ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to this ISPCP Session at ICANN85. It's been a long day already, I suppose. Welcome, everyone. The agenda for today is on the screen, but as usual, before we get there, any updates to your statement of interest? Okay, seeing no hand, just any change to the agenda you'd like to see? Okay, just for you -- Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: Thankfully, thank you. This is Susan for the record. If there's time at the end, we might want to just talk about something that's been tossed around in council around Urgent Requests. So, want to throw that out for consideration.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly. Okay, thank you. We have also, as I think I mentioned it on the list, but we'll be talking about our early input to the PDP on DNS Abuse. So, I'm not sure we can edit the agenda on the fly, but those are two new items that we'll take on Board. Anything else? So, we've got 90 minutes, by the way. Anything else? Okay, thank you.

Let's move on to item two on the agenda. And we've got a speaker from the NCSG. Welcome, Manju. And the topic is trusted notify

networks or network. I believe we've got slides and we can go to those slides. And we've got, let's say, as we say, 10 minutes plus five minutes of questions. That's okay. If you could do 10 minutes, that would be easier, just to make sure that we've got enough time. Thank you, Manju. The floor is yours.

MANJU CHEN

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Philippe. But just to be clear, I'm here not really as much as NCSG, but as an employee of my new organization, Trusted Notifier Network. We are a not-for-profit organization, but we are not charitable. We are registered in Hong Kong as a company limited by guarantee.

And we really wanted to make the -- what we wanted to do is really to improve how online abuse are handled now in the online world by aligning the interest and make it easier for intermediaries to take down requests, make them, you know, reduce the legal risks and costs for them.

And doing this, we try to set up this chain of contracts to improve the quality and accuracy of notices. I'll dive into more details later. This is our team. Just showing this, so if you're interested in my presentation, you can come to find me later, during the week. And my boss, the one at the left, is also here. He's wearing a bright blue jacket every day, so he's very easy to find.

If you are interested and wanted to know more about TNN, please come to talk to us. So, this, we already have pioneered this concept

since 2021 in APAC. But before, it was mostly bilateral, and we think it will be much more efficient and effective if we do it in a network format. That's why we're starting TNN now.

And we started this because what we see the problem is, is really there's this unfair cost transfer. So, for business and brands that have been under severe attack of hackers, so money is flying out of them because the hackers are using their names to scam the users online. But they don't have the expertise or time to deal with this.

For them, their main goal or objective for their business is to sell their products, and they were happy to outsource this kind of difficult task for them to what we see in the market. They call takedown service providers. They pay the takedown service providers to execute takedowns for them, but we all know here in ICANN. These service providers cannot really do anything to take down whatever they promise to take down. What they do really is they send takedown requests freely to internet intermediaries.

And since they are paid to send requests, and it's free for them to send a request, they're just sending whatever they can. They try their luck when it's probably gray area, because there's no cost for them to send requests. And internet intermediaries basically are dealing with takedown requests in a social responsibility kind of way.

If they take down things, sometimes they get blamed if it's based on wrongful information. They will be held accountable or get sued by their consumer. And if they don't take down things, of course,

there are other blames coming from elsewhere, saying they don't take any actions. So, they're bearing all the blames, and money is just flying out of them.

I really want people to appreciate how money is flying out. But yeah, so for them, what they're trying to do is really to reduce this cost that's inflicted on them. And for them, for intermediaries, the best way they can reduce cost is to make whatever request they are accepting stricter. The criteria will be stricter. They will be more explicit and specific on what they want to do, and more limited.

That's their way to try to transfer back to cost. But this whole thing is just unfair to everyone, mostly to intermediaries. And we think that's why nowadays people are having these very confrontational feelings about abuse all the time, also when we enter the discussion.

And let's not forget, aside from the unfair cost where businesses are involved, there's still governments. And governments like to inflict on regulations to intermediaries when they don't feel like they're getting the results they want to see.

So, basically, everybody is just blaming everybody. Abuse is still happening, and takedown requests are not getting better. Governments are coming up with regulations, and intermediaries are still bearing most of the cost. Everyone is just extremely unhappy.

One resolution we are proposing is, first of all, we really need to reduce the cost and risk for intermediaries to deal with the requests they're accepting or receiving. That way, they can feel more comfortable and more confident to act on the requests they receive. And how do we do that? We really have to improve the detection and takedown requests.

And of course, to reduce the legislation pressure, we really have to involve the government in this network to include them, so they don't feel the need to impose us more regulations. And then in the end, in the future, ultimately, we really want this to be a cross-industry effort, because we all know, although at ICANN, we are very limited in our scope, but abuse does not only happen on the DNS. It's also happening on platforms, social medias, and even SMS, tech calls. Those are all the partners we should involve in this ecosystem.

So, our goals to achieve our mission is really, first of all, we think it's very important for notifiers to become the verifiers of the notices they send, because we've been hearing discussions of, well, it's good that they're notifiers, but we still have to spend extra money and resources to verify those notices.

So, if they can verify their notices to ensure the accuracy and quality of the notices already, before they send it to us and us pass it on to the intermediaries, this will reduce an abundant amount of costs for the intermediaries. And also, TNN will authenticate the notifiers by a set of requirements, which I'll talk about later. And

most importantly, we want to provide indemnity for intermediaries in a way to reduce legal costs for them, so they feel more confident to take on requests and take action based on the requests.

And for governments, we will have a different set of process, which I'll also talk about later. And most importantly, notifiers will have to pay to send their notices, so the cost transfer can reverse.

So, I see I'm quite short on time. Probably I'll just move to the full diagram of how it works. So, basically, TNN will send in the middle, and we're making the service providers or whoever they want to send requests, send notices to intermediaries. If they wanted to have their notices to be prioritized and take down in a timely fashion, they will have to meet a set of requirements to become Trusted Notifiers. For example, they will have at least 10 years of direct experience of takedown, and then they will also have to meet the accuracy requirement of at least 95% the first month they become Trusted Notifiers.

