ICANN78 | AGM – ccNSO: DNS Abuse Standing Committee
Saturday, October 21, 2023 – 3:00 to 4:00 HAM

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi all, and welcome to the DNS Abuse Standing Committee session at ICANN78. My name is Kim, and along with Bart, we are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions, comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form. We will read questions and comments allowed during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session.

If you would like to ask a question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model, we ask that you sign into Zoom using your full name, for example, first and last name or surname. With that, I will hand the floor over to Nick Wenban-Smith, chair of the DASC. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: [German language]. I have to say something in German because a German lawyer once told me that to listen to an Englishman saying

something in German is like hearing a dog speak. So welcome to the meeting, everybody. I did actually learn some German in school, but it was a long time ago. So just for the record, my name is Nick Wenban-Smith. I'm the General Counsel for Nominet UK, which is the country code for .uk. And for the purposes of today, kindly with the consent of everybody here chairing this meeting of the DNS Abuse Standing Committee of the ccNSO. So that's the welcome done. The agenda is set up on the screen ahead of you. I apologize for it being slightly dense text, but I hope that the logical flow will look after itself as we go through this meeting.

I don't know if there are any admin matters. I think we had a couple of new appointees since the last meeting. I don't know whether staff have got any other admin matters. As far as I'm concerned, we don't have any further admin matters to deal with. I also, once he's settled down and had a moment to compose himself, would also like to introduce my vice chair, Bruce. But I'll let him let himself get installed for a few minutes before-- although, it is good when people come slightly late to make them feel a bit awkward so they don't do it again. So maybe I should. So no, that would be manifestly unfair.

And actually, I'm very grateful to Bruce, so I don't want to abuse his time and good work behind this group. So while Bruce is setting himself up, can I then move on to item three, which is the repository group, which is very ably looked after by our good friend and colleague, David. Is now a good time for you to speak to number item three? Perfect. Thank you, David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Nick. And hi everybody. David McAuley is my name. I'm employed at Verisign and participate in ccNSO in as much as we manage the .cc country code top level domain. So, as Nick said, I am part of the DASC committee, and I'm leading up the group that is working -- the subgroup rather that is working on what we call the repository subgroup. And we have two initiatives that we're working on, and I can mention where we are on them right here, and I'll do that Wednesday as well in our community meeting, it shouldn't take long. But the two things that we're working on are first, a repository of useful information for ccTLD managers. And it's basically a webpage with links organized into four different categories. Things like blogs or presentations, critical analysis, studies, things like that, like the inner aisle studies, the EU did a study, et cetera.

And there'll be useful links and they can come from anywhere in the community. And they are vetted by the six-member group that I lead. And if they're found to be useful information, practicable information for ccTLD managers, they will be placed in the repository. And on Wednesday we will be putting the link to the repository on the screen and we'll also be putting information on the screen about how to submit things for the group to look at. We are off with a bunch of links. I would say there's probably 15, 20 or so links right now in the repository, but it's a little bit more slow than I had expected. And so we need to, and we will, our plan in this group is to do constant reminders both by email and at ICANN meetings that this tool exists. It is a useful tool for ccTLD managers, please be aware, et cetera.

And we can do that briefly and to the point, and that's what we'll be doing on Wednesday. By the way, I should mention on Wednesday

that there'll be three speakers. I'll be speaking quite briefly, Nick, just introducing our group; Adam Eisner, one of our members, will talk about the repository, and then Fernando Espana will talk about what I'm next going to talk about, that's our email list initiative. And so we will be making the reminders that I mentioned.

The second thing that the repository group is working on is a dedicated email list that will be available for ccTLD managers and it will be closed in the sense it's a list meant for people that manage ccTLDs and related organizations and people. People such as members of the ccNSO council, regional organizations like APTLD, LACTLD, that kind of thing. And it's an email list that is patterned on what we in the ccNSO know as the TLD ops list, which is a security-based list.

It's a collaboration tool basically for ccTLD managers to do a couple of things. One is to speak about issues, DNS abuse related issues in our case, general information that they can share, things they're seeing, patterns or trends that might be emerging, that kind of thing, and they can share that information. It will also have a contact list of people that are on the list. The list will be limited to four people within any organization, individuals, they could be from tech, ops, legal policy, it doesn't really matter, and it can even be a role as opposed to a person such as the office of the chief security officer or whatever. But you will see the contact points there so that you can initiate or participate in offline discussions that are not open to this whole list if you have more particular discussions you want to have about DNS abuse and how to handle DNS abuse.

So again, this by the way is done, we have finished our document that describes this and we will be releasing it, Nick and Bruce to you both in the DASC committee this week. So that's something to look forward to eagerly, and once it's approved by the DASC, we will launch that with an announcement. And again, we'll do our reminders at these meetings and by list periodically. And so that's roughly where we are.

