
ICANN86 | Prep Week – DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 Update
Wednesday, May 20, 2026 – 17:00 to 18:00 CEST

TERRI AGNEW

The recording has started and this is Terri Agnew. Hello and welcome to the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 1 Update call taking place on Wednesday, the 20th of May, 2026. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your microphone to speak.

Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I would like to introduce both you Paul McGrady, Chair, and Nick Wenban-Smith, Co-Chair. I will now hand the floor over to Paul McGrady. Please begin.

PAUL MCGRADY

All right. Thank you, Terri. Good morning, everybody. We are going to just do a little update on where the DNS Abuse PDP number one sits. And I think we can take some questions at the end. I hope I'm

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

saying that right. And we will go ahead and get started. By way of background, what happened?

We're going to talk about background, and then we're going to talk about overview PDP 1, progress made, and then, of course, what we'll be doing in ICANN86. So, we're going to start with what happened. So, what happened was the GNSO Council requested an issues report on DNS abuse mitigation, and that was back in August of '25. Not very long ago in ICANN terms.

By December 25th, the GNSO Council had digested that abuse mitigation issues report and initiated two PDPs aiming to address DNS abuse mitigation gaps. So, within a four-month period, again, lightning speed from an ICANN standpoint.

By January of '26, one month later, the GNSO Council approved the PDP 1 charter, that's us, and that charter has us looking at associated domain name checks. So again, very fast from an ICANN standpoint. And then in March of '26, the DNS Abuse PDP 1 kickoff happened at ICANN85. So, we've been moving quick.

Let me give you a quick overview of the PDP, and we'll move on quickly to the next slide. So, here we are in a nutshell. We have problem number one, the problem, first column. These are squiggly line columns. Those are nice. Malicious actors register many related domains.

Currently, only the reported domain must be investigated, and there's no contractual obligation to review the wider portfolio.

That's not to say that registrars don't do that. Many do, and we heard from them at ICANN85 about how they do it and we heard from some of them, but there's no contractual obligation.

The policy goal that the Council gave us is a new requirement for registrars to proactively check associated domains linked to malicious actors and domains. And as policy goal, the deliberations are to define triggers, scope, timeline, reasonableness, safeguards, documentation, metrics, et cetera. We have some considerations, which are proportionality and due process, privacy and data protection, different registrar models, human rights impacts, those kinds of things, all very important.

And our PDP is a working group model. It's a representative model, meaning that it's not anybody can join, it is a limited number of seats that the Council worked out, and that, frankly, makes us a little bit sleeker and we're able to move a bit faster.

So, that is where we are. I have my vice chair, Nick, is on the line. And Nick, I wonder if you want to walk folks through our work plan slide and we can maybe walk through progress made and then I'll jump back in at direction of deliberations.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yes, of course. Thank you, Paul. So, you can see that we have come up with a work plan. This is just to give some structure to our work and to give the participants and the community some expectations around what is our schedule and when they can expect to see some

concrete outputs from this important work. So, we've given ourselves until you February 2027 for the work group deliberations.

And then you can see that there's some requirements for public comment following that, and under the GNSO PDP procedures, then that leads to the final report to council slated for May 2027, and then final council reconsideration following that, the next meeting following the report being completed.

But I have to tell you that this is just an indicative work plan and we'll see where we're at after the four face-to-face meetings that we're having in Seville. We're making good progress so far through the plan, but obviously, it requires more work and to get things through.

But it'll get clearer as we get closer to the time whether this outline work plan timetable you can see here is right or maybe we can do it quicker or maybe we need a bit more time. We're in the hands of the PDP group as a collective. So, I think that's that. Okay. And back to you Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY

Great. Thanks, Nick. And the work plan, just so everybody knows, is already shorter than the initial timeframes when we started. So, we've cut some months off, and as Nick indicates, maybe we can do it faster, maybe we can't do it faster, maybe we need more time. We'll know at the end of Spain. But so far, so good.