And after that, it's going to be at least 93% of accuracy rate. And all of those requests or notices they send to TNN has to meet these four criteria, verify, indemnify, non-automated, and accurate. Accurate here is actually not the most accurate word.

We actually are aiming for due diligence and due process. So, as long as they follow the due process of verifying their requests to the victim and ensuring indemnity in the notices, it should be accurate in the sense that it's already going through due process. And for law enforcement, we are involving them, but of course we all know

law enforcement will have a problem probably meet the criteria we set for Trusted Notifiers. But it's also not our limit to kind of decide which countries LEA can be involved and which cannot.

So, we're just going to accept all law enforcement if they want to become a Trusted Notifier. But of course, we all know also law enforcement are not naturally to be trusted. So, what we're doing is we involve them, but we will check every single request we receive from law enforcement before we send it to intermediaries. So, we check, we review, and then we charge for them, and we tell them we are doing this according to the industry standards.

And only when they agree to these terms, they will be involved in the network. All of the notices to TNN and from TNN will be standardized and codified just to streamline the process and make life easier for everybody in the network. And because we've already done the due diligence of notices, when intermediaries receive the notice, we hope to decrease or even best eliminate the human review effort they are doing now when they receive requests. And they will feel confident and comfortable to prioritize the takedown notices they receive from us. So, this is basically what we are trying to do to reduce and reverse the cost transfer.

I guess this probably will be my last slide. So, as you can see, the service providers now become Trusted Notifiers. They join TNN via a paid membership. And then intermediaries -- okay, okay. Oh, oh, it's lagging. That's why. Sorry. Let me see again.

And through the contract they pay, through the membership contract, we will hold Trusted Notifiers accountable. And they, in the contract, they will promise indemnity of every request they send to TNN. And TNN also will have an MOU with intermediaries where intermediaries, the lease promises they will prioritize the notice they receive from TNN. But it's totally free, I want to stress, for intermediaries to join TNN because that's the main goal, to reverse this cost.

And of course, hackers will still try to impersonate as paying customers, so they pay intermediaries to get the domain to do whatever they do. But the cost of reviewing all the takedown requests they send are reduced because all the requests, all the notices they receive from TNN are already verified and with indemnity.

And this cost transferred back to TNN where TNN transferred the back cost again to the Trusted Notifiers because they bear the cost and effort to ensure accuracy, and they become their best interest to ensure the accuracy of the notices they send. Oh, sorry. I'm very sorry.

And then, of course, Trusted Notifiers, well, because the request now is better and actions are taken faster, effectively we're reducing harm and impact, and all of the attacks from the hackers are now rendered meaningless because they're effectively and immediately nullified. So, now money is basically flying from the hackers.

So, this is really what we want to do, and I will skip the takedown protocols, and also, we are planning to kind of see if we will be in the future explore on non-technical abuse, but since we're at time, probably I won't do on this too much.

These are the types of non-technical abuse we are considering, but I want to stress that all intermediaries who want to join can opt out of all non-technical abuse if they don't feel comfortable about dealing with non-technical abuse.

And just expected commitment for the intermediaries. We want the intermediaries to ensure, to promise that they will treat notices from TNN as a matter of priority, but we want to also ensure that intermediaries always have the final say. For all of the requests they receive from TNN, they still get to make the ultimate decision all the time.

We put optional here because there have been intermediaries that we talked to, for example, the top registry who told us they really don't want to make the decision. They will trust whatever they receive from us, and then they'll just do whatever we suggest. But of course, if people want to retain the final say, it is the default that they will retain the final say.

For non-technical abuse, we are thinking to build this matrix to see what behavior is illegal in what jurisdictions, and then these notices, we will indicate this information in our notices to the

intermediaries, so they will be able to decide whether they are willing to process the notice they receive.

And most importantly, we are expecting this process to be a multistakeholder process. We are talking to all of the people we can to really invite people to have suggestions and feedback on our policy and see what we can improve, so this really works for everyone. And I think that's it. I will stop now, and hopefully people will have questions. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Manju. Any questions for Manju? Okay, I have one very general question, if I may. If you could go back to, I think it's one of the last slides, the one with the workflow. No, the one before. Yeah, the one where you have the MOUs on the right-hand side. Yeah, this one here.

So, the question is, you basically, as you've just described, as far as I can understand it, you put in place a framework whereby this is proposed as an intermediary to sort of make sure that the takedown requests, and I use the term very generally, are properly framed and properly processed on the other side. So, it's based on a membership on the left-hand side and MOUs on the other.

My question is very naive. At this point, how many members do you have, and how many MOUs have you signed?

MANJU CHEN

Thank you. So, for now, we are focusing on getting more intermediaries on Board. We are not working so much on the notification, because if you don't have people to send requests to, why do you need the notifiers, right? So, we really are more focusing on familiarizing these ideas with the intermediaries. We've been talking to a lot of registries and registrars.

In APAC, we already have several very big, especially in China, because our CEO used to, when he was in his previous job, he has built very strong relationships with China. We all know how, in ICANN, it's kind of more not focused on China. A lot of registries and registrars are having problems to deal with data in China, or rather, if they are facing abuse from China, they were having problems of getting it resolved.

We're having actually the most, I think, it's like either the biggest or the most authorized abuse dealing platforms in China to already sign on to this. So, we hope to kind of bridge the gap in the sense that they will be able to transfer their requests to the intermediaries in China, and they will also be able to share abuse data in China to us.

And also, of course, aside from China, we have other ccTLDs in the AIPAC area have indicated interest. We are also having interest from big registries and registrars of the names we all know, but I don't know they're as happy for me to share it with them, since we haven't signed anything really. But yeah, people are getting

interested, and we are hoping people to comment, actually, on the policy document we have.

That's the main focus we are having now, because, as we said, we really want this to be a modest sale of the process, but we have to come up with something first for people to comment on. So, I will be very happily sharing the policy document to you guys, for you guys to really feedback on it and point out where and what we're lacking. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, Manju. Any other comment or question? I'm sorry, I should look at the queue first. Thomas, you're first.

