
ICANN81 | AGM – Joint Meeting: GAC and ccNSO
Wednesday, November 13, 2024 – 9:00 to 10:00 TRT

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Good morning, everyone. Please take your seats. We're about to start.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Hello and welcome to the GAC Joint Meeting with the ccNSO on Wednesday, 13 November at 6 UTC. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviour and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During the session, questions or comments would only be read aloud if submitted in the chat pod. Interpretation for this session will include six UN languages and Portuguese.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Please state your name and the language you will speak, if other than English, and remember to speak at a reasonable pace. As a kind reminder, tables with microphones are reserved for GAC members and observers and guest speakers. I'll now hand the floor over to Nico Caballero. Please, over to you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, Julia. Welcome, everyone. Welcome, Alejandra. Welcome to the ccNSO-GAC Joint Meeting during ICANN81. I have the pleasure of introducing some good friends. Peter Koch, Chris Disspain, they're going to be talking about policy and procedural gaps in IANA policies.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Jordan Carter, he'll be talking about securing ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. And Nick Wenban-Smith, I hope I'm pronouncing--

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Good enough.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Is that good? About the DASC survey results. This session will be running for 60 minutes, that is till 10:00 pm, and then we'll have a coffee break. And by the way, we'll be later on announcing the results of the vice chair election within the GAC. And just to give you an idea of what the rest of the day will look like for the GAC, after the community session, we'll have lunch and then three Communiqué drafting sessions. So, I hope your caffeine intake will be significant by that time. So, welcome, everyone, again. So with that, let me hand the floor to Alejandra.

ALEJANDA REYNOSO: Thank you so much, Nico. And it is a pleasure for us to be joining the GAC today. It's been a while since we've been together in the same room. We are very excited to share the room with you and also to tell you what we've been working at. So, for this, I am going to hand the floor to Jordan to tell us more a bit about the gap analysis.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. Good morning, everyone. Bright and early on a Wednesday. My name is Jordan Carter. I work for .au, the Australian

ccTLD. And I am the chair of the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group of the ccNSO. And I'm going to give you a short update on that work on topic number one. I'm not Peter Koch or Chris Disspain, but they'll talk to you about WSIS shortly.

And this is designed to be a very brief and light update. If you have any questions at all that are arising, please do feel absolutely free to get in touch with us through the ccNSO secretariat. If we could do the next slide, I'm just going to cover very briefly why this group was established. In other words, what it is here to do. And give you a brief look through the work and output that we've done to date. And then to talk about the next steps for our work.

The essence of why this group exists arose when the Lebanon ccTLD LB had a situation in 2023 where the entity that was listed on the IANA database as the ccTLD manager was not operating the CC and did not wish to be named as operating the ccTLD. And the underlying assumption in IANA practice and so on had been you're unlikely to have a situation where nobody wished to operate a ccTLD. In other words, it was possible that you transfer the administration to another entity, but that no one would wish to resign from that role without another entity having been observed.

So, IANA made a decision to create a status of caretaker operations for that and let the ccNSO know about that, and then could enter into the finding and naming a new manager. But this left us with the fear that there was a gap in the global policies framework that guides how IANA deals with ccTLDs. And so, we started talking about gaps. Are there

gaps in this framework? And we established an ad hoc group of ccNSO Council members after that meeting to start to investigate this issue.

And after a while, we realized that just having an informal group of Council members was probably not appropriately transparent and accountable to the community. So, after the ICANN80 meeting in Kigali earlier this year, a more formal and transparent structure of a ccNSO working group was established. Nominations from the community were invited to participate and so on. And the group had its first meeting in August.

So, there are three tasks that the working group was asked to do. The first was to prepare an overview of the policies, procedures, and guidance that relate to how IANA deals with ccTLDs. And it is a very specific focus here. As you may be aware, the ccNSO does not make policies for how ccTLDs operate in their country. Those decisions are made country by country by the manager in collaboration with local governments, local communities, whatever administration is in place. This is just about the policies that shape how IANA deals with things like assignment of a ccTLD, transfers between managers, retirements, and so on. So, it's a very narrow slice of the policy if you like.

And it turns out that it isn't very easy to find what the policy framework is that applies here. There's RFC 1591 from 1994, which was a founding text, but many of whose provisions 30 years later don't quite relate to the reality of how the internet works. There are successions of the GAC principles from 2005. There is the framework of interpretation working

group final report that was a how we interpret RFC 1591 now that I think was published in 2014 or '15.

