

---

JULIE BISLAND:

All right, for the recording, this is Julie Bisland. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP1 Working Group call, taking place on Monday, the 13th of April 2026. For today's call, we have apologies from Gabe Andrews, GAC; Nick Wenban-Smith, ccNSO; and Claire Craig, At-Large. Alternates are Naoum Mengoudis from the GAC, Bruce Tonkin, ccNSO, and Eunice Alejandra Perez Coello, the At-Large.

Statements of Interest must be kept up to date. Please raise your hand or speak up now if you have an update to share. I see no hands. If assistance is needed updating your SOI, please email the GNSO Secretariat. All members, participants, and alternates will be promoted to panelists. Again, please watch your screen for the prompt to be promoted to panelist. Observers will remain as attendees and will have access to view chat only.

All documentation and information can be found on the DNS Abuse PDP1 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. With that, I will turn it over to you, Paul. Thank you.

---

*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.*

---

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks very much. Welcome, everybody. We are going to just knock out a couple of procedural things and then we will get into the substantive work. Thing one is an update on Zoom features and roles of the working group based upon the charter. Just a couple of quick slides on this. Obviously, try to join the meeting early to test your audio and be promoted to panelists. When you do accept the prompt on your screen to become a panelist, the earlier you join, the earlier the prompt shows. When you log in, change your chat settings to everyone, that way everybody sees the chat and it can be part of the record. If you join after or during the meeting start time, please be patient with being promoted to the panelists as ICANN staff are working as fast as they can. If you have any questions, the best way to get a hold of somebody right away while a call is on is via the GNSO Secretariat at [icann.org](mailto:icann.org) email address. Also, please, if you have apologies or alternate notices, just send them to that email address and not to everybody.

The next couple are important. Just a reminder that all members are expected to participate during the course of the deliberations and in these working group calls. That is your role as a member, and that is not just as a way of delineating out a member from the other types, but it is a reminder that we do tend to hear the same six or seven voices and everyone is here to represent whoever sent them here. Please do engage. For participants, it is different than members. Participants will be able to actively participate in and attend all the working group meetings. Participants do not participate in the consensus designation process. That is the difference between the working group members and participants.

Working group alternates: this question came up sort of mid-call a few calls ago. I did not know the answer to it. Instead of keeping somebody from saying something incorrectly, I said alternates should go ahead and participate and leadership and staff sorted it out. Turns out, under the charter, the alternates will only participate if the member they are the alternate for is not available. Sorry to claw that back, but as I always will, I defaulted on the side of more speech rather than less since I did not know. We took a look at the charter, and that is how it landed. Working group observers are subscribed to the mailing list on a read-only basis but are not able to post. Similarly, observers are not allowed to actively participate in the PDP team meeting. Keep an eye on that, depending on your designation. I do not think I am going to call for a queue on that; it was pretty self-explanatory, so we will just move on.

Next are the working group milestones for April and May. What we have achieved so far: we have had seven meetings completed, discussing finalizing the leadership team, agreement on the work plan and timeline which has made its way to Council, and establishment of the collaboration document so that we can track our deliberations and also straw people. We have deliberated on Charter Questions 1 through 3 and the early input from the constituencies and stakeholder groups on those questions. We have proposed straw person text, draft recommendations for Charter Question 1 and Charter Question 2. We are building that for Charter Question 3. All that to say, the work plan is on track and we are moving forward.

In April and May, we have six working group meetings left until ICANN86. That is nine hours of time together and we have 40 calendar business days, so it is upon us but not such that we should quit working.

---

Here is what we are supposed to do in April and May: we are going to discuss all the charter questions in Cluster A at least once. We are going to consider the early input for each charter question in Cluster A. We will develop straw person, stable but not final text on each of the Cluster A charter questions. For discussion, we will start initial impact assessment on the draft language and adjust draft language based upon initial impact assessment if needed. We have a lot to do before ICANN86, but it is all completely doable. Any questions on the milestones? Does anybody think we can do more or less? I probably shouldn't ask that question.

I do not see any hands going up. That is our goal between now and the next meeting. This next one is just going to be an issue that is introduced. We are not making decisions today, but we wanted to let you guys know that leadership and staff have taken a look at the issue of the iterative impact assessment process. You may recall that we talked about not waiting until the end and realizing we had done something untenable or not board-ready and having to go back and redo a bunch of work. We will be looking at these assessments on an iterative basis, and we wanted to throw out the basic concepts we are kicking around. We get to do impact assessments on human rights, data privacy, global public interest, and existing consensus policies.