THOMAS RICKERT Manju, thank you so much for the presentation. And I know that it's early days for you, since you are starting this initiative. I think particularly the relationship with the Chinese intermediaries is very intriguing, because that's where everyone hits a brick wall, to be quite honest.

And once I have other questions on how you can work with law enforcement, how you authenticate them because those are the things that we are having huge difficulties with. What is your access to the, you said that your CEO has relationships with intermediaries, but is there an interest by Chinese intermediaries to take down material that would not be illegal under local

applicable laws? You know, because I think we have a clash of legal systems to a certain extent.

So, do you actually hear from them that they are willing to respond to takedown notices coming from you and doing something that is not necessarily contravening local laws?

MANJU CHEN

So, this is open session, so I'll try to be as diplomatic as I can. Of course, they will promise, but in the real-world promise, for some people, promise is one thing, doing is one thing. But they are now, they are promising, because that platform, basically, they are in charge of both sides of this, what we're seeing. They're in charge of the notifiers. They're also in charge of the intermediaries.

And in China, as we all know, no companies or platforms or associations are solely their own. They have to follow certain orders. So, in a sense, this platform that's willing to join, they carry that authority. So, if they receive notice and they send it to whoever is the receiver, those who receive those notices, in a sense, have the obligation to follow those orders. That's why we think this is very exciting, because in a sense, in the past, they could just refuse to, from foreigners who, they can claim all the stuff. But if it's from this association that has agreed to sign with us, and this request is sending from them, then they will be much more willing to take down whatever they are told to take down.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Manju. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Thank you so much. And I do think that the goals of the program that you're developing are very, very noble, very strong. I'm wondering what systems and methods you have in place to make sure that you're getting complaints to the right intermediary in the stack to properly and narrowly address the type of abuse that's happening.

I feel like one of the flaws in a lot of these notification systems is that they'll often default to the domain name, the registrar level, for anything, because it's the easiest organization to identify, right? Even though with many different types of abuse, it's really not the right vector to properly address the problem. And so, what sort of systems do you have in place to make sure that it gets to the right type of intermediary for the right type of abuse?

MANJU CHEN Thank you very much. We definitely are developing that system, because as I kind of suggested, that in the end, this is our goal. We are involving names, numbers, telco, cybersecurity, and Web2 platforms. But we are starting with names, because that's what most of us on the team are most familiar with. We are already talking with the numbers' community, and they are very interested. We are talking about connecting the systems between them and us

to make sure if the abuse is mostly the IP side, we can immediately send it to them.

And we have the knowledge, let's say, in the team to differentiate whether this is really domains or is actually hosting providers. We are talking to hosting providers, too, to make sure that if those notices are actually should be referring to them, will be referring to them.

We are building the system inside where we will classify the notices we receive from the notifiers, and this system actually will be shared both sides, right? Because the intermediaries might have a different view of which one is which two. So, this information will be shared both sides, and it's going to be updated on a rolling basis based on feedback from both sides, too.

So, just to make sure, because all we want is really to ensure this is as effortless as possible for the intermediaries, so they don't have to, you know, the whole cost of them dealing with this will be so much easier that they are willing to take more actions. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Manju. And thanks, everyone, for the questions. Thanks for the presentation, Manju. That was a pleasure. I think this discussion was useful. So, we'll now move on to the next item. I'm sure that if there's more feedback, people will reach out to you. The slides will be on the agenda and the records of the meeting. So,

if you want to get in touch with Manju, by all means, I'm sure you'll be welcome.

With this, thank you, Manju. With this, let's move on to item three on our agenda. That's the updates from our councilors, and I'll turn to either Osvaldo or Susan. And as a side note, maybe Susan will be, once we've done with the agenda, and I believe that in terms of votes, that's very limited, maybe we could take that opportunity to actually address the AOB on Urgent Requests under that item, because I think that fits in, if you would be willing.

So, I'll turn to, who would like to say that first, Osvaldo or Susan? Osvaldo?

SUSAN MOHR Osvaldo. Go ahead.

OSVALDO NOVOA Hello, Osvaldo for the record. Here's the agenda. We have only one item to vote on this meeting, it's approving Paul Grady as chairman of PDP1, DNS Abuse PDP1. He was selected by the Selecting Committee, the Standing Selecting Committee.

There is no opposition, although there was some discussion regarding the process to which he was selected, but that's it. So, I think there won't be any objection to his candidacy. Everybody supports Paul, and we know he's going to be a very good chairman.

Then, let me see. Then, while we are going, the GNSO had decided to periodically make available the accomplishments we have done in the previous period, so people know what we do and what we have done. And the accomplishments, I don't know if you want me to list them or each in the document. So, then we are going to discuss the process for Un-Adopted approved, Board approved policy recommendation. That's something that's been on our table for some time.

Now we have a proposal for ICANN Org. I think it's quite straightforward. So, I don't see any problem with that. I don't know if you want me to go into it or it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART I think it's early days for this. Isn't it? This is Philippe, by the way.

OSVALDO NOVOA It's just the beginning.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART So, we have a lot of work to do. Maybe go to item s6 in council item, because this is about SSAD and RDRS. There's been water on the bridge.

OSVALDO NOVOA Well, with the SSAD recommendations, we have two issues. First, regarding phase two of the recommendation that haven't been approved yet. They are for consideration by the Board. The council

is asking the Board to return them, all of them, not approve them. And so that we can go over them and arrange and fix some difference we have found in them that can change the result. That's, I would say, the easy part.

The other part is regarding on phase one, recommendation 18, that it doesn't include, how do you say, previous, I forgot the name now, the, sorry, for the Law Enforcement, I don't remember the name in English, Accreditation. That is in recommendation 18, there is no previous accreditation for the requestor. And there are three options that we are considering regarding this, since recommendation 18 has already been approved by the Board.

