JULIE BISLAND: All right, this is Julie Bisland for the recording. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the DNS Abuse PDP1 Working Group call taking place on Monday, the 2nd of November, 2026.

We do have apologies today from Eberhard Lisse, ccNSO, and alternate Bruce Tonkin will be joining. Also, apology from Erum Welling, RSSAC. Statements of interest must be kept up to date. Does anyone have any updates to share? If so, please raise your hand or speak up now. I'm seeing no hands. All right. All documentation and information can be found on the Wiki space. Recordings will be posted shortly after the end of the call. Please remember to state your name before speaking for the recording.

As a reminder, participation in ICANN, including this session, is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct. And with that, I will turn it over to Paul McGrady. Thank you, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, Julie. Good morning, everybody. Let me see if I can turn on the video here. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Because of the time change in North America, it's a little bit earlier than usual, but that's okay let's get this knocked out. Our agenda is mighty, but straightforward. We're going to spend a little time welcoming, talking about PDP updates, we're going to first read through the draft final

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.

report to see if we captured everybody's comments from our time together and make sure we got it right. Staff will spend a few minutes on the updates to the Impact Assessment and then we'll have an AOB time. So, let's go ahead and get started.

On PDP updates, where we want to go, where we are. Okay, so we did the public comment review during ICANN87 and we are now at step two, updating the final report. In November, we will hopefully get this all the way through to its final read. And then we'll have a consensus call at the end of November, early December, and we will submit this to council, hopefully, again in December. So, that is where we are.

Right now, this is our little timeline. We're at dot number two, November 2nd, first read. The goal is to check the text against the working group outcomes from ICANN87, make sure that staff and leadership capture the comments correctly, got it right, explain things that might look a little bit different than expected, we have one of those.

And then on the second read, which is next week, that's when we will resolve any remaining gaps and material concerns, do proofing and all that, so that'll be next on November the 9th. If we need more time after November 9th, we're going to kick it into high gear. You'll all remember at the beginning of this, I said if we started to come up against time, we would default back to two-hour sessions a week, which is what staff had recommended.

I'm glad we said no, because I don't think we needed them, but if we need them, we'll do that November 12th and November 16th.

Hopefully we don't, but they're there in case we need it and we're aiming for a consensus call to begin November 20th. It's a 10-day period, just like last time where it was virtual. So, we're going to focus on updated text, the rationale, any potentially overlooked input or material risks. So, if anybody wants to raise anything, now is the time. All right.

So, the draft final report read, we're going to focus on, due to revised recommendations and implementation guidance, reflective discussions and outcome of ICANN87. Does the rationale explain how public comment was considered and why text changed or stayed the same? Are comments or evidence missing that can materially affect the outcome? And we will flag material concerns in terms of enforceability or implementation problems, internal inconsistency or scope drift.

So, if you guys see any of those, raise those or concerns that can materially affect adoption or policy meaning. So, in other words, we're focused on making sure that what's in front of us now is what we meant. And as we see it in its mostly final form raising any issues as to if we've drifted out of scope or if there is a concern that we see the board could raise or council could raise.

So, we're going to focus on the updated text. We're not reopening unchanged text without a material concern or overlooked issue. In other words, not asking for relitigation of everything. I think we're quite past that at this point. All right. Let's get on with the fun.

First read, draft, final report. So, these are things to keep in mind. I know we spent a lot of time at ICANN87 asking if there was any public

comment point or member concern that has not been adequately reflected. Maybe airplane time on the way back or the week since something has come up in someone's head that they believe should have been considered at ICANN87. This is not an invitation to reopen things that were, but if there is a material member concern, please raise it.

The other thing we're going to do, like we talked about, is make sure the updated language matches what the working group actually discussed and decided at ICANN87. And sort of the last step, fail safe, is there any concrete scope implementation or enforceability issue that needs resolution before the next read? So, when you raise an issue, identify the provision to practical concern and why it matters to the outcome so be ready to speak to anything that you want to raise. All right.