The progress made, we've established the work plan, we've established a leadership team, I'm very thrilled to have Nick as my vice chair. And we have gathered early input from stakeholder groups and constituencies. It's been marvelous because it sort of sets the table of where everybody is coming from.

In terms of deliberations, we've had 12 working group meetings. We have been working consistently on the rolling development of a collaboration document, which is where things we talk about end up and it helps us sort of revise initial inputs and ideas into thoughts about a charter question, which then we can evolve ultimately into straw persons and so forth, and then move things into draft recommendations.

So, that's been great. Early inputs received from the SGs and Cs have been considered for Charter Questions 1 through 7. We've had deliberations on Charter Question 1 through 7. We already have strawperson texts on Charter Questions 1 through 6. And on our last call, we talked a bit about evolving the strawperson texts on Charter Questions 1 through 4 into draft recommendations.

We still have work to do on Charter Questions 5 and 6 before we can do that, but we're making good progress on those. And we have not a complete blank slate when it comes to question seven, but fairly blank slate, and then blank slates on eight and nine. So, in terms of the direction of the deliberations, I'll just sort walk through these.

Again, nothing is final, but this seems to be the momentum on the issue of what triggers an associated domain name check we have congealed around. So far, again, nothing's done until it's done, but we've congealed around the idea that if there is an abuse complaint that needs to be actioned under Section 318.2 of the RAA, that would also trigger an obligation to conduct the associated domain checks.

We have congealed around what we mean by association, and that is a review of registered name holder or account-related indicators, technical or coordinated activity behaviors and that data needs to be reasonably accessible to the registrar. In other words, there's no obligation to go out and create new data or run studies or those kinds of things. It is the data that is handy.

The associated domain checks investigation applied to association criteria for the ADC in a reasonable and proportionate manner. In other words, the investigation should be robust but doesn't need to boil the ocean.

Again, directions on deliberations for safeguards, we are congealing around the idea that an ADC must be conducted in compliance with applicable law, all the contractual requirements that ICANN has, and data privacy safeguards. In terms of remedies, certain existing procedures, contractual obligations, and legal framework already provide safeguards relevant to conducting these ADC.

And so, we are leaning heavily into the current existing body of contracts and law. But of course, we'll be doing an impact assessment on all of this as we need to do under the bylaws and as we want to do because we're good people. And so, more to come there in terms of looking at remedies for issues that pop up.

And lastly, we are working on, in terms of the direction of deliberations, working on the timeline. Most, not all, are advocating that the ADC be initiated and completed promptly following the receipt or identification of actual evidence of DNS abuse. That's still a live topic, and so, we're just reporting directions, not conclusions.

And so, ultimately, you may end up seeing something different or better or whatever, but that's the general trend here. I am going to hand it over to Nick to talk about what to expect at ICANN86. We have four sessions, and Nick, do you mind walking through that? And then I think that will take us to Q&A.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Thanks, Paul. We have a plan ahead of the sessions in ICANN86 to have had at least a walk-through of all of the nine charter questions at least once and to come up with some strawperson wording on each of those nine questions ahead of Sevilla so that we can really get the most out of the really valuable face-to-face time that we have lined up here. So, it's on the meeting schedule, but for

convenience, it is put here in a summary the four sessions, two on Monday the 8th, one on the Wednesday, one on the Thursday.

And you can see that all of these are around getting the charter questions in a state ready for the initial report. And I think what we're all hoping in the leadership team and staff supporting us is that we will start to firm up some wording which we hope will be the basis for the initial report which as we discussed in the previous timeline, will go then forward to public comment and finally to the GNSO council for approval.

I don't want to prejudge, I guess, whether that will be successful. This is a community process, it's really important that everybody is given full opportunity to participate and we get all the perspectives in at this important point of the proceedings. So, that is still, I guess, unclear. As we get closer to the sessions, we will try to exercise leadership and be dynamic and proactive and to try to resolve some of the differences amongst the different stakeholder group participants.

