JOHN MCELWAINE: Feel free in the Zoom room to raise your hand. Okay, I'm not seeing anything to add to the agenda. So, without further ado, I'm going to kick it off to Mason, who's going to give us a sort of update on the Standing Committee on Abuse Concept. Thanks.

MASON COLE: Thank you, John. Good morning, everybody. Mason Cole, Chair of the BC. Good to be with you all this morning. I wanted to provide a quick update on the concept that the CSG has started to advance in the ICANN community about a standing committee on DNS abuse. The idea came from the fact that the ccNSO has a standing committee on DNS abuse that's been in place for some time now.

There are other groups inside the ICANN sphere that maintain some form of standing organization on DNS abuse. The GNSO has no standing committee on DNS abuse, even though the gTLD universe is where most of the abuse occurs. So, we started forming this idea late last year. We have taken it to the CSG, also discussed it briefly with ICANN staff and some others in the community who may be favorable toward the idea, but I wanted to just run through the idea again quickly here and then get some feedback from the CSG.

And then we're going to continue our discussions with the community and with staff, hopefully to get this in place. So, as everyone knows, DNS abuse is a serious and expanding problem. We have threat vectors that are accelerating every day. That'll be exacerbated by the application of artificial intelligence to abuse vectors. And the CSG, of course, is happy to participate in DNS abuse-related policy development, but our concern now is that ICANN's existing policy development framework, which is capable of handling all kinds of DNS-related business, is incapable of keeping up any longer with the development of abuse threat vectors.

So, the challenge presented to ICANN, which is the steward of the DNS is that we need a nimble and flexible approach with tools that ICANN doesn't currently have. So, in reply to these sorts of challenges, the CSG has suggested establishing a GNSO standing committee on DNS abuse, which is similar to other standing committees like the one that they have on RDRS and the ccNSO Standing Committee.

So, the idea is that such a committee would anticipate, document, and advise the GNSO on abuse threat vectors as they develop over time. The committee would exist in perpetuity. And the standing committee could also support PDP work by facilitating expert opinions and guidance. So, the idea for the committee structure-wise could be that for terms that would be to be determined, perhaps could include one GNSO councilor per stakeholder group

or constituency, one further appointed member from each SG or C, liaisons from the SSAC. I'm sorry, was there a question?

Oh, no. Okay. Liaisons from the SSAC, from ALAC, a GNSO liaison to the GAC, and a liaison to the ICANN Board's Caucus on DNS Abuse. So, the standing committee could then be chartered to advise the full GNSO council about policy development necessary to combat abuse. And it could carry forward on our preliminary idea on a cadence would be, for example, a once per month meeting, including public sessions at ICANN meetings, and then formal reporting to the community and the ICANN board, perhaps twice per year.

The committee's main role would be to function as the GNSO's subject matter authority on abuse and would collect and submit to the council any relevant or timely data that would enable the council to decide on initiation or modification of policy work. It could gather data from authorities both from ICANN and from other credible authorities to help the council and ICANN Board decide on permanent policy.

And in terms of input, the committee could review data, and then with the assistance of abuse experts, could provide recommendations to the council for rapidly developing and implementing effective policy. And one note on that last bullet point I just raised, we've had discussions here this week about policy development schedules on DNS abuse, and the schedule as

presented, I think it was two days ago, frankly looks discouraging in terms of the CSG's interest in DNS abuse.

The first PDP is not anticipated to complete until late 2027, and then that doesn't include Board consideration and contracted party implementation timelines. So, in reality, you're looking at 2028 at minimum for the implementation of the first PDP. This is in contravention of the conversations that we've had over the past probably a year and a half, which includes assurances from the community and from staff that we could implement narrowly scoped and highly targeted quick PDPs concurrently to deal with the rapidly evolving threat of DNS abuse.

So, it's our hope in the CSG that a standing committee on abuse could help quicken the pace on policy development and could be a tool that the entire community could use in terms of policy development. Okay, that's it. I'm happy to accept ideas, talk about questions, anything else that the CSG might have in mind. John.

