

---

ICANN75 | AGM – ccNSO: DNS Abuse Standing Committee  
Saturday, September 17, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

CLAUDIA RUIZ: For this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. Thank you very much.

With this, I will hand the floor over to Bruce Tonkin. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: I'll be handing it over to Nick, I think, who's chairing the session remotely.

---

**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.**

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Claudia. Thank you, Bruce. And thank you staff and everybody for setting up this session. The logistics seem to be working perfectly, certainly from my perspective. That is a great step forwards over some of my previous meetings.

Welcome, everybody. You can see up on the screen the agenda for this meeting this afternoon, or this morning my time. Firstly, I have an action to update about a meeting that we have penciled in with the GAC. It's not specifically a meeting of the DNS Abuse Standing Committee. This is part of the general ccNSO Council update to the GAC. We have regular meetings for the GAC, and part of the agenda for the meeting—I think it's tomorrow—is to give a bit of an update as to what is happening with the DNS Abuse Standing Committee from the purposes of this is something that the Governmental Advisory Committee has always taken a close interest in.

So it's basically an updating session. It's not anything particularly substantive, but it will be a brief overview of what we've done so far, what's happened to date, and what our plans are going forwards. So it's not going to be a very long session. I think I've got 10 to 15 minutes with the GAC. If there's anybody who feels there are particular points I should be highlighting, I'm very happy to put those forward and to include those. So just either drop me a personal e-mail or put it in the chat. I'm very happy to incorporate any of those things because it's obviously a bit of

---

verbal update [inaudible]. So I have some flexibility in what I include.

The only other thing I was going to include in this action item is that I did meet with the GAC's Public Safety Working Group a couple of weeks ago just to give them a little bit of a heads up as to what our work includes. We had a very friendly exchange, lots of ideas for cooperation, and I think a general feeling of support and encouragement for this initiative. And that was good to hear.

So that is all settled, and there's an agenda and some slides ready for the meeting with the GAC. As I said, it's only 10 to 15 minutes as part of an overall, I think, 45-minute session with the ccNSO Council and the GAC. So that is done.

In terms of the actual administrative items, I guess the meeting participation will be clear from the Zoom record in terms of who's attended the meeting. The further agenda, you can see on the screen in front of you the agenda, so I won't read it out clearly. But if there's anything additional that people want to be covered as Any Other Business, perhaps they could either drop me a note in the Zoom room so that I make sure that there's time in the meeting to have that discussion. If not, I will otherwise proceed along with the agenda as set out and move on to the next item. Any further comments? I can't see anything in the chat.

---

So moving on to Item #2 which is the survey and metrics. Just as a little bit of an overview for people who haven't followed all of this, we've set up a couple of subgroups in the DNS Abuse Standing Committee for the ccNSO. One of these is to try to get some benchmark metrics around what different country codes around the globe are doing in terms of the initiatives in relation to countering DNS abuse. And obviously, by way of context, there's a huge amount of diversity naturally between different parts of the world, different ccTLDs, different culture and legal systems, models, etc.

So the Survey and Metrics group is very kindly chaired by my friend and colleague Bruce Tonkin, who's in the room there, I can see. So perhaps, Bruce, if you could lead us through the Survey and Metrics Subgroup, please?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Sure, happy to. So I think the survey has been sent around to the overall list. And we've also provided some example results of what it would look like. But essentially, most of the questions are multiple choice. And so what we would get if the survey is completed by a substantial number of ccTLDs, we'll be able to see histograms. And you'll be able to see, well, this is what the spread of diversity is in terms of size of TLDs. And this is the spread of

---

diversity as to what each TLD considers to be DNS abuse or not, etc.

And so what we're seeking in this session, I guess, is just formal sign-off from the whole working group that they're comfortable with the survey as it is. And assuming that will be the case, we would then release it during the week while we're here at ICANN, letting people know about the existence of the survey, encouraging people to complete the survey. And also, I think, we'd give them until roughly mid-October. So roughly a month, I guess, to complete the survey.

Happy, Nick, to get any feedback from anybody that's got any further suggestions. I know [Jacques] has been steadily refining the survey as each person improves the wording, I guess. So I appreciate everybody's participation and contribution so far.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks very much. I think there are some interesting questions here on the screen around meaningful participation and geographic diversity requirements. [inaudible] had a number of questions immediately come to mind. These are not new questions as things that the group have talked about in terms of once we've done this survey, would the intention be to have a show-and-tell to the community? Would there be future surveys so that we could see whether there were observable trends in

---

terms of the response to DNS abuses? Is going up, going down, sideways? What happening in different parts of the world? Are we trying to draw any conclusions from that?