And I want to talk about recommendation five. This is the one that I said we had something, that it's going to look a little bit different than what we talked about before. When we get to it, you'll see it. We said that we would keep the original black text. We could not get agreement around the proposed read text, but ICANN compliance staff raised an issue about their concerns about enforceability of the black text. And so, I came up with a solution that I think says exactly the same thing, but for some reason staff doesn't think it says the same thing and they're happy with it.

So, when we get there, you'll see that the concerns there were avoiding implying that ICANN must independently interpret or enforce national law or undefined external standards, and to not expand the agreed

policy beyond the working group's agreement. And they raise the potential enforceability adoption concern.

In other words, if we move forward with just the black text we had, that maybe the board would send it back to council. And so, when we get to that one, we need to decide is, did we get this right to both address the staff concern and is the proposed change narrowly scoped and required? So, when we get there, you'll see that one. Okay. Great. So, let's jump in.

I'm going to be looking over to the right. Let's see. Maybe I can make this screen a bit bigger. I don't know if I can do that. Staff, can you make that a bit bigger? Maybe get to the actual text and not worry so much about the comments down the side? There we go. Thank you. Thanks for helping out an old man. Okay.

So, this particular recommendation, recommendation five that we talked about here, we were defaulted to the black text, which would have read ADC must be conducted in compliance with applicable laws, including data privacy laws and contractual requirements. Furthermore, nothing, and then remaining black text that you see there.

Staff was concerned that they would not be able to enforce this. The first sentence, I, of course, pointed out that the RAA already has a requirement that everything being done is in compliance with applicable law. They, compliance staff had a different view. And so, I suggested the following text, ADC must be conducted in compliance with contractual requirements, including, but not limited to section 3.7.2 of the RAA, which contains the applicable law standard.

But in order to not duplicate what was already in the RAA, we just made reference to it. And so, I hope that that solution to the compliance staff's problem and our desire to keep our original intent here, which was, we don't want ADC to go off the rails and be conducted outside of compliance with applicable law, hopefully that threads the needle. So, if anybody has concerns about that, please do raise those, but I hope that done it.

Were there any other outliers? John, I thought we had one for recommendation seven that might be a little bit different. Do we want to jump there now or just scroll through?

JOHN EMERY: Sure. We can jump to recommendation seven if you'd like.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah. John, why don't you do that? Why don't you explain what's going on with that one and then we'll go back, everybody, and start at the top and just literally scroll through the document and say, recommendation one, does anybody have anything? Recommendation two, does anybody have anything? John, go ahead. Thank you.

JOHN EMERY: Sure. Just to update a little bit on recommendation seven. So, the biggest change is that an Implementation Guidance 7 was added, but to the recommendation itself, there was some clarification added that the two-year review would be after the effective date from the consensus policy.

And looking at whether the policy is achieving its intended purpose, a recognition explicitly stated in the recommendation that overall DNS Abuse trends may be influenced by factors beyond the ADC policy and identifying relevant metrics and any baseline early enough for meaningful comparisons. So, there were a number of public comments that suggested having a baseline data to measure off of before that two-year timeline.

And the key for implementation guidance, which was added was to provide a non-exhaustive list of examples of potential information. So, specifically, the metrics were verified by a cross-functional team within ICANN org to essentially say these are the metrics that are available for ICANN to measure these things, and a clarification that compliance data is not a complete record of registrar activity.

So, some of the text that was preserved based on working group discussion was registrar held information was retained after members objected to its removal. So, I'll just scroll to the document really quick. Apologies for the scrolling, but just so you can see a bit of the changes in the recommendation and then we can scroll to implementation guidance as well. Back to you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you, John. So, when we get to recommendation seven, that's the background of why it looks the way it looks. So, five and seven were the two that might look a bit different than what was in everybody's head when we decamped from ICANN87. All right. So that's sort of the background.