There are comprehensive checklists already built for each assessment to be conducted at the end once the recommendations are finalized. However, we are proposing an iterative approach to the impact assessment to ensure the stable draft language matches our working group progress. Here is the proposed approach: one, we draft recommendations for each of the charter question clusters, and then

---

we check them against a smaller checklist for each of the assessments. The charter has three charter question clusters. Working Group 1 is expected to do one lightweight version of impact assessment for each. Once all the questions have been discussed and recommendation language is stable, the working group will conduct its comprehensive final impact assessment for all the recommendations. Iteratively, we take a quick look at them at the end of each cluster, and then we will do the comprehensive assessment at the end to make sure they are all held together nice.

What is up next? Leadership is working on an iterative questionnaire that can achieve this goal for each of the clusters, and then leadership will ask for working group feedback on the iterative questionnaire during following meetings. What does that get us? It gets us a process so that people in working group calls do not feel like they have to stop in the middle of brainstorming to assess an idea. Obviously, that would slow down the process and ideas are not stable language, so it is premature. On the other hand, it also gets us a set timeframe and knowledge of when that assessment will happen so that we do not end up in a situation where folks feel they have to interrupt brainstorming. You can still say you do not know, but you won't be boxed into a corner later where we have stable straw person language and someone asks why the assessment wasn't brought up earlier. We will have a timeframe and a process that will bring predictability and less frustration. Stay tuned on the questionnaire. This is an important one. Let's pause and ask if anybody has any reaction to these concepts. We will be doing these in clusters iteratively in a lightweight way and then doing them fulsomely at the end. Reg, go ahead.

---

REG LEVY: I am not clear on how the checklists and the questionnaires relate to each other. It would be nice to be able to see this in advance.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hi, Reg. It would be great if we could do things in advance, but in this case, we are introducing a concept, not providing documents to review. We are at the conceptual stage at this point.

REG LEVY: Can you clarify the concept? I am not yet clear on the concept.

PAUL MCGRADY: I am happy to do that. Your question was: what is the difference between a checklist and a questionnaire? The checklist is the bylaws-required fulsome review that we will be doing when all of our recommendations are finalized. The questionnaire is a more lightweight approach that we take iteratively at the end of working through each charter question cluster. We are trying to provide a framework where we take that quick look that we all talked about, but we still have work to do at the end to make sure we go through the bylaws-required process. Checklist and questionnaire are two different things at two different points in time. I hope that is helpful. Martina, go ahead.

---

MARTINA BARBERO: Thank you very much, Paul. That is quite clear for me. The iterative approach makes sense to avoid arriving at the end with all the work still to be done or, at the opposite, doing everything up front. Just a question on the impact assessment methodologies: our organization has several hundred-page documents on how to carry out impact assessments. I guess every organization has different best practices or approaches. I think I asked informally how the impact assessment on human rights was done for the previous PDP on diacritics because I am not aware of the concrete methodology to apply to those things. Same with the global public interest. I was wondering if there are resources on the best practices that we can draw on.

PAUL MCGRADY: I am not the assessment expert. I am hoping one of the staff members will raise their hand and tell me what happened over in diacritics land. Feodora, I see your hand. We are going to have you jump the queue so you can save me. Thanks.

FEODORA HAMZA: Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Martina. Yes, there is a template for the human rights impact assessment that was approved and is part of each PDP now. It is quite comprehensive. Staff is very happy to link it in the chat and share the blank one in the notes for you to look at. It was briefly presented at ICANN85, and we can also share the one from the previous PDP so that the group knows what is coming up. We can also share the global public interest one. You will see these are very comprehensive, which is why leadership is proposing these chunks