But ultimately, we're going to have to try and come up with some language where we feel that there could be consensus built. And I'd say, just to echo what Paul said already, we're making good progress. There's a huge appetite to make this PDP swift and successful.

And I think even where the participants are not in agreement at the moment, there's clear agreement that the PDP is required and that the sooner we do this, the better, in terms of raising the standards

and showing that the ICANN processes can deliver a useful policy product in short order which improves the safety of the internet ecosystem for our DNS stakeholders worldwide.

So, the ambition is there, the will is there, and we will spend as much time as it takes, because I think these are the official sessions, but I'm sure there will be some bilateral conversations over coffee in the corridor. In addition, any input is good. If you want to talk to any of us about it and you see us, then this is our priority, amongst myself and Paul, this is our priority for the Sevilla meeting. So, we will make ourselves available and get all the inputs that we can from everybody. So, I think that is clear. And yeah, it's up for the Q&A.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Nick. And I agree entirely. This PDP is moving with all deliberate speed, but it is not moving so fast that we are going past, everything I said a couple of times. At the end of particular cause, like, we're just not done with this, we've got to come back to it, and so that's okay. But I will say to everybody that's listening who wants to know how their representatives are doing, your representatives are doing fabulously.

You guys have sent your A-team to this PDP and it shows they're prepared. They're participating on the calls. They are participating on the list. They are participating in the collaboration document. They're bringing ideas, they're compromising, but also still getting

important things included. We couldn't be happier. And so, from my point of view, like Nick said, it's going well.

All right. I see in chat from Terri, we have two questions at this time via the QA pod. Let's take those. And then I see a queue is formed, we will get to the hands-up queue. I see both of those. But let's find those QA pod questions. Terri, how do we do that?

TERRI AGNEW

I'm going to go ahead and read those out loud. So, question number one is from Siva. It's a bit of a long one, so here we go. "Considering the challenges of detecting wide-scale DNS Abuse, how does the Associated Domain Check, ADC, process effectively function in instances of multi-register abuse, such as when an abusive restraint registering a single domain across each of the 2,000 accredited registrars to build a 2,000 domain abusive profile?"

That's one question of his, but we have more. "What is the process's full scope, specifically addressing whether it verifies a registrant's activity across all TLDs within a single registrar's interface, given that a failure to monitor association across all TLDs offered good, theoretically increased the number of unnoticed abusive registrations from 2,000 to over 3 million." And then he put in quotes, "2,000 times 1,700?" That was the next question.

One more. "Furthermore, as ccTLDs with independent register accreditation processes include under the purview of APC process

currently being discussed and has the recognized difficulty for any single register to perform these complex tasks, prompted consideration for handling these responsibilities collectively by registry registrars or by ICANN.” I will pause there so all those questions can be answered before we move on to the next one.

PAUL MCGRADY

Sure. Thanks, Terri, and thanks for those questions. If I'm understanding them correctly, the question boils down to how is this PDP looking at inter-registrar associated domain name checks? In other words, how would registrar A be able to do an associated domain name check within the records of registrar Z? And the answer to that is, that is not within the scope of this PDP.

We are looking at contractual requirements for each registrar as an independent entity. And we are not looking at whether or not there should be a requirement for registrars to cooperate with each other. There is nothing coming out of this PDP and nothing as far as I know that would keep one registrar from cooperating with another registrar if they wanted to share that information.

Obviously, they would have to be mindful of their own laws and context when they did that. But the very long answer that I've given to a very short answer question is, it's out of scope for what we're doing.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. All right. Just to note, and I'll read the second question from the, another participant, but in addition to that, we have a third one. So, just let me know when you're ready to take that third one, because I know there was hands up as well.