There is one option that is to say that in phase two, the accreditation is included. So, it would need just to be a clarification of the policies to us to include in the implementation review, the accreditation of the law enforcement. And that would need no further policy recommendation. It's just an interpretation.

The other one is to, I think, is to one new recommendation, clarifying that. And the third one is to ask the, to go to the process that hasn't been yet determined to un-approve the recommendation. I think there's a feeling, I'm not sure, perhaps Christian can confirm it or not, that the council is in favour of the first one. That's making a clarification that it was included in the whole policy and just have to be included now. So, I don't know if you have any questions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Any questions on this? By the way, and since I think the other items are, this is the main sort of the main item. The other ones are more like housekeeping with all due respect to council. But I think we can, in terms of going through what's on the table, I think we could, we may stop here. But any questions for Osvaldo? I just have one comment on the vote itself.

So, just for people to remember how that would work. It's under concept agenda. So, unless anyone, any other councilors would like to take this out of concept, there will not be any discussions on this. But if there is, and if there's some question as to on the process, as you say, I think at this point, I'm just speaking personally, but I just want to express my support for the leadership, given the uproar that we've seen at this meeting.

That the PDP might take 18 months, the notion that a delay on the appointment of the PDP chair would mean that in practice, the PDP would have to start after the council meeting is just ludicrous to me, speaking personally. So, there's a discussion on this. At least we could offer some support. Yeah, sorry, I didn't look at the Zoom room.

OSVALDO NOVOA

Okay, one point just to finish. The timeline of this PDP is also under discussion.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Right. Okay, good point.

OSVALDO NOVOA Almost everybody thinks it's too long.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Okay, thank you Osvaldo.

THOMAS RICKERT Yeah, full support for the approach, full support for Paul on the DNS Abuse stuff. I think he's going to do a great job. The point that I want to bring up is with respect to the SSAC recommendations.

I think that the path forward with the clarification on 18, and the arrangement with the Board, that the Board does not adopt the recommendations and we do supplemental recommendations in the GNSO is great. But what comes next?

The thing was that the SSAC recommendations were put together because that was what got the group to consensus. That is what was felt by the group at the time to be necessary to come up with a cohesive system that respects the rights of the registrants, as well as the duties of the requestors that makes us financially sustainable without any cost for ICANN and stuff like that.

So, then we had the operational design phase, as you may recall, and then ICANN came up with this ludicrous figure of what it might cost. And my fear is that if we reconvene the team, bring the band back together or form a new team or whatever, with the same

stakeholders around the table, we might see the same tensions, the same requests being put forward.

And the question is, how do we come to meaningful results that don't face the same destiny as the original set of recommendations? So, I think what is necessary to have a precursor to the policy work where the GNSO talks to maybe the Board and the GAC, including Xavier, to say, what is the budget that ICANN is going to make available for this? Because we have different approaches in agile development, you can do design to budget.

You're right. And I think that we need to adopt some of the methodologies that we know from software development and project management to say, okay, we're going to have a set of recommendations. We're going to prioritize those and we're going to work from top to bottom and see how far we can get. Or time can be another factor to say, we're not going to use money as the indicator, but we're going to have a certain amount of time at our fingertips to get this project done. So, I just think that we need to give some guidance to those who are going to be involved in the policy development before it starts.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, Thomas.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON

I think you're absolutely right on with the what next being the real problem. Within council, there is definitely not consensus that we should just spin up a Small Team Plus and throw them the problem again and have them work it out. I think that there is an acknowledgement within council that it's going to start with the due diligence of sitting down with Board and Org and figuring out a new set of constraints to solve the problem. And

I don't know what's going to happen. I don't think we've figured out what mechanism we're going to develop once we've got those constraints. But I think the first goal is to build those constraints.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Christian. Thanks, Thomas. All good inputs for our councilors to sort of reduce or change the problem space to make sure that we've got eventually a different solution. Otherwise, the odds are, although sometimes ICANN, we come up with different results with the same problem space. That's a sort of tradition, but not being cynical more seriously. And given that council is in charge of the process rather than the substance is something that should be considered.

Okay. Thank you, Osvaldo. Noting Susan's post in the chat, I understand that we can skip the item on Urgent Request. Thank you, Susan. Let's go back to the agenda. Then next is a really quick update on Board seat 14, because you've seen, you've heard it all

during the CSG session this morning. Really not much to add to what John has said, unless there are questions. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON My only question is that has there been a designated time for the CSG and the NCSG to meet and discuss the differences that they're seeing between their top candidates?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART If you mean scheduling a call, we haven't got a date at this point, but obviously that's the goal. We're at the point where we know each other's position and we've got the timeline.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON No next stages in negotiation.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Well, there are. They will have to be anyway. But the question is, do we have a date for a call? The answer is no. But we're in the continuing dialogue on this, as John said earlier.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON In my little position as NomCom appointee, I want to offer up my services to try and do my best to act as a bridge as necessary in some of the negotiations.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thanks for this, Christian. Anything else? Okay. Moving on then. An update on the webinar series. Who would like to take that? Lars?

LARS STEFFEN I can start, yes. So, the webinar series. So, we had our first webinar for the new series on February 11, based on the evaluation of the webinar series and the workshops that we did on site during the last year at the different ICANN meetings and the assessment.

We came to the conclusion that security focused topics are the ones that gain most traction. So, we decided to team up with SSAC this year for a webinar series under the theme Securing the DNS Ecosystem Policy Practice and Partnership. And the first webinar took place in February on Emerging DNS Abuse Trends and Mitigation Strategies, covered by Jeff Betzer.

And we had, let me check, 233 registrations and at the end 107 participants, which is above average what we had last year. So, it was a good start to the new webinar series. And we are now in the phase of finalizing and fixing the dates for the upcoming webinars, which we already have scheduled for, let me check, in April.