And there are a range of other Board decisions and pieces of guidance that together are this framework, but no one had documented them and pulled them into one place where it was easy to find. So, the first task set was to prepare an overview, a guide to the policy framework so that as working group members, we could know what it was, because the first step in working out whether there are gaps is to know what you have already.

So, that was the first task. The second was to identify any possible gaps in those policies or guidance or practices. And the third task is to advise this Council of the ccNSO whether to act to resolve any gaps that are identified. And if there are gaps found that need to be closed, to propose the method by which to do that. That's the task. It's a relatively limited task in scope and time, except that what the gaps are is potentially a bigger piece of work.

So, if we go to the next slide, we have done half of one of these pieces of work and all of one of the others. So, the overview document that sets out what this policy framework began to be evolved by the ad hoc group and the working group picked that draft up, refined it, made it more comprehensive. And we introduced it to the ccTLD community at the ccNSO members meeting yesterday. It's about a 10-page document with a bit of context on the front and then basically links to the various policy documents that apply.

So, that overview is going to be shared online. And we've opened a sort of informal feedback period for anyone who reads it and has any comments about it, primarily RCC NSO members, which will close mid January to give people a couple of months to take a look at it, think about it. If any feedback comes back to identify other sources of policy or guidance that we've missed in that overview, we'll then add those in and reissue the documents in time for the ICANN82 meeting in Seattle. So, that first one task is done and out of the way.

In terms of whether there are gaps and how to fill them, IANA was able to provide us with a sense of the things they noticed from an operational point of view that they experience as gaps in policy or guidance. And the working group has begun working through those. It hasn't finished that work. We had an initial hope we might get it done by this meeting, but the ccNSO has numerous projects and tasks and we're still dealing with some almost implementation issues with a previous PDP. And there was a very big overlap between the group of people working on this project and the people who had to respond to a set of questions from the ICANN Board on the review mechanisms PDP. So, it slowed us down.

So, we're partway through assessing that list of gaps and proposing methods to fill them. And you will have noticed that I've used language like policies, procedures, and guidance. If we need to change the policies framework, if we need to change policy, we have to run a policy development process, a PDP, resource intensive, time consuming, and so on. We have lighter weight methods and structures that we can use to fill things like interpretation questions or a lack of guidance or a lack

of shared expectations between IANA and ccTLDs about how to deal with an issue.

So, if we hop to the next slide, I don't know what it is. Yes. So, this is some of the methods that we've got. Resource intensive, but definitiveness of outcome. The PDP is right over on the right-hand side. Lots of resources, but a very clear way to make decisions. There are other things. There's the framework of interpretation approach that some of you may recollect from 10 or 15 years ago. There's the possibility to prepare advice through a ccNSO working group. We can have agreements between the ccNSO and ICANN or exchanges of letters. Or we can look at an issue, something that might look like a gap and say, actually, we all agree it isn't one. And this is not something that we need to worry about anymore.

So, one way to think about this policy gaps analysis working group is that it's trying to take an overarching view of this set of problems or challenges to determine what types of issues and then to propose how to resolve them. And it's fair to say that the general view of the group at this point is that if we can avoid doing a full-blown policy development process, we will try to achieve that because as already mentioned, they're quite expensive in terms of time and resources.

If we go to the next slide. The next steps for our work in between now and the meeting to be held in Seattle in March are to complete our assessment as a working group of the IANA list of gaps. We're about halfway through. I think I identified 10. We're sort of working through the fifth and sixth ones at the moment. And to prepare recommended

steps for the ccNSO Council to consider at its meeting at the end of the Seattle ICANN. And to assess any feedback that arrives on that overview document of the policies framework.

So, that's what we're planning to do next. I'm sure that the GAC secretariat can share with you the overview document once that's released if you're interested in it. And that is all I have in terms of my update, but I invite any questions that anyone may have through Alejandro or through Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you so much for that, Jordan. Before we open the floor for questions, I have the pleasure of introducing Mr. Ian Sheldon from Australia, who is the new point of contact GAC, ccNSO and Mr. Sean Copeland. I don't know where you're from, Sean, but you can do the introduction yourself. So, would you like to say anything before I open the floor for questions and before we move on, Ian?

IAN SHELDON:

Thank you, Nico. I'm very much looking forward to learning more about the ongoing work of the ccNSO and sharing those learnings with the broader GAC. I'm looking forward to the exchange.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Ian. Sean?