JOHN MCELWAINE So, Mason, it sounds like the Standing Committee on Abuse would be dealing with more than what we just currently define as DNS abuse under the contract amendments. Is there any thought that we should be using different terminology, like maliciously registered domains, just curious to see how we ought to label this, define this, to fit into the terminology we've all been using. Thanks.

MASON COLE

Thanks for the question, John. I refer back to the SSAC's recommendation in SAC 115, which says that the community would be well advised to revisit the definition of DNS abuse every so often to anticipate new threat vectors because no definition can be suitably broad enough to anticipate or include DNS abuse as it's going to develop over time.

So, are the current definitions sufficient? Probably not when you look forward in terms of DNS abuse threat vectors as they evolve. So, I'm mindful of ICANN's remit, but it probably needs to be more expansive.

DAVID HUGHES

I just had a quick question, maybe for the group, but current PDP, if we had to make a prediction when it would actually have an effect on the marketplace or affect the problem, what kind of timeline are we looking at?

MASON COLE

Yeah, thanks, David, for the question. The answer, honestly, is we don't know. But if you conclude a PDP in 2027 and voted up to the Board for validation at their level, and then there's usually, I don't know, a six-month implementation timeline for contracted parties to adopt and work the policy into their operations, you're looking at 2029, 2030. Sorry? Well, there could be an IRT as well. Right, exactly.

JOHN MCELWAINE We got one person in the queue here. So, Lori, over to you.

LORI SCHULMAN Yes. Hi, Lori Schulman for the record from INTA IPC. I want to revert back to this issue on definition of abuse because I think there is a faction even in my own constituency that's basically saying move on, and the accepted industry definition is what it is. And I am in strong opposition to that suggestion. I do agree with Mason, and I think you even heard John say it a little bit about pushing the boundaries on what has been accepted nomenclature.

And maybe we even stop using the term DNS abuse particularly, versus some other forms. I know on the IPC list, I had suggested some terms and I don't remember what I had suggested at the moment, but I have said this in other CSG meetings, and I'm going to repeat it again, and I will put it into the chat, almost two years ago now, INTA adopted a definition of domain abuse that does not include any specific modality.

It's more about intention and effect rather than modality. And I think that is where the CSG absolutely should be going with this, even over the strong objections of the contracted party house, because those objections right now keep them in one point on the field, and if we're going to move the ball forward on the field, then we have to start really being creative and pushing much harder. And I'm going to propose once again that the constituencies of the CSG Consider the IPC definition and consider adopting it as what

we put forward. And if not the introversion, then some amalgamation of it.

And as I said, I'm going to put this in the chat, but I really don't want to drop it. I think that broadening the common understanding doesn't necessarily broaden ICANN's mission or even kick down the picket fence. And as we all know, that fence seems to be a little more pliable than people let on in terms of what contracted parties are even looking at themselves when it comes to fishing.

DAVID HUGHES John, I got a question to follow up. Is that okay? All right.

MASON COLE Lori, this is Mason. Thank you very much for that intervention. I think at this stage, the idea of the standing committee and adopting of future definitions of abuse is wide open. So, I don't know that there would be any objection to taking on it as or at least examining it as a proposed definition. So, if that can be provided, I think that would be welcome.

DAVID HUGHES Now, my question is, do we want to have detailed definitions of subsets of DNS abuse? Are we just trying to come up with a magic bullet definition of DNS abuse? I think we should be talking about two different things. Because maliciously registered domains, I like

this, but does it miss some of what is, you understand where I'm going, right? Like, are there other categories?

MASON COLE

Yeah, thank you, David. So, I'll just say that the CSG should be sensitive to contracted parties' concerns about definitions. We need to cooperate with our contracted party colleagues. And that being said, I again refer back to previous work that was done in the community about redefining abuse every so often. That came from a broad study from the community and from the SSAC.

And when experts make those recommendations, we should heed them. That's why they're here and that's why they're part of ICANN. So, I don't want to get too tied up in the weeds of how we define DNS abuse. But it's worth a conversation with everyone in the community, but particularly with contracted parties about, can we expand the definition as threat vectors evolve? That's my input on that.

JOHN MCELWAINE

You want to run the queue?