The point I'm making is that this is not ... As everybody's well aware, the role of this group is not to formulate policy. It's more to provide a forum for discussion, analysis, and information sharing. So I was just interested in anybody's perspectives. But particularly Bruce, feel free to kick off the conversation. We have a few minutes here to talk about this. But how can we most use this usefully, leverage the results of the survey? And how can we make sure that our community is brought into participation and see that it's for their benefit?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah. I think in terms of the benefit for the CC community, part of what the survey does ... There's quite a few questions which actually tease out the amount of diversity that's in the CC community, which I think would be useful because often outside parties—and you hear that sometime with governments—there's almost the thinking, “W all country codes are operating the same. They do pretty much the same thing.”

I think what this survey will show is, actually, there's a wide diversity across just about every metric in our governance model, the size of TLD, the areas that they focus on, whether the TLD is

---

finding DNS abuse to be even an issue. Because in some cases, it might be so small, a percentage that there's no reason to put any resources into it.

Other TLDs are quite large, and it's the size of them that means that they tend to have instances of DNS abuse. Because the percentage could be very low. It might be point .001%, but point .001% with the registry with a million names is still a sizable number of problem domains, and therefore worth putting resources into address.

So I'm hoping that it will show the degree of diversity, the degree of different approaches, and also just prompt individual CCs to just say, "Okay, it looks like lots of other CCs are using a particular approach to reducing DNS abuse." Perhaps that's something that they should investigate further.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. I think it's nice to try to give the community resources and assistance and to help where we can in terms of sharing information. Obviously, we're very ... Even before COVID, it was apparent how different all the members were and how geographically disparate people were. Now, some of us in our regional organizations have got quite strong, close links. But obviously, that only goes so far in terms of the regional geography.

---

And we get our chances to meet, but it's often in conversations in corridors by chance in different parts of ICANN meetings that you have those sorts of interactions, and I felt that something was really missed out over when we've been unable to meet in person and then those sorts of cross-fertilization of know-how and ideas is not so easily able to happen. So it's nice to try to do something formally to get that engagement and participation.

Just in relation to the presentation, I can see we're talking about ICANN76. If the results are going to be available by, say the end of October, it's quite a long time between the end of October to the next ICANN meeting and I suppose ... Are we going to try to do something intersessionally before the ICANN meeting? Because it seems like quite a long time to wait. How much time is it really going to take us to analyze the survey feedback and to prepare something which we can show?

Obviously from my perspective, I can see that members of the community are giving up their time and effort to contribute to this initiative, and I'd quite like to see some tangible outputs in the relatively near future in terms of how you can see that there's a point in participating and contributing your valuable free time as volunteers to this initiative. So it would be quite nice if we could keep some momentum going if there were some interesting conclusions to be drawn from the ...



---

Just in terms of meeting planning, I suppose, as chair of this group, are we going to try to fix a date sometime before the end of this calendar year, say, to have some outreach and to lay the ground ahead of the next ICANN meeting?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Nick, I think what would be good would be to have a meeting probably early November once all of the results are in and just get the perspectives of the members of this working group on what are the insights that they've seen in the data. And hopefully, there'll be a few trends there that stand out. And then we can write up a bit of a summary. And then obviously circulate the summary amongst the group so that we're all happy that that's an accurate reflection on the lessons learned, if you like. And then I think in terms of presenting it, though, it's pretty much waiting until the next ICANN meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I wonder also, if there's some case for, depending on the response rate that we get, reviewing that and thinking do we want to try and push this over a little bit more if we don't get a very big response for it?

---

BRUCE TONKIN: I was thinking about the response rate. It's a little bit like when you do staff surveys. If you've got a staff of, say, 100 people, you'll often divided up into groups. You might say, "How do female people respond versus male or how do engineering people respond versus marketing?" But you need a reasonable sample size to do that because if you're saying, "Well, there was only one person from the engineering department that responded," you can't really say that that statistically tells you what the whole engineering department thinks.

So I think it's going to be a bit, in this case, we'd want, I reckon, aiming for getting at least 10 responses per geographic region. And if we don't get 10 responses, I don't think we should say, "This is what is happening in the African region" because there's only two or three people responding. Or in Europe or Asia, etc.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But I think, given that long time gap we've got, we've probably got time to look at the responses [we've got from this region] and maybe we can do a bit more outreach and push people into trying to get them to respond.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I was just trying to speak when I've had my mute on. I can see there's a question in the chat around feeling out of the loop in terms of what's the state of the current status of the survey. What

---

I was going to add in is that the survey is currently been circulated amongst the sub-working group members and I think to the whole of the committee to practice doing the survey to see what it feels like from ...