---

between clusters. As noted, approaches are different, but for the human rights impact assessment, there is a document we will share in a second.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Paul. I think I am on the same page as Reg. It is a little bit difficult to agree with the suggested approach without seeing the questions. My immediate reaction is that human rights, data protection, and the global public interest are way too relevant to be split into bite-sized assessments for the policies and answers to our questions. This is a gut reaction, but I am a little concerned that we are agreeing on something without seeing what the questions or the approach will be. I am just putting this into the conversation.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Bruna. The good news is I can deal with the concern that you are agreeing to something you have not seen because we are not agreeing to anything yet. We are just kicking around the concept. You will see the draft questionnaires. If ultimately we conclude it is not possible to do the iterative approach, we will take that back and give it thought. I think it is actually a disadvantage to the assessment process because, by the end, there is so much momentum to get things across the finish line to Council that I worry those who might be open-minded at an iterative stage to things we need to tweak will be less open-minded at the end. Ultimately, if that is the conclusion, leadership can talk with staff and figure it out. I would prefer the iterative approach, so

---

I ask for a bit of a wait-and-see until you see the questionnaires. No one is agreeing to anything today. Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI:

I agree with Bruna's points. As Feodora mentioned, there is a human rights framework that has been approved and we have to go through it as a group. At NCSG, we bring the experience of how we do human rights impact assessments on digital and tech products in other forums. I am going to pass it to Michaela to explain generally how civil society does human rights impact assessments. We are here to work with the group to do it, but the expertise is there. As NCSG, we also have sessions for the community to discuss these issues. We held a session in Mumbai as well, so you can watch the recording. We look forward to continuing the conversation. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Farzaneh. Michaela, go ahead.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO:

Thank you so much, Paul. To echo what others have said, having this cluster approach and reviewing by cluster rather than individual questions could, in theory, be helpful for moving the work forward. I am curious how these checklists and templates were developed for the charter. I was not involved in the charter development process as I am not a Councilor. I would be curious where that came from. We could share resources that organizations like Article 19, Digital Medusa, and others have developed to perhaps input into some of these. In principle,

---

I agree with the concept, but I would like to see more details and understand the methodology here. Thanks.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Michaela. I think that would be a useful history lesson, especially for the checklist, because those are the required ones. We will ask staff to send those around on the list along with how they were developed. The questionnaires will be developed by us because the leadership team and staff are putting together a draft that will go around for comment. Hopefully, a lot of that can be done over the list so that we preserve call time. We are the first to take this iterative approach, so the questionnaires will be bespoke. The goal is not to drain the ocean with a spoon, but rather to visit the ocean and take a look at how we are doing. If the lightweight assessment raises red flags, it is better to deal with that before moving on to the next cluster. That is the concept. We will ask staff to provide that history lesson and share resources. If others have resources, please put them on the list so staff can gather them. As everyone points out, their favorite thing is a human right too, so I am sure the IPC will talk about how intellectual property is a human right. Everyone will have a chance to put their links on the email list. Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY:

Thanks. I see Feodora put one of the checklists into chat. Michaela also asked for this. Since the checklists already exist, we should have access to them. Thank you for that commitment.

---

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes, they are public documents and staff is happy to gather that for us.

REG LEVY: The Human Rights Impact Assessment template is not a checklist, though. If there is a checklist, that would be nice to have. Thank you.

PAUL MCGRADY: Gotcha. Bruna, go ahead.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Quick question, Paul. Will any of these lightweight assessments preempt the final assessment of the policy? I do not think that should happen. My concern is that when it comes to the final policy, someone will try to say that a question was already assessed in the lightweight version and we won't look at the policy as a whole. That would be my issue.

PAUL MCGRADY: I can make that concern go away. Nothing about the lightweight iterative assessment will preempt the fulsome assessment required under the bylaws. If we don't do the fulsome assessment at the end, we have violated the bylaws and the Council will send the work back. I am not worried about that. I hope I am being clear that that is not going to happen. The last thing I want to do is send work to the Council that is not Council-ready.

Let's go through quickly and remind ourselves where we are on things and jump into some work. For Recommendation 1, we have stable but

not final language. The question is what triggers the requirement to investigate associated domain names. Our preliminary Recommendation 1 is: when a registrar has actionable evidence that a registered name is being used for DNS abuse and has taken appropriate mitigation actions under Section 3.18.2 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the registrar must perform an associated domain name or associated domain check.

The rationale is that the working group generally aligned on actionable evidence and action taken under Section 3.18.2 as the proper trigger. This trigger is based upon a contractually enforceable requirement, which ensures it is unambiguous and verifiable. It avoids potentially onerous demands on registrars that could arise from an overly broad or speculative trigger, such as relying on an unsubstantiated report or a prediction of future abuse behavior. The requirements under Section 3.18.2 do not establish limitations on where the actionable evidence is acquired. This means the registrar can identify evidence through its own analysis or be informed by an external reporter, such as law enforcement, cybersecurity professionals, or ICANN org. Both are valid. That is where we landed. I do not know if we need to reopen this unless someone thinks we missed the point. Otherwise, we move to Charter Question 2.