MASON COLE

Sure. Yeah, I'll take the queue. Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks. So, I have no official title, but I'm speaking anyways, if that's all right. A couple of things. One, on the timeline, I want to

de-doom and gloom the timeline on the effects of the first PDP. Yeah, it's going to take us a year. We have 292 ICANN mandatory days between now and when we can get done. There's just no way around it because everybody wants a bunch of public comments.

So, that's just how it is. But we're going to try to get as close to that 292 days as we possibly can. Once it goes there, this particular PDP, I think the recommendations are going to be new contractual language. And so, I don't know that there's an IRT. I don't know that there's much to do other than for ICANN to adopt them as these new contractual clauses as consensus policy. So, there's no negotiating them, so in they go.

And so, that will hopefully help speed the implementation timeline. So, when we say 2028, 2029, we got to be a little careful with that because that's just going to inflame everybody in the GAC and we're going to end up with the GAC telling us what should be in the contracts and instead of the community. So, I want to just say that 2028, 2029 is probably a little doom and gloomy.

Second thing, this is a question for Mason which I'll just drop and then I'll move on to my third thing, and then my third thing is the last thing and then maybe Mason can respond to this. But number two is, I'd like to understand how this effort interacts with the council small team on DNS abuse because it's not actually accurate that there is no GNSO standing committee work or whatever on DNS abuse, it just happens to be within the council rather than out in the community at large.

So, how would these two things interact with each other? Because one of the things we're going to be doing in PDP 1 is when people want to come up with really great ideas that are outside the scope of the charter of PDP 1 is we're collecting our wonderful ideas, and on a rolling basis, we're going to be feeding those to the council for their small team effort. And so, I guess however, this is going to interact with the council, that matters.

And then lastly, Lori, I don't want to be disloyal, and I've not really had a chance to study INTA's new definition, and I'm going to do that. But one thing to think about is, in my experience, it's not so much that the definition is wrong, it's how it's being interpreted, right? So, phishing is being interpreted as, well, you have to send me phishing emails or else it's not phishing. But, of course, phishing occurs all kinds of ways.

And so, phishing is, from my point of view, or the likelihood of phishing, is any time a brand or copyright is used to collect personally identifiable information by somebody who doesn't have a right to use that brand or copyright, right? That to me seems pretty straightforward, but a lot of the contracted parties don't have that.

And so, maybe instead of throwing ourselves on the grenade of trying to get a new definition, to which I say to us, good luck, we just say, listen, we need your definition of phishing to evolve to fit reality, or else we're going to go for the new definition, and that's going to be a bigger fight. But again, Lori, I want to get behind

whatever INTA is doing, and maybe you and I, I mean, I don't know why you would have a one-on-one conversation with me about it, because I'm nobody.

I'm not on the committee or anything at INTA. But maybe there's a way for us to think about how to get the contracted parties to evolve how they're reading our definition rather than fighting that fight, because I don't think we're going to. Well, we may win it, but it's going to be years. Thanks.

LORI SCHULMAN May I respond?

MASON COLE Please, Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN Yeah. So, my thinking, Paul, if you buy me a drink, I might talk to you one-on-one. I'm just going to leave that into the record. The other thing is, in terms of whether or not it's a whole new definition or expanding an understanding of phishing within some kind of subset, to be frank about it, I think you're right. We're still going to have that same kind of issue with this is what we think it is in terms of what the contract says in terms of contracted parties versus what non-contracted parties might think it is, right?

It's still an issue of reaching a common understanding. And the common understanding that is running now is just too narrow. So,

in terms of the approach, if there is a more creative way or productive way to broaden the approach, I don't think INTA would object. But at the same time, I think if we're going to go down this road, it's really important that we have a response.

And the reason that INTA came up with this definition, I will put a link to our entire Board resolution with the rationale, and I'm just going to get it after my intervention so people can click into it, so you can at least understand where we were coming from as an organization. If we even take your approach, Paul, then we still need to come up with what does that understanding look like.

Because to your point, I agree that the contracted parties are going to want precision where, in fact, we know that this is a world that is imprecise in terms of what technologies may be coming down the road and why the current definition is not adequate.