We have the next one scheduled for the 8th of April. We are still waiting for the confirmation of the speakers. So, as soon as we have the speakers confirmed, I will add those dates to the calendar on the ISPCP website and also circulate the invite email that is

always free for redistribution on other mailing lists so that we can expand our group of invitees.

So, the next one is scheduled for the 8th of April on the New gTLD program and the future of the DNS Ecosystem, where we would like to highlight security-related issues like name collisions, for example.

And for the 13th of May, we plan to have a webinar on DNS blocking responsibility also based on the documents of the SSAC, which will lead us to the ICANN meeting in Seville, ICANN 86, where we still have to plan for an on-site session as soon as we will have the opportunity to discuss the agenda setting and potential availability of rooms.

Before I hand over to Santanu about our session yesterday, Susan, is there anything that you would like to add?

SUSAN MOHR Hi, Lars. Thank you. No, I don't have anything. I think you covered it well. Thank you. I guess just one comment, just kudos. I think that the changes to your point have really been positive and really fantastic to see over 100 participants. So, well done to the team.

LARS STEFFEN Thank you, Susan. So, last year, according to our evaluation, we reached nearly 700 individuals that participated also regularly in the webinar series and that I also individually invited to the new series and the first webinar in February. So, I will also continue this

to strengthen the ties to those and also to approach them joining ISPCP, not only for webinars, but also to our work.

And with this, I would like to hand over to Santanu to cover the outreach session that we had yesterday.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

We will do so. Just to reflect, just to follow up on Susan's observation, which is an excellent one in light of the figures that you gave, Lars. What is interesting to me is that arguably the topics that we put together go well beyond policy development. They go well beyond the GNSO. And when you look at the turnout and when you look at the turnout of the meetings and the sessions that we put together when we focus on policy development, to me as an ISPCP chair, that is striking.

So, we're talking literally, as you said, 700 people in aggregate, generally coming from different ISPs and telecoms operators and associations versus, and I'm being polite, probably a dozen individuals when we talk about policy development. I'm not saying that we should draw any conclusions on this, but that is striking to me.

Food for thought for future discussions, possibly in the context of Bucket C, we'll see, but you see what I'm getting at. To me, that is striking. There's probably something to think about moving forward. And beyond the topic at hand and the need to do outreach and to educate people, I think coming back to the

constituency, there's probably something to think about. I'll leave it at that. And we can go back to.

LARS STEFFEN

No, I agree, and I think we should continue this discussion. We've got Susan with a hand. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR

Thank you. Yeah, I think that's a great observation, Philippe. And really the whole package, I think, shifting the focus to having the time of the meeting in the region where the next ICANN meeting is happening, and then having a champion. So, all of the work that Nitin and Santanu and the team did to do outreach in the region and get people involved, I think just that whole package is really moving this in the right direction. So, again, just kudos to the whole project and everyone working on it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Absolutely. Thank you, Susan. With these good words, over to you, Santanu, for the outreach that we had yesterday.

SANTANU ACHARYA

Thank you. Thank you, Philippe and Lars for the opportunity. Can I have the slide? I have one small deck. Can I present it? Sure. Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. And Susan, we are missing you here. And I think the way you and Lars

had designed the webinars; it has done wonders yesterday. Like Philippe said, a lot of good discussions among the young people have made the floor more fruitful. And we had two sessions yesterday. One is AI and machine learning in DNS security.

And if I next slide. Thank you. Next. And if we read about the key takeaways, it is that AI enhances the DNS Abuse detection by identifying patterns and anomalies faster than traditional rule-based systems. And machine learning improves incident response, enabling faster identification and mitigation of threats, such as phishing, malware domains, and botnets. And the third key takeaways were there that human oversight remains critical. Over-reliance on automation can lead to false positives, missed context, or unintended disruptions.

And data sharing and collaboration between DNS operators, security researchers, and policy stakeholders strengthen the threat intelligence. And so responsible AI deployment in DNS security requires transparency, accountability, and continuous monitoring of models.

So, the core message is that AI is a powerful tool for DNS security, but effective protection requires a balanced approach combining automation, human expertise, and cross-community collaboration. The discussion highlighted how AI and machine learning are becoming powerful tools in strengthening the DNS security.

AI-driven analytics can detect patterns of abuse such as phishing, malware distribution, and botnet activity much faster than traditional methods. At the same time, we also recognize that the risk of over-reliance on automation, human expertise, transparency, and continuous monitoring remain essential to avoid false positives and unintended consequences.

A key message from this session is that effective DNS security depends not only on advanced technology but also on strong collaboration between operators, researchers, and the broader internet community. So, that's all the key takeaways from the first session.

Next. Thanks. So, second session was there on the Universal Acceptance, digital inclusion, and the AI factors. So, key takeaways were there that Universal Acceptance ensures that all domain names and email addresses, including new and multilingual ones, work across digital systems. And UA is essential for digital inclusion, enabling people to use the internet in their local language and scripts. Artificial Intelligence can accelerate UA adoption by improving multilingual processing accessibility tools and intelligent system compatibility.

Inclusive technology design is critical as AI system may unintentionally reinforce bias or exclusion if not carefully developed. Collaboration among governments, tech companies, and the technical community is necessary to build a truly inclusive digital ecosystem.

So, combining Universal Acceptance, inclusive technology design, and responsible AI is the key to build an open, multilingual, secured, and accessible internet for everyone. And if we talk about the main core points, this session emphasized that Universal Acceptance is a critical foundation for a truly inclusive internet, ensuring that all domain names and email address, especially those in different languages and scripts, walk across the digital systems, enables broader participation online.

We also discussed how Artificial Intelligence can accelerate Universal Acceptance by improving multilingual processing accessibility and user experience. At the same time, responsible AI development is essential to avoid reinforcing bias or exclusion.

