ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO: DNS Abuse Standing Committee
Saturday, March 11, 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 CUN

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, everyone, and welcome to the DNS Abuse Standing Committee session. My name is Kim Carlson. I am the remote participation manager 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 I will note in chat in just a minute.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use the physical microphone to speak and leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. Those not seated at the microphone may use one of the desk microphones to speak. For the benefit of the participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all Zoom features in the Zoom toolbar.

And with that, I'll hand the floor over to Nick Wenban-Smith chair of the DNS Abuse Standing Committee.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Kim. And welcome, everybody. It's a huge pleasure to be able to see people in three dimensions and to be here in person. Can I just check how many people we've got remotely participating and

check that they're connected and everything is working from that perspective? I heard Angela before. So it's just Angela is it? Okay.

So just for the benefit of everybody in the room, if you are actually a member of the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee, could indicate by raising your hand just so that we all can see who they are? Oh, sorry, Tatiana. I didn't notice you.

So we've got an hour and a half, really. And I was just thinking about this when I was preparing, and in a sense this meeting is unfortunately timed because it's basically the first session in the whole of the ICANN meeting. And ideally when we're talking about what we would like to take from this meeting in terms of next steps over the next 6 to 12 months, what I would have liked to have done is to have had the benefit of our community sessions ahead of that. Because we're presenting to the whole of the ccNSO community on Wednesday, and we have a session this afternoon with the GAC.

And I would like to make it an interactive process given that the role of this group is to reach out to other parts of the community and to do things to showcase what we do. And therefore, I'd like to do that taking into account what they are interested in, but we don't have the privilege unfortunately. So it's sort of a quirk of the meeting timing.

So I think what it means is that when we come out of this meeting with the next steps for the various subgroups and what we're doing, I think in my mind there's going to be a little bit of tolerance or error bars because we may refine that based on what happens later on in the week here. So if that makes sense to everybody.

The agenda for today I think the priority, given that we have a session with the GAC this afternoon, is to decide what to present. We've had a slightly moving target in terms of who we're presenting to, when we're presenting to them, and for how long, but I believe it's now 15 minutes this afternoon. Thirty minutes? Okay. Do you know when it is, Bart? Do you know when?

BART BOSWINKEL: Same time.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Between 1:30 and….

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me use the microphone just to be on the safe side.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So actually, Bart, could you just update us then on the timing, because it seems that I'm out of date, really.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] an hour so it would be the first half hour [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: I don't know. That's what I think. I don't know, but let me [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Bart, do you know if it's for presentation or presentation and Q&A? So how much should we leave for the Q&A?

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll get back to you on this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think if we've got a total of a half an hour, Tatiana, we'd be best doing 20 minutes presentation, 10 minutes questions roughly.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, I've got the email. The former [inaudible] the duration of 15 minutes was from the previous idea of using a slot in the DNS abuse session of the GAC itself. That's been moved to the outreach and engagement group this afternoon. That's, again, the full GAC, so it's not with the Public Safety Working Group. It's with the full GAC, so that's important with respect to what you want to present.

My understanding—so that was the latest email I received, and that was on 9 March—was it's that you have around survey ccTLD 15 minutes and DNS abuse trends at ICANN is 15 minutes. So possible—let me go back—so I think that you come into the 45th minute into the session. So it's the latter quarter, I believe. So it's still 15 minutes and then you have questions around 15 minutes. Speakers to be confirmed. There are still moving parts with previous speakers, so DASC presentation could happen earlier but probably no earlier than 20 minutes into the session. So it's still moving, [effectively]. So go for the last bit, and I'll forward

you the email. You were in copy on the email, by the way, Nick. That's on 9 March.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, I got from that it's 15 minutes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's still 15 minutes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Still 15 minutes. Okay, right. So for the benefit of everybody here, we have prepared—so the survey, we have done an extensive survey in the latter quarter of 2022. And we've got a lot of data and a very rich set of respondents from 57 ccTLDs. But actually the number of ccTLDs included within that group, because some ccTLD managers operate numerous different ccTLDs, the number of ccTLDs is closer to 100. And we have prepared quite a lengthy slide deck to present to the whole ccNSO community, which is probably going to be a 45-minute session and plenty of opportunity for Q&A and for a proper deep dive into it.

But this afternoon we've been asked to present to the GAC, which is one of our important communities to reach out to. So you'll see one of the tasks for this morning was to finalize the deck given that we weren't quite sure how long the session was going to be or who it was going to

be to or when it was going to be even. But it looks like it's 15 minutes this afternoon.

So I spoke to Bruce. By the way, Bruce is the vice chair of this meeting on my left. And we were talking earlier, if we think we've got 15 minutes purely to present, no Q&A, then in my mind given that the GAC has a very high turnover and a lot of them are quite new in their first 12 months working in the ICANN communities, we need to be very careful about what we present them to.

And we need to identify the really two or three key messages and just stick to those and to be very focused in what we present and probably even no more than five or six, seven slides at tops. So I think it would be quite nice to identify, and those of us on the survey subgroup, we've been through the slide deck numerous times and are probably a bit blind to it. But I think it would be quite nice just to go through the slide deck. Do you think, Bruce, just go through and then just…?

BRUCE TONKIN: Just do a walkthrough, I think.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Let's just walk through it and then just try to identify. So having walked through it, I would like us to identify collectively the five or six slides setting out the two or three really key points which we want to land this afternoon. And I think that's the key priority for this morning, and that's what I want to do first. So, Bruce, do you want to take us through the slide deck since you're the leader of this project? Or should we get Angela to do it?

BRUCE TONKIN: How long do you want to spend?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think just flick through the slides and…?

BRUCE TONKIN: So I reckon you just do it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, fine. Okay, so introductory slide about the committee. Next slide. A little bit about the survey. I think this is probably quite a good slide to include.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I think we should include this because [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, so which slide number is that? Next slide. Next slide. Oh, this is a good one.

TATIANA TROPINA: Nick, may I say something? I think because the GAC members turnover is quite high, so there are some new people on this [inaudible] capacity building session anyway. So I think we have to maybe repeat this general message the ccTLDs are not gTLDs perhaps during the first slide or here. So this should be—and that we're not making policy. I think that this is important to reiterate somewhere, perhaps at the beginning.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, which slide number is that? Is that 6?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 6.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: 6, okay. Let's look at the next one.