Obviously, the point is to try to get the survey to be intuitive, to not be a huge amount of effort to complete, but to also try to gather a meaningful amount of baseline data. So as Joke can see ... Joke, thanks for putting it in the chat. I was just halfway through my own multitasking. Quite hard to speak and type at the same time, it turns out. Yeah.

So we will be launching the survey in the meeting, and we've got the final touches which have been put to it. If you're interested, we can, I'm sure, circulate a link to it so that you can see the draft survey because we want to collect as much input as possible before the formal sign-off of the survey. So I'm very happy if somebody could do that.

I can see two hands up in the chat queue, which is very nice and makes it very easy for me to manage that. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Good afternoon. May I suggest that you present ... So going back to the questions. And these questions on the slide, the follow-up from your discussions about two weeks ago, so the last time the survey group met. So you said about 10 representatives per

---

region. I think with the exception of North America because there are only eight ccTLDs in North America and on the continent [inaudible]. So that's already a caveat.

The second thing is, does the survey team itself want to do the analysis and then report back to the full group? I think that's what you said, Bruce. Is that correct, just so we can share?

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah, in terms of scheduling meetings, I think start with the survey group to do an initial pass, I guess. And then engage the wider group. The more input we get in terms of having a look at the data and drawing our perceptions, I think the better. I accept your point about some regions. I hadn't thought about North America being less than 10, but I accept that as a limitation.

BART BOSWINKEL:

So that's the danger of using something like this, but at least have a reasonable ... So that's about 50 in total. That's what you're talking about as a good sample size.

So if you look at the presentations, may I advise—again, also as an announcement to people who participate—that you report back well before Cancún because people will have forgotten about the existence. Say if all goes well, the survey will close mid-October. You'll do your analysis and everything else. And that by

---

the end of November or early December, that you share the results and then have a conversation on follow-up actions.

And then you can implement them and discuss them more in detail at ICANN76. Because this way you keep the community engaged and present the results well before ICANN76 because that's half a year out. There's very long ...

If you do a survey and you hear the results half a year later, "So, what did I fill in? What was the survey about?" The period is too long in between. That was a suggestion. So do it as soon as you can. Present the results and your analysis. I think that's a way to engage the community as well. You want to hear the feedback on what our peers filled in. Thanks. That's all I had for now.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Thank you, Bart. I think that resonated a bit with what I was trying to say in terms of maintaining momentum and it being quite long time until the Cancún meeting.

I suppose, talking about participation, are we going to seek maybe ... I suppose what I'm suggesting is that the survey subgroup tries to get regional champions to push this amongst the regional organizations. Certainly in the European region, I'm very happy to ensure as high of a participation as is humanly possible through my networks. And it's not just in Europe, I guess. But Europe is the obvious place for me to start.

---

But are we going to try and appoint somebody from each of the geographic regions? I can see Pablo nodding, and I hope he's volunteering to champion this for the North American region. Although that's the easy one because it's only got a handful of members. But, yeah, [I believe it's] particularly with Asia Pacific which is a very large region and very geographically diverse, what we can do. Africa and LAC are also areas where we probably would be seeking individuals to champion the survey and to ensure participation so that we get a great input and response.

Pablo, I see you have your hand up.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you, Nick. Greetings. And greetings, all. Thank you for the opportunity and thank you for providing me the opportunity to chime in into this. And thank you, Bart, for helping me, paving the way.

First and foremost, I was wondering that if our community is 173 members, we would like to get a significant number, a representative number, as close as possible to have. Right? Like 80-something.

And in addition to that, yes, please come with me. Not only for the North American region, but also for the LAC region in which I also participate very actively. And we can make sure that we can master as much interest into this. I have my colleague [Demi]

---

here, and I'm sure that between us and others, we'll be able to get the Latin American region to participate as much.

But, yes, I would like you to shed some light on that number because when I was thinking of 15. Even if you take 15 responses per region, that's, what, 60 plus 6 in North America. We're talking about 66. We're still falling short a good 20 from that half of the entire community. Would you consider perhaps increasing those numbers? Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

It's a really good question, and I think this sort of an unprecedented step for the ccNSO. We have not done this sort of survey before, so we don't really know what good looks like in terms of participation. Clearly, participation is optional so I'd much rather try to find reasons to see why people can see the benefit of the survey and to participation. So I think that is, from my perspective ...