This might be tedious, guys, but I don't know any other way to do it other than start at the top with recommendation one and we'll just go recommendation by recommendation, asking, one, did staff and leadership get the working groups comments correct when we made changes? Two, any material public comments that had not been raised yet by anybody that wanted to? Three, any out-of-scope issues or adoptability issues that have not already been raised, and three, and this sounds really ridiculous, any typos or internal grammatical inconsistencies? So, let's just start.

And everybody's got the document open I hope. And I'll just ask for a cue on recommendation one, any anything in those categories anyone would like to raise? All right, I don't see any hands. Terrific. Okay.

Recommendation two, raising and opening the cue. Sound of silence is not uncomfortable. It's the sound of people who already read it and did their homework so that's great, but that's not to say if you have something you want to raise that that's not great. It is great. Silence is great and raising hands is great. Okay, I don't see anyone. Oh, here we go. Michaela.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO: Hi there, Michaela for the record. No, two small questions. One, so in this portion, we talk about a trigger domain name. Might be very obvious, but curious if the group thinks there should be a definition that goes with that, or is it clear that what we're talking about when we say trigger domain name? And also, just wanted to echo Dennis's comment about removing the consistent width because I also think that's a bit

redundant and we might have to play around with the numbers if something changes in the order. So, it might just not be necessary to have that last bit consistent with recommendation one as well as la, la, la. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Michaela. On the last part, I mean, I, as a lawyer believing in font minimization, in the perfect world, I would agree with you, but that edition was very prominent throughout public comments and lots of folks asked for it. I don't see that it does any harm and so unless there's a groundswell to get rid of it, I think we should keep it because it was raised by multiple groups.

And then associated with the trigger domain name, I mean, I know what it means because I've been involved in this PDP. The question is, will other people know what it means? I mean, I think that since the policy is directed at registrars, they'll understand it, but again, maybe not. Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY: Sorry, this was back on 2.1 so we should close out this conversation first.

PAUL MCGRADY: Oh, okay. Does anybody think we -- Okay, Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: No, just to note, I agree with you, Paul, that I think that the concept of the trigger here is pretty self-explanatory given the rest of the context. And so, what I don't want to do is over-engineer things by like creating hard definitions where we don't have to, where if the context can do the work for us, I'm definitely comfortable with trigger here.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Brian. Eric, go ahead.

ERIC ROKOBAUER: Thanks, everybody. This is Eric for the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Yeah, I'm also okay with trigger, especially with now the reference being used for DNS Abuse as defined in 318, one of the RAA registrars are familiar obviously with that. And that's where a lot of the references of reported domain name with DNS Abuse so I think trigger is fine. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Eric, and I see others supporting trigger in the text. Okay. All right. I think we will leave that the way that it is. Reg, you had something back on 2.1. Let's scroll back up.

REG LEVY: Thank you so much. So, this whole purple section that we scrolled past the first time, as well as the compromised domain section here, there's a big, three paragraphs, if you scroll down, that we didn't look at. And I think that this says that we should make updates to the second purple

paragraph above, where the compromised domain quasi-definition is. That it should be used by an unauthorized user and not try to say so-called beneficial user, registered name holder, account holder. Like just an unauthorized person full stop because that could be anyone and that encompasses everything. And if we put that up in the second purple paragraph above, then we can remove these three purple paragraphs.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it. Let's open a queue on that. Do people agree with Reg? I will say, though, I think that in this particular paragraph, these three, this is not policy or implementation guidance, I don't believe. I think we are in the territory of explaining how public comments were processed, right? So, I don't know that we necessarily need to delete these three paragraphs, but if there's something missing, then we should identify that. Reg, do you want to -- Your hand's still up. I'm hoping you'll save me.