BRUCE TONKIN: You'd run through them pretty quickly, really. Like this just shows that the ccTLDs vary in size. Some are small, some have got more than a million names. We've got about 20 of those. So, yeah, just a couple comments on this slide.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. So I think these are all really good slides. I mean, that's why we put them in the full deck, right? Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. I think it's very interesting information. Remember that many of the GAC participants are not English speakers and maybe it's the second or third language for them. Although they have translation, maybe they have some difficulties in reading. Maybe if you could enlarge a little bit the text or explain the text while you're presenting so the translators have the time to translate. That's important because if not, they will lose the information.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Olga. I really appreciate your perspective as obviously a former GAC member and more familiar with that community. I think it comes back to what I first said which is we need to really think clearly given the very small amount of time about the very key points that we want to land and to not include lots of things which will require lots of talking or thinking because that will be a distraction. Okay, let's….

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nick, sorry. I have a comment from Leonid. He said, "Plus one to Tatiana." And that was for her previous comment. As well, "Why the slides heading is 'Demographics'? A confusing heading." And then, "Plus one to Olga."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Leonid. Okay, let's run through the next slides. Can we change it now, Bart?

TATIANA TROPINA: Maybe explain why we call it "Demographics."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: [laughs]

TATIANA TROPINA: No, seriously. A couple of words.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] I think rather than repeating the heading “Demographics” because it’s a particular economics/statistical term, I think I'd just say it’s really the key message that’s underneath that which is, “One size does not fit all: the ccTLD landscape is diverse.” That’s really the key message, and these are just different aspects of that.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, okay. Let’s just go through the next slides. Mitigation trends, yep.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] want to use this. Which slide number is it?

TATIANA TROPINA: This is 11.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that’s important because this is one of the [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

TATIANA TROPINA: This is 13.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: 13, right. Okay?

TATIANA TROPINA: Nick, Bruce, I think that [pretext] slides we can easily remove. So this is something that is not needed for a 15-minute presentation because this is diving deeper.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

TATIANA TROPINA: So anything [pretext] let's just remove it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I'm assuming essentially what we're talking about, Nick, is it's the one deck and it's just how fast you go through it, really. So we're probably talking about the slides where you pause and make a comment versus flick through.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. Next one. Okay, yeah, no. No, yeah. Yeah. Okay, this is complicated, yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: These were the new ones [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: Angela, will you be available to talk through this slide? Because this is the concluding slide. This is the one you've inserted a couple of days ago.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Yes, sure. But I'd be able to just quickly connect this to the slides on demographics.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, [inaudible] wait till you hand it over because….

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. Okay, next.

BART BOSWINKEL: And again, the message being this is the starting point for further discussions and analysis based on the material of the survey.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it's hard to [inaudible]. Yeah, I think you can't do that in 15 minutes. You can't land any meaningful points. No, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no. Again, it's 15 minutes. It's too much information for the [inaudible].

TATIANA TROPINA: I think it is a bit too much information. I think that. And also, we will have one or two speakers. Like, Nick, you're going to present and Angela or only….

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: This afternoon or…?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. No, no, the…. Yeah, this afternoon at GAC. Because it's only 15 minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, I think we have to have one speaker and all of us be available for any questions. I think that this is the best.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] session [inaudible] an hour [inaudible].

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, exactly. That's where we can go through all of them. I do think that the last slides are going to be too deep because to actually understand what we mean here we need to go through the full slide deck. So maybe just, well, one can say a couple of words there, but it might be an information overload for the GAC and for 15 minutes. I don't know.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, and what's the next slide? Are there more?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I mean, at the end of the day we can always invite and our session is open to the public, right? So if they want to get more additional information, they're more than welcome to join our session.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I agree.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, we basically invite people to [inaudible] remember what the [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: But I think that when we were talking about the scheduling there was a specific conflict for the GAC on the Wednesday session, from memory.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry, just one point. So among these three last slides, for example, region might be okay. But when we are talking about registry model it might be too much. So if we still want to leave one of the last slides and ask Angela to talk about this, maybe region might be the slide to talk about. This might speak to GAC just normally, but the 43 and 44 slides, registry model and domain size might be a bit too much. So maybe Angela can talk briefly about the region, and then we can wrap it up.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because the intention was to may turn this even for the GAC into a bit of a [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's when we thought we had more time than we actually have got. So from my perspective, the key points to land with the GAC are that the amounts of abuse within the ccTLDs is very low whichever way you measure it. That the CCs are very proactive about how they tackle this and have responsible registration policies and effective mitigation. And that that varies enormously depending on where that ccTLD is in the world and its nature whether it's a governmental organization, whether it's a private company, whether it's a not-for-profit or foundation. That there's a huge amount and a number of things that they do, but essentially what we each do in our way is very effective. And I think if we can get those points across, then I'd be very pleased. Is that fair?

And bearing in mind that we've just run through the slides, which slides do people think? I mean, maybe I'll have to slightly wing it which is my

favorite M.O. anyway, but I think that is where I'm coming from in terms of getting key messages over to the GAC group.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: And, Nick, Angela has her hand up.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Oh, thank you, Kim. Angela?

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Yes, thank you, Nick. I just wanted to follow on what Tatiana suggested with maybe having this one slide on the region. And I think you can also talk to it. I don't have to exactly jump on that so that we can save the 15 minutes. So this is essentially just solidifying the point that ccTLDs are different but we still see some common ways of mitigation. Which, frankly, when you're looking at the graph it's all the regions doing similarly the same thing except, well, this one outlier with North America where we didn't get anyone who's doing consumer awareness. But I think that just this one slide you could do a wrap-up and say, yes, this is the kind of information we're seeing in terms of mitigation per region, yeah.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: And then we can remove the rest, yeah.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think we all know that the North American region—not to speak down on our North American friends—but there's a small number of members in the North American region so it's not necessarily representative statistically.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Yeah.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Fine. So I think I'm happy with that for this afternoon. I'll just put the floor open if there are any other points that anybody wants to raise in terms of the presentation to the GAC this afternoon.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Nick, there is one other comment in chat from Leonid. He says, "If I were a GAC member, I would like to see a core message per slide in an enlarged font."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. I mean, that may be an ideal world. I understand that the slide deck is now fixed, so it's more the commentary which I will give to it. So I'll have to think between now and then as to which points I'll try to do and which ones I'm going to focus on. Thanks, Leonid. Okay, any other points on this?

Okay, shall we go back to the agenda? Okay. How are we doing for time? So I think we've done Numbers 1 and 2. The repository group, can I hand over to you, David? Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Nick. So hello to my DASC colleagues and to observers here. My name is David McAuley. I'm employed by Verisign. I participate in the ccNSO by virtue of our management of the .CC country code top-level domain. And I'm leading a subgroup of DASC called the repository group which is handling the creation of a repository of useful information for ccTLD managers with respect to DNS abuse. And then we will also move on to create a dedicated email. And so to talk about the next steps in what we're doing, let's go to the next slide.

