ICANN82 | CF – ccNSO: DNS Abuse Standing Committee Session
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 PST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom.

On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you. And with that I will now hand the floor over to Nick Wenban-Smith, Chair of the DASC. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Thank you, Claudia, and thank you everybody for joining and welcome. Today is Saturday 8th of March and this is the in-person hybrid meeting of the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee. So

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.

the agenda is on the screen. I hope if you're joining online you can see the agenda as well. It looks like there's lots of things on the agenda, but I hope some of them are going to be quite quick to get through. In terms of managing the time for the session, if there are any other items of any other business or anything else that anybody wants to introduce into the meeting, then now would be a good time to let me know so that I can manage the time appropriately. So good.

Like I always say in my welcoming comments that this shouldn't be a monologue of Nick lecturing you about DNS abuse and all the things that CCs are doing about it, and how we're better than everybody else. I do prefer it when there's more voices in the room. And I genuinely think that in terms of governance models, a committee of one is good for some things but it's not good for things where it's a community collaboration effort. So it's very nice to see a lot of old faces and fellow members of the task, and it's nice to see some new faces in the room as well. It's a very open and inclusive, if we're allowed to say that in America these days.

Process. So it genuinely is supposed to be welcoming to everybody from whichever part of the community they come from. Any questions about the agenda? Seeing none. Okay. Administrative matters, any statements of interest updates? Seeing none.

So just moving on then to the real meat of the session. You'll see that I've taken the liberty of quite grandly putting in the title, that this is about strategy and planning. And I just wanted to spend a minute just looking at the context of what we've done over the past

two years. So the DASC was set up in 2022, and we've had two full years of existence. And we're looking forward now to the next sort of 6, 12, 18 months and what we're planning to do. So there's a sort of a waterfall of further activities and intersessional things coming up of high interest and relevance to our community and to carry on the work. To do that, I think it's useful, especially for people who have not been with us on the journey for the whole two years, just to remind ourselves of some of the things that we've done.

In particular, the first DNS abuse survey showed that a lot of ccTLDs had a surprisingly low level of awareness about the amount of abuse that was taking place within ccTLD. So in order to address that we had a dedicated session on the different methodologies and tools and free sources of resource to help ccTLDs do that. When we repeated the survey questions two years later, it was really nice to see that the number of ccTLDs which had responded, we don't know was sharply down, and the number of ccTLDs, which we do know when it's very low levels of abuse was sharply up. So that was a nice piece of work to do.

So tools to track abuse. I think as I've said many times, and it's nice to have some of my GNSO friends in here as well, in terms of abuse threat actors are agnostic as to whether the vector is a gTLD or a ccTLD. So trying to work together on the same way front and share information with the gTLD registries, I think, is a very useful thing, and especially in terms of standardization of policies and contract amendments. What's happening in there is something that all ccTLDs should be mindful of. So that's a little bit about the past.

We've tried to, and I think been quite successful doing some of that stuff.

So if we move forward on the slides, I think it comes to the review. So I must admit I'm embarrassed, but I didn't realize this, but in the ccNSO intersessional standing committees and working groups, there is a review process. So every two years each of our subcommittees is supposed to be reviewed by the ccNSO council to decide whether or not it has a continuing purpose to the community. I strongly support this sort of initiative in the sense that I see a lot of activities in ICANN where it's very easy to start them and very difficult to stop them once they're up and going. And one of the things I repeatedly say is that volunteer resource is one of the most limited and important constraints we have on our work. So let's not waste our time on things which don't have a continuing purpose.

I've put up on the screen the headline findings. So although you may not have been aware of it if you were at the meeting in Istanbul, in November, but that was part of our review. So three council members who don't participate in the DASC came in and interviewed a number of attendees at our sessions, interviewed me and Bruce.

So broadly speaking it was a positive outcome from the review. As you can see, participants generally felt their input was well received. Lots of information sharing one of the core objectives in our scope and in terms of references around engagement and knowledge sharing in terms of best practice. So, that was very

pleasing to read, significant interest in going more involved, more information on specific topics. And I think AI mitigation is something which has obviously developed a lot in the last two years. So that's something that we should do some more work on.

We deliberately didn't get into spending too much time on a ccNSO definition of DNS abuse because lots of other work has been done in other parts of the community in terms of. There's an ICANN accepted definition of DNS abuse, DNS Abuse being with a capital A and a defined term. And given that each of the ccTLDs works in its own national law and jurisdiction, we could spend a lot of time looking over the detailed definitions of what compromises DNS abuse in one jurisdiction versus another. But I'm not sure whether that is, apart from the intellectual satisfaction, a very useful exercise to conduct. But basically overall a positive experience and some ideas identified for improvement. So I've moved on the next slide.

Met the objectives for high levels of engagement and collaboration. So these are the areas for improvement and that's around more data analysis tools, which I think is an interesting thing. Workload distribution. I think there's a common theme across lots of ICANN's areas of work. It's a small number of individuals who seem to be doing most of the heavy lifting. So we should try to share that out a bit better. Diversity outreach is again something that is always a challenge, but I you said, in general terms the group is well aligned with its mission and goals and viewed positively.

