COPENHAGEN – GAC Public Safety Working Group Meeting
Saturday, March 11, 2017 – 06:30 to 08:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hello, everybody. We'd like to start the Public Safety Working Group meeting. But I'd like to urge all the GAC members who are here and interested in Public Safety Working Group, if you would please stay behind. It's

Thank you.

We'd like to call the meeting. I'd like to call the topic leads to the front, please.

GAC colleagues, please don't leave. The Public Safety Working Group is an important one. Thank you.

Hello. Good evening, everyone. We're going to get started with the Public Safety Working Group session. So everyone is warmly invited to stay and listen to the session. If you have other business to attend to, we would invite you to leave the room now. Thank you.

All right. Welcome, everyone. My name is Cathrin Bauer-Bulst with the European Commission. And I'm one of the co-chairs of

the Public Safety Working Group of the GAC. My other co-chair is sitting to my right, Alice Munyua.

We would like to start with a brief round of introductions. We realize there's many people still in the room, which is great. And we would just like to do a quick tour for everybody to briefly introduce themselves and their affiliation so that we know who is present.

Alice, would you like to start?

ALICE MUNYUA: Alice Munyua, co-chair Public Safety Working Group, African Union Commission.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Fabien Betremieux, ICANN organization, GAC support.

NICK SHOREY: Nick Shorey, U.K. government.

GIACOMO MAZZONE: Giacomo Mazzone, European Broadcasting Union.

ALEXANDER MOZHAEV: Alexander Mozhaev, .UKRAINE.

EN

GERVAIS GREEN: Gervais Green, FBI.

TEPUA HUNER: Tepua Hunter, Cook Islands.

LILI SUN: Lili Sun, INTERPOL.

BRAD MARDEN: Brad Marden, INTERPOL.

SUBHASH DHAKAL: Subhash Dhakal, Nepal government.

BERTRAND de la CHAPELLE: Hi. Bertrand de la Chapelle, Internet & Jurisdiction.

ADRIAN KOSTER: Adrian Koster, I'm with the Swiss national CERT.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Maxim Alzoba, .MOSCOW.

EN

LEONIDAS SAVVOPOULOS: Leonidas Savvopoulos, Greek minister of Digital Post.   Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Hi. I'm Paul Wilson from APNIC. Thanks.

DIRK BLUE: I'm Dirk Blue with the Drug Enforcement Administration from the U.S.

THOMAS WALDEN: I'm Thomas Walden with the Drug Enforcement Administration.

RITA FORSI: Rita Forsi, Italian government and Italian national CERT.

JIM EMERSON: Jim Emerson, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

JAMES BEARD: James Beard, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

GARY: Hi. Gary Donal (phonetic) with the RCMP.

LINET OYNANDO: Linet Oynando from Kenya.

JOSEPH NZANO: Joseph Nzano, Communications Authority of Kenya.

MICHAEL KATUNDU: Michael Katundu from Kenya.

HECTOR GONZALEZ: Hector Gonzalez from Colombia.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) from Electronic Transactions Development Agency, Thailand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Saying name) Digital Opportunities Foundation from Germany working with the Federal Family Ministry on Children's Rights. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Ashley Heineman, U.S. GAC rep.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm (saying name) I come from Taiwan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...because that's the whole purpose of the exercise. We plan to publish the newsletter three times a year, and we're thinking of doing so immediately before each of the ICANN meetings.

We also have a -- a sort of guide for law enforcement public safety organizations to Internet governance and ICANN insuring. That has been updated to reflect the newest policy development processes and other -- other recent events.

We have printed copies, and they're right here in the front of the room on the first table on the left from your perspective. So if you're interested, please come up and take a copy at any point in time. It gives some general background on why public safety organizations have an interest in participating in Internet governance and ICANN in particular, and also gives an update on some of the positions that the GAC Public Safety Working Group has recommended to the GAC and have been reflected in GAC advice as well as ongoing work in other current policy development processes. And we also hope that you will find this helpful.

We have also started producing, in an effort to ensure greater transparency because not all the GAC can always participate in these meetings, we have started producing a regular activity report to the GAC where we basically provide some highlights of recent PSWG activity for the GAC to be fully aware of everything that happens also between meetings, and to have an opportunity to be updated on our work aside from the regular sessions that we have where we brief the GAC at the face-to-face meetings at the ICANN conferences.

Now with this, let me turn to the working session agenda of today.