REG LEVY: Oh, sure. Sorry. It is early for me. I didn't put the hand down. I'm used to Google Meet that does it for me. So, I think that it would be reasonable to incorporate the public comments in the second purple paragraph above, to the extent that it reads, a compromised domain name means a domain name that is used as a vector for DNS Abuse by an unauthorized user. And that simplifies the definition and incorporates the public comments. And if you want to leave why we made that change here, I don't have a dispute with that, but it would therefore incorporate the public comments.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay, so let's go back up then to a compromised domain name means and Reg, you're suggesting it should read, a compromised domain name means a domain name that is used as a vector for DNS Abuse by an unauthorized user.

REG LEVY: Correct.

PAUL MCGRADY: And scratch without the knowledge or consent of registered name holder or beneficial user?

REG LEVY: Exactly. We can leave the second piece if we want. I'm fine with that second sentence, but that gets around whether it was made by me, quote unquote, because I was the person who logged in because my login information was compromised. Right? So, it looks like it was me logging in, but it wasn't me logging in. That's just an unauthorized user, even though kind of technically it was still the RNH so I feel like that just simplifies everything.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Reg. So, this this text was talked about a whole lot over the last several months. And so, if we're going to make a change like this, I think

pretty much we need strong support for it. So, I'm going to open a queue on Reg's proposed variant. Michaela, go ahead.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO: Thanks. Yeah, I'm of two minds. I do like simplicity, but my concern here is that we lose something around consent to the extent to which the registrant is participating in this. So, I'm a little concerned about losing that part of consent here. I don't know if there's a way that we can keep it. Yeah, I mean, I guess authorize can cover that, I just saw your comment, Reg. Yeah, I guess I'm still up two minds. I might have to think on this a bit and maybe consult with the NCSG, but that was just my initial concern. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Michaela. Anybody else have concerns with Reg's proposed change? We got the full crowd here so now's the time, guys. Okay. Martina, go ahead.

MARTINA BARBERO: Thank you, Paul. Full honesty, I think we need to move it over a bit. Not strong feelings about that, but I will need to check with my PSWG colleagues, with the colleagues from the Public Safety Working Group. I don't see anything strongly against it, but I'm not the law enforcement authority here.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got you. Thank you, Martina. Okay. Hearing only, I'm not immediately opposed to it, but need to take it back. Let's make Reg's change here and remember when we do our hopefully final read next week that this was put in on probation. I'm not trying to hand anybody the keys to the kingdom, but sort of a late change like this over much talked about text, if we're going to make a change like this, this late, it really should be without much resistance.

So, hopefully when NCSG and Public Safety Working Group takes this back, they'll come back and say, "Great." If not, we'll need to be ready to listen next week. By an unauthorized user. Okay, yeah. All right. Thank you, Reg. You're definitely not being difficult. You're being elegant. I love it. I'm a thought minimalist myself. I like to pin in as few characters as we can and still convey the meaning so that's good.

Oh, Mark says, "IPC wants to consider as well," perfectly fine. Everybody should consider. Yep. All right. And Jothan says, "The change might impact the less worse scenario I mentioned in Bali." Jothan, why don't you speak to that?

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, sure. Can you hear me?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Right. So, there's a situation or scenario that happens quite frequently where a domain name might be on a payment plan, or a domain's registrant or owner is leasing a name to another party. And you could either have a malevolent other party, or you could have the compromise scenario where a third party other than those two were involved. And so, if you've got that lease situation or payment plan situation, we may want to make sure that that could be accommodated here without – Sorry, it's quite early, thoughts not working good.

Basically, I think that, my intervention here would just be that we want to consider if there is a lessee, lessor situation and there is a compromise, it may appear to be that without the knowledge or agreement of the registered name holder would work, but unauthorized may not work. And I would just probably want to take and consider that with other parties. So, that might be something to take back also. I know I had said initially no issue, but upon some further thought, I think that that might require some consideration. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. Thanks, Jothan. I guess my question is, are there people who lease domain names out without restrictions on DNS Abuse? Because if there's a restriction in the lease that you can't use the domain name for DNS Abuse, then doing so would be an unauthorized. And so, to a certain extent, I guess I'm questioning whether or not ICANN policy can project good business practices out into the marketplace and whether or not that's our role. But I don't want to squish the thinking, but I do kind of wonder.