So, the second question is from Anne Aikman-Scalese. She has to run to a doctor's appointment, but she was wondering how the registrar will know what promptly means in terms of the timing for doing the Associated Domain Check. In other words, how does the register know when it is in compliance? And she's going to review the Zoom when she returns.

PAUL MCGRADY

All right. I'm happy to hand that question to Nick. Okay. So, I guess the short answer is the same way that the registrar knows what the word promptly means in its contract already. The RAA contains the word promptly several times, and it's the baseline. And so, we've not heard that registrars and ICANN compliance don't understand what promptly means.

That having been said, as I mentioned in going through the summary, that is a live topic, and there are those that are advocating stricter timeframes or perhaps not stricter, but at least defined timeframes, and we'll see how that one lands.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yeah, thanks. And it's a good question. We spent a long time discussing it. And actually, there is already an ICANN advisory from

Compliance around the use of prompts for existing registrar obligations which use the prompt wording for resolving DNS abuse. So, I can say to you that the guidance in the advisory currently says the appropriate action to take or mitigate or to disrupt an instance of DNS abuse will vary depending on the specific circumstances.

Consequently, the appropriate amount of time to investigate and take appropriate action will also vary, making it impossible to prescribe a fixed amount of time for an action to be considered prompt. Instead, registry operators must demonstrate an ongoing attentiveness to allegations of sponsored names being used for abuse. The attentiveness should be commensurate with the potential harm DNS abuse cause its victims.

And it goes on to explain how the ICANN Compliance people, that they will require the registrars to explain how their actions were prompt considering the specific circumstances, and then they will review that explanation and the relevant circumstances to make case-by-case determination to decide whether or not the actions were in fact prompt in line with the obligation.

And it gives some illustrations and examples. I can put the advisory into the chat just so that you have it there, but I think the point which was made is that we can build on existing work in this area and leverage off the existing use of this prompt language which gives essentially a graduated response deadline depending on the specific circumstances, understanding that some are going to be easier and more urgent to do than others. I'll leave it there.

PAUL MCGRADY Terrific. Okay. Terri, we will go to the two hands in the live queue, and then we'll go back to question number three from the pod. Anil, go ahead. Anil, are you on mute maybe?

ANIL JAIN Yeah. Am I audible now?

PAUL MCGRADY Okay, great. We can hear you now.

ANIL JAIN Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Paul. Anil for the record. In fact, two questions. One is related to the working group. It's that, there are different type of registrars in the system, small registrar, medium registrar and big registrar. The ADC compliance include not only identification of a domain, but also, collecting a lot of data, doing the check, and then maybe mitigation also.

It involves cost in the system. Sometimes the small registrar may not be able to undertake that work because of the cost implication. Are we also considering to compensate a registrar for the ADC investigation? This is question number one.

Question number two is more administrative. Nick, you inform that we are running fast? Yes, we are running fast and I am part of the team. Can you please inform how many months we are shortening

as compared to the previous schedule which ICANN or GNSO has put in front of us? This is number one.

Number two is that there are four sessions in ICANN86. We have discussed till now the charter question number five and six to some extent. Are we going to cover up to charter question number six or we are going to extend beyond that? Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks. Okay. So, I think question number one was, are we going to compensate registrars for doing the ADC? So far, no. And it's not a charter question. It's a contractual requirement. And I see Russ's hand went up, so maybe Russ will save me because I don't want to say something that gets me in trouble.

But doing the ADC, like doing a domain name abuse from my point of view, dealing with the domain name abuse, it's part of the cost of doing business as an ICANN registrar. But we'll have Russ answer that, but I'm going to answer the second question first, which is, do we intend to look at charter questions 8 and 9 before Sevilla? And the answer to that is yes. We want to at least have done an initial walkthrough of those questions, and that's part of our meeting schedule. Russ, do you mind jumping in here and saving me?