So in terms of the recommendations next slide. So the review team recommended to the council to continue as respondents overwhelmingly support the continuation. So, this is where it gets interesting, and I'll be interested to see what the thoughts of my fellow members of the DASC are and any other community input. So to enhance its future impact, the working group could explore new goals such as addressing broader threats or expanding outreach to diverse communities.

And it's this point about broader threats. This is because there's been a number of when it touches on the definition of DNS abuse, do we feel that we are strictly within our mandate to just deal with DNS abuse as defined in the ICANN role of phishing, malware, and spam as a vector, the usual classical definition, or would we look at more broader harms on the internet, for example child abuse material, for example financial fraud and cryptocurrency scams, and that sort of stuff. Because that's been suggested to me a number of times. I think has some merit.

So that actually came through in the review recommendations, that we could maybe expand our horizons a bit more. So, just want people to just think about that a little bit. And be more flexible about our description to improve stakeholder understanding, consider redefining objections to align with emerging challenges and opportunities. And that's why on one of the previous slides I highlighted the reference to AI.

So let's just move on to the next slide. There for everybody's reference, is the link to the review, and also a link to our existing terms of reference. Next slide.

So when I was thinking about what should we be talking about in our planning and strategy, this is a planning and strategy meeting after all, should we look at things more broadly? Is it confusing because everybody has a very clear understanding in the ICANN world what DNS abuse is and should be, or more importantly what it shouldn't be?

So I was wondering about if we're going to have a more expansive view about online harms more generally, is it confusing to remain calling ourselves as the DNS abuse standing committee. We could just be the abuse standing committee, the ASC, not the DASC. Or should we be more expansive in terms of like an online harms standing committee, OHSC. Anyway, I know. This is one of my favorite things about ICANN, is that people come up with acronym and then reverse engineer their subcommittee name into it. So I've done a really bad job of that, but we could do a better job of coming up with an amusing acronym.

And I like things in threes. So my third thought on this was actually the DNS abuse system. Such a lot of good work, you see the positive feedback in the review, the recommendations. You know, don't change, the brand is good, but we could, as a starting point to this more expansive look at the bad things on the internet, perhaps explore some online harms which have a high correlation with the technical abuses, say fraud, financial scams,

cryptocurrency scams, that type of thing. I think there's a high interest within lots of ccTLD around.

Our national legislation and governments are very concerned about child protection, and in particular child sexual abuse material being available online. They expect industry to fully do its part to mitigate that. It is not at all in the definition of DNS abuse, because it's not phishing malware, but it's obviously an online harm. It is 100% content. So that's an area where, particularly within the gTLD world, because of ICANN's doctrinal legal position on the bylaws state that they can't interfere on the sort of content side of things. But as you know, ccTLD like Prometheus Unbound, we don't really care about that sort of distinction around content. And if it's a harm and we don't want it associated with our ccTLD, then we don't feel ourselves constrained by that sort of content, non-content division. So, what do people think? Sir?

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Yeah, this is Abdalmonem Galila for the record. Yeah, first question for me, are we talking about domestic abuse service center, or direct air support center, or another term related to DASC itself with military knowledge. So the third one should be out of the game, out of the game. The second one, online harm standards committee, actually, there are a lot of types other than DASC abuse to harm standards committee, so the second one is out of the game. Abuse standards committee, what type of abuse we are talking about? Out of the game.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Thank you for that refreshing and candid input. I mean, where I did agree with you is in relation to online harms. Online harms is a huge topic, so I felt that that is too broad, and I would like to focus on areas of high importance and relevance, and I think to be over broad is unhelpful, potentially, was what I thought. David?

DAVID MCAULEY

Thanks, Nick. David McAuley speaking for the Record. So, just a preliminary observation, since I was the chair of our only subcommittee, I might ask us to consider starting a new one, the malicious URL standard committee, the MUSK. But apart from that, so on looking at it, I think these are our valid thoughts, but I think we should be very cautious. And remember, we should recall how the committee was formed by the council, by the ccNSO itself. And the discussions about concern, will we be morphing over to policy kind of things or best practices, and we assure the community, no, we're not interested in that. What we are about is helping people understand DNS abuse and come to grips with it and address it.

So if, as we move on, I think we need to be equally cautious and take some time to internally discuss what we want to do. And then go to the council and say, we're thinking along these lines, and I think we should base that on having succeeded as we have, largely, in our original mission. But also, as we do that, I think we should look out at the community, because there are discussions starting on online harms. That's a huge topic, as you just said, and I think

what we want to do is make sure that what we're doing is helpful to the community at large, the ICANN at large, as well as the ccNSO, to which it will be directed.

But let's take account of what's happening elsewhere on online harms and just check it in. So, to me, this is a great idea to discuss this, but it's not something I think we would do just, flat out be done with it. I think it will take us a couple of meetings, a couple of times at least, to discuss this and to get our arms and heads around it. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's very wise, council, and as the primary drafter of the terms of reference, it did take a bit of time to get people over the line to agree the terms of reference, to have a fairly narrow remit, as you say, to exclude policy. But I just don't want us to miss a trick. I think one of the beneficial things, if we want to blow our own trumpet, is this has had a very high impact, this committee. So, if there's more that we could do, which other parts of the community find hard to do for various reasons, then maybe that's a low-hanging fruit in terms of this slightly broadening area of scope. Bruce, you've been uncharacteristically quiet.