We've worked quite heavily on the repository group, but we're not done yet. We lost a step around the holidays. I got a little bit sick, but we were able during that time to move forward with the terms of what we call the repository editorial board. This is going to be an administrative group appointed by the DASC and responsible to the DASC for managing the repository of information. And I'll show you in a few moments just what kind of information I'm talking about.

But this board is actually going to have some formal obligations with respect to administering, vetting the information that's put on, ensuring reliability, making sure that it's responsive to the needs of ccTLD managers, etc. And the repository editorial board itself will be appointed by the DASC, as I said, responsible to the DASC, and they're will be a term limit. People won't stay on this forever. Let's go to the next slide.

The content that we're talking about, I'd like to just talk about these four bullet points at the bottom here for a moment. It's going to be things that will inform ccTLD managers about DNS abuse, what's going

on, what's happening, how it's evolving, and what steps might be available.

We'll start with we'll have a section on presentation and reports. These are formal things you see like - Interisle study, the EU study, things of that nature that we will have links to with an explanation. This is what this is.

With respect to tools I see Graeme and Rowena are here. So the DNS Institute that PIR set up is doing good work on creating tools like NetBeacon and Compass. These are tools for reporting DNS abuse and for a form for doing that. But that's where we look to have links to tools which will be extremely invaluable for ccTLD managers.

We'll have a section on definitions and policies. This will not be extensive because there won't be a multiple of them, but there are differences in what people see as definitions and policies with respect to DNS abuse.

And then we'll also have articles and commentaries. This will be evolving, obviously, because there's so much written. I see Mason in the back there. Mason writes in CircleID about it. And there's a lot written about DNS abuse. This is where you'll go to have a link with a brief description of this, is what this is about.

And so this will all be with a view, Nick and Bruce, to informing ccTLD managers. Can we go to the next slide, please?

This is just the administrative responsibilities that I mentioned briefly a moment ago about the repository editorial board. Next slide, please.

Well, okay, let me just talk a little bit about the email. I forgot about the email list. So you'll see there are people that are participating in this. On the repository side we're just about done. Rowena, you sent me some links. I have them. I haven't lost them, haven't forgotten them. But until we formalize this process, we're not going to really launch this thing. But we're at the end. We're getting very close to doing that.

And so I did want to comment on the other project that we have in this group, and that is to create an email list. A dedicated, closed email list for ccTLD managers build on the TLD-OPS model.

Now for those who are not in the ccNSO, the TLD-OPS email list is a closed email list through which in real time ccTLD managers can help each other in dealing with security incidents and security information like DDoS attacks, those kinds of things. It's an extraordinarily useful tool and good group that runs the TLD-OPS.

So on the DNS abuse side, we will build an email list on that model. It will be closed. It will be for managers to talk about what's hitting them with respect to DNS abuse. Has anybody seen this? This might be new. How do people react. What's been the reaction? How successful has this been? Those kinds of questions. And so that is where we, the repository group, are moving just as soon as we finish with the repository itself.

And so, Nick, that is in a nutshell the next steps. I'm happy to answer questions, and I have some of my colleagues here that are in the group.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I have some questions, but I'd like to open the floor for other people first. Okay, everyone's being very polite. This is how it is in the ccNSO.

Everyone's very civil. We talked a bit about the repository and the difficulties of curating it and keeping it live and current and to make sure that things which are out of date are removed out and new materials are sifted and put on and highlighted to people. So I understand the editorial board. Do you know how many people would be on the editorial board? And where's the repository actually going to be if I as a ccTLD want to go and have a look at it?

DAVID MCAULEY: Well, with respect to the number of people that will be on it, we believe it will be small. Probably on the order of four, I would guess. I'm just guessing here. We have to finalize that, but it would probably be a small group. And it would be maintained by the secretariat. But it's still in flux in that respect.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: And so maybe a side question.

DAVID MCAULEY: Could I make one other comment?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Sure, sure.

DAVID MCAULEY: With respect, you're right. We want that to be an active site where at some point links will become dated, but we do intend to have an archival savings of them.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I mean, I know some of us are looking at the ccNSO website because there's a project to generally overhaul the ccNSO website which is going on in parallel to this. So I'm just wondering, is this sort of a private area with a password or is this a public resource or how does that work?

DAVID MCAULEY: Right now, it will be a private area at the beginning for ccTLD managers, regional ccTLD organizations. But the editorial board can open it up. Bart, did you want to comment?

BART BOSWINKEL: Currently, it will be initially—and this is where the blueprint is—is on the wiki space. So it's not on the website yet because you know it's in flux. And this way it's easy for the secretariat to upload and download relevant information at the instruction of the board. That's the role of that board. So it's really they determine the information that will be in the repository. So the editorial board [inaudible] editorial board, so it's not the role of the staff.

Secondly, the email list is definitely intended also to inform people what type of information is posted, so it allows people to be updated. One of the real issues we from the secretariat are facing but probably the council and others as well is if we send out emails on the existing lists to the ccNSO members and to the ccTLD managers, because these are two separate lists, we only reach those people who are subscribed. And we don't know who they are, what role they play within the ccTLD manager. And this is reversing that model because that's the experience

of TLD-OPS is you reach and can target the people who are dealing and handling DNS abuse within the ccTLD manager. That's the purpose of that email list, so that's why you need both. Having the repository is one side of it. Making it active and making it relevant for people is that they know new stuff has been posted. So that's why they both need to be there. To make it really work, they both need to be active and all activated.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So, sorry, just to be boring and bang on it. So if I understand that correctly, the two elements, the email list and the repository resource, are complimentary in the sense that by virtue of subscribing to the email list that's when you will find out when new materials are put on or be directed to a new story.

BART BOSWINKEL: At least that's when you're informed. It's still a question because in principle I would say the information is publicly available anyway whether you want to close it or don't close it. But that's something for future. Or you want to have a closed section or a non-closed section with it, that was not discussed yet. But in principle, if you want to have an information repository, people need to be alerted that new information is included, otherwise it has no [value].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So my second question is there's obviously a lot of other work in this area, so what's going to make this distinct and unique and useful and drive traffic to it in a way in which we maximize the time and volunteer

resource spent in doing this versus what's out there? Or is this supposed to be a sort of a single point specifically for the CC community? Obviously, the G with their policies have a whole bunch of separate issues. But is this largely a gathering together of resources from other places in a helpful and accessible way or…?