RUSS WEINSTEIN

Sure, Paul. I didn't raise my hand to answer the question. Hi everyone, this is Russ Weinstein. I'm the SVP for Policy Development Support for ICANN. So, in terms of compensation for

registrars, I don't believe that's in scope as Paul discussed or the charter, and I think the way the GNSO looked at it was DNS abuse mitigation is part of the responsibility of registrars and registries, and this is essentially a cost of doing business, and the idea in the PDP is to define that scope appropriately so it's a reasonable obligation. So, I'll leave it at that. And I'll get back in line because I had a different question and I don't want to jump the queue.

PAUL MCGRADY

Oh, great. Thanks, Russ. I appreciate.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

There was a question asked about how much time have we taken off the original timeline that you didn't answer. I don't know the answer to that, but I know that we haven't answered it.

PAUL MCGRADY

Yes. And I don't know the exact answer to that, and I don't want to guess wrong. In my head, it was four months, but maybe Theo can tell us how much. It was three to four months there in the chat. So, she sent me a note. Thank you. Three to four months. So, yes, we've already shaved three to four months off. I don't know if we'll be able to shave off more or not, but we are going to see what we can accomplish. Okay. Tinuade, please go ahead.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Hello. Can you hear me? Yeah, thank you so much.

PAUL MCGRADY

Yes, we can hear you.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Yeah, quickly. I don't know if it's on the question and answer already. I just wanted to confirm if you are worried at the working group, if some of the proposed mitigation requirements could unintentionally increase maybe compliance costs, especially for smaller operators, maybe Global South, like the registrars that are looking to do this maybe for the first time and all that. And if that is the case, is there any way the working group is addressing this? Thank you. Apologies, Tinuade Oguntuyi for the records.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thank you. So, yeah, I think it's a similar question. The costs of compliance are not in the scope of RPDP. It's not a question that the GNSO Council asked us to look at. Again, whatever I say about the cost of doing business with ICANN is personal opinion stuff, not opinion of the chairs, the leadership, ICANN, or the working group. If that is a concern, I encourage you to take that up through the GNSO Council process, and that may be a charter question someday for a different PDP. But we're not currently looking at that question.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yeah, and I think it's fair to say there's been a lot of discussion and a lot of input from registrars, is the first thing to say. So, we are

getting valuable input from registrars. The second thing, I think, which is interesting context, is that many registrars already do these associated domain name checks.

And so, we're trying to listen to what their experiences are and try to basically ensure that the base standard across all the registrars is moved up to that good practice standard. I think that's the first thing to say.

And the last thing to say is that, the prompt to cause an ADC is an instance of actionable DNS abuse. And that actually, in fact, what we're hearing is that registrars quite often effectively already do that ADC because they get the abuse report, and as part of their investigation and acting on that abuse report is to identify other domain names which are also DNS abuse which are associated because they can see that the data strongly suggests a link and that causes them to create that association.

And so, we're trying to do this in a proportionate way which matches registrar business models and to make sure that what we put in as a policy recommendation is beneficial for the ecosystem as a whole. They're very mindful of those sorts of concerns. I see Volker has his hand up in the queue. Russ, is that an old hand?

PAUL MCGRADY

No, it's a revised hand because I called on him for the wrong thing. So, let's be fair to the queue, and we'll go with Russ and then we'll

go with Volker and then we'll go back to the Q&A. So, Russ, go ahead.

RUSS WEINSTEIN

All right, thanks, everyone. First of all, Paul and Nick, thank you very much for volunteering for this role as leadership of this PDP, and all feedback I get is you guys are doing a fantastic job. So, thank you very much. Chairing a working group is not easy and it's a big-time commitment, so thank you for that and to the whole PDP working group.

Thank you for the time, effort, and care you're putting into this important initiative. I wanted to ask a question about how the PDP is going. I heard really good progress from you all. I was curious, were there any topics that have been more challenging to reach convergence on, and any topics that seemed easier to reach convergence on, and if there's anything interesting to share with the group?