SEAN COPELAND: Hi. I'm sorry about that. So, I'm actually from the US Virgin Islands by way of Canada. Long story. I sat in on your session earlier this week. I found it enjoyable and interesting and looking forward to interacting with all of you. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: So, thank you so much again, Sean, Ian. You've been introduced. So, with that, let me open the floor at this point for questions for Jordan. I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see any hand online. So, with that, I'll give the floor to Alejandro.

ALEJANDA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nico. So now we are going to our next topic, that is WSIS+20: securing ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. And for this, we have Peter Koch and Chris Disspain.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Alejandra. And good morning. My name is Peter Koch. I work for DENIC, which is Germany's country code top-level domain registry. And I have the pleasure to inform you about the topic of WSIS+20 in the context of the ccNSO, and the ccTLDs. I won't have slides, so bear with me. And Christy Spain, to my second left, will intervene when necessary.

First and foremost, many of the country code top-level domains are engaged in their local internet governance community, running NRI secretariats, or in many other ways, engaging with multiple stakeholder

groups. And usually, we count ourselves into the technical community. That said, much of this year's work was about the Global Digital Compact and the engagement in the process where possible. And so, we have collectively our ccTLDs, WSIS+20, on our agenda for next year.

We had installed an internet governance liaison committee within the ccNSO, I think two years ago or three maybe, where we regularly inform each other about internet governance trends and challenges, and also inform ourselves about our respective activities within our local communities. We do that on mailing lists, on regular meetings of the committee, which has a large attendance from country code top-level domains, and also during meetings at ICANN. And we had a meeting at this ICANN already, where we had a panel about, again, WSIS+20 and the strategies and experiences from the GDC and strategies towards WSIS+20.

Colleagues shared experiences, and one topic around the GDC, of course, was the challenges around providing input and the process of the GDC in total, where still most of the ccTLDs were happy with the general outcome, I should say, or the principles, which does not imply endorsement or any questions around that.

Next steps, WSIS+20 on our agenda. So, we will engage with local communities and with other stakeholder groups. Many of the ccTLDs are active in what we call the TCCM, the Technical Community Coalition for Multi-Stakeholderism, as one voice, I should say, a TCCM, because there's only one voice within the technical community where ccTLDs, other registries, registrars, but also colleagues from the number space,

engage and cooperate in formulating statements, submitting contributions to processes that will be available throughout the year to strengthen the voice and also strengthen the presence and the messages of the technical community.

Actually, we're also asking for your help to gather information about how to be able to intervene, and especially important is the process for WSIS+20, the opportunity and chances for ccTLDs and other parts of the technical community to contribute. We rely on many of you to give us information and also to shape the process in an open way, as open as possible. So, we have engaged in a broader way, like some of us now engaging in ITU processes, which is not necessarily our main turf and beyond, and we're looking forward to more cooperation. Chris, do you want to add something? Okay. Thank you. Do we have anything to add? No, thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Peter. Good morning, everyone. Chris Disspain. I just wanted to add one final piece to all of this, which is some of you will remember that in a couple of ICANN meetings ago, at the geopolitical discussion, the open session plenary, there was some comments made about what ICANN's role was in this, and people were suggesting that it perhaps wasn't taking as much of a leadership role as it had in the past.

As a result of that, the ccNSO ended up, the Council ended up writing to ICANN and effectively saying, look, we think you need to be a little bit more visible in these processes, and we think that the community is expecting you to take a little bit more of a leadership role. And as a

result of that, we have set up a discussion group, think tank, call it what you will, and the SO and ACs of each have people sitting on that discussion group, and the GAC has two members sitting on it.

And it's basically an informal group that isn't going to make any decisions or do anything, but it's a place where ideas can bubble up and we can talk about what ICANN is actually doing. So, we've been discussing things like what are they doing at the IGF, the upcoming IGF, and perhaps more importantly, what will they be doing at the IGF next year, which of course is now going to be in June, just before the WSIS+20 review. So, that's an interesting place to think about what might be happening there. So, I just wanted to update everybody on that and let you know that there is a conduit up into ICANN, and we I think are feeling relatively pleased that ICANN is being a little bit more proactive in this area. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you for that, Chris. Do we have questions for Peter or for Chris regarding the WSIS+20 issue? And I have India, please go ahead.