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the whole intention of this anyway. It's say when the DNS abuse committee was created it was always the intention not to overlap any of the regional activities or any other activities which are relevant for ccTLDs. And to date, I think one of the outcomes of the discussions when we created the roadmap is there is this need for a central repository of information, say a one-stop shop. That's what people wanted, and that's why we say the repository group started.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I get that, and I thank you. I think that's helpful just to clarify in my own mind. I know that providing resources and sharing best practices is one of the key objectives of this group, so we just need to make sure that when we're down in the weeds of organizing all of this stuff that we refrain from inventing wheels which other people have already invented and that we do stick to that overall mission of actually how do we highlight best practices, how do we provide useful resources and do that in an engaging way which the information is kept current and the stale stuff is removed?

BART BOSWINKEL: That's why you need an editorial board. That's one.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I think you touch upon a very interesting aspect in make it publicly available. As we as staff are on both groups so we see what is happening in the repository group but also see some of the additional information that was shared through the survey, the survey already includes some links/directions for policies ccTLDs are using which are publicly available anyway and which you can post there that nobody was aware of.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Great. Kim?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I've got a couple comments on that. I think with the repository group, the intent is to have, I think, a yearly digest or a monthly digest on new content. And that the entire DASC will still serve as the oversight audit committee for this site so that it stays useful and relevant. So that they can come in and say, okay, this is old material. But the full DASC should still remain as the oversight and audit committee of the repository group.

BART BOSWINKEL: And maybe a final point, Nick, if you allow. At the end of the day, it is the DASC itself whether they want to continue with the repository, yes or

no. Whether you don't want to continue it for the sake of continuing, it needs to add value. And that's something to review in one, two years' time.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, I mean, that's my answer to a secondary question which is the evaluation of the success metrics that we set ourselves and then evaluate to say whether or not we achieved what it was that we thought we were going to do. Because there's an awful lot of things that you can do, and I'd much rather focus on things which are useful and to euthanize—if that's not too unkind—things which have proved to take up effort but not actually be accessed by the community or to provide a useful resource.

And I think my final reflection is that you shouldn't underestimate the amount of time it needs to keep content active and well curated. I think when I was part of the overall ccNSO website team I was pretty shocked really when I looked through the ccNSO website. There's a lot of stuff in there, and a lot of it I wasn't really aware of. And a lot of it is very out of date. And keeping any sort of site or resource current and up to date requires a huge amount of work, and I don't want us sleepwalking into something which is going to absorb a huge amount of resource or not get done in a way which would then detract from its utility. So I think that's my final points on that. Thank you very much, David. I think it's anything great piece of work and [inaudible] lot of support.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: If anybody would like to see the current form of the repository, I did put the link to the wiki in the Zoom chat. If you want it separately, let me know, but the link is in the Zoom chat if you want to take a look at it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Kim. I must say it's very nice to be here in person, but I'm not in the Zoom room so I feel like I'm missing out on some of the side chats and that's sort of a learning point for me. Back to the agenda, is there anything more on the repository group? I think we've done that now. Okay, so Item Number 4, next steps on the survey/metrics. The survey/metrics subgroup is ably led by Bruce to my left.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, just something I've been reflecting on as we're sitting here, particularly with comments Olga was making about the different languages in use in the GAC. We're obviously conducting all of these conversations and all the surveys are all being done in English.

It occurs to me though that what might be useful is taking the survey that we've done so far and actually writing up a set of key messages which I would say be less than a page of material and then we can actually I think, Bart, consider translating that into the different languages.

If it's just a small page, here's the key messages, I think that could be useful particularly as something as a takeaway that you can then give to government and other people in different languages. So essentially, taking the survey as sort of almost a written report but short just with the key messages. And I think we'll refine that after this week from the

questions and discussions that we get. But to me that would be a next step is a one-page summary of key findings, if you like, supported by the data.

And then in the next discussion and I know in the sub working group we've been talking about we've got a lot of data that allows you to cross reference. So you can see how many organizations in a geographic regions or how many organizations of a particular size use DNS abuse tools. So the next step for the subgroup, I think, is actually breaking some of that data apart into some key messages that's looking at using the demographics.

So the first pass of what we've done is just the raw results, if you like. The next pass I think is a summary of key messages and then having a look at some of the correlations. So is there a correlation between size of registry and type of abuse they get or size of registry and type of tool they use, etc.? But broadly I think we've found that size [does have] a huge bearing on just basically the tools that people are using. Probably size has a degree of the resources available to the TLD. So there are quite a lot of commercial tools. Obviously, the larger TLDs can afford to use those commercial DNS abuse tools, but even the smaller TLDs can use free publicly available tools as well.

So anyway, those are my thoughts, but I'm happy to get further impact from this broader group that I think the subgroup that I'm chairing would look to perhaps create a written summary and then have a deeper dive into a lot of the work that Angela started doing which is the correlation between the data.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. I mean, I think that this slide deck to present is interesting, but actually it's the commentary and narrative which goes with it which is particularly interesting. Just so that people are aware, of the respondents to the survey about half of them said that they were very happy to be publicly recognized as having contributed to the survey, but about half didn't want them to have specific attribution. So when we've presented the data we've tried to do it in a way which doesn't single out individual ccTLDs or to identify any particular registry from the data.

But I think we could pick out some of the datapoints from ccTLDs who have expressed that they do not mind public attribution and use those to specific…because I think what brings some of the information and the data to life properly is real examples of how different countries have tackled it in such different ways. And that's for me one of the most engaging and interesting talking points. So that might be something that could be done in prose after this set of meetings.

So I'm quite in favor. I'm a very democratic sort of chair of this group, but I would like to put a time by when things are going to get done. So in terms of the forward workflow if we're going to produce a written report, when's that going to be? I mean, spoiler, I think it should be before we do the next survey, for example. And when's the next survey going to be? Is it going to be an annual thing? Are we going to do one in, say, Quarter 4 2023? In which case, would we before the, say, Washington, DC, meeting want to have the write-up done? First question.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I think what I was describing as that one-page summary of what we've seen so far, I think it would certainly be good to get that done by Washington, DC.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: And then the second question saying when should we do the survey again, I don't know. I'd almost make that conclusion at the end of this week, whether people have found this survey very useful. No point doing another survey if people thought this wasn't useful.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. I see Tatiana has her hand up. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, I'm actually not a huge fan of doing this survey annually. But what we can do because we have rich data now and we haven't presented everything yet, so I believe that during the DC meeting and further if we see any gaps, if we see that we would like to have some more information about something, we can develop and send a very short additional survey. Like please give us this data so we can close the gaps here and there. But otherwise, I don't see any need to do anything very quickly from now.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Bart, go on.