The whole point of this is to ccTLD managers is to say, this is a useful tool, there's nothing about policy here, there's nothing about standards of conduct, this is simply a tool with the email list. We intend to keep it closed to the ccNSO community, but by virtue of being email, everyone will understand and we will tell them there's no guarantee of confidentiality here. And so that's where we are, we've made great progress. We want to get engagement, get people participating, and we plan to do that over time as best we can. That's it. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Brilliant. And in terms of how do I sign up for the email list and where's the repository? The resources are available on the DASC website, and resources, or can we put them up on screen if staff can find easy links. I just feel a bit guilty because I didn't yet sign up for the email list and I realized it was probably incompetence or laziness and I feel I should.

DAVID MCAULEY: No, it's not ready yet. Actually, we're going to release our document establishing the list and describing the list, who can participate, what

the limits are, what organizations can participate. We're going to give that to you, the full DASC, this week. It's done, we just finished it. We're a little bit behind schedule on that. That's probably my fault, but that will be released to you. When the DASC says good, then we will publish how to sign up on the list and the details of the list. With respect to the repository, both the link to the repository and the link to how to submit ideas, those are both available and they've been mentioned, but we're going to mention them on Wednesday in the public setting, we will put them up on the screen.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Brilliant. Thank you. And thank you, Joke from ICANN staff has put it into the Zoom chat, the links to the things, which is probably what I should have suggested. But luckily, people are more able around me, which is very nice to have. So we're now at ten past three local time. The session is designed to go through till four o'clock, so that, with a lightning-fast arithmetic, gives us 50 minutes. The remainder of the agenda is essentially divided into two parts. The first part is to talk a little bit about what is happening in Hamburg, and the second part is about what's happening after Hamburg, and I propose more or less spend about half the time on each of those two things because those are the two big things that we want to talk about.

In the Hamburg meeting, you can see there's three activities happening. Firstly, we have a session with the Public Safety Working Group, which is part of the GAC. I know there's a previous member of the Public Working Safety Group behind me. I'm a little bit unsure as

to the constitutional significance and transparency around what it's for and who gets on it and why they're on it.

But essentially, it's a group of engaged government representatives who like to find out some things and ask for things in more detail. And they have requested a meeting with us tomorrow afternoon. So I would like to talk a little bit about what I'm authorized to talk about with the Public Safety Working Group tomorrow in terms of getting some guard rails around that topic. So that's the first issue.

Secondly, I think it needs a little bit of a discussion, the prep meeting with the Public Safety Working Group because that came quite late into the schedule and I don't think we have properly socialized or got a good understanding between ourselves as to what good looks like in terms of getting out of that session what we want to get out of that session. Secondly, we have actually got a more formal presentation opportunity with the full GAC, which I think is on Wednesday morning. I should know that. I'm pretty sure it's on Wednesday morning.

And then finally and most importantly, we have our CSO member session. That's a full two-hour session on Wednesday afternoon where the organizing group for that session have, I hope, put together quite a compelling and engaging program. The main theme, apart from a little bit of a general catch up on the working groups of the DASC in terms of the surveys and the repository, which David just spoke to.

The main session, which is going to be probably an hour and 45 minutes of the two hours, is going to be a series of presentations from providers of tools and measurement for DNS abuse. The reason why we've prioritized this as our first major session is because when we did

the survey of the ccTLDs, more than a third of the ccTLD respondents, in answer to the question, how much abuse do you think you've got, not worrying too much about how you define it, but how much abuse do you think you've got, replied with a either don't know or not sure sort of response.

So the objective at the end of this session is to show the whole community there's a range of tools, there's a range of free resources, different people look at it from different angles and they don't necessarily come out with the same answers, which is in itself quite fascinating, frankly.

But by the end of that session, literally nobody in the CC community should be answering I don't know to the question about how much abuse have we got in our own ccTLDs. I myself think, sort of speaking philosophically just for a moment, that obviously running a safe and trusted TLD should be the very core mission of all of us. So in order to be able to do that, you must have a bit of an idea as to how much malicious activity is being observed in your TLD. And that's what that whole session is around, the resources, the tools, the materials, a bit of a deep dive. We've got four different presenters, including ICANN'S DAR team who have this domain abuse reporting tool. So that is optional for ccTLDs, but compulsory for gTLDs.

But it requires your ccTLD to hand over their zone file, which I know there's a bit of an issue for those of us who are careful with our data, which I guess is most of us. So there's a presentation from ICANN, there's a presentation from the DNS Abuse Institute. You have these very nice reports and dashboards for every country where you can

track monthly how much abuse is observed, observed and verified malicious registrations in your TLD.

And we also have the DNS Research Federation also produce some reports on observable abuse and do lots of interesting research papers and academic looking into those sorts of topics. And we have finally got a presentation, a joint presentation from the Belgian and Dutch registries who have got a project ongoing where they're harnessing AI to try to work out a bit more around threats and abuse within the TLD and trying to do quite an interesting tech collaboration, which they are also, I think, presenting more on the technical side of things on the tech day on Monday.