Question 2 is: what criteria should be used to define association between domain names, and what elements can be considered to establish such association? This is where we are on the preliminary recommendation. We are still working on this. We talked this out last time and we encourage everybody to take a look at it in the

---

---

collaboration document. We would like to move this into stable but not final space. Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY:

I really like the first one: associated with the same account or customer relationship. For some of us, that is where it has to stop. Common patterns or indications of coordinated activity, if available, may be reasonable. Some business models have access to IP addresses; I do not. Information reasonably available and same account are the two that can be linked across all business models. I am happy for someone with a different model to disagree, but that middle one is not necessarily something I can search through my databases reasonably. I am talking purely from a wholesale registrar perspective. I operate a retail reseller, so in some circumstances, I may have additional information, but generally speaking, I am talking about wholesale registrars.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Before you go, we tried to deal with that with the word MAY in big capital letters, so the bullet points are flexible options. Does that take care of it for you, or do you need another word?

REG LEVY:

That middle one I am never going to be able to do, so I don't know.

PAUL MCGRADY:

It says may, not must. Let us know if you need a dependent clause like when available or if available. You can't use common patterns or

---

indications of coordinated activities that are not available, so that does not bother me.

REG LEVY: Tell that to the people complaining that we are not doing enough. I agree that I can't do what I can't do, but a lot of people assume I can.

PAUL MCGRADY: Gotcha. The point was to build a flexible recommendation where the actual methods exist in the guidance. I think we have done that, but let us know if you need a change. Volker, go ahead, and then Mark.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I don't have an issue with those because it says may include. The technical systems may provide different data between registrars. Even within the same registrar, it may be different depending on the platform. For our registrars, we use one accreditation, but it goes through a wholesale platform, retail platforms, and brand protection platforms. Depending on the platform, the details and information available may be different. The may is essential here, but having it there opens it up to various ideas.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Volker. Mark, go ahead.

---

MARC TRACHTENBERG: Is there a reason that registrants is not included? That seems like an obvious way to correlate domain names. I agree there needs to be some flexibility for registrars, but I think there should be some baseline requirement. That will be subject to debate, but there should be a minimum requirement. This is different from the previous DNS abuse amendments. For those obligations, it is evident to third parties whether a registrar is complying, and they can report to ICANN. In this situation, that ability does not practically exist. No third party outside of the registrar will know whether they are complying with this policy. There is no way to report it to ICANN, so ICANN will need rolling audits. Even then, how do they determine whether the registrar complied? Having something loose like this seems impossible and unworkable.

PAUL MCGRADY: This is not stable yet, so it is in the collaboration document. If you have practical suggestions, let's capture them there. The more concrete, the better. Some registrars can look at the account but not registrants, while others are the opposite. Maybe we can drill down on the commonality to push toward an or statement. Mark, please give us practical ways to tighten this up. We have Ching and then Volker.

CHING CHIAO: I echo what Mark pointed out. In the final recommendation, a baseline approach should be clearly stated regarding the minimum for a registrar to perform an associated domain check. On the other hand, we want registrars to have the flexibility in how they do this because of different business models. At the same time, we do not want to give attackers a

---

blueprint of what to avoid. We don't want them to know exactly how registrars are doing these checks so they can get away.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Ching. Volker and then Rod.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Ching brought something back that I wanted to raise. My only issue is the word customer, because that can mean different things depending on the business model. I was wondering if we want to tie that to registrants or something else. The customer relationship for me as a wholesale registrar is entirely different than for a retail registrar, so it yields wildly different results.

PAUL MCGRADY: Reg said she can't do registrant, so we can't swap customer for registrant. Is there a universal word? Is it same account or something else?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Account can also mean a reseller account. I would prefer end customer or beneficial. End customer is probably the best.