BART BOSWINKEL: Not about this one but a separate topic for consideration probably by the survey group is, okay, you've got this rich data. You present on it. And how will you use it for furthering the work of the DASC in general? I know you had some discussions around it, but I think definitely by ICANN77 when you have a full analysis presented to the community, okay, we got this rich data. We know this, we see this. Is there an interest, for example, in sessions on tools? Is there an interest in sessions on this type of work? Because then the results really make sense and this is how you use it. But I think that is definitely something to consider between now and ICANN77, first by you and then by the full DASC.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Bart. That's a very good segue into my next comment which is I did set the survey subgroup who were participating in the last call a little bit of homework around for the deep dive into specific topics.

And one of the things I'm personally very interested in are the reputation feeds and the phishing feeds. And some of these contain a huge number of false positives in terms of spam notifications or spammy type domain name registrations which would fall by most of our thresholds well short of the level which would require any registry, certainly registry action, to address those.

And I think there's a huge interest and opportunity in sharing amongst ourselves because some of these things are provided for free. So to get ccTLD managers who are doing this job well at a very low cost and

getting actionable information to make sure that any abuse in their ccTLD is really mitigated proactively and quickly, I think that would be a fantastic thing to share learnings of what works well and what doesn't work so well. How can people tackle the abuse in their ccTLD really cost effectively and quickly.

And I think in addition to those cash resources of subscribing to feeds, it's also the operational cost internally in terms of the FTEs required to go through the data to remove the false positives and then to do something actionable with it. I think we can learn a lot from examples and also examples of what works well but learn from other people's experiences of having put investment and resources into certain areas and found that actually it didn't really move the needle in terms of the amount of abuse mitigation that they managed to do successfully or that it took a disproportionate amount of time and effort.

So I'm quite interested in that, for example, as a specific workshop on metrics of feeds and which ones work well. I think measuring abuse is something that we've talked about many times, and I think I'm quite interested in objective benchmarking around how we can do that. I know obviously there are groups who specialize in that as well, and so that's one of the things. But I don't know if anybody else had any sort of high-interest specific topics that would merit a more dedicated workshop to try to get really into the detail of different members of the ccTLD community and how to make sure that we share those best practices. Obviously, stepping back to the purposes of this group, it is obviously to showcase and reach out to other parts of the community but also within our own to learn from each other's experiences and

basically raise the standards overall to everybody's benefit in terms of Internet users globally. Are there any?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Nick, Angela's hand is up.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Oh, Angela, I'm not in the room, Angela, so I rely on Kim's letting me know. But the floor is yours.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: No problem, Nick. Thank you. I think I just wanted to reiterate what has been [thrown] to the floor about the next steps. So Tatiana did say we haven't really gone deep with the analysis of anything to really say we can tell the whole story of the information that we collected. So I'm in support of not really having another survey go out for some time until we can really make a full story out of what we already have because it is rich, like everyone else is saying.

And secondly, I think you, Nick, did say something about naming some of the responders, those that had agreed to the publication. And I think that this could be helpful not only to have them come through with sessions where they can share some of the best practices but also most importantly building this community we can have one ccTLD manager who'd like to maybe benchmark and so they would know who to reach out to. And, of course, going back to the repository as well, some of the information that was collected through the survey was links to policies and tools and things like that. So I think we have that important part of

a sense of community where managers can directly interact with each other and say, listen, this is what the survey said about your way of doing things and I'd like to learn or I'd like to go through your policies and see if the same could work for my ccTLD.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. And that reminds me of the session—was it in Kuala Lumpur, I mean, they all merge into one a bit—but we had the five examples from the different geographic regions each presenting on their own perspectives on abuse. And I thought that was a really engaging and invaluable session, and it reminds me. So maybe we could do something similar to that where specific ccTLD managers whose survey responses have leapt out at us as actually having something important to say more broadly would be given a platform in which to do that more specifically. Just a thought. Stunned silence.

In terms of the cadence of the repository subgroup and the metrics subgroup are we going to carry on, on the same sort of fortnightly pattern until the next ICANN meeting? That's a question for the chairs.

DAVID MCAULEY: That's our plan, every other week.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. Bruce, is that our plan on the survey/metrics group?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I think, yeah, the survey/metrics group will need to meet a few times between now and Washington, DC.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: And are we planning to do anything more specific in terms of a webinar outreach, more specific deep dive session between now and the DC meeting on any of these sorts of topics? Or are with just going to carry on with our intersessional group work and then try to do something in the DC meeting?

DAVID MCAULEY: Nick, with respect to our group, we're going to be polishing off the repository business. And when we do we will probably want to do something like a webinar, depending on the timing. If it's close to the DC meeting, it wouldn't make sense. We would do it there. But it would probably be in the form of—one of the roles is to announce it, encourage use, and that kind of thing. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: So based on my experience or our experience, I think probably it's a combination. Either you kick it off at Washington or in the Washington meeting, so ICANN77, to be followed up previously with a webinar targeting those people who will not attend. Because at the end of the day, if you look at the number of ccTLDs involved—take again the example of the TLD-OPS. I think there are over 200 ccTLDs subscribed to TLD-OPS. Some of them are not members of the ccNSO, some of them are. The majority are.

But they will definitely not show up at ICANN meetings for various reasons, and probably these are exactly the people you want to target with the repository because they're outside there. People who are in the room right now, they're very aware of DNS abuse. It's always the people who are not in the room who are outside who have the most need for this type of information. That's the real challenge I guess for both the repository group and the survey group. Thank you.

DAVID MCAULEY: I think that's a good point, Bart. It will be a combination, for sure, and it will be continuing. I mean, the editorial board has got sort of a continuing obligation to use the tools at hand, you know, the list, webinars, periodic. And you're right. I think the TLD-OPS does go beyond ccNSO members, for sure, and I certainly expect this will too. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: One of the interesting ones which I recall was I think they're not even a member of a regional organization is Vatican City. They're a member of TLD-OPS. And so it is nice to use their experience in how they built that list. And again, these are dedicated people completely different than the DNS abuse, but at least they are very dedicated people in the security and stability area. And it took quite some effort to get them subscribed.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's a really good insight, actually. And I think what I'm trying to tease out in the nicest possible way is some sort of concrete plan over

the next 6 to 12 months in terms of roughly what is going to land when and when are these things going to be planned and put in the schedule. Because if we don't plan them and put them in the schedule, then a) participation and engagement is going to be reduce, and b) they may not happen, and c) you end up with three or four things happening in short successions over a period of time. I'd like to stagger things so that they land in a way which is not a burden on the community, is engaging, and is useful. And I would like to have a little bit of a—I can't believe I'm saying this because I'm so disorganized and I never plan anything—but I'd like to have like a Gantt chart around what is going to land roughly when.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's very [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I can't believe people are mocking the chair in his own meeting. Oh, well, this is one of the risks of taking on these sorts of roles. Bruce, is there anything more we can do to plan on the survey stuff? Because I would like to have some rough target times. If the answer is no, then the answer is no.