You'd rather put positive reasons for participation and see that this will produce a useful, tangible output. And I think that's got to be the focus. But in terms of what's realistic, I just don't know really what that number looks like. And, yeah, obviously, the more the better. And if we're having difficulties, this is why we're putting a lot of effort, I guess, into preparation of the survey to make sure that it's meaningful and easy to complete.

---

And it helps to make sure that it lands well and to get the communication and outreach done as part of the planning of the survey so that we try to maximize that. But I think the group is going to have to reconvene and reflect if there seems to be issues with trying to get people to complete it. Or if people start to complete it and then find it too difficult or complicated, then we're going to have to reassess our approach. But we're trying to do this in good faith with a best first effort. And we will proceed on that basis.

But obviously what, at this stage, we want to do is to get maximum community input to make sure that we are doing this the right way, that it does land effectively and considerately amongst our communities so that they can see that this is not a particularly complicated thing to do and that it has tangible benefits for all of us. Not just for the individual ccTLDs, but as a community as a whole.

Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe just as a point of reference, if you would look at, say, something like voting in PDPs and voting for rules. Voting for PDPs, I think there is a quorum of 50% of the members. So that's 173. If you look at voting for the rules, it's 33% of the membership. And this is just a minimum number that the community agreed,



---

so that's a reasonable line of thinking. So maybe that's something like this as well. Say, "When do you accept the result as being fairly representative?"

With the caveat saying that not all of them will resonate. At the same time, "this is always an opportunity and this is always dependent upon the outreach efforts that you do and we do to engage as many people as possible." Because in some cases, we've achieved a higher level of participation in the past for various topics. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you once again. And thank you, Bart, for the clarification. In that case and within that context, 15 responses per region plus North America is pretty close to that 33% of our population of our community. So it sounds very reasonable. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Pablo. Thanks, everybody, for that. So we will take that forward. We will try to finalize the survey and launch it and during this ICANN week. Obviously, as many people who are now aware of it can just make a request and have access to the draft survey

---

before it gets signed off, there's opportunities to complete the survey.

The answers you put in, the test draft one, will not count. So you can put in just whatever survey information you want. It'll all be deleted ahead of the formal launch. So you can feel free to see what those questions look like and to think a bit about whether they could be improved or made clearer, if that's possible.

There's just one other point here around other interested stakeholders. It's really important that I think the communities are aware that we're doing this. But obviously, the survey is just for the ccNSO members. There are a lot of other parallel activities going on in terms of DNS abuse, whether that's within ...

The GNSO has a small working group on this. So I myself and Bruce met with the leadership team of the Contracted Parties group on DNS abuse to basically build lines of communication and share. I know, obviously, there's the DNS Abuse Institute who are doing their own work on metrics and benchmarking. And there's a lot of other parallel activities.

I'm interested to try to make sure, particularly where we talk about these final two points on the slide—the other interested stakeholders and metrics and discussions and working things—that we work not in an isolated bubble. That we do try to work in partnership and with good communication and coordination

---

with other groups, given the amount of activity which is happening in this area across all parts of the community.

So I'd be interested if there's any input or other thoughts about how we can most effectively do that. The Standing Committee will ensure that we do not forget about this and just carry on in our own little ccNSO bubble. But I think it's part of the role of the group to showcase and to show to the wider community that this is not an area where the ccNSO is just sitting and doing nothing.

I reiterate my points that, for me, tackling abuse in your ccTLD isn't necessarily subject to its own importance because you make one change to registry policy or other checks and that can impact other parts of the registry operation. And I think the whole policy framework that whichever ccTLD chooses for its own community and situation is up to it.

I suppose what I'm trying to say is that I just see that countering abuse is just part of being a good registry. And I'm very keen to try to emphasize that. That just because people don't talk about DNS abuse all of the time doesn't mean to say that it's because we're not interested in running a good registry. Running a good registry is a multi-faceted operation, and it's very individual to ccTLDs and it depends exactly on your legal status and other cultural and historical aspects.

---

But I'm very interested about the way that we can most effectively leverage this and to ensure ... Because I think the value of this group is all well and good to congratulate ourselves on how we are and to sit in our own little rooms. But it's the outreach and exchanges with other parts of the community and recognition and awareness of what we do which I think is the real value add here.

And I suppose this is why we give ourselves these sorts of resources in terms of the service. It's why we're doing it. So that we have something which we can leverage in terms of those discussions and to ensure that we're part of the leaders of this agenda and debate, as opposed to followers and being cast up or caught up in other people's initiatives and then end up in situations where we feel that inappropriate intervention in sovereign ccTLD matters is being pushed upon us by people who don't have full knowledge of what's actually going on in individuals ccTLDs. So I'm interested in that.