BRUCE TONKIN: I think my view is we should preserve the term DNS abuse to align with, I guess, the ICANN contractual definition, which is around sort of phishing, farming, etc. And I think because of that particular term, looking at the title of the committee that's broader than just

that defined term of DNS abuse, I think, is useful. But I think it's also helpful to still anchor it in domain names. In other words, we're not just talking about what's going on in social media or someone doing a TikTok video or something. So, maybe it's domain name harms standing committee or something, or harms facilitated by domain names. I realize it's a bit long, but I'm just trying to anchor it in domain names, but just go a little bit broader than the definition of DNS abuse.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: No, thank you. And it's never too late. So, if we want to do our own TikTok, then why not? Lara, you can be our social media outreach. Okay, cool. Are there any other thoughts? Bart, do you want to say something? Your wisdom, tell us not to do something.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think I'm more in Bruce's camp, say anchor it. I think that's the critical term, anchor it somewhere. And whether you call it DASC or keep it DASC, it's fine. And be very aware that, say, you're talking about the scope of, I would say, the areas you are dealing with, not in your remit of actions. Your remit of actions is very limited. As you said, it's not about defining policy. And that was not the suggestion.

This is really, if you go back to the review report, it's really about the topics that you research, share information, do not touch your other area or the other part of the scope is what type of activities you undertake. You're not developing policy. So, that's out of the

question. I think that's a good point as well. And why not? Look, I'm a great fan of keeping the name DASC, however you define it, get rid of DNS abuse, and it will emerge what it will mean at one point. It's like framework of interpretation. It's one of those, it has its certain meaning at this point. But when it started, when the group started, nobody knew what it meant.

So, call it DASC. And it has this anchoring with DNS or domain names. And that's it. And everything around it. And that makes it easier and just evolve. I think going back to the review team, what it wanted to avoid is that you would stick to, it wanted to broaden your scope a little bit, as you did and as you could see in the results of the survey. And why not refract it and be very clear about it in say, in attracting new people and the topics you want to share with the community.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Yeah, these are all very valid observations. It was just interesting, particularly having presented the surveys twice now, looking at one of the open-ended questions in the survey is, what do you consider to be abuse or DNS abuse? And criminality and online harms frequently came up. Child sexual abuse material invariably came up as being something that ccTLDs considered to be an abuse of the DNS. So, it's just one of these sort of interesting points, I guess.

I think one of the nice things about not having to go through sort of policy creation is that it gives us a lot more latitude in terms of what we discuss. And we can give things a good listening to and an airing

of perspectives and share knowledge and resources without being too worried about policy implications, because that's always left to the ccTLDs individually to decide. But we try to empower them through community discussion and resources so that collectively the standards can be raised across the whole globe. Cool.

Oh, sorry. It's very hard with the layout. It's pretty good for the people in there, but not so good for the people next to me. So, go on, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. I strongly believe that keeping the name is a good way to go about it. Not only because the DNS Abuse Standing Committee, we could also be the domain abuse standing committee. But at the end of the day, it's related to what we're doing and what is mostly intrinsic to us as TLD operators, ccTLD operators. So, I like to support Bart's expressions, and I think it would save us a lot of time and energy in that. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I think that's also a very valid point, because you can spend a lot of time arguing about names and stuff. And actually, I'm much more interested in the substance. Are there any more voices?

OLGA CAVALLI: Very briefly, Olga Cavalli, for the record. Plus one to Bart and Pablo comments. So, it's easy.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. I think that's--

FERNANDO ESPANA Fernando Espana. Yeah, I believe that DASC has a strong brand in itself. So, changing it would be harmful, I think. And maybe we go like the way that the streaming services providers go, and we go DASC Plus.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH That's a great idea. I love that. I love that. And also, I quite like the idea of putting a non-ASCII character into our name. We should get an idea in there somewhere as well. Maybe a little Enya somewhere. Cool. Are there any more from anyone? Okay, so we move to-- Oh, sorry, go on.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yes, finally, I agree that I need to add my voice to Bart and Pablo. As I tried to formulate other names away from DASC, and I found the same abbreviation for these names, we'll find another abbreviation for other category or other industry. So, I think it's better to keep it as it is, DASC, and go ahead and not waste a lot of time on that. Otherwise, we could use some AIs to predict something.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Should have just got some AI to do that. Yeah. Anyway. Cool. Right. Are there any more comments? That's a really good discussion. So, thank you very much. That's great. Okay, next up.

So, in ICANN81 Istanbul, we did a referendum, which I'm not a big fan of coming from the United Kingdom. However, I accepted the result, even though I didn't vote for the winning option. And data validation. So, the intersection between data validation, the data fields that registries collect, what they do when they collect the data, the verification of the data to ensure that it is current and stays accurate, was the number one pick. So, on Wednesday, that is the session that we are running.