But I do want a concrete outcome which is a bit of a timetable over, like I said in the last full DASC meeting, I want a bit of a timetable over the next 6 to 12 months. What is it that we want to put in and when so that in 12 months' time when we're reviewing what we've done we can say, oh, this is what we set out to do and, look, we achieved what we set out to do and it was a benefit to the community.

Because the volunteer time--I've made this point numerous times—the volunteer time into all of these sorts of activities is significant, and we owe it to the people who are giving their time and volunteering to make sure that it's useful and there are tangible outcomes. Otherwise, we should basically pack up our bags and do something more interesting. There are some very nice beaches near here, for example.

So I'm trying to encourage in the nicest possible way some sort of plan, but I'm only leading by consent, as it were. So I don't want to push people out of their comfort zones, but I do want there to be useful outputs from these sorts of activities because it's hours and hours and hours of volunteer time and this is actually one of the most limited resources that we have and we should not waste that. I think that would be a terrible shame.

BRUCE TONKIN: So I think the three areas, and again these are just my thoughts and would need a meeting of the subgroup to land the timetable as you say, but my thoughts would be that I kind of use the ICANN meetings as milestones, if you like. So for the next ICANN meeting in Washington I think it would be nice to have a short written summary of the survey so far of the key messages. More or less the messages that you'll be giving and will be giving over the next few days but just in a succinct written form. The second is an updated slide deck with the deep dive stuff that the subgroup's been talking about which is the correlations and the commentary that goes with that. So a lot of work that Angela's been doing. And then the third….

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, the slide deck get done before and then present it at the ICANN meeting. And then the third area I think perhaps identify some deep dive topics which may require some further questions, as Tatiana had mentioned, but I think a bit of a workshop format. Like you, Nick, I'm quite interested in the diversity of tools that people are using, and I think what we can usefully do is perhaps give collective feedback to the tools vendors in what we find useful and not useful.

BART BOSWINKEL: Nick, I think you misunderstood what Tatiana meant.

TATIANA TROPINA: [inaudible]

BART BOSWINKEL: No, it was more if you look at if there are lacks in the survey results itself, that's something to [inaudible].

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, additional questions.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, [inaudible].

BRUCE TONKIN: I agree [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, but the other point is, maybe I'm just using Nick as an example [inaudible] example to push him a little bit, but if you could by ICANN77 identify areas for other sessions that might be relevant and then question this to the community at ICANN77, do you really want to have a deeper dive with the community on these topics? That will set the schedule for the next coming meetings as well. So for example, tools is good. That's one I understand. If people in the room at 77 are interested in tools, then you know you've got a very good topic for 78. And maybe there are one or two other topics. So for the successive meetings you can organize interesting sessions first around tools, then for example around policies or whatever.

BRUCE TONKIN: [inaudible] area, yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: So that's a way to use the various ICANN meetings as well.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: [inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I know. I'm sorry, I'm a terrible bully. Joke, you had your hand up at one point. Are you taking notes of these commitments in writing and making sure that they're…?

BRUCE TONKIN: [inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Signed in blood.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, Nick. Yes, I'm indeed taking notes. And before Bruce took the floor, I wanted to suggest a similar timeline and maybe to add one additional item to Bruce's proposal. So the first item was have the written report and have an additional session at ICANN77 and then identify deep dive into the topics. But perhaps there's also added value to having another written report after ICANN77 once you did the presentation of the remaining data. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So ICANN77 is in June, right? So that's another three months or so. I'm more interested also in the next 6 to 12 month frame, but maybe that's a bridge too far.

BART BOSWINKEL: We said is if you identify topics at 77, then the DASC is really positioned to organize these sessions going forward. So at 78 and 79 or whenever. So using the results and again with the consulting the community, what

do you want to discuss next around DNS abuse? And then organize a session at the next meeting.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Got it. Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: That is, I can tell you, it's hard work.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, yeah, I'm sensing that. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: No, just a very short note about these suggestions for discussions and asking the community. I think for what it's worth because we have so much information we might also come up with a proposal that we see an interesting topic here and there. Either choose from them or offer yours. So sort of structured and directed discussions so we will not have defeat in silence be we overloaded people with information.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So are there any further thoughts around planning activities next steps? Are there any questions from the floor? Is anybody unclear as to what we're doing and why we're doing it and when roughly these things are going to land? Because we're here to be accountable to our peers and community members. So if anybody thinks that there's something unclear or if anybody thinks that we've missed something, then this is the benefit of these sorts of opportunities to step up and say something.

By the way, it's lovely to be in person, and I wish there was a bit more interaction. And I do always advise people to say something publicly quite early on in these sorts of meetings because otherwise I will randomly pick people to say something insightful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Monsieur Bonis? Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Nick, there's one comment in the chat by Angela saying that "an interesting session could be the story the survey data is telling around the proactive methods of DNS abuse mitigation via registration data validation and verification data and keeping the WHOIS data accurate."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Finally. Thank you, Angela. What a brilliant suggestion. I think one of the things we've talked about for many years is the link between the accuracy of registration data and abuse. If you are of a mind to commit abuse by registering domain name, you tend not to put your genuine verified details into the WHOIS or into whatever we call it now, RDAP lookup.

And I think one of the specific questions when we were looking at it in terms of verification/validation accuracy measurement of the WHOIS data is that we all recognize that just because some WHOIS data is

inaccurate doesn't mean to say that a domain name is going to be abused. But there's a very high correlation between abused domain names and inaccurate data. So these things do focus on the same thing.

And I've thought about this I think for most of the past decade around the challenges of doing that. Obviously, from my perspective with the .UK, it's an open registry. We have 11 millions domains. The challenges are different from my Norwegian friends who were talking about just the other day in the [CENTR GA] meeting around their apparent relaxed attitude to DNS abuse. But then they have verified Norwegian business registration numbers for every registrant in their domain, bar none. So you're looking at slightly different issues, right?

And I think it's a very interesting point around, well, to what extent do you frontload know who your registrant is versus dealing with a more open system and then having to mitigate after it? And each of these approaches is quite valid, but it comes down to quite operational practices and it's very dependent on the jurisdiction and the registration policies that you have set nationally and within your own national legal frameworks as well.