Sorry, I know we're going through the meeting time quite quickly, but if there's any thoughts on that final point before we move on to the next item, I'd be super interested to hear them. And I obviously, partly for the record, want to put down that that's my feeling. But if I'm going wrong or people disagree with that, then I want to give them the opportunity to tell me tell me, "No. Actually, there's another perspective, Nick. And what the

---

Standing Committee members should be focusing on is something different.”

Or if there are other perspectives, then I think I would like to give people the opportunity to express those. This wasn't supposed to be a long monologue, by the way. And I don't want to dominate the discussion. I'm happy to move on to the next item if there's nothing further to be said on it. Thank you.

So the second of our two subgroups is around the important point about providing community resources in terms of repository and how to effectively message across communities. And I'm very pleased that David has volunteered to chair this subgroup, so I'll hand over to him for this section. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you very much, Nick. Hello, everybody. Hello, colleagues. My name is David McCauley. I'm employed by Verisign, and I participate in the ccNSO by virtue of our management of the .cc country code top-level domain.

As Nick mentioned, in the DASC committee we've created subgroup four repository and messaging services. And this is really sort of the nub of what the DASC was conceived to come to grips with.

---

Let me first mention the members of the subgroup who are participating and have been quite helpful. Maria Uduma, Jordi Iparraguirre, Fernando España, Diego Ernesto, and Adam Eisner.

We have, amongst ourselves, been working to a timeline that Bart suggested to us. We haven't confirmed this yet, but we believe that we can do our work probably by the year end on the repository side, which we will tackle first. We're going to review categories of information to put into a repository. This will be a repository of information of use to ccTLD managers in fighting DNS abuse.

With respect to the messaging part of our work, we will develop a charter and create the idea for the list. We expect by the November-December timeframe. Kim, can I get the next slide, please?

So let me talk first about the repository. And as I go through this, I will speak to these points. But Kim, could you for a moment just show the repository on the screen? How it currently exists. And maybe in the chat put the link?

In any event what we're working on is signing off of the categories of information. And you can see them scrolling on the screen. We expect to have things like ccNSO presentations. As we've built up to this DASC and as we continue going forward, we'll have ccNSO

---

presentations. We'll have other presentations and reports. And you can see some of the examples there on the screen.

We will have a section of tools. And in the tools, we refer to NetBeacon, which is a product of the DNS Abuse Institute that Nick just mentioned. And we'll have a section on definitions and policies. All of these, we think, will be a way to organize, to group together the information that we want to provide to our ccTLD managers, to ccNSO members.

But the point of this discussion today is also to seek feedback, either here or on list to the DASC. Feedback as to what we might put in individual web pages. These are all publicly available web pages. There's nothing in confidence here. And so we're looking for feedback and suggestions along these lines, even suggestions regarding categories.

Some of the questions that we will take on is: who's going to be responsible for ultimately populating this? Will it be this existing subgroup going forward with a report to the full DASC? Or will we simply bump this up to the full DASC? Not something we've decided yet, but it's probably going to be a fairly interesting discussion. And it should not be a hard decision. But if there are people that have ideas on this, please let us know.

Will the repository be open? Will it be a resource open to anyone on the Internet, or will it be limited to ccNSO members? Will it be

---

available to ccTLD managers irrespective of their membership? Those are questions that we will also tackle. Could I have the next slide, please?

On the messaging side of what our work is, we expect to work on a Statement of Purpose. Now the messaging side is unlike the repository side. This is going to be a confidential e-mail list, basically. This is going to be much more action oriented as opposed to informational.

So that the questions it will include are the things that we will address in the Statement of Purpose as it's related to DNS abuse information only or recommendations. Would they be part of it? Things like that. Can DNS abuse assistance be requested and rendered on the list? That'll be something we consider, and it relates to that very next bullet you see on the screen. We will consider the TLD-OPS model as we tackle this question.

In that respect, one of the things we initially intend to do is learn more about the TLD-OPS. And our staff support Kim Carlson and Brett Carr of Nominet have kindly volunteered to help educate us as to the TLD-OPS. Many of you know what TLD-OPS is on the security side. So this should help us inform the creation of our own list, the e-mail list that will exist within the DASC for these kinds of purposes.



So we will ask, then, who could be subscribed to this? Will it be limited to membership or available to all ccTLDs? And who will have ultimate approval on people who can have access? Will it be an opt-in/opt-out? Those are the kinds of questions that we're going to tackle. What functions should ... Will this be a recommendation or a requirement? What functions within a manager will have access to this list—tech, policy, legal group, security group? Those are the kinds of things that we're grappling with.