Ultimately, advanced Universal Acceptance together with inclusive AI and, I would say, responsible AI and collaborative efforts will help build a more open and equitable digital ecosystem. So, these are the key takeaways from both the sessions. And thank you again to our leadership team, Philippe, Lars, and Suzanne for designing these unique webinars based on the requirement of this part of the globe. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you, Santanu. And special thanks to Nitin for coming up with a presentation at the 11th hour, I should say. Noticed on Monday morning. So, thank you very much for this. That was really useful. The turnout, as we said, was extremely

good, mostly from both local ISPs, regional ISPs, as well as fellows and youngsters, from my perspective, mind you.

So, that was really great. And there were excellent questions of substance on both topics, including things around how the policy development and the sort of AI approach on the first topic could, the interplay between those two, and as well as on the second, the DUA perspective.

What I thought personally on the second topic was that the three, the item on CODI, the one on ISP plus AI plus UA, and then the third on the work of the expert group was really neat. I thought that the interplay between those three was great. And it helped understand where sort of on the first one, what the ecosystem was expecting, as well as the communities were expecting, what the sort of the operators may be using for the second item, and what tools they may be using.

And finally, how the work that's been done at ICANN, either through the UASG that we formerly had, and now the expert group would help actually providing the material to help with this. What I understand to be a sort of continuous effort, because on these things is so broad and complex, given the sheer nature of the problem and the number of languages and scripts, et cetera. That will have to be a continuing effort.

So, thanks to everyone who's been involved. And we'll take that online as it were, moving forward with our webinar series, with the hope that it's going to be as successful as the one and we'll put

together something similar for the next ICANN meeting. We'll try and make sure that the community locally, regionally is equally aware of this. And we hope that we'll have an equally good turnout. Lars, anything to add?

LARS STEFFEN

Yeah, I just wanted to emphasize again that usually we struggle having rooms available early enough that we can plan and invite and make announcements and things like that. So, thank you very much, Santanu, for doing all the magic in the background, also inviting the local community. So, this was great work. So, thank you very much for this. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Santanu. Thanks, everyone. With this, it's now two minutes past the hour. Item nine, which is not on the screen, is the one that we've added, relates to our potential early input to the DNS Abuse PDP, up to the group to decide, obviously.

So what I thought is that we could, and we've got, say, 20 minutes for this, which is good, I think, given the very nature of the topic. So, I'll hand over to Nitin to sort of organize the discussion, maybe set the scene, and then we'll, if we have time, go to the actual language that we can use as for our next steps in terms of developing our early input.

I think, I suppose you have the timeline with you. Do you have the timeline of the early input? I haven't got. I think we've got another couple of weeks probably to come up with.

LARS STEFFEN I think we have two weeks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Okay, with some final text. So, we've got some time, but it's good that we use this session to sort of make people aware of where we are. With this, Nitin?

NITIN WALIA Thank you, Philippe. So, I think two things here, since we just left another 20 minutes. So in the agenda, we just missed the topic number five, which was related to UA, actually, first. Anyway, so I want to cover that in the end, because that is also something which is open for the Public Comment and would need the attention from our group.

So, first, when we talk about the DNS Abuse early inputs. So, I have a small slide of, that was a two-slide presentation. Next slide, please. So, I think, as far as the ISPCP operational perspectives respective is concerned, as an infrastructure operator and ISP and connectivity provider, I think ISPCP continuously operate and provides operational frontline to DNS Abuse and its impact.

So, to set the context in terms of the DNS Abuse, early inputs, I've just structured them here. So, experience the real-world effects of the phishing and malware, botnet activities, operate at the downstream points where abuse affects users and networks, and actively mitigate abuse to preserve network stability.

So, I think in this, for this particular PDP, specifically for our group, there would be very important line items wherein we should put our early comments into that. So, the key policy question would be that as the PDP explores and associated with the domain checks, how can abuse mitigation be strengthened and while minimizing the impact on the legitimate registrants and the DNS stability.

So, based on the early inputs in the areas where this PDP needs consideration, I think on the operational experience, ISPCP inputs highlights the importance of evidence-based triggers for associated domain checks, reliable and trigger associations signals, maintaining distinct between investigation and enforcement, and due process and registrants safeguard, operational feasibility across registrars, diversity.

And these early considerations are the inputs to support the PDP work and are reflecting into the ISPCP draft, which I've shared on the list with everyone. So, I think if we want to discuss on the draft, we can just have a view of that draft.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Maybe on this sort of high-level view of the input, any comments on that approach? That sounds really good to me, but Thomason.

THOMAS RICKERT Yeah, first of all, that's an excellent document. I really enjoyed reading it. What I suggest we probably do is go through it again in the light of what we heard during this week.

NITIN WALIA Okay.

THOMAS RICKERT Because I think that we have some folks that want to expand the limit a little bit, to illustrate this. We have this discussion about the necessity to look at different business models for registrars and bake that into the policy, one way or the other. I think that's pointless. If there's a trigger moment, you should then be required to do investigations pretty much along the lines of what you've outlined. But I think the business model is totally irrelevant for this.

So, maybe we can do a clarifying note in here that we think that this can be a lightweight approach, regardless of the business model. You see where I'm getting at. So, maybe make some minor tweaks. And the only thing that I would offer to expand on a little bit is at the very end, where you talk about the ecosystem, role of ISPs and broader abuse mitigation ecosystem.

Maybe we can expand for the benefit of the readers a little bit on that. I know that this has no direct impact on the policy development, but since these inputs are going to be read by a lot of folks, I think it makes sense for us to explain a little bit more how the different types of intermediaries need to interact and that what we're doing here at ICANN is only a small part of what is necessary to be impactful and successful in the fight against DNS Abuse. But other than that, kudos. Thank you so much.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Thomas. Nitin?

NITIN WALIA Yeah, thank you, Philippe. So, thank you, Thomas. I think you rightly said, because what we are listening in last seven days, specifically in all the last four sessions which happened into this particular PDP, I think timeline was one of the areas in which we need to even mention it to our document, because this is a recent development which has been shared about the timelines and all those stuffs. And also, in terms of in the end, what you mentioned about including on the perspectives of the ISP.