So that is essentially an overview of the three different activities. The presentation, I've just talked a bit about the member session, I think we are quite well prepared. There's a slide deck which the contributors to that session have all completed their things. I haven't actually confessed, I haven't fully reviewed. I've done my bit, but I haven't checked everybody else's yet, but I'm sure it's good, I've been told it's all completed. But I will have a quick look through that before the session, but essentially that is all prepared and done.

The presentation to the GAC is more by a way of an up general update presentation. I'm looking at Joke and Bart, but that's more of a general update as to our activities. And because I'm stupid and lazy, I already did this to the Latin American TLD association a couple of weeks ago. I proposed to recycle the same material as I will probably try to update it a little bit, but in essence, we already did this for the Latin America and Caribbean TLD association.

I will try to use the same resources for that session. And maybe we'll try to leave a bit more time for questions because that's the full GAC. And just to preempt any questions as to why we're doing that, it's because we are not here to set policy or standards for ccTLDs, but we are here to show and tell and to communicate with other communities. Our government equivalents and representatives are obviously for all of us, well, certainly for all the people that I'm sure are here are a key constituency, stakeholder for all of us.

Sometimes they are closely associated with the registry, other times, not so much. But it is important that we educate our legislators and policy makers and help them with some of the more complexities around this difficult topic because I think a lot of negative expressions are made around the amount of abuse there are in TLDs and how TLD operators don't do enough.

And I think it's very important because all the work that we've done in the year and a half that we've had this group going, I think gives us very extensive evidence that actually ccTLDs are some of the safest and best places to have registrations. We are active and responsible guardians of our spaces and I'm delighted to have the opportunity to basically say the exact that to the government representatives, ccTLDs are super well regulated and responsibly run for the very large majority.

And if you look at any of the objective metrics, for whatever reason, I'm not entirely sure about the reasons, but for whatever reason, we come incredibly well out of any analysis of malicious registrations and abuse. So that is something that we should, and unless anyone tells

me that I should be doing it differently, but I'm very keen to press that point home in front of all of our government colleagues to make the case for continued self-regulation of the ccTLDs and that we are effective and trustworthy custodians of the spaces that we have.

So the order of those three sessions in ICANN78 are in essentially chronological order. And because I'm not very structured, I've gone through it backwards, I realized anyway. But actually, the one which I think we need to talk about a bit more is this prep meeting with the Public Safety Working Group because that's the last thing that we had requested.

And if I am correct, they have come to staff with a request, I think to me and Bruce, with a couple of quite specific, should I say pointed requests around what's good practice in ccTLDs. Give us some good examples. How are you guys intersecting with registration data, and oh, what about pricing of domains and low cost, price of domains equals more abuse, doesn't it, kind of thing. That was my take home, but Bart, you can probably give us the official request in a slightly more polite [CROSSTALK].

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me put a little bit more perspective around it. The idea was the Public Safety Working Group is obviously very interested in what this group is doing like with your counterpart in the gTLD registry space. So in preparation of the session for the full DASC, so this is not replacing that session, this is just to structure it a little bit more, they had a discussion internally about some of the topics they are interested in.

And what I have in front of me and what I shared with you, Nick and Bruce, is more or less what is the understanding, their understanding, what might be of interest for the full GAC to understand. So that's a bit of the context of what I'm saying. So what they are really interested in, and this is again based on the results of the survey, is verifications and issues and methods around verification.

That is a topic they're interested in, whether you address it in the slide deck, but at least something to where they're interested in actions when abuse is detected. Is there anything in the survey that indicates how ccTLD deal with and what are the actions when abuse is detected and how does it work across the ccTLDs. A DNS abuse levels comparison. If you recall in the various surveys, there was a comparison of levels of abuse across various, I would say, parameters.

And then the final one is impact of domain pricing on abuse levels, because I think that was an interesting conversation, at least in Washington. And I think Bruce did all the research around it, and it was very counterintuitive, one would almost say. And they're interested in say the reasoning, et cetera behind it and the results of that comparison. So that was what they were looking for say, and maybe as a starter in your conversation tomorrow. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Bart. You've articulated that a bit more clearly than I did, probably, I think I got the gist of it from the message. I think that session with the Public Safety Working Group is maybe up to 30 minutes, is that right? And it's a prep for the full session. So my heart slightly sinks with a thought of four quite substantive issues, which all

have quite a lot of complexity having to basically go along. And I feel like I've been asked to the headmaster's office to explain myself a bit. And so I'd be interested in, I'm up for this, I'm very happy to do it and I am happy to be as blunt as you think I should be in terms of responding to some of these questions.

But I just thought it'd be useful to, before we do this, we should socialize I think what we want to get out of that. I think we've tried to get out of it a positive and polite engagement, and we want to land some of the very good points that I think we've got fantastic evidence and engagement and support on all of these sorts of things. But they are as I think one of my doctor friends wrote a book about this actually, and the title of the book is, I Think You'll Find It's a Little Bit More Complicated Than That.