And it's going to be actually, I have to slightly eat my own words in that actually, I thought this is a really tedious topic, because data quality and personal data stuff in ICANN is just like everybody's talked about it for years. And it's the same old discussion. But actually, it's going to be a very interesting session on Wednesday, when we talk about the intersection between good data quality and prevention, and tackling DNS abuse.

So, slightly unhelpfully, in terms of the other topics, which were considered, it was pretty close. You can see 18, 16, 16, 17, in terms of future work. Because I'm thinking next Wednesday session is done and dusted, that is in the bag and going to be brilliant. But it's not very long now to the Prague meeting. And then, like I said, I want to be continually planning going forwards. So, this is just a reminder that we did have an unscientific referendum in Istanbul around what people wanted to talk about.

Some of these suggestions actually come from the first DNS abuse survey in 2022, collaboration with registrars and governance models. Compliance models has come into the frame relatively late, I think. Just for context, when we were looking at the DNS abuse clauses in the gTLD contracts for the contracts with ICANN accredited registrars to act promptly on actionable reports of DNS abuse. And the point was made, actually, it was made by me. I made the point that it's all very well in gTLD world, because gTLDs pay a vast amount of money to ICANN, and ICAN has got a big compliance team who enforce those clauses.

But if ccTLD adopt clauses, then that brings sharply into focus. Well, it's all very good to have the words in the contract, but who's going to do the compliance and enforcement, because some ccTLD are very small and not very well resourced. So, actually, you're just moving the problem from one place to another, potentially. So, that's just a reminder. Are we doing another poll next? Yeah

So, this is where it becomes a bit more interactive, and you need to have a sort of device getting ready. You can tell I'm a bit jet-lagged. I'm not really with it today. So, this is quite fun, isn't it? You can send a little thumbs up on your phone. Okay. Don't get too excited. How are people finding signing up to get onto the Mentimeter?

BART BOSWINKEL 13 have signed up.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

It's a bit like asking who isn't here, isn't it? Cool. 15. Is anyone here or online want a couple more minutes to do the thing? I know it's not super easy to do for the first time. Do you want to just go back one slide? Because I think we went through that quite quickly. So, I put up here some suggestions, but there's also free text in the bottom. So, if you can think of something else.

By the way, this question, I think, I wanted to have the conversation about the name and the remit and the breadth of mission in advance of having the vote because some of these are a bit of an expansion on domain name stuff. But if when you're casting your votes, you can take my assurance that whichever one of these things that we go, there will be an element of being anchored in the domain name because I've taken that feedback strongly to heart. So okay, cryptocurrency scams, but it will be obviously from the context and from the domain name and DNS system. So, just take it in that spirit.

That's probably enough time. Shall we do the thing? By the way, I'll be very cross if each of these gets the same number of votes. I want to see a clear winner. Oh, my God. Sorry. So, in your device, you can up vote and down vote things. You click on the thing, Bruce. Yes, exactly. I think you can probably change as well. Well, this is better than TikTok, right? I don't know if gambling answer that because people like gambling or because they hate gambling. Yeah, please put the speaker on and introduce yourself.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA Okay.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH For the record, introduce yourself.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA I'm Jaijit Bhattacharya. I'm from New Delhi. And just a clarification, because gambling, there's something called real money in games. And that's RNG gaming. And sometimes if it's not a game of skill, there's a distinguishing between whether it's a game of skill or a game of chance. If it's a game of chance, then that's gambling. But it's a very thin distinguishing between the two. And just wanted clarification on that, because it's perfectly legitimate to have real money gaming, which is a game of skill.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH So, thank you for the question. I think it's a good question. I think when we're talking about gambling in this context of DNS abuse, we're talking about criminal activity and illegal gambling. So, things which fall into, say, a regulatory regime that would be activities, however you define them, that require to be regulated or are criminal if unregulated. I think that's probably the context.

BRUCE TONKIN I don't know who suggested it. I think the challenge is that the laws of gambling vary very much country to country. But I think broadly what you're saying is it's illegal somewhere in the world.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA Yeah. Sorry, just closing on that point. Absolutely what you're saying, it becomes on which jurisdiction we're talking about. In some jurisdiction, everything is legal. So, do we have the rights to dictate over the jurisdiction of each area? So, that'll be a sovereignty issue.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH I think it's partly why it's probably ranked quite low for that exact problem. But if in nine ICANN meetings time we have to deal with that problem, then this is one I'm happy to postpone. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Pablo Rodriguez from the registry at PR. I have a question regarding cryptocurrency scams. Isn't that a subtopic of fraud and financial crime?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Yes. I mean, it certainly could be. I guess it came up as a suggestion as a subtopic or sub-division of fraud and financial crime, which was a particular concern. I think it was from the Nigerian online regulator. Cryptocurrency was their number one pressing issue in that ccTLD. So, that's why I just thought it was interesting.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yeah, Abdalmonem again. Actually, gambling is just one more. You could have auction. For example, it is regulated. For example, for

Egypt, we have auction to sell telephone numbers, the block codes of telephone number, the license, the number at the license of your car. It's a lot of money. So, gambling maybe could be behind fraud and financial crime as well. With all its sections, auctions, assets.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH I think that's right. Good catch. Bart, did you want to say something?