And so that gives you the idea. We're really a rather new subgroup. We've met a couple of times. We're making progress. We're organized and we're moving on. And you can see that we've already started to populate the repository.

But these are the issues that we're going to come to address. And so that's why I'm here on behalf of the subgroup asking for feedback. And as I said, either here in the room or on list, we would love it because we're going to press on in our work and make our recommendations to the full DASC probably by the end of the year.

And so, Nick, that is pretty much the sum and substance of what I wanted to get across today. Thank you.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Brilliant. Thank you, David. I think that's pretty clear and comprehensive. Are there any questions or thoughts or comments in relation to the messaging part of it? Because I think it's a key part of our activity. I myself am not active on the TLD-OPS list, but if anybody has any thoughts or comments on how that works in operation. I don't know how much activity there is on the list, but I know it's used as the model within the CC community for that sort of interaction and exchange.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The activity of that list is quite low, but it's something we're trying to encourage more use of. And as David mentioned, I'll be very happy to talk to him and anybody else who wants to listen about how TLD-OPS works [, etc.] We're going to do a presentation to ... Me and Kim are going to put something together for David and the rest of the group.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks. Okay, I can't see any further questions in the chat. So if we move on to the next item, in terms of interaction with groups. Perhaps we should brainstorm this a little bit now in terms of other groups that we should be interacting with. I think there are some fairly obvious ones, but we want to spend our time effectively. So where we can identify areas of prioritization, then I'd be very interested to hear the group's thoughts on that.

---

And one of the questions I think we had at a quite early stage is did we need to have official observer or liaison status amongst other parts of the community? And if so, how would we structure that in terms of the degree of formality? Would we seek volunteers from the group to be liaisons to other parts of the community? And that is, I think, going to be an interesting one here.

So I can see, Levy, you have your hand up. The floor is yours.

LEVY SYANSEKE:

Thank you. My name is Levy Syanseke. I'm from Zambia as a Fellow in ICANN75. I have a question with regard to what was shared earlier, some of the questions to consider on the DNS abuse [inaudible] survey, I think. My question is around, does the survey also take into consideration, for instance, how users are affected? Because I realize it's mostly focused on ccTLD leaders as well as the country code managers. Right?

Does it also consider people that are in law enforcement, for instance, in trying to curb DNS abuse? Or is it mostly restricted to just those in the ICANN working group space? Because to some extent, I think law enforcers and some of the regular users also face these issues. Or maybe they could offer better insight into how ICANN can also create policies that can ensure the safety of the regular user of the Internet.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That's a very interesting question. Bruce, have you got any immediate thoughts on that question?

BRUCE TONKIN: I didn't quite catch the question, Nick. Can you just summarize it for me?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think it was essentially around the survey and whether, essentially, non-ccTLD manager participants. So if you're in the law enforcement community, then how do you interact with the survey and end users who have experience of the bad aspects of the abuse? And specifically, I guess, the DNS. How can they be heard as part of this survey?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. It's a good question. I think, initially, the survey is really trying to find out from CC managers what are they actually doing about DNS abuse. But once we get some findings, then getting input from law enforcement or end users would certainly be part of the outreach, I think, that we do on the survey results. That's how I'm thinking about it.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. It's primarily for us as the CC community to essentially gather some data, first of all. But I think the important part of it is what we were touching on earlier, which is once we've done the survey, then how can we meaningfully talk about it and get input and thoughts from other parts of the of the community including, as you said, end users and law enforcement around what the survey says. And just try to promote that sort of discussion amongst the wider community is the whole object of the exercise.

So I think it's a good reminder that, you know, it's very interesting for ourselves to do these sorts of surveys, but actually it's how we show that to other communities, which is really the point of the exercise.

David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Nick. On addressing your questions about interaction with other groups, I have some thoughts. On identifying relevant other groups, to me there's two sets of groups. The first is rather easy, I would think. And that is, people on the Contracted Party side of the house, both—the CPH DNS Abuse Working Group as well as those within the Registrars and the Registries Stakeholder Groups—were all in the registry service, with the exception of Registrars. But the interests here are similar, and I think those would be rather easy.

---

The next set would be others who are very interested in DNS abuse but are not themselves in in the business of it. And so I think that might be ... It seems to me that, with respect to that latter group, we would want to perhaps have interaction, but maybe a little bit later in the process once we get our legs under the desk.

My hat is off to you and Bruce for getting us started very well. But we may want to wait a little bit before we do that.