And it's not quite as simple as, oh, well, cheap is abuse, and if you don't verify, then that's abuse. And these are complex and nuanced topics. And so I'd be interested in feedback. There's this four suggestions. Do I just sort of present it and then take the flack? Because I'm worried that in that short period of time, I'm not going to be able to-- and I'm not sure if particularly it's wanted. I'm not going to be able to give a huge amount on each of those topics. Thank you. I'll take Tatiana and then Chris.

TATIANA TRPOINA: Thank you, Nick. Tatiana Tropina for the record. Schönen guten Tag, everybody. I felt like I have to say something in German. Just following the topics Bart indicated, I think that for verifications for the actions when abuse is detected, we had a pretty good slide deck,

which was based on the results of the survey and both statistics and free text. And I think just kind of taking a couple of slides from there would suffice honestly. For DNS abuse levels comparison, I'm a bit more mindful about this topic for one reason, we have to indicate clearly that when we talk about the survey group and the results, it is self-reported, it's almost like a perception, right?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Not the whole of the market, and it's self-reported. Exactly.

TATIANA TRPOINA: Exactly. So if you include this, you really have to be clear about this and have to be clear that if we'll start making any comparisons in this regard and connect it to other types of data, not only it gets complicated, the problem is that you will not get reliable data just because you might have confounders. And this is the same with impact of pricing. I really enjoyed Bruce's presentation about this. So part of presentation in the last webinar, or at least you were doing something on this slide, right, Bruce? I don't know if you want to invite Bruce to present it or you want to present it yourself, but I think that this is a very interesting thing.

To me, it wasn't counterintuitive exactly, because I think that this is just such a strange correlation and causation to explore that you really have to think about other factors that might influence DNS abuse level, not only price. But frankly, I think from more than a year of work of our group, this is all covered. And this is all based on our data, our

discussions, a question that were asked during our presentation. So I think that we are good here, except the point three.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, thank you. I know Bruce, I'd ask you to think about this just for a moment, but you did do this, this is in relation to this question around how much abuse have you got? And I think we took the actual survey respondents and lots of them said, we don't know. Then we looked at the objective data from the DNS Abuse Institute around how much there was, and it turned out there might be a good explanation for this don't know, because it's so small and so infrequent that they probably wouldn't pick it up statistically with a smaller ccTLD and very low levels of abuse. But I think that would, and I'm thinking of it, I think that would be a pretty useful slide to drop into to this. And we have already got all the collateral as Tatiana has helpfully pointed out. So that's good intervention, thank you. Chris, I think you are next.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Nick. Chris Disspain. I want to go back to fundamental principles, which is whether we should actually be having this meeting in the first place. I guess we're having it because we've said we will, but I want to just talk about what the Public Safety Working Group is meant to do and what it does do and why we should or shouldn't be talking to them. First of all, we're not obliged to report to anybody, and I don't think something bad about telling people what we're doing, but it's not a reporting exercise. We don't report to the GAC and we don't report to the Public Safety Working Group.

These questions as I understand it, and I'm more than happy to be corrected in this, but my understanding is that these questions are not the GACs questions. These are Public Safety Working Group questions that the Public Safety Working Group thinks we should talk to the GAC about. Well then, I suggest that the way to handle it would be for them to go to the GAC and say, we think these are the questions you should ask the ccNSO, not have the Public Safety Working Group drag us into a room, spend half an hour prepping for a session with the GAC that the GAC knows absolutely nothing about, as far as I'm aware.

As a matter of general principle, the ccNSO should be dealing directly with the GAC. I can tell you that the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group and registrars are taking pretty much the same stance, which is, look, if you want us to talk to you, we're happy to talk to you, but what we're not going to do is go and talk to the Public Safety Working Group, then have the Public Safety Working Group go back to the GAC and tell them what we've told them, and then have the GAC ask questions based on that.

I think there is a fundamental principle here that we should be dealing directly with the advisory committee, the GAC. And the GAC should be asking us whatever questions they choose to ask us. But having this working group act as an intermediary, and I'll give you one simple example just to finish.

At the last ICANN meeting, the registry stakeholder group, the GNSO registry Stakeholder Group met with the Public Safety Working Group, and out of nowhere, some gentleman from the Japanese government arrived and spent almost all of the meeting discussing the issues of

manga, which have really nothing to do with public safety and appeared to be simply taking the opportunity of getting some registries in a room to talk about stuff. So I just think we need to be very careful and very clear in our lines of communication. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, thanks, Chris. I'm interested in that, and I have some sympathy with it. I guess my gut responses that any interaction with any governmental type people, first of all, when you'd have tea with the devil, you take a long spoon. But since we already have all of this collateral previously created, then there's no harm in recycling it. Although we could equally say thanks very much, the answers are all in these previous things, which are on our website and we could save ourselves half an hour of our lives, which we wouldn't otherwise spend maybe talking about Japanese manga, but that is the beauty of the multi-stakeholder model, so why the hell not, right? Tatiana, do you want to say something? Quickly, or…?