So, it's good. I think this draft is already on the list. So, I think if all our members who are willing to contribute into that with a small modification or changes into that, I'm happy to incorporate them all.

THOMAS RICKERT Shall we make this a shared document to make it easier to keep?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Yeah, we'll have to anyway, because what we will do is probably out of this meeting to have a Google Doc of sorts to make sure that everyone on the list can have a look at that and endorse, just sign off what's being proposed just formally. That's something that we will need to do. So, Nitin, can you take that? Make sure that if not already, I know that was a PDP.

NITIN WALIA That's a Word document actually. I can upload that on a Google Doc. And I think we can give a week's time to all of our members to comment over that. So, that we have sufficient time to just wrap it off. And then finally, you can share it as group feedback to the from our constituency.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART That would be great.

NITIN WALIA Perfect. I want to do that today.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Okay. Thank you.

NITIN WALIA Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Any other comments on this? Okay, okay. Seeing no hand. And my apologies, there was some confusion. I don't know why we jumped. We leaped to outreach directly. But we have an item on Universal Acceptance. And the updates on the expert group, and the outreach at this meeting, which we haven't had. So, Nitin, since you're the GNSO appointee to that group, that would be great if we could have that update.

NITIN WALIA Thank you, Philippe. So, I will be quick, actually, because you all are listening to about Universal Acceptance and almost several sessions which are going into this ICANN85. And in fact, yesterday also, there was a quick update, which wasn't being given by Nabil also in our one of the sessions.

So, this is merely a definition. So, I think everybody in the group is pretty aware about what Universal Acceptance is. And it's been similar for almost last one decade. Next slide, please. So the background, basically, is that this expert group was being, since USG got 10 years and post that ICANN decided not to support the USG and decide to form a new expert group.

So, with a task to develop the guidelines for ICANN for advancing UA adoption. So, this expert group was being formed last year. So,

in March 2025, we all know that this resolution has been passed. And in early August 2025, we commenced the work.

In February 2026, we published the draft guidelines for the Public Comments. And in March, the finalization of the public guidelines was being decided on to that. Next slide, please. So, structure of the group was that we were almost like five members, which were being nominated from different constituencies. And I was being nominated from GNSO. And from ICANN Board, we were having James, who was the Board liaison.

And there were ICANN CEO and President appointees on to this. So, they are industry people who were being involved into this policy development. And Edmon Chung and Sarmad were the co-chair for this.

So, the scope was that the UA expert Working Group was tasked to develop a guideline to address the multiple topics. Next slide, please. So, as I said, the meeting started in August, and there were 10 topics as per the charter. The there was a predefined charter, which was being given to this task force to develop and review the guidelines on these specific topics, which are mentioned through those charters.

All the proceedings and deliberations were being posted on weekly, timely. And as far as the UA guidelines are concerned, altogether, 45-odd guidelines have been developed by the expert

group. And these guidelines are now published for the Public Comments on 23rd of February.

And ICANN Org has invited the community on behalf of the UA expert group to review these guidelines and provide the early feedbacks. So, I will not deep dive into the guidelines, but I'm just going to give you just a glimpse of the stakeholder discussions which we had.

So, as far as the guidelines are concerned, there are two general guidelines, five guidelines which were there to encourage big tech organizations, five guidelines to encourage the Open Source communities. And then we have specific standards which are there, which are three. Four which are for the software development professionals. And there was a reach out to system administrators, which is two guidelines.

And five for encouraging DNS industry, including gTLDs and ccTLDs, registry registrars and resellers. And four guidelines are there for encouraging hosting providers and internet service providers. So, I think this is, these four guidelines are very important to be reviewed by this group, so that if we have any early inputs, we can give those inputs and our recommendations into the guidelines, which are published for Public Comment.

And as far as the reach out to public sector and collaboration with government is concerned, there are five guidelines. Academia, we have six guidelines. And for measurement of everything, there are

four guidelines which are there. So, all together, these are the, this is the summary of the guidelines, which is already there.

So, the next step is planning and implementing these guidelines. So, once the expert group get the Public Comments and finalize these guidelines, these guidelines will be shared with ICANN, and then ICANN is going to decide for its implementation.

So, as I said, draft guidelines are open for Public Comments, and the Public Comments are getting closed on 13th of April, 2026. So, I think it's important for us to have a review of these guidelines. And as a group, as a constituency, if we have any inputs, we should post it jointly.

I also recommend if, because there are several members in our constituency who were earlier part of USG and are actively working in UA environment. So, even if they want to provide any individual inputs on these guidelines, please feel free to share your inputs on the Public Comments. And what one important thing which we are seeing in last seven four to five days in various sessions is these guidelines do not cover anything about AI.

And there is a lot of inputs which are being given by the community in terms of putting some guidelines even towards AI and how AI is going to impact on the Universal Acceptance adoption. So, we have anyway requested the community to provide their early feedbacks in the Public Comments and post that once we resume in hopefully in May or early April.

This group will be reconstituted to discuss on the Public Comments. And I think by ICANN86, the final guidelines will be published for ICANN to start working on these guidelines.

Next slide. I think that's it. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Nitin. Any questions for Nitin? Thomas, is that an all hand? Okay, thank you. Any questions? And just to Christian, you sort of somewhere in between.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON It's very good work. And I appreciate it. And I look forward to, I mean, the ISPCP has always been highly supportive of the work that's happened here. I was trying to understand when the group came to speak to council, I know that there are recommendations in the report that some sort of a next stage working paper be put together.

And I was trying to look up the terminology that was specifically in it. When they were talking to council, I was trying to figure out whether they could foresee any policy work coming out of the work that you're doing, basically.

NITIN WALIA So, Christian, I think the most important thing there, which is what is missing in GNSO, which has, in fact, I've even shared in the last meeting in ICANN84. And in fact, the update which I've given to the

council about this particular work is all other groups, be it ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, have a dedicated Working Group, which is working inside those groups for UA.