MASON COLE Thanks, Lori. Just housekeeping wise, I'm going to cut the queue at Vivek because we're going to run over time and we have other business to cover. But I want to respond to Paul's question. Paul, from my point of view, it doesn't necessarily matter how we implement or how we merge with a small team on abuse that currently exists in the council.

This is a concept, it's malleable, this originated from the BC, and the BC's interest is the fact that DNS abuse impacts the businesses financially, reputationally, and operationally in a very negative

way, and it costs a lot of money and time and effort to combat that abuse. And we're looking to the steward of the DNS to help us.

We're not looking to bother contracted parties, we're not looking to annoy anybody, we're asking for help. So, we're looking for the best way to merge the idea into an ongoing attention that can be paid to the abuse concept. So, you can buy me a drink and we can talk about how to put those two things together. So, let's go back to the queue. Philippe, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Mason. Philippe Fouquart, ISPCP. Yeah, I guess it's a more procedural point, although there's substance behind it. I forget what you have in the proposal, but it'd be good if that were to address things like external interfaces, if you see what I mean, engineering terms, i.e. how that relates or how the dialogue with the ccNSO Standing Committee, the GAC's structure on the same thing are actually organized since at this point, GNSO is the only SO that hasn't got something of that nature. So, there's sort of cross-community dimension to it.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Philippe. Yes, and I have had a conversation with Nick Wenban-Smith, who's the chair of the standing committee on the ccNSO, and he offered some good council on how to adopt some of their concepts into this proposal. So, thank you for that suggestion. Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT

Yeah, thanks so much. A couple of points on the definition. I think that this is probably not a good point in time to start that conversation, unless we want to drive a wrench in the community. So, if anyone wants to discuss definitions with me, probably you need to buy me more than one drink. But joking aside, what I like about the way we are approaching DNS abuse at the moment is that we're talking issues-based. So, we're talking about how to tackle associated domains at the moment. Then we're talking about APIs.

So, I think that starting a discussion about definitions, which we can have, and I'm not shying away from that, is probably going to distract us and not getting us anywhere because we will likely not be able to agree on a definition anytime soon. So, even with new threat vectors coming up, maybe it's another approach to consider is to look at the implications on what the ICANN community can do to respond and then address it policy-wise on an issue basis rather than on a definitions basis.

So, talking about that, how do we approach that best? You know, we've been talking about the idea of a standing committee for a while. I think I've cautioned the last time that we should be. aware that we're creating new structures with new responsibilities for the individuals involved. So, I pretty much sympathize with the idea that Paul refreshed our memories on and that is how do we utilize the GNSO small team.

So maybe we can use this group with invited guests to have longer conversations on where we want to go strategically, but then use our resources to maybe revisit, empower the DNS small team and try to get our things going there. Just a thought. So, duplicate structures, I think we should avoid. The other point I think we should discuss again, and I hope that I'm not going to bore you with this, is the timing of the PDP. I think within the PDP, you should probably focus on substance, and Paul is managing that greatly.

The offer of doing that in 18 months has already caused reactions by the GAC. So, they said, well, are you crazy, guys? That's what I translated their interventions to. So, we promoted this as being a low-hanging fruit, as a narrowly tailored PDP, and then we come up with a timing that seems to be unacceptable to them.

So, we have our limitations, we can't go lower than 13 months with the current way the PDP is structured, but I think that we can shave off five months. And I think that we should find ways to maybe introduce that idea, maybe go to the GAC and say, okay, this is what we think we need in order to give everyone a voice and all that.

So, that's why we plan on the basis of 18 months. But we hear you and we're trying to limit the two phases in this snake where I think we can make changes. And then the first one is before we do the initial report. And the second is after the public comment period, where we now have, I think, a couple of months that we can save. And I think what that requires, and I think this is something that the

CSG can offer, is that we are taking a look at the proposals on the table and we're not doing rocket science here.

So, contracted parties are doing associated domain checks already. So that we say, okay, we will be conservative in our reactions and in our criticisms hoping to find a common ground very early in the process so that we will do what we can to get through this as quickly as possible. And then call upon the GAC and say, we would like you in return, well, I think we can't make it too transactional, but you get the idea.