PAUL MCGRADY: End customer is getting traction in the chat. Staff, let's grab that and Reg's dependent clause. Mark and Ching advocated for a baseline that

---

isn't a free-for-all. Let's see if we can do something with that while maintaining flexibility. Rod and then Martina.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

There is a lot of heavy lifting going on by common patterns or indicators of coordinated activity and information reasonably available. Since we are working on policy, those words have to do heavy lifting. It would be good to run through lists of those things to ensure we are not performing a gap analysis and glossing over something. One thing covered by the third point that has extra weight is receiving a report of a domain performing DNS abuse where the reporter also provides what to look for in associated domains. A reporter may know what bad guys are doing in a campaign. For example, they might say if you see a domain name with a certain name server set, it is used only by a specific criminal group. That should be checked. I want to raise that as getting the keys to deal with a specific set of domains in a campaign.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thanks, Rod. Martina, go ahead.

MARTINA BARBERO:

I wanted to acknowledge Gabe's suggestion from last week regarding threat actors and the same abusive scheme language. We want to identify the same threat actor so that if they have multiple domain names, all are checked. Some abusive schemes could involve naming conventions or campaign characteristics. I think this is partially covered by the second bullet point. I suggest we keep that in. We would also

---

welcome registrants or something similar so we cover that, especially if we have a MAY because that leaves it to the registrars.

PAUL MCGRADY: Maybe it is same account, customer relationship, registrant, and threat actor as the case may be, to show we aren't narrowing it but acknowledging different data sets. Luke, go ahead.

LUKE WOOD: I want to clarify a sentence in Charter Question 1 about indicators of future activity. How does the prediction of future abuse behavior correlate with the second charter question? For some campaigns we detect, the infrastructure is all the same. We can provide thousands of these. 500 will be active and 500 won't. If they do associated domain checks, they find another 100, but the other 400 aren't active. I wanted to see if that is in scope or if it's confusion on my end.

PAUL MCGRADY: Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY: From my perspective, if they are not active, that is the point. If the other indicators are there, that is why we do the ADC. If we come across those, that is a reason to suspend them because they are in a similar account and have other indicators. Is that what you are asking, Luke?

---

LUKE WOOD: Effectively, yes. But the sentence says the prediction of future abuse behavior would be out of scope because it's an unsubstantiated report. I wanted to clarify my point on that.

REG LEVY: I feel an unsubstantiated report of abuse or prediction of future abuse are the same. If we had a substantiated report of DNS abuse, it is no longer a prediction. We are finding things that are already abusive; they just are not turned on yet.

LUKE WOOD: Agreed. It might be good to clarify that.

PAUL MCGRADY: I like the back and forth, but let's maintain queue control. Martina and then Volker.

MARTINA BARBERO: If we are back to Question 1, we still have an issue with the phrase has taken appropriate mitigation because we believe it doesn't need to wait until mitigation actions are taken. Maybe the ADC will uncover a large campaign that requires a different approach than the single domain found at the beginning. Volker made suggestions that would be a compromise, such as has decided to take action, which gives more leeway. I can prepare something for the next meeting.

---

PAUL MCGRADY: I don't want us to go backward into Recommendation 1. We need to stay on Question 2 today. Staff, please capture that. It may be a concept we couldn't all get behind, but I will look at it. Volker and then Michaela.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Martina is right. The timing should be as flexible as possible and is likely dictated by registrar processes. Some find it easier to do after action, some as part of the process. Having multiple domains might influence the decision on the initial report. Regarding unsubstantiated reports, this is only about the initial report, not the domains uncovered by associated checks. We cannot take action on unsubstantiated reports alone, but once we uncover evidence, we can take action against similar domain names structured the same way. We have the ability to look at that, though others might not.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Volker. Michaela and then Farzaneh.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO: Taking advantage of this moment on Question 1, I wanted to reiterate a point made by Brian. We suggest including language from Section 3.18.2 of the RAA to take into account the cause and severity of the harm and the possibility of collateral damage. To Martina's point about timing, the ability to take broader action should the results of the ADC point to a need for it doesn't preclude initial action. Having done an initial action doesn't prevent you from doing action later based on findings.

---

PAUL MCGRADY: Farzaneh, go ahead.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I am struggling with discussing the language while other issues have not been sorted out. NCSG has been clear that we don't think the ADC should start only with one abusive domain. Discussing preliminary recommendations that are already displayed limits our ability to come up with other language. We need to discuss what a customer relationship is. We have to discuss common patterns and what the activity entails to see the impact on data protection. The charter requires us to do a data protection impact assessment. I feel uncomfortable having these preliminary recommendations set the tone before we get into the problems, impact, and methods.