On the third bullet point, I actually have some experience to mention. And I've mentioned this before. Because many of you know I participate in the Registries Stakeholder Group, too, as well as the ccNSO. And so I have been sort of acting informally as a liaison between the two groups, and I've mentioned that to each group when I've done something like that.

So I've seen benefit in that and I've seen ... So I would suggest that's something we might want to do. Just so everyone knows, I will plan to continue being an informal liaison unless we think that's unwise and want to stop that. So I thought that would be a pertinent comment to make here, for full disclosure. And I think the liaison, especially with contracted parties, is really an excellent idea. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks very much for that, David. I completely agree, and I've made a note of comments as you were speaking them out. So I

---

think in terms of identification of other groups, you're spot on. And as you know, Bruce and I have already spoken with the Contracted Parties' Small Working Group on DNS abuse. That's an obvious one for us to maintain active dialogue. And I'll talk to Bruce and with them about whether we should have an informal catch-up sort of on a monthly basis or something just to sort of stay in touch and to see how we're going to do that.

I don't really propose to do anything more formally than that. I think it's very useful with your informal ongoing liaisons with the contracted parties. Obviously, ccTLDs are registries and gTLD are registrars, and there's a huge unity of interest, even though we come from very different perspectives on policy and regulation. Essentially, a lot of the things we're talking about, there's a degree of commonality whether it's participation in DAAR, whether it's the utility of the different [fee] providers and which ones are good and which ones are reliable and how to improve that.

There's a whole bunch of topics around the correct interventions to be made when it's not necessary. It's something which is a problem with the domain name registration itself. But it's the website which the domain name directs to has been compromised and hosts malicious software and how you can effectively deal with that because it's not necessarily a registry fault or registry problem that is causing the bad behavior or the

---

dissemination of malware. Or other problematic criminal activity [has not been] coy about it.

David, do you have a further point there?

DAVID MCAULEY: No, sorry. I forgot to take my hand down. Thank you, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. And I think, Peter, I can see your comment about a general ... These meetings are open, and that's exactly why, so that we do get observers into there and this is not a private meeting at all. We want to get people's interaction and we want to move forward with the support and in full view of the whole of the community.

I think we need to move on a bit with the agenda, if that's all there is now, and move on to meeting frequency, timing, and that thing. So as far as I'm concerned, it's been working fine. So we have meetings every couple of weeks. The subgroups have been meeting as and when required. There's been a bit more activity on the survey subgroup. But I'll be interested if there's any views or proposals as to how often those need to meet and if we need to change anything there.

I see Kim.



---

**KIMBERLY CARLSON:** Hi, Nick. Hi, everyone. So Claudia created this map of the members. So if you look here—and she can scroll down to a certain area—in the red it indicates where you're going to feel the most pain. And there's a couple areas where there's only one red. And unfortunately, I think it's for Bruce. But instead of going—

**BRUCE TONKIN:** I look like a sea of red, actually.

**KIMBERLY CARLSON:** So instead of going multiple, three sessions because at the last meeting—we had it at, whatever, 23:59—it was poorly attended. So maybe we could come up with two rotations instead of a rotation of eight hours and three. And we can take this to the mailing list and we can send this to the working group if you want to look at it closer.

**NICK WENBAN-SMITH:** Okay, thank you. I think that's a really interesting thing. And it's a perennial issue with all of the CC policy groups that I've been working with around the rotations. Because, as you say, we need to be inclusive. We need to be fair. And yet, we still want to encourage participation. There's no point having meetings where there's only one or two people because it's for the majority of people in the middle of the night. I speak from some experience.

---

When Bruce and I were talking about the leadership of this group, it did seem to me a very complimentary, the fact that I would be in Europe and he would be in Australia so that we would chair sessions when it was at the most anti-social time zone for the other of us. And we agreed to sort of share that out so that the pain was diminished.

But I agree entirely with your observation that we need to make sure that we have a good attendance of the volunteers on our working group. And I want to move forward in a way which has the support of the whole working group.

Jordi makes a good point about time zones changing. It's not going to get any easier when we shift to daylight savings back to the wintertime. So let's take and absorb this and discuss that going forwards. But the suggestion that we perhaps have two rotations as opposed to three is well made, I think.

And in terms of the next meeting, have we got a date for the next meeting? Let's see what that is at the moment.

Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

It depends a bit on what's said at the next one. The frequency of the full meeting and work. Do you want to keep the same cadence

---

for the time being or do you want to say the full working will meet once we've got the results back from the ...

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We've got two meetings, haven't we, before we rotate back to the worst one? So let's stick with the current schedule for the time being. But we need to agree at the next meeting whether or not we're going to stick [inaudible] just in case.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Yeah, I know.