You inject your feedback into the process as early as you can, and you will be conservative in your reactions, not issue GAC advice on this, or let us know very early in the process that you're unhappy with the potential outcome. And the same would go for the Board, because the 18 months that we're talking about is just before we throw it over the fence to the Board.

And then you all know what the destiny of the recommendations might be to tell the Board, we expect you to be conservative in your reactions as well, be pragmatic and get this done with maybe in a total of 18 months to Board resolution. So, I know that my role in this is very limited, but maybe we as a group, if you agree, we can maybe try to get this condensed a little bit.

And Paul, if you think that what I say is crazy, please do speak up and I keep my mouth shut. But I think that we would be all well advised to try to get this done faster because we have a series of

these things coming, and the better we are on this one, the better the others are going to be.

MASON COLE

Thanks for that input, Thomas. Yeah, I think in general, abuse happens in minutes, hours, and weeks, and ICANN policy develops in months and years, and we're looking to shrink those two timelines closer together. So, thank you for that good counsel. We really need to move forward with a cue, and so I ask your interventions to be quick, please. Marie.

MARIE PATULLO

Thank you. Marie Patullo, BC, who will be very quick. I understand all of the sensitivity about what is the definition and what is the process and what does the step need to be, but the reality is what's happening on the ground. And Mason, you mentioned the businesses of the BC. I will mention our consumers and our customers. They don't know the definition of abuse.

What they know is they get a spam email, they get a text, whatever it may be, claiming to be from one of the members of my association, saying click here. That's what they know. Now, this is not about the content. This has nothing to do with content. This is purely about the use of my members' names as vectors to defraud people.

And we've seen recently, as Ian knows, in Europe, some discussion about an online fraud action plan where they do reference DNS

abuse. But again, they're missing this human practical link. When any of us get an email, we do not know who it is from, and we should. And I'm sorry to be so obvious in my statement, but can we please remember the reality of what we're dealing with and not just the process and the words? Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Marie. Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Margie Milam with the IPC. The timeline isn't really that useful because the PDP isn't going to have a mitigation requirement. The scope is so narrow that even if it finishes its work, there'll be an obligation, theoretically, to do an associated domain check. But it doesn't say what happens after the check. So, there will be no requirement for a registrar to take down the malicious domain names that they have identified through the associated domain check.

So, we will not see a significant impact because the good registrars that are already doing it are going to continue doing it. But the bad registrars, the ones that aren't doing it will not have an obligation to mitigate. And that's the problem with the current PDP, unless the scope of the charter is changed, but that takes time. And so, I just wanted to flag that because I think there's a misconception that the PDP will produce a solution. It will not.

MASON COLE

Okay. Thanks, Margie, for that input. No, you're right. It is a problem we need to overcome. Vivek, quickly, please.

VIVEK GOYAL

Yeah, I'll try my best. One, the name of the standing committee that Mason talked about, we should change this to maybe the DNS ghost standing committee, because it's a program that's doing what it's not supposed to do from the matrix. Then people will not worry about DNS abuse another thing. I think the DNS abuse small team is not disbanded because they were supposed to deliver the report they have done and they are gone.

On the timeline for the PDP 1, it's a timeline. If we give them a good timeline, the PDP team will try and achieve this. It does not stop them from taking longer. It has never stopped anybody in ICANN to take longer than planned. So, if it needs longer, we'll give them longer. But if we give them so much time, then it will definitely consume that time, and it does not help any one of us.

On the charter thing for Margie, we raised this, we had a discussion about it, and what we were told is that once an associated domain check is done and one of the checks releases a domain that is malicious, then it again triggers the ICANN compliance that if you identify a malicious domain, you need to act on it. So, it's not as if they will identify, find it, oh, that's phishing, but I won't do anything. That won't happen.