TATIANA TROPINA: Very quickly. Super quickly. I want to say that I'm with Chris here about the channels of communication, but I think that there is one thing about GAC. GAC reps keep changing and not all of them are aware of the differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs, not all of them attended the previous meetings. And I think we really, really have to be mindful about this. But then when you speak only to the full GAC, you really have to start from ground zero. And the question is how many times you can start from ground zero, what the expectations are, how do you set them? And I think that this is what we have to think of.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, like I said in my lengthy introductory thing, dealing with governments continually reinforcing some basic core messages, it's like being a kindergarten teacher, it feels like sometimes, but you're going to have to repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it. Because as you say, they have quite a short tenure with a lot of the GAC people and they're coming in and it's their first couple of meetings, and it's like, for the fast learners, it takes a couple of years, and by that time they're probably shifted off to deal with digital policy somewhere. I'll let Rosemary, and then Bart, and then I think Bruce is still very, very patiently waiting, but he was late, so.

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: Yeah, just on this issue, we recognized that some time ago when we organized that ccNSO is going to talk to the GAC. So I think we've created a relationship and we should try to build on that in a multi-stakeholder mode. There's a very interesting document that I just sent to Bruce, which is actually the work plan for 2023, 24 for the Public Safety Working Group, which has been endorsed by the GAC. Its strategic goal number one is around develop and support DNS abuse and DNS related unlawful activity, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So that could be a useful framing. There are nine action items, so it would be only a very small amount of information that you could provide. But this is the way they are thinking about DNS abuse and we've got lots of information and so on to provide, but that might be a way of framing the presentation.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. That's a very helpful comment, Rosemary. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Rosemary, can you send it to me, please? I'll forward it to the full DASC. Thank you. That's one. The second thing I wanted-- so this is more about the DNS abuse level comparison. I think you got all the material there as well. One of the issues that we came across and which is very difficult for at least my colleagues to understand is because it's self-reporting, it's also self-reporting on the definitions of DNS abuse. And that creates a lot of misunderstandings in the outside world because what some people call DNS abuse, others don't and other things as well.

And that's probably something that's really well covered in the slide deck. And that shows, and that's why you have this variance as well. And this goes back to the principle thing is no ccTLD in that sense is alike. So you've got the diversity of the respondents, you've got the diversity of ways how to deal with it, and that's why, yeah. And as a result, you've got different levels of different DNS abuse definitions, and therefore different levels of DNS abuse as well. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Point is well made and it is something we have discussed a number of times, but as you say, it seems like quite a simple ask. But behind each of those slides and definitional type questions is once you start scratching at it, it does take a bit more time. It's like I said, it's a bit more complicated than that straightforward bar chart or whatever, because you need to have some of the context behind the differences,

you need to understand this was self-reported, you need to understand people don't have the same definitions globally because the globe is different and varied and we are the microcosm of all the international facets you have around the globe.

So that's sort of nice and is to be expected, but you can't then extrapolate some sort of concrete and quite radical suggestions from that starting point. It's just not a sensible way to make evidence-based policy making in my opinion. Bruce, it's finally your turn. You're off the naughty step.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Nick. I think Chris's point that we always want to be presenting our results, if you like, to the whole GAC rather than a working group. I think that's key, which is what we are doing this week. And I also take on board that this is a set of members rather than the whole membership of the GAC, that probably have particular interest topics and we can take those into account.

But I think Tatiana is right, that I always view that when you're speaking to the GAC, you've effectively got to think about 80% of them are new at any point in time. So you do have to restate the headline issues. I think some of the things we can help a bit, because I was in a session yesterday where there was a lot of focus on I guess European regulation and their focus in turn on validation of information.

But one of the things to point out is that when we're talking about DNS abuse as a whole, it's a mixture of what we'll call sort of malicious. So deliberately misregistered names and compromised names. And for a

lot of the ccTLDs, the portion of compromised is much higher than malicious and the proportion of compromised is actually more to do with the quality of content management systems and whether they're kept up to date.

I think sort of getting that message across that it's not just the registration processes, but it's a much wider problem that relates to the hosting of websites and basically patching software. And certainly, what we observe in .au is typically the compromise websites are usually more than five years old. In other words, the content management solution is out of date and it's getting hacked. So there's no relation to price nor any relation to validation that compromises in proportion to unpatched content management solutions.

And then even if you take price as a factor, if you're looking at the wholesale price of a registry, that doesn't necessarily correlate to the retail price charged by the registrars, and registrars do promotions at well below cost, so there's a factor there. And then the other thing, if it's an actual criminal element, they're using stolen credit cards. They don't actually care what the price is because they're not paying for it. And so, there's a lot of reasons why it's not as simple as our low price domain has got abuse or lack of validation's got abuse. So I think what we can do is just give a couple of reasons why it's not simple.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's a really nice context and you expressed extremely nicely there, Bruce. But it is a lot to take in, so you need to think carefully about presenting this data and thinking about those exact same points. So thank you very much. So in amazing chairing, we have

come to the point where we're going to switch on to item number five and talk about the future activities. I think I've had a good deep dive into these ones. Hello, Barbara? What have I done now?