T. SANTHOSH:

Thank you, Chair. This is Santosh for the record. So, during the month of October in New Delhi, there was this World Telecommunication Standardization Agency meeting, which discussed about the country code top-level domain. So, is ccNSO aware of that resolution, the final test?

PETER KOCH:

This is Peter Koch for the record. For full disclosure, I had the pleasure to be part of the German delegation for WTSA and I'm aware of the-- It was resolutions, it's 47, 48, and also 64 and IPv6. So, this Council is aware of that. We haven't had the chance to discuss this in depth, but we will be very closely looking at these resolutions, and also follow up, for example, the upcoming process for the next Plenipot, which will also have similar resolutions. But thank you very much for pointing out these very important resolutions in the ITU.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, India. Thank you, Peter. I have the Netherlands next. Thank you.

MARCO HEGEWONING:

It's Marco from the Netherlands for the record. To the point our friend Santosh just made, and then for people who are less aware, please note that the Resolution 47 on ccTLDs was a no change. So, the original text has been maintained. 48 about IDNs have seen some, but well, from our perspective, some significant improvements with regard to the use of IDNs and the multilingual internet. But that was in response to the previous speaker.

Question to the ccNSO, and it's a bit on the edge of the mandate, but with regard to the WSIS+20. I was also curious to hear how the ccNSO sees it as an individual role of the ccTLDs, or maybe in regional groups such as CENTR, to help and channel into their respective governments with regard to the WSIS+20. So, if there's any, if you could, well, maybe

tell us if there are any activities on that front. I appreciate, of course, also the channeling into ICANN and working up, but I'm particularly interested in the horizontal layers being used. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah, let me start with that. I think that a lot of ccTLDs have an open channel of communication with their government on this, and the amount of influence varies. As Peter just said, he was part of a delegation into what is effectively a government process, and the same thing may well happen with certain governments in respect to WSIS. They might have their ccTLD manager or representative of the ccTLD with them as part of their delegation.

Or if that's not workable for some governments, then at least an open line of communication back to home to ask questions and seek clarification. So, I would sort of bounce the ball back to you and say I would encourage governments who may not necessarily yet have put those arrangements in place to reach out to their ccTLD manager and start talking to them about how we can help you in that WSIS process, because ultimately, you're the ones in the room, not us.

JORDAN CARTER:

Just to add one point. It's Jordan Carter here again for the record. There have been a few discussion sessions during ccNSO members' meetings talking about this challenge over the last two years, maybe. Almost every time it gets discussed, someone will say, please, ccTLD managers, talk to your governments. Find out who in the foreign

ministry, who in the current ministry are dealing with these issues and build some relationships. So we're encouraging you to contact your CCs, encouraging CCs to contact you. Everyone is singing from the same song sheet.

ALEJANDA REYNOSO: May I? Thank you, Nico. This is Alejandra, for the record. Just to say that the role of the ccNSO itself is to provide a platform to sharing information and be able to interact and communicate with each other. So, that's why we have these sessions where we discuss these things and where we provide people with information on how they should be aware of this important topic. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Alejandra. And speaking of governments, I have the government of Switzerland next. Go ahead, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you, Nico. Jorge Cancio, Switzerland, for the record. Good morning to everyone and happy to see you here in this bilateral. And yeah, let me just commend you for taking the initiative in this matter of common interest. Thank you also for organizing the exchange we had yesterday in the ccNSO room on this topic, which I think was quite worthwhile. And I at least found it very, very useful.

Just to remind everyone in this room that the WSIS documents include very important mentions to the ccTLDs, both the plan of action of

Geneva that invites the governments as appropriate to manage or supervise their ccTLDs, and also the Tunis Agenda on the information society, which includes paragraph 63, which I will spare you of reading, you can look it up, which has also important mentions about the relationship between the countries and their ccTLDs.

So that's really up for discussion as well, every time you do a review. So, it's important that all colleagues in the room, be it from ccTLDs, be it from the GAC, be it from observers are aware of that, because that might be discussed during the review process.

Another point is also to welcome the initiatives of getting organized by the ccTLDs, be it the TCCM, or what you are doing at the level of the ccNSO awareness raising, that is all very useful. And I would like to invite you to go beyond your community, try to build a sort of platform that is as broad as possible, that shares this view of the WSIS update, and that includes stakeholders from all countries, not from all parts of the world, and from all stakeholder groups. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, Switzerland. I have the UK next.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. Nigel Hickson. And just three brief points. First of all, to echo what other people have said, how important it is for the whole sort of community to be involved in this WSIS process. And I think the leadership the ccNSO have shown is really, really splendid. 10 years ago, I remember a discussion in ICANN

about the WSIS review at that point, and there was actually quite a bit of pushback from the community for a technical organization such as ICANN being involved in these wider, if you like, geopolitical issues. But I think it's of just so much importance.