I think it's a really, really interesting area. And I don't think it's actually very well understood in lots of the parts of the community just what a complicated area this is, and it's only really when you look at tangible examples. Sorry, there's something in the chat, but I can't read it. Kim, can you let me know if there's anything.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Just "it's an interesting conversation. Glad to have joined."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: And then the final one is, "the survey tried to cover all of this, so we have stories to tell."

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It's screwing with us with the multiple format, but it's nice to have the chat record for the thing. Okay, so I think we've got two ideas for deep dives, at least two ideas. One is around tools and feeds for post registration abuse identification and mitigation. And secondly around data validation and verification practices. Have I got that right?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, Nick, I just thought that in terms of what we cover in this survey it's just the entire cycle, right? From the beginning until the end. And cycle wise with these two stories to tell, two lines, how about the registration/pre-registration validation should go first and the tools should be the second one. I mean, just logically if we…or are we going to pick from these two? Not necessarily, if we cover both, then tools should come second, I think, in terms of just logical sequence.

BART BOSWINKEL: So you just touched upon a very interesting one, is like the Norwegian case as just as a showcase how it works and contradicted to another one to where they have a completely different method where the end

result might be the same thing but using a different methodology. Because that shows you that then you illustrate some of the arguments you've made. There are more ways that lead to Rome, but at the end you will be in Rome.

TATIANA TROPINA: Well, it also…well, yeah, in a way. But some of these cases very much illustrate, like Norwegian case, how ccTLDs have the borders to operate which are not established by ccTLDs themselves but by the governments or by law, by courts, by some decisions. And this is why and it just highlights this idea that a) we are different, b) no one size fits all solution. Even for the [inaudible] itself, did Norway comment on this like, yeah, brilliant. So, you know, some situations are different.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Sorry, I know we talked about Norway. Do the Norwegians present want to make any comments? This is your opportunity. Because actually one of the things that this subgroup is entrusted with is giving members of the community the chances to show off and say how great they are compared to other people in front of a fuller range of stakeholders.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you, Nick, for allowing Norway to brag about our….

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: This is Ann-Cathrin who is from the .NO registry, for the record.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Well, of course, we would be happy to share our showcase if necessary in any next webinar or at the next meeting, you know, talking about next steps. But of course, I think Tatiana is pointing to the very nature of this. For ccTLDs it's, of course, also not only we have the local presence requirement and have had it for many years which makes us in this position to be, yeah, able to know who the registrant is. Which is one of the decisions that was made many years back so we've kept it. Annebeth is over there. She was partly responsible as well for that. And it's like Tatiana says. It's our government and legislature that made this decision many years ago, so yeah.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, Nick, I just wrote in the chat and I think in its essence we are here…there is a fine line between external circumstances and internal policies, tools, and actions for the ccTLDs. And while in our survey we were trying to get to the core of internal policies and whatever, but in some cases these internal policies will be very much influenced or even defined, predetermined by external circumstances. And maybe this is also the message we have to broadcast. Later, not now, but later. We sort of scratched the surface on this during the presentation for the full DASC group, but I think that we also have to be clear that most of the time the survey was looking at internal what the ccTLDs are doing.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I think it's interesting. And actually just last week I had a lively exchange with Hilda who's the CEO of the Norwegian registry about her, in my view, overly strict interpretation of some of the European data protection legislation. But then, they have a completely different setup.

They have a completely different setup from how we have it, and you're not really comparing the same things. It all comes down to context, and you can only make limited conclusions. And I think that's part of my difficulty when we look at the survey data is that sometimes you are looking at completely different registries, apples and oranges, and you're trying to create or draw conclusions from them. You need to be very careful how you draw your conclusions given the sorts of things that we have been talking about. And I think education of communities to understand that these things are really important, that that's the sort of factual context in all of these things is really important before you draw any hasty conclusions such as Norway doesn't have any good policies to mitigate DNS abuse. It's because they don't really have any DNS abuse because they know all their registrants by name. Sorry. Right, who's chairing this thing and why has it got out of [inaudible].

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Nick, we do have a comment from the audience when you get around.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Now is as good a time as any.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Good morning, all. It's great to see you all here. And good time of the day for those of you who are participating remotely. Related to the message to the recommendation or suggestion that Angela made, I'd also like to bring to your attention that it would be very interesting to check two variables which is price versus DNS abuse.

I am confident that it is my inference that those domain names that are of a lower price are more prone to be used for DNS abuse than those that are more expensive. But that is only an inference of mine, so it would be very interesting to do a little bit of research to find out if that in any way affects. If there is a correlation or a causation involving it. So it only remains to be seen. Thank you for the opportunity. This is Pablo from the registry .PR. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, that's one question we didn't ask which is price.

TATIANA TROPINA: But I also think that strictly speaking we can talk only about correlation because to establish causation we need to conduct an experiment, you know. So instead of survey, that's what I mean.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Muchas gracias, Pablo, para la pregunta. I completely agree that anecdotally it's been said for many years that there's a correlation. Not necessarily causation but a correlation between domain names. And I myself have seen this where, for example, one of our large registrars would be running a promotion sort of £1.00 or $1.00 domains and then that is…people exploit that and you see a little—sometimes you see, not always—sometimes you see a little link with an increase in abusive registrations as a result of that.

So I think it's been well discussed and perhaps not very welcome understood. So maybe that would be a good topic to talk about. And I

think it's an interesting one, isn't it? Because it touches on another side of things from a legal perspective which is that the ccTLD or any TLD has to take account of its pricing and the pricing has to be fair. And then there are competition laws and other things which come into play. And it's not a very good message to send to your fair consumer pricing authorities or competition authorities that actually you need to charge $50 for a domain name in order to reduce abuse. So I think it's a really interesting topic, and I think that it does merit some sort of further socialization of that sort of a question.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thanks, Nick. I do appreciate the support. And also, just to reply to Tatiana, we should not be afraid of testing and running experiments when the need be. So once again, there are many angles to this, and I'm confident that price along with other variables is playing a significant role in how DNS abuse behaves and is conducted. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you very much. One question. Actually, I've just thought of this as we have talked about the importance of pricing and promotions. For many registries we operate the registration model with the registrars. And I was wondering whether we shouldn't try to explore a bit more in terms of the registries and their partnerships with the registrars, which ones are effective.

Because we've had some fantastic, just from my .UK experience, we've had some fantastic partnerships with registrars where we've seen a problem with abuse and we've had a discussion with them to raise it

and it's dramatically changed the amount of abusive registrations we've had from that registrar. Sometimes they just simply aren't aware or they don't see the patterns that the registry sees.