PAUL MCGRADY: I will gently push back on the concept that we have not talked about these things. We spent weeks on Question 1. Some groups wanted it to be more than one abusive domain, but we did not have enough people going along with that. This is what PDPs do; we advocate for positions, and at some point, we have to put things down where we seem to be landing. If we want to talk about things multiple times, we can put on more meetings, but we need to move forward. The collaboration document is there if you think a concept was overlooked. If you put something in there that people did not rally around, you should expect a comment saying so. We have to draw a line under it eventually or it will take a whole lot more time. Mark and then Feodora.

---

MARC TRACHTENBERG: I will resist the urge to comment on Question 1. Regarding registrant, I don't understand why that can't be a baseline requirement. Every registrar is required to collect a registrant name and organization. This is the most obvious way to find related domain names. Even in a reseller model, the reseller must pass this to the registrar. I am sensitive to the issues raised by resellers, but this seems like a basic baseline.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Mark. Please get that into the collaboration document. I'd like to understand if saying registrant limits the review because I might have different company names under one account. I think we could put an or here: same account, customer relationship, registrant, or threat actor, making them non-exclusive. I don't view registrant as the silver bullet. I like Martina's approach of thinking about different ways domains should be associated and listing them as non-exclusive categories. Feodora, and then Volker and Reg.

FEODORA HAMZA: The word recommendation is confusing; it should have been preliminary language. Staff and leadership wanted to capture the discussion from last week in a digestible form. The ambition is to discuss each charter question once. These build on each other, so points not included yet might be clarified in later questions. These slides are for the working group to amend and change.

PAUL MCGRADY: Volker, then Reg.

**VOLKER GREIMANN:** Registrant seems like the point of contact, but it is not that easy. The registrant may be a privacy provider, and shutting down everything they have would be problematic. The data we see might be a law firm or someone acting on behalf of others. A registrant may have dozens of sets of data depending on the system. One reseller may send new details every time a domain is updated, while another reuses the same data. Finally, criminals know we look for that. They use stolen data from telephone books. Often, someone reports that a domain was registered in their name. That is a fact of life.

**PAUL MCGRADY:** Bruce said in the chat that specific examples would be helpful. We are not trying to build a recommendation with hard and fast rules, but rather something that requires association without prescribing it; the guidance would do that. In that guidance, we have concepts like checking the same account, customer relationship, registrant, or threat actor. Saying it has to be registrant is not all that great for finding patterns. Bruce's point is well taken, but it is jumping ahead to the guidance. Reg, go ahead.

**REG LEVY:** As someone who was cut out of the queue previously, I disagree with exceptions. But to Mark's suggestion, I can be comfortable with may for same account, customer relationship, or registrant. Although we have registrant data, we cannot always search by it. It can't be a must

---

because we simply cannot do that. I also want to thank Feodora for clarifying that this is a straw person, not a recommendation.

PAUL MCGRADY: Mark, go ahead.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: Bad actors use different registrant information, but not always. Sometimes they use the same info, and that is an obvious way to see if a domain is connected. If resellers are using dummy contact info for every domain, that is problematic under the Registration Data Policy. We can't let problematic behavior obfuscate this policy.

PAUL MCGRADY: Let's move to Question 3: Defining Investigation. What constitutes a reasonable investigation? What steps are required or recommended? Are criteria proportionate and necessary? What is the impact on registrants? The early input suggests a reasonable investigation should be practical, proportionate, and consistent with Section 3.18 of the RAA. Some themes are that the definition of association is related to investigation, and the advisory from Question 2 is likely applicable. This is the time to talk through concepts. We have no straw person yet. Mark and then Reg.

---

MARC TRACHTENBERG: I don't know how we answer Charter Question 3 before Question 2. Three is dependent on the answer to two. It seems like we are jumping ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: We can capture concepts for Question 3 without finalizing Question 2. Otherwise, we have to stop and bake each question fully. There is interdependency here, and we have to keep working as best we can. Reg, then Brian.

REG LEVY: This is not the first cart-before-the-horse thing in this PDP. If we assume the proposed version of Question 2 is what we are basing this on, then the reasonable investigation is defined by that: looking at the account or customer to review domains. I feel it was already answered by the straw proposal.