BART BOSWINKEL Yes, I think if you look at the number of votes, you've got 21 people voting. I think this is a clear and nice, I would say, top three or maybe top four even around topics you may want to work on in the next year. I think that's the basic thinking. Because some will emerge again. Some will get merged into others. I think this really sets your dance cards for the next year. So, don't get too hung up about the last ones because you will revisit this again in a year's time.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. Cool. So, thank you very much, everybody. I think we nailed the methodology to avoid the situation that there's a lot of-- No here exactly. Thank you. That's nice. Yeah, I'm liking the color. So, AI and fraud and financial crime. Good. Got it. Thank you. We will take that away. Thank you, everybody. Good. So, what have we next? Okay.

So, we've got through our discussion pretty quickly. And in terms of any other business, we were lucky enough to have a good illustration of the perils of rebranding. It used to be called—I don't recall what it used to be called. It used to be called DNS Abuse Institute and now it's called NetBeacon Institute. So, there's a little bit of an update from Rowena, which is one slide. We're going to go back to that. We're going to go back to the slide on the NetBeacon and Rowena can give us a couple of minutes on it.

JOKE BRAEKEN Yeah, sure. I can do that. Just to let you know that we skipped a few agenda items.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Oh. Why? Is that because the slides are in the wrong order or is this a Chaz error?

JOKE BRAEKEN I don't know.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Okay. But thanks for a reminder. If you hold on for a moment, Rowena. What time of the day it is in the UK. Not even that late. So, in terms of planning going forwards, so I think we've got session ideas for ICANNs 83 and 84. So, thank you very much. That's good. We will, as a committee, think about what an engaging session on

AI and engaging session on fraud and financial crime type things would be.

Actually, if anybody wants to say anything about what they would consider to be good sessions on those or any ideas, feel very free just to shout out now, as we've got a few minutes, or feel very free just to drop me an email or anybody you want. Like I said, it's a very open and collaborative session of work. So, any ideas on that, then feel free to shout out or drop me a note.

So, item number six, call for volunteers. We will put out a public call for more volunteers. You saw from the review recommendations that more people want to get involved. It's been a very successful initiative and that the workload in terms of running the committee could be better shared out. So, well, let's do that then and have more call for volunteers. So, if anybody actually wants to join the committee. Staff, help me. Does the committee have to be comprised of people from a ccTLD, or could anybody who wanted to join do it?

BART BOSWINKEL I think as members, you need to be ccTLD related, but you'd have room for other participants, observers. So, that's easier.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. All right. So, roll up and pick your poster if the task needs you. Do you want to say something, Alan? Yeah, sure.

ALAN WOODS

Alan was from CleanDNS, so not ccTLD, but just in relation to the planning, it just occurred to me that two things on the AI topic that I think you probably could think of. The first one is the use of AI in monitoring. Specifically, the difference between inference and evidence is something that's very topical. So, I think that's something that could be very interesting for you. And then secondary is obviously the use of AI in abuse itself.

So the generation, the faster generation of abuse, but also something that if you're talking about expanding beyond the concept of online harms or beyond DNS abuse and thinking of online harms would be the use of AI in faking non-consensual indecent imagery is something that is pretty topical within the community at the moment. Of course, use of AI in child sexual abuse material, as well as another one that is intriguing and could be an interesting conversation piece, at least. So, just throwing it out there because they occurred to me.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

No, thanks, Alan. I don't think AI touches everything, doesn't it? So, as you say, in terms of generating abuse, of carrying out abuse, of generating fake ID, which someone was talking to me about earlier, and then also mitigating and tools to combat abuse. I think there's lots of different potential facets. I suppose that's because it's such a big subject as well as thinking where maybe we should have a talk about what do people think would look like a good, what it could look like in that context.

BART BOSWINKEL Cool. And maybe that's a topic for your first meeting, let's say, at the end of March, because after, between now and Prague, it's only, I would say, three, four meetings of the DASC.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Yeah, no, exactly. And I think, given that we just had the conversation and the vote, like, well, people who chose AI must have had a reason for choosing AI. So, while it's fresh in mind, let's hear some thoughts from people in the room while we're in the room, which is always a bit nicer to do it in the room.

BART BOSWINKEL If you really, say, made it your major priority, could you indicate why you think it is an interesting topic for the first upcoming meeting, AI? Because it's very general, as you just said. And if you go ahead, the gentleman over there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER Yes, I also chose AI as the top topic. And I guess, to your point, AI cuts across all of this. Whether it's financial crime or gambling or illegal marketplaces in general. A lot AI is being used these days to fast track the creation of that content. The second thing I chose was financial fraud, because most of the things that people are misled into online is pretty much using, trying to get money from their pockets or wallets or cards in one way or the other. Whether