Okay, well, let's leave this where it's at. We will raise it next week. I don't want to lose a month talking about it. So, if we can't get there, we can't get there. If we can, great. Let's keep rolling. I think we're on rec three. Opening a queue on rec three. Do we have changes on rec three?

JOHN EMERY: No changes on rec three or Implementation Guidance 3.1.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it. So, no changes, but still the same questions, which question number one we've answered, did staff and leadership get the comments right? We think so, because there were no changes, but any internal inconsistency, any major public comment, concept not addressed. Opening the queue. Okay. All right, moving on.

Recommendation four, opening queue on our standard set of questions here. Did leadership and staff get the comments right? Any major gaps from public comments that were missed, overlooked, not addressed? Any internal inconsistencies or scope creep or adoptability issues? Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, thanks. I have two things on this one so try and do one and then maybe the other in case there's any discussion, unless you prefer that I just list them both. So, the first one was, the concept around shared registration systems between accreditation credentials for registrars by contract or separate registrars, but in actuality were acting as one. That's discussed in the rationale or the work group, the new purple text

below in the rationale section, but my recollection was that we were going to try and accommodate that more directly, maybe remembering that wrong. I was expecting to see some text there that would address that, so it wasn't there.

The second issue was on the discussion we had about references to documents that provided good guidance around items for association. I've mentioned SAC135, there's also OCTO44, which has further references. I know we discussed that and you had mentioned something about sending a personal letter, but that's not covered in the discussion the work group had on those public comments. That's an unaddressed public comment in this draft at least. So, those are my two.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, thanks, Rod. SAC135 is addressed in Recommendation 7. So, maybe when we get there, we take a look at it and see if that…

ROD RASMUSSEN: That was a separate context, though, separate issue.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. So, let's go back to Recommendation 1 then, or Comment 1.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Four. Four.

PAUL MCGRADY: I'm sorry. Recommendation 4, your Comment 1, number one.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes.

PAUL MCGRADY: So, what text would you like to see changed to address your comment?

ROD RASMUSSEN: There's a couple places it could go potentially. So, this is the idea that when you're doing an association you can look across if you have it on a common system, right? So, you may have different registrar credentials, but it's a common system. So, we're not trying to do inter-registrar looks, we're looking just simply your particular operation as a registrar with multiple credentials.

So, you could put that into, either the recommendation or the implementation guidance. I would think maybe the implementation guidance under where we have the bullet points, the three bullet points, that might be a really good place to mention that. I think that the rationale, if I remember right reading through this earlier, talked about the idea of reasonable access would cover that. Reasonable access doesn't say, “Hey, you should look at that.” That's [inaudible - 00:33:10]. So, it's kind for those who may be less inclined to do kind of proper ADCs, they can use that as a good out-of-jail-free card. That's the concern.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. Well, we're kind of at the stage where we need some concrete text that people can take back otherwise we're going to start slipping the time frame. So, let's assume that there's going to be a new bullet under Implementation Guidance 4.1, Rod, what would you like that to say? Do you want to put it into the chat?

ROD RASMUSSEN: You might actually just be able to put it in the first bullet point because it says domains within the same account, customer, registered name holder, and customer or other potential common connection points. And they might even just put including under different registrar credentials within the same administrative system or something along those lines.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay, staff will you want to type that in so we can see it as it would look and then people can react to that? Thank you.