Secondly, to just reference, and I know that at this ICANN meeting, there's been lots of WSIS stuff, if you like, but we have the plenary session next, which is not focusing exclusively on WSIS, but is talking about the multi-stakeholder paradigm and our involvement in it. So, no doubt this will be on the agenda as well.

And thirdly, really just to articulate something we were discussing yesterday in our GAC session. That there's one thing to be involved in the discussions, which is absolutely necessary, and really recognizing the call that Chris Disspain made for countries to reach out to their stakeholders, including their country code top-level domain to have collaborative discussions. But of course, also there's the issue of substance and what stakeholders and governments want out of the WSIS process. I think, there's need for clarity as well. And certainly, for some of us, it's in addition to the endorsement of the multi-stakeholder process, the endorsement of the continuation of the UNIGF with a renewed and longer mandate.

And many congratulations in saying this to Norway, of course, for first of all, volunteering and putting their hat in the ring and secondly, being selected to host the UNIGF at the end of June next year. In addition to that, there's other issues such as reducing the digital divide, working on the WSIS action lines, which I think are also important. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you for that, UK. So, before we move on, are there any further questions or comments for Chris or for Alejandra? And for that matter, we can go back some slides and you can ask questions to Jordan as well regarding his presentation. That would be perfectly okay as well. So, I don't see any hands in the room or online, which means that we're okay to move on to the next topic. Over to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nico. So, our next topic, it's on the DNS Abuse Standing Committee (DASC). And for this, we have Nick Wenban-Smith to talk about it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Good morning. Thank you, Alejandra. My name is Nick Wenban-Smith and I'm with Nominet, the country code top-level domain for the United Kingdom. I'm here in my capacity as the chair of the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee, so the DASC. I know that this is one of the GAC priority issues. So, we're very pleased to present to you our updates and our latest findings from the ccNSO side. So, I have a few slides here and I will just briefly talk them through, and then obviously, there's many opportunities for questions and comments.

So, I think it's already been said this morning, but you can see at the bottom of the slide, the text that we do not formulate policies or standards because country codes are essentially sovereign entities and they do not fall within the ICANN contractual jurisdiction. So, we are

independent, both of ICANN and of each other as it should be. But it's important to remember that.

What we do as a community within the ccNSO is to share information, discuss topics, promote understanding and education, provide insights. And I think we've had a very instructive set of discussions over the past two years around this topic of DNS abuse and trying to really understand the nuances and the complexity of some of the issues. But I think whilst I've said that we are not here to create policies, be under no illusion, we want to reduce DNS abuse. So, that is a specific objective in terms of mitigation and prevention of abuse of the DNS system.

So, we provide a number of, just as a summary of our sort of activities, but we've set up a DNS abuse library as a public resource for ccTLD managers. We have a dedicated email and contact so that exchange of information and communication is better and on a specific topic or alerts can be raised quickly. What I'm going to summarize for you in a moment is the survey of the global ccTLDs that we've recently conducted in 2024. But we conducted another survey initially quite soon after the group was set up in 2022. So, this is our first opportunity to compare the survey results from 2022 with the survey results from 2024 and to see if there's any emerging trends. So, that's what I'm going to talk to you about in a moment.

We've also held a number of, I guess, capacity building sessions. And specifically in the ICANN Hamburg meeting, we had a specific session, quite a lengthy session with many contributions, including from the ICANN's OCTO office with their DAR project in terms of tools and

measurements. We had the NetBeacon Institute talking about the resources that they provide for free to all ccTLDs and had a very good conversation actually around some of the ccTLDs and what they are doing in terms of analysis of abuse. I'll leave it there for the moment.

And in the Kigali meeting, you may be aware that within the gTLD entities, earlier this year, there were amendments to the base registry agreement and also the standard registry-registrar accreditation documents for ICANN contracted entities, specifically in the topic of DNS abuse and putting on sort of stronger obligations onto those entities. So, we had a workshop in partnership with the gTLDs Registry Stakeholder Group around that and making sure that ccTLDs were fully aware of what was happening there.