it's even the marketplaces or direct scams. So, I think that's also a big topic we should definitely be discussing.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Right, that's great input. Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL Maybe somebody else? Yes.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA Just stepping back on the list of abuse that was mentioned. Essentially, abuse is targeted towards either people or infrastructure. People abuse is based on either financial or on dignity, where there is fake news about people, and associated harassment. Now, everything else, which is AI or gambling and so on, are associated with these two buckets. And then there's the infrastructure part, which is harming infrastructure through DNS abuse, where we need to get into specific examples of how that happens. So, that's where my submission is, that it's largely these three buckets we're talking about. Everything else is a tool of how these three are executed.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH That's great, thank you.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Thank you very much. Actually, I start by AI. Actually, AI in all things, even at your home, if you are going to buy a refrigerator, at

least use AI technologies. Your car, future car, will have a lot of sensors. It is AI. It means that AI, for me, it's considered for the future technologies as well, M2M, IoT, whatever. Second one is related to financial scam, financial fraud for financial. Actually, as I am working for one of the big projects inside the telecom operator of Egypt related to the auctions. So, I try to find how could the client abuse or the company abuse the system and have this price in a lost bay and scam all of this. That's why I selected the second option related to currencies and fraud.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ One of the things that I like of Alan's proposal is that we should focus also in looking for ideas on how to protect ourselves from fraud and other types of abuses using AI. We hear much too often in the many ways that AI is being used to abuse technology or abuse the dignity and the financial interests of people, but very little have we listened to, have we hear of examples of how can we use AI to protect ourselves. And I think there are plenty of opportunities to explore that. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL Maybe one more final round. Anybody who wants to--

NICK WENBAN-SMITH I can see David's hand up, so I was just making a note of that.

DAVID MCAULEY Thanks, Nick. David McCauley again for the record. Just as background information on the fraud and financial scams, I want to mention, and I'll put a link in the chat, that The Economist had major coverage of this in their February 6th edition. It's breathtaking the size of online scams. So, I'll put a link in there. I think Economist has a paywall, but there's access you can get at libraries or maybe from friends, that kind of thing. But I'll put a link in. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH My mother is a professional economist, and we've got stacks of them lying around. So, that's good input there. And I'm just interested on the fraud and financial crimes and the views that were expressed in terms of anchoring in the domain name system. I have taken that on board, but has anyone got any other thoughts? Because things like quite often a fraud or financial crime, which is conducted using DNS, starts off with a phishing domain name, right? So, that's quite similar to the workshop on phishing sort of thing, but that was slightly lower down the preferences list. But do you think some sort of case study of a phishing fraud type thing, and then the user journey from the threat actor or from the victim's perspective would be interesting, or any thoughts? Brian?

BRIAN BECKHAM

Thank you, Nick. Brian Beckham from WIPO. I think use studies cases, those are always very useful for people to understand sometimes what is a bit of policy jargon in a tangible way. But what I was actually going to suggest, I thought there may have been a place to add your own suggestion in the survey, but since there wasn't, I will offer one, which I've asked about before, and I understand it may be a little bit of a work in progress.

But what I think could be useful is, it's great, whether it's in the contracting party space or in the private sector or in the ccNSO, to see the different things that are being done to mitigate different types of abuse without getting into definitions and that sort of thing. But what could be useful is to catalogue and document publicly all of that information somewhere, because I suspect there's a lot of good information being deployed that might not be always front of mind for other people who want to be engaged in the space, but don't maybe know where to start or who to talk to.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Can you give me an example?

BRIAN BECKHAM

So like for example, at the Hamburg meeting you had a presentation from, I think the .NL and the .BE people. In the Istanbul meeting you had a presentation from the host ccTLD, in those instances, they were kind of algorithmic approaches to identifying certain types of abusive registrations before they were able to be deployed by bad actors. Those are just examples, but it

might be that somebody else in a different space would have need or utility to use the same type of tools that were being deployed by the Belgians or the Dutch, and to be able to find out, is it something that I can use? Who can I talk to about developing that on my end or partnering with? But just a rising tide, lift, saw, ship type of information sharing.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. We have a very young Dutchman to respond.

BART BOSWINKEL It's one of the things that maybe that's something to look at. I don't know if you're aware, but this group maintains a library of all kinds of material. And if you think there is interesting material missing, please send us a note and we'll add it. David is the chair of that subgroup, and they're looking for material and it's available for everybody. So there is this activity specifically by the Dutch of building a library of that kind or repository of that kind of material. So it's captured for now and for future use.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Bruce, did you?

BRUCE TONKIN I just wanted to comment just on your financial scams. I think they've evolved a lot from the old-style phishing attack. So the old-style phishing attack was a website that basically looks exactly the same as the bank. But I think there's been a lot of training, if you

like. I know certainly most of us probably run training for our staff around being able to identify phishing and that kind of thing. Whereas the financial fraud is actually generally a bit more sophisticated. So it's not a copy of the bank website. It's basically a deal that's too good to be true. If the interest rates are 5%, I've got a bank deposit for 50%, and people are sort of taking those up.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA Just one more clarification. Just taking up on the point on the economist where there's a paywall, there are also websites which allows you to access that material despite the paywall, which is a copyright violation, which is actually allowed in a few other countries. So again, it comes back to the jurisdictional issue. So a clearer definition of what is abuse would be helpful. I know I'm going to the woods, but I think that would need clarification as we move forward.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Thank you. Thank you very much. David. By the way, I should have said at the beginning of the meeting, but I'm requiring everybody to say something. So you need to think of something to say pretty quick because I'm going to pick on you if you've not said anything interesting so far.

