



DNSAM PDP1
Meeting #14
1 June 2026

Agenda

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. ICANN86 Prep**
- 3. Start Deliberations on CQ8**
- 4. Start Deliberations on CQ9**
- 5. AOB**

A stylized world map composed of a grid of small white dots on a light gray background, centered behind the main title.

ICANN86 Prep

Road to ICANN86

Week of 11 May

Deliberations on
CQ5 and CQ6

Week of 18 May

Discuss
Strawpersons CQ5
and 6

Week of 25 May

Review language
on CQ1-7 as
whole
IA next steps

Week of 1 June

Start Deliberations on
CQ8-9
Prep for ICANN86

ICANN86

4 Working Sessions



DNSAM PDP1 ICANN86 SESSIONS



Monday 8 June

11:45 - 13:15 CEST

Objective:
Discuss Straw proposal
CQ8-9



Monday 8 June

14:45 - 16:00 CEST

Objective:
Review language on
CQ1-9



Wednesday 10 June

10:00 - 11:15 CEST

Objective:
Review and refine
language on CQ1-9

Discuss CANNOT
LIVE WITH language
and modifications



Thursday 11 June

11:45 - 13:15 CEST

Objective:
Review Scoped
IMPACT
ASSESSMENT

Continue CANNOT
LIVE WITH
discussion

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE WG?

1. WG Members to review prelim rec document above and identify any areas of “CANNOT LIVE WITH” **before 8 June.**
2. Staff to share scoped impact assessment (HR and DP) on current prelim language with WG today. WG to review **before 10 June.**
3. Identified areas of concerns/feedback/questions will be added and discussed during ICANN86 Working Sessions.





Deliberations CQ8

What metrics will be used to evaluate the policy's effectiveness?

EARLY INPUT CQ8

Early Input Themes: There is broad agreement that the policy should be evaluated using real-world, tangible measures, that are generally outcome-oriented rather than abstract commitments. The IPC, ISPCP, and BC all offer concrete quantitative metrics and the GAC proposed OCTO as a party that can measure data abuse trends. There is some slim alignment that quantitative measures alone are not sufficient. NCSG supports accuracy, proportionality, and process quality, while the ISPCP and BC emphasize campaign disruption, reducing uptime, and recidivism reduction rather than quantity alone. There is some variation as well between process safeguards (NCSG), proactive identification (IPC) and hybrid proactive identification and downstream impacts (ISPCP, BC).

SO/AC SG/C Early Input

Full Text Available for each submission for the WG on this Google doc:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk2-h2E8sY1OI64-k8-hnW2FGgaiaQ1M_csEmUMFNC0/edit?usp=sharing

PDFs of each submission are available on the wiki: <https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/x/DgCeOg>

SG/C EARLY INPUT SUGGESTIONS ON CQ8

- Number of pivot investigations initiated per reporting period; number of associated domains identified; number of domains suspended, transferred, or otherwise actioned as a result.
- The framework should specify a review cycle (e.g., every two years) at which aggregate metrics are assessed and the framework adjusted if evidence of systematic over-enforcement or ineffectiveness is identified.
- Average reduction in abuse uptime
- Number of associated domains mitigated per confirmed seed domain
- Percentage of confirmed seed domains that resulted in associated domain checks
- Recurrence rate of DNS abuse associated with the same registrant/account
- The Metrics should focus on the number of additional domain names being used for DNS Abuse that were identified by registrars without having to wait for a report of DNS Abuse.
- Increase in the number of associated abusive domains identified and acted upon
- Decrease in recidivism rates for registrants and customers previously found to engage in DNS Abuse
(i.e., fewer new abusive domains registered by the same entity)



A stylized world map composed of a grid of small white dots on a light gray background, centered behind the title text.

Deliberations CQ9

How can registrars demonstrate their compliance with the obligations to ICANN and what types of evidence and information can registrars submit?

EARLY INPUT CQ8

Early Input Themes: The input largely agrees that registrar compliance should be demonstrated through a good-faith process, rather than outcome-based guarantees. Multiple groups emphasize procedural evidence and a reasonable investigation process (BC, NCSG, ISPCP) and RrSG points to this existing in the RAA. There is broad alignment on documentation and recordkeeping including logs, documenting steps (NCSG, ISPCP, IPC, BC) and record retention for audits (GAC, ISPCP, IPC). There is also convergence that transparency and accountability can be achieved without disclosing personal information. There is a divergence in the levels of evidence required and whether this is already covered in the RAA or requires new policy.

SO/AC SG/C Early Input

Full Text Available for each submission for the WG on this Google doc:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk2-h2E8sY1OI64-k8-hnW2FGgaiaQ1M_csEmUMFNC0/edit?usp=sharing

PDFs of each submission are available on the wiki: <https://icann-community.atlassian.net/wiki/x/DgCeOg>

CURRENT DNS ABUSE COMPLIANCE PRACTICES

Enforcing Contractual Obligations with Registries and Registrars

ICANN Contractual Compliance (Compliance) enforces the contractual obligations set forth in ICANN's policies and agreements, including the [Base Registry Agreement \(Base RA\)](#) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). The abuse-related provisions enforced by Compliance include Specification 6 Section 4 of the Base RA and Section 3.18 of the RAA which, since 5 April 2024, contain requirements for registry operators and registrars to take mitigation actions against well-evidenced DNS Abuse. Compliance enforces these requirements, and all other obligations across all ICANN's policies and agreements, through the processing of external complaints and by conducting certain proactive monitoring activities and regularly scheduled audits.

ICANN Contractual Compliance follows established process to enforce the DNS Abuse obligations. The process comprises two stages: an informal and formal resolution stage. The informal resolution stage (through which most investigations are resolved and closed) generally entails, at a minimum, three notifications and two phone calls to the CP. These communications include an itemized list of information and records needed to evaluate compliance.

ICANN Contractual Compliance's enforcement of DNS Abuse requirements for April 2026:

<https://compliance-reports.icann.org/dnsabuse/dashboard/2026/0426/dns-abuse-report.html>

AOB