Once they identify, they are forced by compliance to take action on it. So, I think we should see some results coming out of it. The challenge is not that. The challenge is how do we measure those results so that everybody agrees that these measures are correct and either we are seeing something or not seeing something. That is the challenge. Hope that was fast enough.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Vivek. All right. The queue is closed. We need to move on with the agenda. But one final point from at least my personal point of view, and that is the tone of discussion within ICANN on DNS abuse. The tone sometimes becomes confrontational between us and contracted parties. I don't want that. I certainly don't want that. We're asking for help, and we're doing that in good faith. And I would like our colleagues in the room to help contracted parties understand that when we do talk about DNS abuse.

This is not an effort to annoy contracted parties. This is an effort to work together as a community to solve a problem that is being experienced like Marie said by those we represent. So, to the extent that you can underline that message, I know speaking personally, I would appreciate it. Okay, the queue is clear John. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks Mason. So, the next item on the agenda was to provide a Board Seat 14 update which I will do. So, just to cover briefly, the

ISPCP, BC, IPC, interviewed the top four candidates. We've now decided on our preferred candidate, communicated that to the NCSG.

That was not their preferred candidate. And so, now we're in the position that I'm going to meet back up with Rafik and see what he thinks we ought to do for next steps and talk about some of the other candidates that each of the constituencies favored.

So, that's where we're at. We don't have a decision yet, but we're currently working through it. I'll pause there to see if anybody has any questions, but I'm not going to really get into specifics. Yeah.

JIM PRENDERGAST John, Jim Prendergast, thanks for taking the question. What's the deadline for you guys to name somebody?

JOHN MCELWAINE I believe it is early April. Devan, do you have that? Okay. We have it in an email. It's right around the corner though. We'll find that and we'll put it in the chat. All right. Okay, I don't see anything else. I'm going to move on in the agenda to the prep for the Contracted Parties House meeting.

The topics that we've discussed with the Contracted Parties House is to cover, it says DNS abuse, but it should be DNS Abuse PDP. They wanted to discuss implementation of SOI rules, and I suggested UDRP next steps. I think we should probably as a group of constituencies here to kind of divvy up what we're going to cover.

Mason, I would think you're pretty up to speed on the DNS Abuse PDP. Philippe, do you want to cover any particular items from that list?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, John. Happy to chime in on the SOI. I think we may have our own perspective. Although when I say my own, we do have different membership statuses where the notion, the concept, I should say, of a customer may apply or a third party that is through, to be clear, associations, et cetera, where the stakes may not be as obvious as for people like me, incidentally, who have an employer and only one. So, I think we can chime in on B, although it's probably not A, not a strong position and B, probably not something that would change the approach that's proposed here.

JOHN MCELWAINE Thanks, Philippe. Yeah, these topics are not particularly well scoped out. I'd ask for some more detail from the contracted parties on what they wanted to talk about with respect to the DNS abuse PDP and SOI, and I think just travel and lateness got in the way, so I didn't ever have a response to that email. So, we'll just have to kind of take the SOI implementation on the fly. The UDRP next steps, I think I will take.

That was suggested by me. And I'm not purporting to give the CSGs sort of take on it, but to preview the IPC's take on the UDRP is that we have an expert report, essentially, and an expert study that has

been done on it. And that is the type of issue that is particularly well suited for the involvement of experts and a very narrowly scoped PDP, even really, if at all.

And so, to the extent that the community is very busy with DNS abuse PDPs and the RDRS or the SSAD supplemental policy work that's going to be going on and all the other activities that we ought to either go down a more narrow route of an expert type report or we should push it off. So, I don't know if you guys have any comments on that if you agree. Yeah. Okay. All right, let me pause there to see if anybody has any questions or comments about the prep for the CPH meeting.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, John, this is Philippe. Just a general note. A, I would expect the first point to take a large amount of our time. And speaking personally, I don't want to stay in the way because I think that's time well spent. B, but if we do have time at the end, maybe we could consider discussing, well, I'd be curious about the answers that the CPH may provide to the Board's questions, since we all have the same questions from the Board. So, there may be value in discussing this if we have time. But again, this shouldn't stand in the way of a thorough and robust discussion on abuse as we do.