PAUL MCGRADY

That's a good question, Russ. We spent quite a bit of time on the trigger. More than I thought we would. But I think we've congealed around that. And then from my point of view, the next thing that we need to sort of congeal around is the issue of timing, because we are sort of, not overwhelmingly, but we are largely at promptly, as we discussed.

But we do have live suggestions from each of the BC and each of the IPC, which need us to look at them. And so, we've talked about those a little bit, but at the end of the last call that we had, I declared it not done. We want to shave time off this PDP, but we can't do that at the price of quality. And so, Nick, I don't know if you have anything else to add to that.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

I think that the two sticking points, we haven't actually gone through all nine questions yet, but on the work to date. It's clear that some of the constituencies are concerned about the ability of ICANN Compliance to police these provisions in a clear and consistent and meaningful way. and to their mind

That means you need to have in black and white A, you must do this within, pick a time frame specifically, like 72 hours or 24 hours or a week or whatever. There should be a cutoff against which the obligations can clearly be measured in order to make them a good policy with enforceability by ICANN Compliance.

And that's where this whole sort of prompt versus a specific deadline debate. And that's not finished, I don't think. I would like to get everybody unanimous around a position, not for there to be dissenting minorities ideally.

We want to really try to pull people along. The other area I would say is in terms of the NSCS, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Constituency is that, there are concerns, I think we've heard these

a number of times, there are concerns around the impact on registrants of conducting ADCs and whether there are appropriate safeguards in terms of data handling and processing and adverse impacts.

I guess if there's a false positive as a result of some of the checks done in this ADC process, what does that look like? And although we've kind of agreed that it's not within scope, but the question of remedies for innocent registrants who are adversely affected through DNS Abuse mitigation, a false positive, maybe they're unfortunately a victim of ID theft or some other thing, which means that they are caught up accidentally in some sort of mitigation, then how does this PDP protect people in those sort of situations.

And we don't think it's part of the PDP process, but I think we heard it was an important part to many people that this is a further area of policy development. And I think my final point is that it's been helped by having narrowly scoped charter questions, very specific on point. This is not to cure all DNS abuse.

This is a very specific registrar obligation that if you've got, say, a dozen domain names maliciously registered to conduct phishing, which is the sort of the classic DNS abuse, the majority use case, as a registrar, a single actionable domain bound for that should mean that you don't need to receive abuse reports for all 12 of those in order to take action.

You should be taking action more proactively just based on the one and the fact that you can see that there are another dozen

associated with that proven abusive domain. So, having a very clear objective to get something which we think is already best practice in lots of registrars and pretty much common sense, I guess, to try and codify that in a good policy is helping us keep focused on the task and getting through it in a reasonable timeframe. Sorry, I feel like I've talked to a lot. I'll be quiet now.

PAUL MCGRADY

Yeah, thanks, Nick. And I guess just a couple other quick thoughts. Quick thought number one is on all of this, we will be doing impact assessments on human rights, on data issues. There are requirements under ICANN bylaws that have us do that.

And I know I've mentioned that before, but it's an important thing not to lose track of. We are also working on sort of a lightweight initial run through those issues before we declare anything final enough for a preliminary issues report. And then in addition to those robust reviews on impact assessments. So, that's coming and that's important.

The other thing, Russ asked what's going well. I know I've already said this, but man, what's going well is the team. Like I said, everybody's sent their best people. They're studied up, they're ready, the calls are efficient. We are avoiding pontification. We are avoiding relitigation.

I'm not saying that nobody ever got their feathers ruffled on a call, we're people, but the feather ruffle ratio in this particular PDP is

pretty low compared to some of the other ones I've been in. And so, for me, the big thing to celebrate is the relationships and how well the team is doing.

So, anyways. I think we have Volker, and then I do believe we've got at least one more question in the pod. So, Volker and then pod.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes, thank you. I just wanted to come back to some of the comments that we heard earlier. One was with regard to compensation of registrars for that. I think incentivizing registrars to do their job is not what we want to do. I think it would set the wrong incentive if abuse mitigation as a business model were to become a thing. That is one thing. The other thing is whether it would increase our compliance costs.