And just briefly, we basically kept the surveys the same from 2024 and 2022. We provide a slightly shorter timeframe, but it didn't seem to make that much difference because people tended to respond to the survey in the last week or last day before the survey closed. So, that was an interesting point and I think a learning for other people collecting information from the community that necessarily a long period of time doesn't necessarily get you a higher number of responses.

We did obviously take on Board feedback from the first set of survey questions and we tried to remove any duplication or ambiguity. And certainly, some ccTLDs actually through their GAC representatives did say that they were, for various reasons, having difficulty completing the survey and we allowed them to complete it by a word document or some similar alternative.

So we invite all ccTLDs to respond, whether they are ASCII traditional two-letter ccTLDs or the 61 IDN ccTLDs, which are in existence. We anonymize the results. We want to get people to provide candid responses. But fundamentally, yeah, we're here to provide a picture of the abuse landscape and also talk about other future work in terms of workshops in terms of what the community is looking for.

So, the response to the survey essentially amounted to about 100 ccTLDs out of the total of 316. But I just want to make that clear that that's actually a very good sample size. All 10 of the largest ccTLDs are included in the survey. There are various ccTLDs. And the example I like to give is the ccTLD .aq, which is for Antarctica. We did not receive a response from Antarctica. And that's not surprising. So, there are many ccTLDs, but obviously some of them are not going to be responding to these sorts of surveys. And that is understood, but that's important to understand that in the context, for example.

And then this is another sort of just a reminder so that you can understand the results in the proper context. ccTLDs are a significant number of domain names in the world, 140 million, so 39% of the global number of domain name registrations globally. Out of the 10 largest top-level domains in the world, 7 of those are ccTLDs, so this is an important piece of work and it's important in the global context.

This is a summary of the important differences, not just between ccTLDs and gTLDs, but as between ccTLDs and other ccTLDs. We are, as I said before, very geographically diverse, independent of ICANN. We have quite a wide range of different registration models. Quite a few ccTLDs

do not, for example, have registrars, which is completely different from the ICANN gTLD model. We all have a close relationship with our domestic law and jurisdiction, obviously, and many of us have strong working cooperation with our local and regional governments. Some ccTLDs are very large, some ccTLDs are only a handful of people, so it's a very diverse community.

This is the survey results. These are just the initial findings. I just wanted to give you a very brief sort of what struck us when we looked at the survey results from 2024 versus 2022. These are the initial highlights. We will be holding a webinar. There's about 50 questions in the survey, so we will hold a webinar between now and ICANN82 in Seattle to allow people to see the full data set, and there'll be a recording of it so that people can look at the full data set at their leisure. But this is just the initial findings.

Firstly, I wanted to check that when we're comparing the survey results from 2024 with the results from 2022, that there's broad comparisons in terms of the inputs. There's a slight geographic difference, so the dark blue on the right-hand side is slightly larger. That's the European input. We had one less response than 2022. We had 56 responses in 2024, 57 responses in 2022. As I said earlier, that represents about actually 100 ccTLDs, and that's because many ccTLD managers operate more than one ccTLD. They have the IDN variant, or they are the manager for multiple ccTLDs.

One of the striking findings in 2022, and this is the column on the left, when asked about how much abuse they believe they had in their own

ccTLD, more than one-third, 35% in 2022, responded that they were not sure how much abuse they had. That led directly to our workshop on tools and measurements, because if you agree with principle that you cannot manage or you cannot measure, then the first step is to get some analysis and to understand the numbers of abuse in your own ccTLD, because only then will you be able to see whether your policy or operational interventions are having a positive effect in terms of the reduction in abuse.

We had a workshop, and I was very pleased that, yes, it's still, I think, 21% in 2022 replied that they're not sure about the amount of abuse, but it's quite a significant reduction from what we first saw in 2022. As I said, part of the core mission of our DNS Abuse Standing Committee is to improve awareness. So that's an important part, but it's obviously something that we need to continue on. I think I just want to reiterate that we were pleased in 2022 to see a very low amount of abuse. I mean, in context, we do not define abuse for ccTLDs, we leave that to be defined in each national territory, and it can vary from place to place. This is a broad-brush picture, not a scientifically rigorous peer-reviewed piece of research.