JOHN EMERY: Rod, could you [inaudible - 00:34:27]?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, differing registrar credentials in the common system. Yeah, there you go. Try and keep it as simple as possible.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. Let's deal with this first, and then we'll talk about the SAC35 and OCTO paper. Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY: Okay, so I think I understand what Rod is asking for, but I think registrar credentials is not the right term. Accreditations, I think, is what he means. So, like if it's registered to Tucows-164, but that is in the same database as Tucows-165, then I can search that, that would be a different registrar accreditation.

But if it is registered to Ascio, even though that is under common ownership with Tucows, I don't have to try to search them because that's not the same common system. I'm using that as an example. But I understand that there are registrars that do use common systems across their accreditations and I think that's the word that we want there instead of credentials.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay. Thank you, Reg. Rod, ask yourself if that change is okay. We'll come back to you. Jothan, go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: That's it precisely.

PAUL MCGRADY: Okay, great.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Yeah, I was offering some suggestion there. If you changed credentials in a common system with accreditations operating on a common platform, that would I think solve the spirit of what Rod's saying and leave it to where they are on a common platform. Because there are some situations where there are registrars that own multiple accreditations, but those are not operated on common platforms. So, it gives the room to do the important stuff that Rod's talking about while still accommodating some of those areas where that might not be possible. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Jothan. Rod, are those changes as they appear now okay with you?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yep.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Everybody else, are these changes okay with you? Raise your hand if you've got concerns. Jothan, you have concerns with your own suggestion, go ahead.

JOTHAN FRAKES: No, but we lost the letter S on connection point, it should be connection points, plural.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Okay, perfect. Thank you. Typos matter, right? All right. Lots of supporting going on out there. Okay, great. Thank you, guys, in the chat. Appreciate that.

And then the second thing Rod raised was, how do we reference the SAC135 and the OCTO report? I think that we could drop a footnote to those reports here if that solves it and staff can find a sensible place to put that. Rod, would that solve the issue?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, just the main thing would be to just make sure the IRT is aware that there are documents out there that would help them put together the program. And that's all I was really concerned about, was making sure that some reference to that was there. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it. Okay, staff, I'll test that with you to find the right spot to drop a footnote and to get those in. Okay, great. Last call on recommendation four.

Great, moving on to recommendation five. Same set of questions. Oh, this is the one that I sort of introduced a bit and why I made the change, the verbose change, and it seemed to be supported when I introduced it, but maybe folks have had more time to think about it. Same set of questions. Any concerns, anything missing, any scope creep, any inconsistencies, any typos? Martina.

MARTINA BARBERO: Sorry, just trying to unmute myself and put the camera, but thank you. Thank you very much, Paul, for giving me the floor. I just have one question on whether this language has been, let's put it, run through ICANN Compliance and it addresses their concern. I guess that you have with them.

PAUL MCGRADY: It does.

MARTINA BARBERO: Okay, good job. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: All right. Any other hands, questions? All right, I'm going to nudge Martina to lower her hand. There it goes.

Okay, moving on. Recommendation six. Same set of questions, concerns about the text, did we capture things correctly? Any public comments missed, overlooked, internal inconsistencies, scope creep, or board rejections, and also typos? Going once. Jothan.

JOTHAN FRAKES: So, the strike through is something I believe we discussed in Bali, right?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes.

JOTHAN FRAKES: Okay, great. Then, no issue. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Great. Okay, no need to belabor it, moving on, recommendation number seven. Same set of questions, did we get the comments correct out of Bali? Any public comments overlooked? Any scope creep? Any board adoptability? Any staff enforceability? Any typos? And you'll recall this was one that John spent some time introducing at the beginning.

All right, we're going to keep going, but I do want to highlight Implementation Guidance 7.1, this was all the new stuff. John mentioned these. I don't want to belabor it and cause a problem, but I want to make sure everybody is focused on all those things. Okay. All right. I see no hands, so no need to belabor it.

Let us move on to recommendation eight. Same set of questions. I don't think we made much by way of changes to recommendation eight, but we do have the section about how we considered public comments, that's purple. Same questions, did staff and leadership get the comments right out of Bali? Any scope creep? Any board rejection concerns? Any implementability, enforcement concerns, typos, internal inconsistencies? All right, I see no hands. Terrific. Okay.