DAVID MCAULEY Thanks. David McCauley again for the record. I just want to pick up on what Bart said. We have an existing library that he mentioned to Brian. And I'm always looking for a chance to advertise it, market

it, just for everybody in the room. You don't have to be part of the ccNSO to do this. Send us information and we'll post it. I will, in the chat, put a link to the email address to which you can send that. But we're always interested. We'll take a look. You don't want to make sure we're not getting scammed ourselves, but we will post good stuff. Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

That would be ironic. Yeah. Not in an Alanis Morissette sort of way. Cool. So let's move on to the AOB on NetBeacon. And in fact, I've checked the slides and there was a slight error on my part in the order in which the slides are. So it's not that we left things off the agenda. It's just I misnumbered the agenda. So my fault. So if we can move on to slide 12 on my version. 13. Okay.

ROWENA SHOO

Thank you very much. It's Rowena Shoo from the NetBeacon Institute for the record, formerly the DNS Abuse Institute. We changed our name for a number of reasons, but here we are. I won't go into that.

So I just wanted to talk to everybody about one of our services, which is called NetBeacon Reporter. This is something that we introduced a few years ago, focusing on gTLDs at the time. And the idea was that putting out good quality abuse reports to multiple parties at any given time is something that's pretty tricky. If you're trying to report DNS abuse, you need a little bit of industry knowledge to figure out who the registrar is, navigate their own

reporting system, and that's not particularly scalable or helpful a lot of the time.

And on the other side, the registrars that were receiving reports were getting things that were duplicative, not necessarily for them, not having enough evidence. And so we built Reporter to sit in between these two entities. And we focused on gTLDs because they were much easier to find. gTLD registrars had to have abuse reporting emails. And so it was quite easy to do that. But there are a number of challenges around how to reach ccTLDs.

And as we engaged with ccTLDs on this topic, it became quite clear that the best, most sensible approach to quickly integrating ccTLDs would be just to send the reports to the registry. And then the registry could decide what was appropriate for their jurisdiction. That might be managing the report themselves, it might be referring it to their registrars, or it might be sending it to local law enforcement. It's really up to them.

So I'm really here today to tell you that we have this service to integrate ccTLDs. We have quickly grown to about 32 partners, which I've put on the slide. In my rough estimate, that's about 60% of the ecosystem. But I would love to get us to 100%. The volume is probably going to be really, really low for most of you. And integration is quite easy. You can provide an email address, preferably one that isn't spam filtered, because there's going to be domains that are bad going through it. Or you can connect with an API if you prefer. But as I said, the volume is fairly low, so that might not be justified to begin with.

But all of this is completely free. We hope the reports are in a format that you find helpful. Talk to the people that are already on board, perhaps. I see Nick nodding, which is reassuring. But yeah, I'd love to integrate as many of you as possible. So please do reach out or come talk to me. Thanks. Happy to answer any questions.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Rowena. And thank you for the free resources that you provide to the ccTLD community. Much appreciated. Any questions about this service and how to? Yes. Oh, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. This is Pablo Rodriguez from the registry.pr. To become a member, is it as simple as sending an email to this netbeacon.org/ccTLD-partners?

ROWENA SHOO: Yeah, exactly. Or you can just come tell me where you want the report sent and I can integrate you right now. I should say the Institute is part of Public Interest Registry, so we're funded via PIR. So there's no cost to anybody. Just agree to receive reports and off you go.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. Any more? So there is a little bit about any other business, which I forgot to mention in the beginning, which if we move to the next slide, we'll be. Oh, sorry. Oh, please come. Oh,

	can you use this? Otherwise, we can hear you probably in the room, but people online can't hear.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER	I'm from the .cv TLD. I wanted to ask if the API is available to anyone, because I checked the website and I couldn't find a link to the API. Thank you.
ROWENA SHOO	Yes, we can talk with you and give it to you. We just haven't had anybody from the CC community use it yet to receive reports. So come talk to me after.
NICK WENBAN-SMITH	Because we have so little abuse that it's not really worth it. Yeah.
JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA	Do you need any help in getting more countries on board? I see obviously a lot of countries missing. So especially South Asia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh.
ROWENA SHOO	Yes, please tell your friends.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH It's an important thing, right? So it's free and it's easy. So someone else is doing all of our homework for us. So we should say thank you and accept. Oh, please.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Last one. Actually, I don't know if it is IDN ccTLD here for Taiwan. It's IDN ccTLD. Or it is ASCII or just name this one. Second one is that I didn't see, I think 1% from these countries are only from Asia Pacific and Arab countries. So we need to look for what are the challenges for Asia Pacific and Arab countries in order to join this program.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH I think that's a really good observation here. And it came in through a little bit in the review findings around diversity and the lack of diversity. I don't think we're, by the way, the only part of the community which is finding that difficult, but it's a very good observation that, yeah, there's sectors which are heavily underrepresented and that's not right.

