comes up at the informal today, it will not be tabled as a specific agenda item tomorrow. So, we would have a couple weeks to get our ducks in a row. So, we can definitely do that.

BETH BACON All right. Thanks, Sam. That's great. After Chris, we're going to close this out because we are sneaking up on time.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Just to say that the 24th of June is the, as Carla said, the 24th of June meeting, it would be on the agenda then. So, if anything's happened between now and then, it would be useful to know. That's where we're at. Thanks

BETH BACON That's really helpful. Thank you, Carla. All right. So, we have a date in mind. We will add this to our next agenda. We can also, if we find that we have the need to, have a small individual call for folks who are interested in this. So, thanks, Chris, for hopping back in. All

right. We will go back. John, are you ready? Okay. We'll go back to John for the PPSAI IRT update. And then we will absolutely smoke through the rest of these updates.

JOHN MCCABE

Thank you. This is John McCabe for the record. The Registry Stakeholder Group put together a small team to address the issue of PPSAI IRT and come together with a position paper. So, I'll share that with you, if I may. I have to say that it was brilliantly put together by Ajith. Thank you, Ajith, if you're in the room or not.

On the mandate, the IRT's mandate is to review whether all recommendations in the Working Group Final Report are fit for purpose. The IRT must seek guidance from the GNSO and the Board on how to proceed if certain recommendations are found to be implementable but others are not. The IRT should not cherry-pick recommendations from the Working Group Final Report. Sec point two is the IRT is designed to implement recommendations and it must not stray into developing policy recommendations as this is outside its remit. The GNSO has specific operating procedures to develop policy recommendations.

Now, on the current status, the IRT first point is that the IRT should complete its drafting of threshold questions on which it needs guidance from the GNSO. The IRT is currently working on three threshold questions. On definitions. Since the current services of the market are not reflected by the final report, the GNSO must

provide guidance on how the IRRT must approach this challenge of definitions.

On accreditation. There is lack of clarity on whether the final report envisaged a complete accreditation model in the first place and if such accreditation is even necessary. On illustrative disclosure framework. Whether the illustrative disclosure framework was intended to be an illustration of how the disclosure could be undertaken or it is policy and must be implemented as is.

Next point. Given that these threshold questions are fundamental to the work and scope of the IRT, the IRT's primary focus must be to complete the drafting of these questions and solicit GNSO guidance. In addition, the IRT may also pose an additional question to the GNSO to clarify the scope and mandate of the IRT in case specific recommendations are found to be unimplementable. Only when these threshold questions have been addressed by the GNSO can further work, including on alternatives to accreditation mechanisms, be structured.

Without clarifying the GNSO position on these questions, and because these questions are foundational to the work of the IRT, the IRT should not seek to address additional issues. And that's it in summary. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Thanks, John. Any questions for John? All right. I see nothing in the room. Brian, can we turn to you and to Jeff for Base RA Review Team Update?

JEFF NEUMAN

This is Jeff Neuman. So, as you all know, and I think as we discussed last week, the registry agreement now is out for public comment. So, that's one of the comment areas that Catherine is gathering our feedback on. And so, that's obviously number one. The language where the registry-- If you recall, there's language that's been changed because of the work of the IRT, which is being discussed or was discussed within the IRT. And then there's separate asks from ICANN that were labeled as operational changes, which were the ones that we, the small team, discussed with and are discussing with ICANN org staff.

We've narrowed the issues down, which is good. Discussed a whole bunch of those on the last call. And we are having a meeting today at lunchtime. Unfortunately, no lunch will be served, but it's at lunchtime. But yeah. And I think the main agenda items really are to review the schedule for completing our discussions. As a reminder, there may likely be or will be a Public Comment 2 that I believe will start somewhere in the September timeframe. It's covered like September and October so that everything is hopefully finalized by the Board by the end of the year so that it's all done either with the Applicant Guidebook or shortly after the Applicant

Guidebook's out there. But the goal would obviously be to get everything out at the same time.

So, yeah. So, we'll have this meeting and then update the Registry Stakeholder Group for our next call as to what the outcomes were. Hopefully we'll nail down a schedule for our future meetings. And, yeah, so I think that's the crux of it. Brian, anything?

BETH BACON Thank you, Jeff. DNS Abuse Working Group?

CHRIS DISSPAIN Real quick. Session yesterday, CPH DNS abuse session. Most of you were probably there. Nothing to report on it other than it seemed to go very well. And staff, ICANN staff were taking notes and have presented the four ideas to the GAC this morning. So, the GAC is now, those GAC people who obviously weren't in the room, will now know that those are the four ideas that the CPH has put forward and onwards and upwards. Thanks.

BETH BACON Beautiful. And I've heard anecdotally from folks that they thought it was very positive. and went really well, and none of those people work here in this room. So, that's nice to hear. I'm going to, again, just fasten loose with the agenda. Can I turn to Jen for two seconds for the DNS Abuse reminder and update? Thank you.

JEN CHUNG

I'll take five if it's possible. Jen Chung for the record. Just another reminder, since it's right after the update from the DNS Abuse Working group here, small team on DNS Abuse and Council, the homework for registries is to really take a look at the matrix, the gap matrix. We really need registry input. I mentioned this yesterday as well. I'm going to drop the link on the chat, and I'm also going to bring it back up on your inboxes. So please, please, please do take a look. Deadline for input, just like what Sam mentioned for accuracy as well, the 18th. Thank you.

BETH BACON

Thank you, friend. I'm going to throw to Rick for a CSC Update. I'm going to maybe step on your toes a little bit and note that there's some more depth that we need to go into on CSC updates. We'll have more information for you. There's some charter questions and things that we're going to be doing that we maybe don't need to dive into today. So, Rick is going to stick with the standard update. It's going to be zippy and perfect per usual. And also, to say a big thank you to Gordon, who is our current alternate and has put his hand up to be our representative, and we will go through that process as well.