NICK-WENBAN-SMITH: Does that make sense?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, it's fine. So we've got we got other stuff to do like—

NICK-WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. So we'll stick with the current cadence in the subgroups as well because the survey subgroup still needs to have a discussion around whether they want to continue. And looking at the metrics

---

in general. And the repository group as well has some work to do. So I assume they will continue. But does the full working group want to meet ... So, do you want to meet in that cadence as well?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I mean, it's a fair [shot]. My gut instinct is with all of the activity with the subgroups, it's not a very big Standing Committee. And most of us are involved in one or other of those different subgroups. So maybe that we leave most of the day-to-day work to the subgroups, and the full group only really needs to meet once a month to have a recap as to what's happening. I don't know if anybody else has a thought or perspective on that. There's no point in having meetings in the middle of the night for the sake of having meetings in the middle of the night. Right?

I mean, I know that's not the ICANN way and I'm probably ... This is heresy, but ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Oh, no. Not at all. But I think the way the subgroups are evolving is really working out well and they drive the output of the group, and that needs to be confirmed by the full group. That's the way you work right now.

---

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Agreed. Okay. Let's stick with the next meeting for the time being. But I'm going to propose that we meet as a full group only once a month and that the subgroups continue on the current schedule since that seems to be working very well.

BART BOSWINKEL: That makes the time zone issue easier to absorb as well.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I agree. I agree. Okay, that seems right. So we've got three minutes left for any other business. David, I see you have your hand up.

DAVID MCAULEY: I just wanted to mention, Nick, in the Subgroup on Repository Messaging, I don't believe we have another meeting set. So I'll just go to the list, to the members. I just wanted to mention that here. I'll go to the list to the members to set the next meeting once we finish here in Kuala Lumpur. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, David. Joke.

---

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you, Nick. Apologies. Just one question regarding the survey. When does the DASC consider the survey to be final and when would you like the survey to be launched? Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's a good point. I think we're pretty much at that. I think we're just waiting for people to use it and check that there aren't any further improvements in terms of clarity to go. But the full intention was that it should be launched during this ICANN week. I'm right with that, Bruce. Right?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I think maybe keep testing going until the end of tomorrow, which is Sunday here in KL. And then we'll sort of launch it from Monday onwards and clear all of the data that's in there, basically.

BART BOSWINKEL: Make it Tuesday morning so [inaudible].

BRUCE TONKIN: Tuesday morning is [fair].

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. The reason is that Alejandra can make that announcement as the chair.

BRUCE TONKIN: In the ccNSO. Yep, that makes sense.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yep.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And I think the question about when we should consider it closed, I think we probably want to hold on to that decision for a little while because, depending on the amount of results we get, we might change that date.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. But if you don't put a deadline, people just don't do anything [inaudible]. So you've got to start with a deadline.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. [inaudible] you can extend the deadline. Cool.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. But you can extend [inaudible].

---

NICK-WENBAN-SMITH: We have an initial deadline, but we don't commit ourselves to not being able to extend it if we don't feel that we need to.

BRUCE TONKIN: Great. Yeah. So I think you set a date which is, let's say roughly—I'm happy for the staff to suggest a date—but sort of mid-Octoberish. But completely agree. I think in the working group we discussed that we would have visibility on how the survey's going. I think, Joke, like how many were getting in each week and things like that. And therefore determine what degree of outreach we need to do. And if we need to extend it, we'll extend it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Good. Is that okay, Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Absolutely. Thank you, Nick. [inaudible].

NICK-WENBAN-SMITH: Kim, I see you have your hand up. We're just coming up to the top of the hour, so we need to close the meeting soon. But is that okay, Kim?



---

**KIMBERLY CARLSON:** It's just a quick comment. It's a follow-up to what David said. I know the repository group wanted to meet informally here in person. So if you still want to do that, just contact me and I'll schedule you a room.

**NICK WENBAN-SMITH:** Oh, thank you very much. That's a very kind and thoughtful suggestion. So that's coming to the end of the meeting. I think we've covered all of the matters of Any Other Business. At least those which were flagged with me.

That just leaves it for me really to wrap up the meeting. A huge thank you to every person for participation. Thank you also for people taking an interest, observers from the other parts of the community. And of course, a massive thank you to the ever-steadfast and tolerant support staff of making this happen and to making sure that everybody attends well and that the meeting goes ... I think that was a very nice session. So thank you very much, everybody.

**KIMBERLY CARLSON:** Thank you. Please stop the recording. This concludes the session.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**