BARBARA POVŠE: It's a minor comment and I'm probably speaking as a mathematician by education. I was attending the webinar where you presented the survey results, and I would strongly suggest to normalize the results. You can't talk about, yeah, the survey shows that the most abuse is in Europe, or maybe it's because most European registries answered the survey. This really blurs the whole picture I got quite nervous listening to, because it wasn't just that. The results have to be presented in a different way because others will not take in account that they were not normalized.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: That's a really good point. And it is a challenge to present quite a lot of dense data in lots of different ways. Sorry. So yeah, that's a very good point. So thank you for referencing that. And I must admit, I had the same thought when I was looking at some of the way that the surveys were presented. It's like, Europeans are so good, and then we know their data is so good and we know that their abuse levels are so good, but we look overweight in some of the pie charts because we are so good that we also responded to the survey. So that did look a bit like Europe is a hotbed of abuse, which is not. So moving on to the future activities.

So the genesis of future activities, including the tools and measurement session on Wednesday afternoon and the slightly tentative other suggestions around activities going forward at the Cancun meeting, I got a few laughs when I said that I really liked planning in advance and I liked a bit of structure and I wanted like a forward-looking view over the next 6 to 12 months over what is roughly happening and what point in time and in what order so that we can plan for it and maybe deliver good and engaging and well-attended sessions for our communities. And if we're not, then my proposal is we wind ourselves up and go and do something more useful to be clear because it was a volunteer time as a premium, and so we owe it to ourselves to organize it properly.

So this is essentially a rather basic attempt to look at the next 6 to 12 months and what sort of things might be put in when we were looking at suggestions for areas of closer cooperation and areas for specific deep dive into some of the more interesting specific topics. We had, I think four suggestions when we initially presented to the GAC, I think it was. One of it was around the tools and managements and specifically from ICANN side of things, it's like, why can't you get more ccTLDs to engage with the DAR project in terms of tools and reporting and measuring and helping us make the internet safer. So that's happening on Wednesday with the tools and measurements session. So we also looked a little bit around. So if you see here, there's activities going forwards.

So there's cooperation with the gTLDs, ccTLDs have got quite a lot in common with the gTLDs. We, for example, cooperate very effectively I think in terms of the IANA oversight in terms of the CSC which has two

representatives from country coasts and two representatives from gTLDs as basically the main customer base for the IANA service. So that's something that we do. Maybe we should be looking at a bit more corporation with the registries stakeholder group because we have probably got a lot more in common with them when it comes to some of these benchmarking of abuse and stuff. So we are actually joined by the leadership team of the Registry Stakeholder Group who look at DNS abuse specifically on Wednesday afternoon to have a bit of a discussion around the different tools and measurements and the commonalities between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

So, that is already sort of slightly in hand. But we were also looking for more opportunities to join forces as no point us going off and doing our own thing. If I look at it more holistically, if we make ccTLDs safer, but the abuse just goes to gTLDs, then are we actually carrying out a public service or are we just sort of acting slightly on our own self-interests and pushing the problem somewhere else? I'm extremely keen by the way to try not to because I find it irritating other people where you come to them with a problem and they say, oh, you need to go and talk to those other people. I'm trying to sort of lean into reasonable requests and try to be as helpful as possible in general.

But working with gTLDs instead of saying, oh, it's all the problems in gTLDs, go and talk to them, I don't think is a particularly responsible or constructive way of dealing with it. So we are looking to cooperate more with the gTLD team. But we're interested in ideas for maybe closer cooperation. If you see item B, there's possibly going to be an actual workshop where we might get some tangible examples of, okay, this is how you do it, this is what you do over time, this is how you sign

up, these are the benefits. And a bit more of a how to workshop is one of the suggestions coming out maybe in-- we'll see how it goes on the Wednesday afternoon.

But that's one of the ideas that those of us who are on the leadership team for this standing committee came up with. And there were other suggestions which we haven't yet tackled, which is sort of what about the registrars? And how can ccTLDs better cooperate with registrars to prevent, mitigate DNS abuse? And some of us have got some quite good examples of a particular attack which happened and we noticed it in one registrar. We worked with that registrar to basically wipe it out. We saw it then move the same sort of threat act was moved to a different registrar, we were alive to that.

So get some of those sort of examples about how really good corporation between registries and registrars can actually be quite an effective tool and to socialize more. Again, coming back to this showcasing of things that we do responsibly and well to particularly say government communities but also other parts of the ecosystem who think that ccTLDs are slightly a law unto themselves and don't care about the public interest and safety and security and that kind of stuff.

So working with registrars, I was wondering about that for one of the ICANN meetings next year, if not the 79, but maybe the 80 meeting. Again, looking forward to, okay, if we're going to do this in Puerto Rico, then we should do the other thing in the Rwanda meeting. I'd like also if we are going to be in Rwanda to think very strongly about the regional representation about maybe we can do some more focused

regional representation with our African folks because they were actually very underrepresented in the survey, so maybe we should be trying a bit harder to engage more there. So that's an opportunity which I was also thinking about for the 80 meeting. And then the final suggestion we had was around governance models and the intersection between different types of governance models and abuse levels in ccTLDs.