RICK WILHELM

Very good. Thank you, Beth. Rick Wilhelm, PIR. Quick CSC update. First and foremost, and most importantly, operations at PTI/IANA

continue to be stable. So, that's the most important thing there. They continue to do a good job at delivering their service.

Staffing-wise is as Beth just alluded, Dmitry Burkov is termed out in October. We've put forth a call for volunteers. Gordon Dick, who's joined us here today, from Nominet, has put his hand up to fill that seat and has not been met with any opposition, given that he's tends to strike fear in the hearts of any opponent anywhere, unsurprisingly. We will be looking for a new alternate, which is the role that Gordon has. So, if you're interested in that, either reach out to me or to Gordon or Beth, of course. So more on that as it comes.

Over at CSC, we are currently in the process of changing the process by which the SLAs, Service Level Agreements, are being changed. We're not changing the SLAs, 64 of them, but we are changing the process by which they would be changed. That just went through public comment. The public comment period is currently open. It's about to close. The Registry Stakeholder Group has a comment and submitted, and so that's currently being processed and such. So, that should be finalized here shortly. That's all going reasonably well.

And then one last item. Pivoting a little bit over to the AINA Function Review Team, which is not part of the CSC, but sort of related. Public comment on that has recently closed and is about to publish its final report, which is expected to be largely in line with

the initial report. Happy to take any questions either now or offline since we're really tight on time. Thank you, Beth.

BETH BACON

I was trying to uncover my Zoom room so I could see if they're on my laptop. No questions? Comments? All right. Also, just to add, we said this on the email list, but also a big thank you to Dmitry, who has spent just a really good long amount of time doing this for us and I'm sure has made it look spicy and entertaining for Gordon, who's going to come in and swoop up that responsibility. So, thank you guys very much. Really, these are important things. We need the representatives and we need you guys to volunteer for these things so that we can continue to be effective in all areas. And we really appreciate it.

So, we are going to, again, just really fast and loose. We're going to trash the entire end of the agenda because we simply do not have time to get into some of these things. But I do want to flag some of these items to discuss in our next biweekly meeting. Some administrative things, I think these will help are things that we can think about. They'll help us organize ourselves more effectively, making sure that everyone who is participating in various roles know exactly what they're volunteering for, what they're putting their hand up for, and what that means for level of commitment as well as scope of work.

So, one of those things is just representative updates. We're thinking about putting together some sort of a guideline document

that could live as a resource on our website for members so that if you are thinking I want to be in a working group, or what's the difference between a registry representative and participating just in a group as my own individual registry, I think that might be helpful for newer folks and folks who are not new but maybe thinking of putting their hands up.

So, if that's something that's interesting to you, please let me know. We will try and draft that around. If you don't feel like that's necessary, I assure you it is. So, let's do that. I think it's important. We get lots of questions at the ExCom saying I would love to be a representative, but I'm not sure what that means in the practicality. So, I think we do need it. But if you have special insights or if you've taken on a role like that recently and you have insights of things that were really surprising to you that you would have liked to have known, please let us know and we'll include that.

Another issue is registry meeting logistics. We've had some questions and thoughts from our folks who are, as you know, we're in the room together right now, most of us. We have lots of lovely humans online all over the globe. Time zones are hard, especially in Asia Pacific. So, we're having some questions and thoughts about could we be a little more inclusive of the Asia Pacific folks.

We have tried in the past to take just take a biweekly and just have a biweekly at 11:00 p.m. East Coast time. We got very low participation from East Coast, West Coast and Asia Pacific. What I've heard from folks is the drop in call isn't a very workable time

for some Asia Pacific folks. So, my thought is—I'm throwing this out here, noodle on it, other ideas welcome—turning one of the drop-in calls a month into a full biweekly call. So, we would have an evening one on the East Coast, but it would be morning for our Asia Pacific friends. So hopefully that is something that might work.

And then we did have a request for more detailed meeting notes. And I'm trying to find a tactful way to say this, but guys, you just need to scroll down in the email that Sue sends every week. She does notes. One of the thoughts is that Sue may PDF those notes instead and attach them to the top of the email, so they're more visible, but there are notes. So, if you've been looking for those, we have them. So, those are some of the admin things that I would like everyone to just noodle on. If you guys have other things that that you think are not working well or could be improved, let us know. Those are things that we need to work on, not just our policy stuff. Questions, comments on those? Okay. And then Jeff has an AOB for us. Yeah.

JEFF NEUMAN So, two real quick. Number one, if you're a funded traveler and you have your assignments for this meeting, please submit your recaps of the meetings within a day, within 24 hours. So, yesterday's sessions, we should be getting recaps to the registry list. Of course, for the last day, just as reasonable of time you can get it to us, great. And number two, funded travelers for the next ICANN meeting.

	Just reminding everyone the due date for the application is June 18th
BETH BACON	June 18th is a big day, guys. Any birthdays on June 18th? Make it really spicy? Okay. We have exactly one minute left before they cut off our sound. Does anyone have any last business, comments?
CATHERINE PALETTA	I put this in the chat. The transfer PDF public comment is closing on the 12th, which is two days from now. We have a statement drafted with the help of some of our reps to that, and if you have feelings about it, get them in now because we need to submit that, I believe, on Monday. And we'll close that document in two days. So, that's the only one that's actually.
BETH BACON	Yeah. So, that's the only one that we have a closed deadline on. Last call. We packed a lot in. I'm proud of us. Thank you, guys, as always for being a spectacular group of humans to work with. If you have any needs, if something comes up, find an ExCom, find anyone else. We're happy to help all week. We're out.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]