We are the oldest group in ICANN ecosystem, which is GNSO. Still, GNSO has no internal Working Group to start looking on these UA activities.

Now, tomorrow, when these guidelines will be given to ICANN, and these guidelines will be shared to respective groups towards implementation, I think all of the groups are already having the small teams and respective UA groups into their constituencies and into their groups, where they can start implementing and discussing and creating policies around that. However, into our group.

I think since we have nothing in place right now, so it could be a challenge because there would be, until and unless we do not have a specific dedicated group or a team working on this within GNSO, how to implement these policies, how to circulate them into our community and their members will be a big question mark, actually, which I've already flagged.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Sure, that makes sense to me. The work that's happening with the overall ICANN ecosystem around outreach makes a tremendous amount of sense, right? And the things that we're doing here and the things that you're working on are fantastic.

I think that the reason why that probably is, is because I don't know the extent to which contractual compliance by DNS operators is a part of the problem, right? And that would be the area in which the GNSO would sort of have an ability to do anything, because it's not an outreach organization. It doesn't have any outreach tools, right? And so that's what I'm wondering, whether there is a way to determine whether like registry and registrar compliance is a part of the problem or not.

NITIN WALIA So, if you see the new agreement, which is there for the new round, I think there are a lot of recommendations and there are a lot of early inputs which are already being given to those revised drafts of the agreement, in which the significant importance towards Universal Acceptance and making the registries and registrars ecosystem Universal Acceptance ready has already been put into those drafts.

So, I think if those things have to be checked and ensured that all the registry and registrars are complying with that, I think there would be a bigger task for GNSO to look into that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you. Thank you both. This is Philippe speaking. Anything else on this particular topic? I just want to note that on the topic of

AI, and we had a very interesting discussion yesterday on the sort of outreach element to it in terms of making sure that those who would down the road use AI for code generation, make sure that the material that they use to train their models are actually UA friendly.

So, it's not only a matter of covering AI in the material, but also making sure that in the sort of outreach efforts, those stakeholders are actually targeted. Otherwise, they certainly wouldn't be aware of the need for that. So, I thought that was an interesting exchange that we had yesterday.

Okay, anything else? We're pretty much done. There's one thing that I'd like, if we could go back to the agenda. I think we're pretty much done. I want to just note the Review of Reviews, that item that we covered this morning. I'm not going to be repeating this or ask Osvaldo to do that. I think we're done. The one item that I want to mention, if people would like to discuss it, is our slate of members of the DNS Abuse PDP.

There's been some confusion as to the number of members that people were allowed. It happens that all together, there are four seats, which seems to be a lot. That's why we misinterpreted the ask originally, but there we are.

Anyway, the point being that moving forward, I want to be totally transparent to the group, but I don't think we're being unfaithful to anyone, because given the expressions of interest that we've had on the list, no one will be left aside, if you see what I mean. But at

this point, we have, as list of members an alternate. We've got two members, Lars and Nitin, one alternate, Santanu, and one participant, Anil.

Moving forward, and we've had a discussion of our respective commitments to the group, as well as the potential interested members, Lars has indicated, I don't want to put words into your mouth, that you'd be perfectly comfortable with leaving your seat, because in terms of bandwidth, that might be challenging. Thomas has expressed some interest on this, so our proposal would be to switch, just having Thomas as a member, and the rest wouldn't change, as was listed.

And I want to make sure that everyone's aware of this, and if there are concerns, by all means, speak now, or to the list, because, for the reasons that we've been discussing, over the last three days, the PDP is now in flight, and we want people to be in their seats, literally speaking.

So, any questions or concerns there? Okay, seeing no hand, I'm sorry, is there a hand on? I'm sorry, Nitin.

NITIN WALIA

Thank you, Philippe. So, I think just one quick update onto this. Anil has expressed his interest, and filed his nomination for the vice-chair for this particular PDP. And if he got majority support within the group, and if he got that position, then in that particular case, his seat will also get vacant.

So, depending upon the outcome of the results, if he got elected, then the group can come back to us and ask for somebody else also to fill that particular position. And also, regarding the PDP-2, I think a similar structure would be open. So, once that decision, by when they're kicking off that, is available, so we can decide if we have additional bandwidth or additional team who would like to volunteer for that, or whether the similar team or the group have to take on that activity. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, Nitin. Lars?

LARS STEFFEN Yes, and if I may add, so when we put together the list of names for PDP-1 and for the potential and hopefully coming PDP-2, my name was under the PDP-2, and I did this and agreed to this intentionally, also mindful of my bandwidth and contributing to this. So, this is why I came up with this, so just to be fully transparent on this.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART And the reason for this is, again, some confusion as to the sheer number of people that was expected from SGCs, which seems, well, to some, at least, out of proportion with the notion that we have a Small Team and a tight timeline. But that's the sort of background. Thanks. And to Nitin's observation, if I may express a personal preference, there should be at least some reasonable overlap between the two teams if there's some parallel running between

the PDPs, for consistency's sake, up to the group to decide. But there's the issue of bandwidth, certainly, for people.

I understand that that's a concern of the PDP leadership at this point. There's going to be a 19-minute call every week, so that's sort of manageable at this point.

NITIN WALIA: So, initially, it was being recommended for 120 minutes, two calls in a week, but somehow the group had decided to initially start with 90 minutes a week call, and if it's required, then this time would be increased. So, definitely, I think that we would be needing two parallel teams to working with the PDP to also kick off parallelly.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Nitin. With this, I think it closes our AOB. Anything else that people would like to discuss? It's 28 minutes past, so I think we can go check. Okay. Well, thank you very much for turning up. I think it's been a very efficient meeting, and I count the outreach in this because it was a really good discussion yesterday.

And with this, we close the meeting. Our next call will be next month, and we have, for those of you who have an interest, we have a meeting with the Board this afternoon, I think. And until then, and if I don't see you again, safe travels, everyone, and speak to you soon. Bye Susan.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]