So, on the report, I think we have two issues that are take back home issues to make sure that the proposed changes. One by Reg and there was another one staff, maybe you can put it in the text for me because I'm having a senior moment. Those will be highlighted in the email. And yeah, you're right, one by Reg, one by Jothan, yep. And those will

be highlighted in a cover email. We'll go ahead and accept all these things that we looked at today, leaving only Reg's tweak and Jothan's tweak in the document to be looked at.

So that will make your homework a little bit easier because it'll narrow down the scope of what remains. It'll also be a good reminder for you to take it back to your groups and in our next call, we'll reconvene around those two issues, see if we can knock them out one way or the other. And nothing's a fait accompli so if there are concerns from your groups, let's have them. If not, let's have that too, that would also be great.

The next thing in our agenda after the Recommendations is to take a look at the Impact Assessment Updates and I've asked John to go through these and explain the updates. John, he's been the staff member who's been in the weeds on Impact Assessment for us so John, if you don't mind doing that. This is usually where I call him Dr. Emery to remind him that there's a lot of pressure on him, so go ahead, John.

JOHN EMERY: Thanks so much, Paul. This is John Emery from staff for the record. So, I wanted to give everyone a bit of an update on the updates made to the Impact Assessments. 17 of the 42 submissions included feedback on there. We went ahead on the impact assessments and gave the updates in green text so it's easier for you to see kind of throughout each tab the updates that have been made.

So, some of the key themes addressed across all of the contributors were on the human rights impact assessment, balancing DNS Abuse

Mitigation benefits against potential harm to legitimate registrants. So, there were a number of comments talking about the harms of DNS Abuse. On data privacy, it was a number of clarifications on potential personal data risks and safeguards, and on the global public interest it was looking at operational impacts and potential effects on investment.

So, for consensus policies, there were a couple of comments on potentially marginal impacts with existing policies. These were not incorporated for the fact that since this is planning to be an ICANN consensus policy, theoretically, when adopted that there would be kind of minimal impact on existing consensus policies.

So one example that was raised in public comment that wasn't incorporated because it was pretty hypothetical was the idea that an ADC being conducted while a domain was being transferred. So, there could be a theoretical impact on transfer policy, but that seemed a bit out of scope for what these normal consensus policy impact assessments are.

So, I did want to highlight that, but we did synthesize overall comments, and I will show you kind of, for example, how these were integrated so you can see in the green text on the human rights impact assessment, highlighting exactly what was there. So, we'll keep it green for a little bit for everyone to go in and review all of the impact assessments and give any feedback on that, but that is an action item for everyone to go through and look at those.

So, this is intended ultimately to make it more complete and responsive. And so, as you review this, focus on whether the update assessment

accurately reflects the public comment and working group deliberations for this. So, be sure to check out the green text on each. Back to you, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, John. So, there'll be a link in your homework email to take a look at the public impact assessments, the changes that John described. And you now have the reasons why those changes are in there so if there are concerns about the changes, please be ready to raise them on the next and hopefully what will be the final call, but we'll see. So, that's not a big homework assignment. The changes were modest and precise, but still, we need to look at those so thank you for doing that.

So, we are way ahead of schedule, which is nice. So, before our next read in a week, leadership and staff will essentially accept everything that we've settled on and highlight the two proposed changes, one by Reg, one by Jothan so that when you get that the next round of the draft final report, it's looking pretty ready.