As a registrar that already does these Associated Domain Checks, I can basically tell you that they will actually reduce your compliance costs, because if you in one swoop detect 10 domain names out of one report that you receive and take action against those, that's nine more reports that you won't have to deal with anymore because you've already taken those domain names down before they can become actionable or before they can become a problem.

Therefore, the amount that you're spending on tickets will go down. You will have a much easier time mitigating the abuse and ultimately save costs. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY

Thanks, Volker. All right. Terri, take us to the pod.

TERRI AGNEW

Thank you. Our next question, back from Siva again, and there's a couple of questions in here. "Given that phishing is included in the ICANN-defined scope of DNS abuse and that identifying phishing, which involves tricking a victim into revealing sensitive information through sending fraudulent or lookalike emails or luring end users to copycat websites is fundamentally reliant on the examination of content, what clear objective and policy enforceable criteria prevent the inclusion of this content-dependent abuse from logically expanding ICANN's remit to encompass all forms of content-related abuse?" End of question one.

Question two. "If identifying phishing requires analyzing content, why is this necessary content review permitted while other equally harmful forms of content abuse are deemed strictly beyond ICANN's mission and scope?" End of question.

PAUL MCGRADY

Okay. Well, that's a great question, but I'm going to wimp out on the answer and just say that that's a great big giant question that is above our pay grade. It's simply just not within the charter of this PDP. There's been endless discussion within the ICANN community about what DNS abuse is, its definition, how to spot it, all those things. That is not a question that we've been asked by the council to address again.

And so, if you believe there's more work to be done there, I highly encourage you to bring that up through your council rep and see if they can get you traction. I know that's probably not the answer you wanted, but we're just here to talk about Associated Domain Checks. Nick, anything to add to that?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

I echo that and I'd say that this is not a new question or a new discussion. And for better or for worse, there is an ICANN definition of the technical abuses. This is a technical abuse system that we're looking at, and the technical abuses include phishing.

So, that is supposed to make a clear distinction between technical abuse and content abuse and to put these phishing type things into the technical abuse category in order that it falls within ICANN's remit.

I know that's not 100% agreed to across the ecosystem, but that's the starting position that we've been given, and it's certainly the position in the existing ICANN contractual framework for registry operators and also registrars. So, it kind of is what it is, I can see your point, I guess it comes down to more of a philosophical point around content versus technical, but that's what the community has given us as the starting line for this PDP. So, we're not going into those very interesting philosophical questions.

PAUL MCGRADY

All right. Well, I see from Terri that we have no other pod questions at this time, and we have no other hands up. I don't want to make this longer than it needs to be. If we've answered the questions, that's great. I will wait five seconds to see any other hands. Going once, three, two, one. All right, we did it.

Everybody that's on the call, thank you for spending your time with us. We hope it was helpful. We're looking forward to seeing many of you in Seville. And in the meantime, Staff has very kindly put up here links to the materials for the PDP including the wiki space, the email list, archive, that's a good one, and the overview page.

Also in the chat, John has put a link to the wiki space there. You'll find most everything that you need there. We encourage you to keep following along with us, and wishing many of you safe travels to Spain. I will hand this back over to Terri. And Nick, thank you so much.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Just one final thing which would be remiss to conclude without saying is a massive thank you to the ICANN policy support team and staff. It makes mine and Paul's lives much easier just with the preparation and the volume of material and the circulation of things in a timely manner.

So, we really appreciate the support that we've had there because it really is an important part of the thing, and a lot of that work goes unthanked behind the scenes. So, we do appreciate that.

PAUL MCGRADY

Wonderful. I agree. Terri.

TERRI AGNEW

All right. We want to sincerely thank everyone for joining. Our time has concluded. We will stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Take care, everybody. Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]