And maybe another topic for closer examination would be to get together with some of the registrars and to talk about from a registrar's perspective what's helpful for registries to do in order to prevent abusive registrations and to effectively mitigate against it in terms of communication, policies, all of those sorts of things.

I mean, I know we try to provide them with information in terms of access to feeds and blocklists, but I don't know that that's universally working particularly well. But I mean, I think it would be interesting to hear from other people examples of what works well in terms of their registrar channel given that it's an important part as we talked about from the beginning to the end of the domain name lifecycle. I think that you can't ignore the registrar perspective in that, and maybe that's something that we would have a benefit from having a specific session on.

There are nine minutes left. I don't know if there's anything else that we need to talk about in terms of next meetings. I do quite like to finish meetings punctually and give everybody five minutes back in order to make the next sessions feasible. So in the next four minutes, when are the next meetings planned and are there any other items of business that people want to raise now? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: May I suggest with respect to the next meetings that the subgroups meet first after the ICANN76 meeting and that for the full DASC we somewhere end of April to take stock where everybody is. So that's the sequence. The subgroups can meet regularly like you indicated, every two weeks the survey group, every two weeks, maybe more frequent than that.

The full DASC meets once a month. We do it just to keep everybody updated on where the other groups are heading. And those who are not subscribed in the other groups are informed as well so there are no surprises for the DASC membership. So the first full DASC meeting would be by then end of April and that in between the subgroups meet.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That seems reasonable to me. Is that okay with everybody else? And the other question I had around the meetings was in terms of the cadence of the timing. I mean, I know poor Bruce has to either get up very early or stay up very late in order to have the benefit of hearing my pearls of wisdom. But we also talked, I think, at one point me and you, Bruce, about trying to divvy these things up in terms of time zones so that we shared the antisocial time zones between us. And I don't know whether we've done that. We seem to have stuck ourselves with antisocial time zones for the both of us, either early or late in the day. I don't know if there's anything better we can do given the participation of the particular groups. Because obviously, poor David's in the States and Angela's in Botswana and there are some of us in Europe and you guys are obviously in the Central European time zone.

BART BOSWINKEL: Again, I think that it's easier for the subgroups to organize their action, and this is where you have the most issues with Bruce on the one hand side and some people in the U.S. on the other hand side in the subgroup, the survey. The repository group is fairly simple. The timing will be [inaudible].

DAVID MCAULEY: I think we're in pretty good shape.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, you don't have that issue as they are facing. But it's the full DASC and we just do a Doodle poll and we use it the same way and try to find a sweet spot. And at the end of the day, the DASC if you think about it, the full DASC will meet twice, end of April, end of May. And then you're into ICANN77 already.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that makes sense. I think that's all pretty clear. I mean, it's always a problem with all of these groups, right? In terms of geographic participation. Fine. Were there any other areas of business that people…? I've got one but I don't know if there are any others.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Rowena?

ROWENA SCHOO: Thanks, Nick. It's Rowena School from the DNS Abuse Institute. I just wanted to let everybody know on the topic of metrics and measuring DNS abuse that we have a project called DNSAI Compass. We've published a lot of information on that publicly already around aggregate information at a high level, but we have a huge amount more of that information at an individual TLD level.

And Graeme and I are speaking to people this week and showing them their individual data which I think everyone we have spoken to have found incredibly interesting. So I would really encourage you to come and have a chat with us and sit down and we can talk to you more about the project and show you some of that underlying data. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. That's a very good point. I think it's very germane to the issue of measurement and objective measurement. For the record, Rowena did actually used to work for me at Nominet, so I'm not just saying this but actually we at Nominet had a presentation of their insights into the .UK abuse data. That is the number of abusive registrations that we had and then how effectively they were mitigated once they were identified. And actually, I think we found that a very useful exercise, and I would recommend that others who are interested in both understanding or looking at other people's perspective looking outward into their registry what they see and then how you compare versus more international and global benchmarks and get some free

consulting and tips as to things you could do to make things better for yourselves.

BART BOSWINKEL: There is one more question in the chat from Mujtaba Hussain from the MoITT, “What if there is a shared platform for anyone to report DNS abuse or phishing related to ccTLDs? It can improve the incident reporting but will be challenging to filtering the false positive.”

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Graeme?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Hi, I'm the executive director of the DNS Abuse Institute. We run a service for free for anybody to use called NetBeacon that you can use to report DNS abuse. I will admit right now it only works with gTLDs. The plan is to start including ccTLDs, but as you're all quick to remind us you're all different. And so we’ll be doing that starting this year and continuing over the next couple of years to hopefully be able to report abuse through this single place for free to the entire DNS. So I'll keep this group updated on that work as we begin to add CCs. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Graeme. I think it’s an interesting point. Obviously, part of the issue about all the CCs having very distinct legal, governmental, and other frameworks is that there’s very little standardization. It makes your work quite difficult in terms of collecting that. And it’s a different topic but even within our own, those of us here on EPP registration

systems the schemas are all different from the different ccTLDs. It makes it quite hard for registrars and other people who are doing things in a standardized way. And that may be another area for discussion. What is it more we can do to help ourselves provide data to others to help basically raise standards and lift the bar and make it harder for bad actors to take advantage of the DNS.

So I think that's two minutes to 12:00 local time.

BART BOSWINKEL: And as always, there are always questions coming in at the end.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I told people to speak earlier in the session. I told you.

BART BOSWINKEL: First of all, there is the remark from Angela, "there is the DAAR project also." Also and then a question from Jean F. Queralt, "May we have the URL of the tool just mentioned?" So that's the [inaudible].

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think the point on the DAAR is very interesting, actually. That reminds me we did have a conversation when we were setting up this group around some of the CCs who have joined the DAAR project and the experiences they found. And I think we were hearing quite mixed experiences as to whether or not it was as painless as ICANN staff and the technical team told us it was going to be and how useful it was to be included in that. And that might be another topic for a specific session.

So I'm going to close the meeting now. Thanks very much for everybody for their participation. Nice to see people in person. And I think there are going to be more conversations on this topic, several more. It's very obviously still a high-interest topic across the communities, so I look forward to everybody. The full session for the ccNSO is going to be on Wednesday at….

BART BOSWINKEL: Block 3.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So I think that's in the afternoon like 1:00.

BART BOSWINKEL: Block 3, after lunch.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Block 3, after lunch, on Wednesday for the full session.

BART BOSWINKEL: And one more administrative matter. If people are interested related to ccTLDs to participate in the work of the DASC, please contact the secretariat who'll ensure that you either become an observer and/or subscribed as a member. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Brilliant. Thanks very much. And that's the end of the session exactly on time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]