Staff will share the updated documents with you as soon as they're ready. I think that the changes are very minimal, so it should be pretty soon along with a link to the impact assessments. Each of you please review the two changes, flag material concerns, take it back to your working groups and let's be in a position in our next call in a week to address those and hopefully get this wrapped up. I see some hands popping up in the queue so I'm going to declare AOB and then we'll run an AOB queue. Marc, go ahead.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: It's not actually AOB. It's a comment on your plan for going forward. I think when you mentioned Reg's change, it was the change to recommendation two and I don't know if you've been following, there was a lot of discussion in the chat so it probably was not possible for you to do so. But Eunice also came up with some proposed language which I think actually might work better than Reg's to capture what we're trying to capture here. And so, I just wanted to make sure that staff captured that.

There seemed to be some positive consideration of Eunice's proposal in the chat and so I wanted to make sure that that proposal was also captured by staff, and that people could take that back to their various groups and also consider that.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: I think, yeah, John just put that in the chat. So, I think that might actually get closer to what we were trying to accomplish because even beneficial user, like that's better than having nothing in there because the whole reason we have beneficial user is this issue where the vast majority of domains are registered by proxies. So, it's like, what is with the knowledge or consent to the registered name holder, that's kind of meaningless. That creates a huge loophole where everything could fall into compromised domains and so that was the purpose of adding in beneficial user.

Beneficial user is not the clearest thing either. It's better. And so, I think maybe Eunice's language might get even closer to what we were trying to accomplish. So, I just wanted to make sure that was captured. It looks like it was by John so that was just my comment.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it. Thank you.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: I just want to make sure that when we discuss this next time, your view wasn't that, oh, this wasn't raised before. This is now a new proposal because this proposal was made, but just in the chat.

PAUL MCGRADY: Got it, yeah. Thanks, Marc. I appreciate that. It is hard to follow the chat as it moves so fast.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: Impossible.

PAUL MCGRADY: Yeah, and why I do love verbal interventions, but I know not everybody is comfortable with that so thank you for raising it. Staff will grab it and so we will have a discussion on this one when it gets back. And we are at the 11th and a half hour, so if we can't get there, we have longstanding, very heavily negotiated texts to fall back on, but if we can

find a way to collectively improve it, we should. But if we can't, we can't. Rod, go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah. Hey, just procedurally here, there were some comments in the document, many of which were just typo slash style stuff, but some were I think maybe not hugely substantive, but more than just a copy edit. What is the plan for handling those? Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY: Well, I mean, we got time now, so what did you see? What needs to be dealt with?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, just as an example, there's something in recommendation one. There was about copying something from the glossary and then Gabe had some edits as well which was syntactical, but also important. It's because words are more. I think there were maybe some others in that same one as well. There's so many copy edits it's kind of hard to pick out the ones that are more substantive, but I don't know that we actually talked about all of them on the call so far.

PAUL MCGRADY: So, Rod, yeah, that was the purpose of going through the recommendations one at a time and asking for those kinds of typos or inconsistencies. And so, we're not done until we're done, but maybe as you go through the document and you find those things, let's have them

on the list and staff can take a look at it. Staff, tell me what you want rather than going through and creating a bunch of edits in a document. I don't want to lose document control this late.

JOHN EMERY: Thank you, Paul. This is John Emery from staff. As we go in and accept the agreed upon changes, if there is anything that you see typos and things like that, you can go ahead and just put it in a comment. Please don't edit the document. And anything that you feel is substantive that needs to be addressed, please raise it on list.

PAUL MCGRADY: Perfect. All right, thanks, Rod. Thanks, John. Anything else? All right. Well, use the extra time to write home, tell them all about it and get some instructions. I am looking forward to next week. In the meantime, thank you in advance for doing your homework. I'm glad it's limited in scope. That's nice.

And for Eunice, and Reg, and Marc, I encourage you guys to pick up the phone over this next week and see if there might be something that could be worked out that we could all hear about on Monday, don't be shy. All right, thank you, everybody. Have a fabulous week and we will see you next Monday hopefully our last call. And I really can't praise you enough, this has been fantastic work. You guys, you're the poster children for how to do this right and I appreciate each of you. Thank you very much. We'll see you soon. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]