It's a topic for discussion. I know we've had in my working lifetime several sessions on ccTLDs and governance, so I've kind of down prioritize that in terms of the order which things come to. None of this by the way, is set in stone, I'm just laying it out to everybody here just as sort of a, this is kind of the thought plan for the next 6 to 12 months. And I'm asking for feedback basically on do you agree with this kind of thing? Have you got any other ideas? What have we left out? What should we change? And I'll shut up for now. The final thing I wanted to say was we did the first survey in the fourth quarter of 2022, and this is not the Republic of Rome exactly in terms of democracy, but it's not a dictatorship either.

But I have unilaterally decided, and no one's disagreed with me, that we would repeat the survey in the fourth quarter of 2024, i. e. two years later on with the objective of hopefully seeing for example, that the number of people who said don't know about levels of abuse hopefully reduces. And it'd just be interesting to see whether we can get more participation and other things over the course of time. Because what I'm looking for is an evidence base of increasing engagement and decreasing levels of abuse, better clarity, understanding, and action over time as a result of the work we're

doing and the resources that we're providing, like the email and the repository.

And if it goes up, then maybe we should change tack, but hopefully we'll see some positive things and we can give ourselves a pat on the back, and then it will guide our future work or we can decide our work is done and disband ourselves. That's kind of fine as well. This is not a, hopefully a job for life. So, just wanted to say that. Tatiana, you've been meeting very patiently, but thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Nick. Two comments actually. One to what you just said about repeating the survey, and this is something that maybe we better announce here to anybody who filled the survey out, who responded. If you have any comments about design, about something that didn't work, maybe let us know and let us know before we start the new one. But this would be announced I think on the list or whatever anyway. But it would be two years after you filled it out, maybe you will not remember.

So please, please talk to me, Nick, to Bruce, to Angela, to somebody, if you remember that something was not clear because I've heard some of the complaints. So please do come to us, this is the first one. The second one, I like and very much dislike the point E. I do think that the idea to explore the relation or correlation between our governance models, and I'm not sure what do you mean by regulatory frameworks? Is the national regulatory frameworks or the internal frameworks?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It's what you wanted to mean.

TATIANA TROPINA: Okay. So what I strongly dislike and what I strongly, absolutely, strongly suggest to rephrase is the word impact. Because it's not going to be experimental research or anything. It will be extremely hard to find the metrics to operationalize and to analyze all other factors that might impact the level of abuse. What you can do, however, is to look at the ccTLD governance frameworks and regulatory frameworks and see if they can contribute to the or correlate with DNS abuse. But I will strongly suggest to rephrase the word impact because correlation and causation is not the same, and impact always implies causation. And I think that you will never, ever, ever find it within the work of this group or ccNSO or whatever.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I completely agree actually. And on the survey questions, I must admit, when I was filling in the survey for .uk, I did think these questions are a little bit confusing, a couple of them, and who came up with them, and I realized it was us. But I didn't do what you just suggested, which was to make notes as to why they were a bit confusing, though they seemed to maybe overlap with a previous question or something. And so we should try to make the survey clearer and better, which we will with the benefit of the prior survey. But thank you for that input. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: We just asked from a planning perspective in support if you don't mind that we just do a temperature of the room, if they support first of all the topics and secondly the order, because that will drive your agenda going forward as well.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Bart, I've told you about this before, and I don't agree with referendums, but I'm very happy to have a warm clap of hands or something. But are there any other thoughts from the wider group about any of this stuff please?

EYITAYO IYORTIM: So my name is Eyitayo from the .ng registry, and I like what you talked about. Well, I'm going to add to your comments on E about impacts. I'm a psychologist, yes, correlation and causation, definitely we need to look at that, but I think that we can look at how the regulatory frameworks have affected the responses to abuse. I think that would be a valid thinking because then there's a lot of learning around that. But we've also done some training for law enforcement, and you did mention law enforcement.

So we did in Nigeria with the .NG Academy. and we were able to put law enforcement in a room and say, this is how the DNS works. So you see, we had so many cases of just going to go and pick up the registrar and then locking them up or whatever because there was abuse on

domain name. Sometimes even when they're not responsible for the hosting.

Yes, we have some who are doing the hosting, but we have many more cases where they're not even hosting the domain name. So there's a lot of that. I'm wondering if we can include that in the conversations with GAC since law enforcement and government is closer and that we can use that to drive the conversations on that side.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's a very smart observation, and thank you for that. So we do have six whole minutes left, so there's plenty of time for people to make any other observations or say something in and or whatever. Hi.