JOHN MCELWAINE That's a great idea. As I said, we don't have a whole lot of back and forth as to what the different questions are going to be or topics are going to be from CPH, and essentially on our side, we've only put forward the UDRP next steps. So, we could certainly have more room. Jan, over to you.

JAN JANSSEN In terms of narrowly scoping the UDRP, the next steps, it may be interesting to see what the CPH take on it is because I think most of the implementation of the UDRP is not done by them. So, for them, their interest might be that everything remains the same as well, and I think we ought to find out what points that they would like to focus on in such a review because it can be used to our support in dealing with other parts of this community.

JOHN MCELWAINE That's a great point. Anybody else have any comments on the prep for that meeting? All right. Then, I'm going to move on in the agenda to the Prep for the Board Meeting. There were two concepts that were presented to the CSG in terms of the agenda for that meeting. The first was whether we would want to answer the Board's questions. And I believe that the IPC and ISPCPs decided to do that.

And then there was also a concept of do you have any topics or questions for the Board? And the BC decided they would go down that route. Maybe not a surprise that both the IPC and the BC had

very similar ideas. So, the question that the IPC was answering was the one to identify any trends. And the trend that we were identifying and trying to describe it maybe as a perfect storm of, I don't want to use the word DNS abuse or DNS abuse lowercase a of maliciously registered domains, essentially seeing a large increase in abuse, fraud, cyber-squatting, et cetera.

We're seeing that along all the metrics. WIPO set a record year in the number of UDRPs, found some stats online about the use of AI and fishing with a really significant increase in just a number of studies recently done showing an increase in, again, fraud and abuse, lowercase a, not the DNS abuse definition. So, we intend to talk about that and its impact on the fact that we aren't addressing it and it is only getting worse is going to likely result in intervention from states legislating to solve some of those problems.

Again, it's not a particularly new topic to come from the IPC, but it is a trend that we're seeing, and it's been continuing now for a couple meetings. Mason, I might turn it over to you because you and I have been discussing how your DNS abuse topic kind of intersects with that. So, you want to kind of give your thought of how we can kind of meld those two topics?

MASON COLE I'll try. So, John, you from the IPC put together some talking points on the IPC's position on abuse. I've got some from the BC. My understanding is we're going to put those together and bring those to the Board. I don't have a well-formed outline of what that looks

like. That was going to be my afternoon work today. So, I apologize, I'm not prepared to answer that question fully.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Mine too. And so, Philippe, are you prepared to answer your question to the Board?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Sure. It's not my afternoon's work. But joking aside, the reason for this is that the question has been around for some time. And just to be specific, that second question is about our input to the review of reviews effort, CCP as they call it. The outline that was put forward by the CCP and the feedback from the community. So, as far as the ISPCP is concerned, our main focus is on what's called Bucket C. That's the structural review.

We consider that it's long overdue. We've got a 25-year-old structure that's never been revised in any corporate structure. We do this regularly as of principle, and we think we should do this in this organization with a small o. We also consider that this should come first because all the other reviews may depend on the outcome of that structural review.

We also consider that moving forward, that should take into account the current internet ecosystem that is radically different from the one that was the basis for the original organization, structural organization, and as well as the supply chain.

So, I think we're trying to frame the sort of problem space without going into the solution space. Hopefully people will appreciate that. And again, as a rule, we consider this should come first. That's the gist of our input to the Board, as well as to the CCP moving forward. Thank you, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Thanks, Philippe. All right. Well, that would take us through the agenda, but I want to see if anybody has any points to raise concerning the statements and the prep for the Board meeting between CSG and the Board. Not seeing any. Anything else, any other business people want to raise at the CSG level? Go ahead, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Is it working? Done, but not quite on. So, as I was saying, we hope that we will have a frank and robust discussion with the Board without having too much scripted answers to them. That's what we did last time, it worked out quite well. So, we hope we'll do the same this time.

JOHN MCELWAINE: Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Thank you. As you know, I'm going to cover DNS abuse again, something, unless somebody wants something different to talk

about, I'll wait. Okay. As you know, the report came up with a lot of gaps and the associate domain check was the first one. And we know there is a draft charter for the second one, but somehow there is reluctance across from many factions, which says we will not start the second one till we see where the first one is going.