But pleasingly, when we move forward to 2024, for example, on the right-hand column, you'll see that there was a small amount over 0.2% of abuse in 2022. That's now reduced to 0. If you look at the amount of very low abuse, less than 0.05%, that figure has increased from 2022 to 2024. You can see, I've summarised, in the two lowest categories of abuse, ccTLDs moved from 49%, which is, I think, very good, in 2022, but it's now 69% in 2024. So, there's a significant reduction in the

amount of abuse reported from this cohort in the survey between 2022 and 2024. So, a very positive trend.

This, by the way, although it is self-reported, if you look at any of the open-source resources, say, for example, the NETBeacon Institute, which looks at all registries, ccTLDs and gTLDs worldwide, and registrars, you see, for reasons not fully understood, essentially a factor of 10 less abuse in the ccTLD world than the gTLD world. I think we shouldn't be complacent about that, but it is very pleasing in terms of comparison. I have discussed with my colleagues on our DNS Abuse Standing Committee the reasons for such a big difference, and we don't fully understand that yet. We are pleased, obviously, but we don't fully understand it.

I would say, in the UK, we use the same registrars as gTLDs, but we have much less abuse. So, what is going on? It could be that gTLDs are intrinsically more attractive in terms of if you're a criminal and you want to address a global market, maybe you would more logically take a gTLD than a ccTLD. There could be some interesting linguistic bias that most of the measurement tools are in English, and therefore abuse not in English or in non-ASCII characters just simply isn't captured or measured.

So, there are various reasons why we have that. As I said before, ccTLDs also have a very strong connection between their national law enforcement, CERT authorities, and so that could be a reason we're just more vigilant in terms of responsibility. I was going to say something controversial, that possibly the ccTLDs' compliance departments are

more proactive and effective than ICANN's compliance department. But to be honest, we just don't know.

I was going to say I'll wrap it up here in terms of questions. We did ask about 50 questions in total, including, for example, on the use of AI in abuse mitigation and detection. So, quite a significant number of ccTLDs now use AI tools in terms of threat detection and mitigation. It's still a minority at this point, but I think when we repeat the survey in a couple of years, it would be interesting to see how that progresses too. So, I think the next slide is just a sort of thank you and questions. So, I'll hand back over to Chair. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

So, thank you so much for that, Nick. Before we wrap up, we have eight minutes for questions. For Nick, regarding the DASC, that is the DNS Abuse Standing Committee survey results, but also going all the way back to WSIS+20 and questions for Jordan or for Peter and Chris regarding gaps in IANA policies. So, the floor is open, and I already have a queue here. I have India first and then the European Commission. Please go ahead, India.

T. SANTHOSH:

Thank you, Chair. This is Santosh for the record. So, during the GAC meeting related to RDRS, that is Registration Data Request Service, GAC contemplated that whether any ccTLD operators might be interested to join voluntarily on the participation of RDRS because as we are aware that the RDRS is mainly participated by the gTLD operators. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I'm happy to answer that. The policy framework for each ccTLD is determined in jurisdiction and it will depend a bit on the privacy laws of that jurisdiction, the data access. In the vast majority of ccTLDs, there are well-established procedures for privacy and also well-established procedures for access to the data, particularly by national law enforcement or public interest authorities or people who wish to enforce rights or to investigate abuse.

So I think we follow what happens in the gTLD world, but it's difficult to integrate a very diverse set of national policies into the ICANN work. We speak to them, we cooperate with them, we are good friends, I hope, but for various reasons it is just a very distinct set of data which doesn't fit with the gTLD model perfectly. So, there are some issues why that's difficult, but thank you for the question.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, India. Thank you, Nick. I have the European Commission next.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Good morning. It's Gemma Carolillo from the European Commission for the record. I was going to ask the same question from our colleague from India. I will refrain. Thank you for the answer. I would just like to add a small comment that the registration data request system, it's a request system. So, in a way, perhaps to be considered that this is not a disclosure system, so accessing to this system would perhaps

facilitate life for the requesters in reaching the ccTLDs, but then the disclosure would still depend on the practices that the ccTLD adopt. And then I also have a question, but please, if you want to react to this first.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, I was just going to say we have a forward-looking work programme and actually the next topic for discussion is the intersection between registration data and accuracy and quality of registration data and abuse mitigation. So, this is actually one of the things that is actually next on our agenda for discussion. So, I just wanted to point that out, but please ask the question.