Good. So I think we've got sounds like a handful of signups. So in terms of the next slide. This is my, any other business I forgot to mention in the beginning, but I'm going to call on Bob actually, because we've tried doing some rotation meetings because I'm really grateful that you turn up to our meetings when there are three, four in the morning, your time in Asia Pacific. And we have done some rotational meeting times. We're quite lucky in the sense that, well, you're unlucky, but you've got me as your chair, but

we're lucky that Bruce is in the Asia Pacific region so that we can actually equitably handle out the management of these meetings in a way which is very inclusive in terms of the time zone things.

So we have tried that since Istanbul and we intend to try doing it going forwards. But before we put the times of these meetings in against the dates, which the meetings are set for, just wanted to get a bit of a feedback from people about, how's it going from staff? Does it impact on the number of attendees to these meetings? How's it going? At the moment we do, I've done it a number of different ways. I've done it in various PDPs where you rotate the time zone through six hours.

So there's four different meeting times, or you can rotate it through eight hours. So you get three different meeting times during the day. But for this one, we're doing it two times. So it's either at three, four in the morning for me, or three, four in the afternoon. But that seemed to be pretty good and also a little bit less confusing, if I'm honest. But I'd be really interested to find out how members of the DASC are finding it. David and Bob, I wanted to get you on record as well.

DAVID MCAULEY Thanks, Nick. David McCauley for the record. I think it's had a modest impact on attendance, very modest. I think we need to soldier on. It's only fair. And we just need to press on. And I think we will get back to the level where we were and where we need to be. Thanks.

BARBARA PEARSE

Bob Pearce. I think the 3 a.m. and 4 a.m. ones are pretty difficult. If you could arrange them so they were either sort of up to 10 p.m. at night or after 5 a.m. in the morning, that might be more workable because you're not interrupting people's sleep. But otherwise, I'll soldier on and try and get up and participate at three in the morning.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

No, and we're very grateful for people who do cover these meetings at quite antisocial hours. The problem of a globe with different time zones is yet to be solved by AI. But yeah, we will do what we can to try to accommodate preferences and to maximize participation and inclusion. Oh, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

Maybe another question. I think this is specifically for all the members of the group. Say that the DASC has been working with a clear division between two subgroups, say the survey subgroup and the repository subgroup, and then you have the full DASC meetings. Is that something to continue? Because the smaller the group, and I can imagine something, and you see it as well in the prep meetings for ICANN sessions, so these sessions like the one we're going to have this week and probably something like we're going to do in Prague as well, that's most times it's a subgroup.

So it's easier to arrange for subgroups. Is the cadence of a full DASC meeting once a month, is that workable for everybody? Do you

want to maintain this? Because that's probably the most difficult one to organize, where you have the full membership. And we could notice, if you look at the full DASC, a decline in attendance over time.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: My perspective once a month is the right cadence for it, and the other subgroup committees can do things. David, you suffer most from this.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks. David McCaul again. I just want to comment, Bart. I think you make a good point, but with respect to the repository group, and I haven't looked around, I see Fernando's here, but I'm not sure who else is here. With respect to that group, I think we're close to winding down. Nick and Bruce, I think we need to discuss this at some point, and either as we look at what's in the future, we might stand up another subcommittee, if we need, but we are meeting less frequently in this subgroup, and that's probably going to continue, and we'll probably wind it up, if these two initiatives get their forward momentum. Right now, we're in marketing mode. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you. Any other thoughts on meeting cadence? Otherwise, we'll go away and continue, more or less, as is. Just keep an eye on the time. Okay. We're very nearly finished, so that's good, and the next slide you'll see, slightly out of sync, is a call for volunteers. If

anybody's unsure or shy, they can just reach out to me by email or to the ccNSO Secretariat, but please do volunteer.

And finally, this is the pitch for the session on Wednesday afternoon local time. So you'll see here, because the clock's changed tonight, apparently, so it's minus seven hours, not minus eight hours. So just set your alarms a bit earlier. We're looking forward to your 9 a.m. meeting tomorrow. So, yeah, so we're having an interesting deeper dive into the issue of registration data accuracy and the relevance to DNS abuse.

We've got an interesting panel around some presentations from ccTLD and the different approaches to data collection and verification, and then some formal law enforcement, and actually the people who have to deal with lots of different types of registries, gTLD registries, ccTLD registries, different types of data verification. So I've got from a big registrar, Tucows, who has to deal with lots of different types of registries to also give her perspective. So I think it'll be very, I know it's going to be a very interesting and engaging session. Abdal?

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yeah, just a comment. Why you are so serious inside this picture? You are the only one looking serious.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH This is about brand and management, and everybody knows I'm a very serious person. I didn't actually pick the picture, I think is probably my only excuse on that one, and look, with that, I think

we've come to the end of the session. If there's any more comments to say, sorry Rowena.

ROWENA SHOO: Sorry, it's Rowena Shoo for the record. I just forgot to say earlier that in addition to PIR funding the Institute, CleanDNS donated the development work that created NetBeacon Reporter, so I want to recognize their contribution in making that available. Thanks.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, thank you, that's a nice segue. So I'll give you back four minutes of your time unless there's any more business, but thank you very much for your engagement and participation. We've got some really good feedback and interaction, some good steer on the way forward. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]