NISHA: Hey, Nick, it's Nisha from Sky. I just wanted to put a point out here because we are still very confused at a business like Sky as to what DNS abuse actually means. I think I'm just echoing something that we kind of mentioned earlier. It is so broad that when we're working with our cyber threat intelligence, all these departments, they literally do not understand why us in a domain management team cannot take a name down, cannot bring anything down even when I've gone to say the dot, sorry, Nick. it for example, and there's an actual trademark registered, Nick. it is telling me, sorry, we can't do anything about it, it's clearly our trademark and we are left in a business like Sky where we've got a generic word, everybody lives under the sky.

It's one of the words that everyone's going to want to claim stake to. And what do we do as a domain management team when we can't actually explain what ICANN are doing around DNS abuse? All I can say, hey, report it to Net Beacon and let ICANN know. But I mean the word sky, how many domains can we tackle? It's a generic dictionary word and we still don't understand really what we can explain back to leadership or what we can explain back to our cyber threat teams. I just don't have an explanation.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's interesting. Thank you first, Nisha. Good to have some of the business constituency infiltrate our meetings. And I think, so from a personal reply, DNS abuse does not exist in any of the .uk policies. We have abuse and we have criminality and we have trademark infringement, and they are dealt with under different things. So if you're looking for the words DNS abuse on the Nominet website, you will not find it because I think it's an abstract construct and it's also an irregular construct in the sense that people seem to define it some cases to include any harm which involves anything on the internet, maybe with a domain name to more technical limited functions.

And then you've got the whole definitional thing within the ICANN thing that if it's content, then that's kind of outside of the-- that's someone else's problem [00:56:00 - inaudible] shoulders about it all. But I think in general, in terms of trademark infringement, there are other mechanisms, and generally DNS abuse does not. I mean obviously phishing domains, but you have malicious domain for phishing, which may or may not have the word sky in. So that would

fall into the bit, but as I said, it is a little bit more complicated than you might have first guessed.

NISHA: No, totally get that. It's just hard to explain, that's all I have to say. Like I said, the business is always expecting us to do take downs, have a take down, and we can't get a positive outcome.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, I think then that's a reflection of a failure of all of these communities to educate and to bring people forward. I mean, sometimes you can bring horses to water, whatever metaphor you choose, and they refuse to understand or they pretend to be stupid, or then like with the GAC people, they get rotated into a different role and then you have to start again. But it's our responsibility to provide clarity on problem, solution, problem, solution. That's a different solution to that sort of a problem. We are working on that. That's difficult because it's complicated and impacts wider things like, oh, why don't you pull down the BBC's website? Well, that might be disproportionate. So a little bit of sophistication and education, which is one of the key, if you read our terms of reference, which I do every day.

It is one of the key objectives of this group is to help people get to a better position. And if we go for a coffee, I'll give you a bit more collateral to explain all this stuff anytime, Nish, of course. Any final thoughts before I'm going to ask for a referendum on the future plan of the company. No, country. We're going to leave Brexit. Germany

quits the EU in shock news. No. But we're going to have a little yay, nayyy, this is your chance to give us-- and actually, genuinely we want to reflect back to you as a group of what is interesting for you. If this is not it and it might not be, then it's useful to get that. And sorry, Bart, are you going to [CROSSTALK] leaving.

BART BOSWINKEL: The reason for asking, this is work for the DNS abuse group. So that's why you need some commitment that we agree with this.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We just had a really nice volunteer from Nigeria for some of the governance models, so. No, no, no, but genuinely, we want to provide engaging and helpful things and we want people to lean into it and we want it to be interesting. So, if you find a boring session in a future meeting, it's your own fault. But genuinely receptive and I have no pride in getting the right answer. You can tell me, Nick, you've got it all wrong, and I totally take on point.

The thing about the impacting abuse, that was poor language and I take responsibility for that. Any further thoughts? Okay, well, look at that, two minutes. Okay, in the final two minutes, I'm just going to ask for a hand. We used to get like the red and green and yellow things. Where have they gone, Bart? All right, Bart, can take on this bit.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you agree with the list of topics as they're on the screen, so the activities going forward, if you agree with this is a good list, this is what

the DASC should focus on over the next couple of months, then raise your hand. If you don't agree, then don't show your hand at all or walk out of the room.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's impressive to get Bruce to put his hand up. He's done put his hand up already.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'm abstaining because I'm conflicted for the record.

BART BOSWINKEL: So at least we see support for the topics. Now the second question, because that will drive the agenda of the DASC. If you agree with the order of the topics, please raise your hand. If you don't, that's fine. If there is support, especially we know who are on the DNS abuse committee, if you agree with the order, please raise your hand because there's work involved and this sets your agenda for the next year, so that's the nice thing about it. So if you agree with the order, please raise your hand. If you don't agree, then it's-- I think from the DNS abuse group, I think the majority-- let me do it the other way around. If you disagree, please raise your hand. So, okay.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I'm sorry, Bart, we've run out of time. No one has got the opportunity to disagree with anything. That's the end of the meeting. No, seriously. Thank you very much. It's been a really great meeting.

Thank you for everyone's engagement and contributions and see you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]