GEMMA CAROLILLO: Thank you. So, the question relates to the encouraging results that you have shown as regarding the decreasing trends of DNS abuse in ccTLDs. And also, I understand the spreading of practices related to the use of emerging technologies, such as AI to improve detection and mitigation. We had the session with the Contracted Parties House, and we have also discussed some parts of the struggles in mitigating DNS abuse. I was wondering, is there any process in place to socialise good practices in terms of addressing DNS abuse between the ccTLD community and the gTLD community?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: We work very closely with the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group. I think we all understand that it's fantastic that abuse is low in ccTLDs,

but that's no good for our communities if the abuse just moves to different places. So, we want to remove abuse everywhere. So, we have a strong, I think, strategic interest for the protection of our own communities wherever we are to reduce abuse across the board. And we do cooperate very closely with the gTLD registries. Actually, my organisation, we operate gTLD registries as well as the ccTLD. So, we obviously integrate those practices. So I think more work to be done, but we completely understand the point. Over to Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Nick. If I may, I just wanted to add to that to say that, in fact, the current intention is that at the next ICANN meeting in Seattle, there will be the first of what we hope will be a continuing series of registry meetings where gTLD and ccTLD registries will meet together and talk about all sorts of different things, one of which, of course, will be DNS abuse. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Chris. I have the government of Netherlands and then the USA. Please keep it short and sweet as we only have two or three more minutes. Go ahead, please.

ALISA HEAVER:

Thank you. This is Alisa Heaver for the record. And thank you for the very interesting presentation. I was wondering, do you see a correlation between active participants in the ccNSO, so active ccTLD registries, and the respondents to this survey? As well, if I understood it correctly,

approximately you had 100 respondents of 57 registries. So at least two-thirds of the ccTLDs have not responded to the survey. I'm wondering, is there any correlation between participation?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

There absolutely is. Antarctica does not participate in the ccNSO and they did not respond to the survey. But I was encouraged that all the largest ones in terms of volume were certainly there. But yes, it's only a sample of people who responded to the survey. It's not the whole data set. And I think that's a very important point. But very pleasingly, everybody who participates in these will contribute to the survey and be part of the discussion.

NICOLAS CABALLERO:

Thank you, Nick. And I have the USA and then we need to close the queue. US, go ahead, please.

OWEN FLETCHER:

Thanks. Hi, this is Owen Fletcher from the USA. Thanks for this session. We would support continued GAC engagement with the ccNSO to identify issues of mutual interest. And we welcome our incoming GAC liaison in taking up the role, which we think will be helpful as we look forward to receiving more reports on the ongoing work of the ccNSO.

We're also encouraged about the work of the ccNSO Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. We think it's a valuable step to improve stakeholders' awareness and understanding of existing policy and guidance and

practices related to ccTLDs. We look forward to more discussions about that and any identified gaps. On this question about any possible interest from ccTLD operators in the RDRS, which obviously is not something that's been done yet, and if any operators were interested, I suspect would be on an individual basis rather than something the ccNSO as a whole were to consider.

You mentioned limitations related to some national considerations such as data privacy laws or others. Could you also help us understand if there are technical limitations that might need to be overcome or would possibly prevent any operators if they weren't interested in exploring this idea voluntarily?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

There certainly are technical limitations. Some registries do not collect at all the same datasets, what you're talking about the RDRS. Some registries only require an email address and not a physical address. There's a lot of use of proxy services, which obviously make the whole point of registration data a lot more complex.

In terms of the actual technical systems, so I've got a Peter on my left here from Germany. Germany has a very special registry. It's one of the largest ones and one of the most successful ones, but the technical implementation and life cycle of domains and the interface between registries and registrars is completely different from most other registries. And quite a few registries in the ccTLD world, for example, do not use registrars at all. You register directly with the registry. So, the way that the datasets are collected and managed are incredibly diverse

and that's a huge challenge if you're trying to standardize something like the RDRS.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you, US, for the question. Thank you, Nick, for the answer. We need to wrap up the session. A couple of housekeeping details before you go. Next session will be the community session in the Uxudar. That is the primary. Sorry, my Turkish is not very good. The primary ballroom, I understand, one or two floors down or one floor down.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Same floor down. I'm sorry. Where the opening ceremony was. That's one thing. And the other thing I wanted to share with you at this point is that we'll be giving the results of the GAG vice chair elections this afternoon in this room at 13:15. So, we'll keep the mystery till 13:15. Thank you so much to Peter, Chris, Jordan, Nick, and of course, Alejandra and the whole team.

ALEJANDA REYNOSO: Thank you for having us.

NICOLAS CABALLERO: Thank you so very much. And thank you to the new points of contact, Ian and Sean. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]