PAUL MCGRADY: We are not finished with Question 2. Homework is to suggest changes in the collaboration document. If you have something unattached to that straw person, please add it. Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Question 3 and Question 2 are intertwined. I dropped a link to the advisory that ICANN staff put out for the DNS abuse amendments. While registrars have the obligation to conduct an investigation, the advisory doesn't say how. It doesn't get into the granularity of steps.

---

That is probably right here too; saying an investigation must be reasonable is enough for a policy, rather than defining particular steps.

PAUL MCGRADY: That is consistent with early discussions that this may be a guidance-based recommendation. Martina and then Naoum.

MARTINA BARBERO: We agree we don't want to reinvent the wheel if it is already in the contract. There is an understanding of what an investigation is for compliance. Regarding Reg's comment about investigating within accounts: the GAC cares that campaigns can be across multiple accounts. There are tools to check naming conventions across different accounts. We would expect that if you find a specific name, you can check that naming convention elsewhere to see if different registrants are involved in the same campaign. I don't know if we can accept limiting investigation to within the same account.

PAUL MCGRADY: Naoum, go ahead.

NAOUM MENGOU DIS: Regarding investigation steps, a registrar could contact the reseller and ask them to pivot on their information, like IP addresses. You could combine information between the registrar and reseller and pivot on both databases, rather than just containing the investigation to information accessible to the registrar.

PAUL MCGRADY: That is an important idea. Volker and then Ching.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Reasonable investigation may change between business models and services. What is reasonable for a brand protection portal is different than for an end-customer portal. In many cases, we rely on resellers to investigate their customers because we don't have that data. In other cases, we can do more across platforms. However, that is sometimes dangerous; if we provide wholesale services for other brand protection registrars, they may have the affected brand as a customer. It would be the stupidest thing to eliminate a string across all occurrences because some are the thing itself being attacked. A pattern may be beneficial, but it has to be measured and looked at every time. A one-size-fits-all approach doesn't exist.

PAUL MCGRADY: Ching, go ahead.

CHING CHIAO: I am speaking in my personal capacity. I would love for leadership to clarify the question. Should we focus on the registrar and registrant relationship? Once the registrar performs an ADC, what is the reasonable investigation to collect from the registrant, and by when must the registrant respond?

---

PAUL MCGRADY: We don't have personal capacity here; this is a representative PDP. What we say should be for the people who sent us here.

CHING CHIAO: I understand. I pointed it out because what I shared I didn't go through the BC yet.

PAUL MCGRADY: Farzaneh, Reg, and then Feodora.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Bruna mentioned in chat that reasonability should speak to principles of accountability, transparency, and fairness. A reasonable investigation is proportionate, does not lead to guilt by association, and doesn't lead to deactivation of domains in bulk because of a few abusive domains. It depends on whether the action is necessary and what the circumstances are. We also want to discuss the impact on other end users.

PAUL MCGRADY: We will talk about this more next week. Move to concrete ideas. Reg, and then Mark.

REG LEVY: I don't think reviewing across accounts should be a requirement, but neither should it be restricted to a single account. When we perform an investigation, we may see things that are the same across accounts, and

---

those domains would be collected. However, it should not be a requirement to look in every account for domains registered at a certain time because we don't always have those timestamps or search capabilities. Every business model is different. We can't say something that creates an impossibility.

PAUL MCGRADY: Mark, keep it to a minute.

MARC TRACHTENBERG: We are often conflating investigation with enforcement. They are separate. We can't say the impact of investigation is the same as the impact of enforcement. We are not requiring anything else besides investigation. The only mitigation steps required are already in the RAA. We are not discussing requiring the registrar to do anything else on the enforcement side.

PAUL MCGRADY: Feodora, one minute.

FEODORA HAMZA: Regarding clarifying the question, points raised for Charter Question 1 could fall under this. Once you have the trigger and steps for ADC, those fall under investigation. The group needs to discuss if steps are necessary and proportionate and what the impact is. Investigation is about the steps undertaken for the ADC to take place.

PAUL MCGRADY: Two minutes left. Next steps: review the straw person for Question 2 in the collaboration document. Staff will update the document based on today. We will continue Question 3 next week. Reg, go ahead.

REG LEVY: I'd like to appeal that we are allowed to thread comments in chat and react with more emojis to make conversations clearer.

PAUL MCGRADY: Staff, please grab that concept. Thank you all. Have a great week, and we'll talk a whole bunch next week about Question 3. Thank you. All right. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**