And I've tried and the BC have tried to push forward. I mean, it's going well. Let's start the second one. I mean, what are we waiting for here? So, I wanted to get a sense from the CSG if this is something we can all push forward and say, what is the reason for the delay? And let's get started on the second one as quickly as possible.

Otherwise, if we let it go, then it will happen that once the first one finishes, then they'll start the second one. I mean, we have a long list of gaps to fill. We'll be here till we are all retired and won't see anything happen. So, if CSG is aligned, then we will push for the second one to start as quickly as possible without delay. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT Yeah, Vivek, great point. I think that we need to be careful how we play this. You might remember that I've asked for both PDPs to be kicked off simultaneously and then do a little bit of agenda Tetris. So, start with this one, and once we have our initial report out for public comment, let's say the other one can start substantive work

so that we make the best use of our time. So, I think that maybe we should choose our battles carefully.

Do we want to push for shaving off a couple of months for this one and not maybe talk about the second one now? Because I think it might probably be too much to ask for condensing the first one and doing work on the second one. Or shall we say, okay, if you want to stick to the 18 months, then at least let us try to work on the second one in parallel. So, I think that maybe strategically we should align on one of those approaches.

VIVEK GOYAL Happy to hear others' thoughts., then maybe I'll say a few of my thoughts.

JOHN MCELWAINE Well, I'll chime in from the IPC. So, I think we definitely would support moving forward with the second PDP as soon as possible. I think your approach in asking why can't it start, I mean, what are the reasons would be a very important thing to evaluate first.

But I also would like to see for these PDPs, whether we can do some creative ways to narrow them down and make them quicker, as Thomas has been saying. I trust Paul can come up with some good ideas to do that. The quicker we can get these PDPs taken care of, the better for the community, I think.

VIVEK GOYAL

And that's what we are hoping for. My concern is if we take the pressure off, then it will be like we did one PDP on DNS abuse, ICANN has done its work, everybody celebrate, kumbaya, and let's forget about DNS abuse for another five years. That's my biggest worry because they have one win, and then they'll go around all across the world saying we are doing something on DNS abuse, not to worry about other things.

So, I want to keep the pressure on and just get these things out as quickly as possible. And I know Paul has the great ability to get things done on time, and I hope Thomas will take up the PDP too whenever it starts, and I have full faith in them to push things through and get it done.

PAUL MCGRADY

But the first thing I'm going to do if Thomas takes that PDP too is to come to a public meeting and ask him to shave eight months off his schedule and tell him he's moving too slow. Just so you know, can't wait.

THOMAS RICKERT

Boy, just to make sure this is properly understood, I said that this is no criticism whatsoever. And you can work along with every timeline that's being given you. I just thought that you would be happy to have six months of your life.

JOHN MCELWAINE Okay, we have about four minutes left. Anybody?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Thank you, John. This is working. Just to note on the timeline that we had that discussion last year when the notion of the three PDPs was put forward, and when we said that hypothetically if they were to run back to back as Vivek said, that would mean 2035 or 2040 for the completion, which is just by that time then the very concept of an API may be gone by then.

So, just procedurally at that time, the answer was that there's no way we were running them back to back. They will have to be done in parallel somewhat. So, I think there's just another argument, a procedural one, for doing some of this at least in parallel.

JOHN MCELWAINE I see that Susan has her hand up. So, Susan, over to you.

SUSAN MOHR Hey, John, thanks. I appreciate all the discussion on the DNS abuse. And I just want to echo some of the comments that Susan has in the chat, that there's been some discussion already about when we should kick off the PDP 2. And so, I do think that pressure is there, and I agree that there's no reason to wait on the charter. And so, I suspect that we'll see some movement here. And I think everyone understands that there's a lot of pressure to move this forward, and I think we're all feeling it and we'll push for it.

JOHN MCELWAINE Thanks for those comments. And yeah, Susan has mentioned that she thinks we can get started on discussions to get the second charter going. All right. We are about at time. Anybody else have anything to say for the good of the order? Okay. Well, thank you everybody for coming out and we'll see you later on today at the CSG Board meeting. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]