So as you've heard -- Fabien, if you could -- sorry.

As you've heard, there's an event to honor the current GAC chair who will be outgoing at the end of the year due to a promotion, and we don't want to cut your opportunities to actually participate in this event. We're going to try to keep this brief. So we're going to aim for about an hour of this session rather than two hours, just so you're aware. And we have slightly shortened the agenda. So what you see now, we have five points that we would hope to cover today. And then points 6 and 7, we have now put sort of on a tentative basis. Those are the ones that, for us at the moment, are the least priority to discuss across the PSWG membership. And we will try to get them today, but if we

don't, if time doesn't allow us to do so, we would come back to them on Tuesday, on Tuesday morning at the second working group session.

So what we plan to cover with you today is an update on abuse...

...mitigation where one of the Hyderabad communique of the GAC on how to better mitigate abuse.

The second point will be an update on the work of the consumer choice and consumer choice review team. The third point will be a brief update on the security framework for registries to respond to security threats. Then we turn to the privacy/proxy services accreditation framework where we're currently looking at the implementation, and then to the Registration Directory Services Review which is a new process that will start soon.

So for the first point, I will turn to Bobby to please give us a brief update on what is happening on abuse mitigation.

BOBBY FLAIM: Thank you, Cathrin.

This is Bobby Flaim from the FBI. In the form of advice to the GAC at the last meeting and the GAC responded to those

questions on February 8th. Sorry, the ICANN responded to those questions.

So just to give you a little history. In 2009, the predecessor of the Public Safety Working Group, which at the time was a group of...

...enforcement agencies provided can accredits registrars and it also addresses part of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement; specifically, the WHOIS, how domain name registrations and the registrants are vetted. And those recommendations actually were put into the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And part of the Annex 1 is follow-up to that. There's still some outstanding provisions that haven't been implemented that we were requesting to see where they are insofar as implementation. And more importantly, we wanted to know how the 2013 was actually implemented. If the effects or the results that we were desiring have actually come to fruition, meaning were -- were there contractual enforcement, how was that working. If there are WHOIS complaints, how were they processed? Is there transparency and accountability with that?

So that was some of the history on the first section. And we'll go into that a little bit more.

And then with the new gTLDs that came out, the GAC had recommendations, specifically consumer safeguards or new gTLD safeguards. And we wanted to follow up on that as well. And those safeguards came out in 2013, so here we are four years later, so we wanted to review that again.

And as I said, what we did as the PSWG with the GAC's endorsement is we had provided a list of questions on basically three topics. So we'll go into that.

Next slide, Fabien.

So obviously what we're trying to do, this is an overall mission insofar as the prevention, the mitigation, and the attribution of abuse on the DNS with domain names. So that has far-reaching consequences for public interest and public safety. Not just for law enforcement, but for consumer groups, security groups, and a lot of others who are interested to ensure the security and stability of the DNS in the Internet, which is really one of the missions of ICANN.

So we as public safety wanted to loop back to some of the GAC advice that we had provided in the past and we wanted to see, as I said, if that was implemented.

So the first piece was actually the registrar related provisions and enforcement. some of the things that we are still concerned

EN

about is the WHOIS, how that's being -- some of the contractual obligations are being enforced, and what ICANN, specifically contract compliance, is doing with that. One of the answers that they did provide is I believe there were 32,000 WHOIS complaints last year. So we were kind of interested insofar as how those complaints are being addressed and what are the ramifications for WHOIS inaccuracies.

Part of the contract says that if the WHOIS inaccuracies are not cured, that would be the basis for de-accreditation. So obviously that's a very extreme penalty, so we wanted to see how -- what ICANN does with those type of -- of contract violations. So that is something we hope to hear more about and to get from ICANN.

Some of the other things more specifically that has not been implemented is the WHOIS specification, which is kind of an annex of the actual 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And one of those provisions which hasn't been implemented is the cross-field validation for addresses. That specifically is to make sure addresses in the WHOIS, they look like they're supposed to according to postal codes and that specific country's, I guess, if you will metric on how a postal code would look insofar as having a street address, having a county, having a state or province, ZIP Code, if that's applicable in that particular country. But obviously for different countries, those

are going to -- those are going to change and those are going to be different. So we wanted to see how that was going.

There have been groups and discussions about this implementation over the past three years, but there has been no concrete provision nor implementation. And I believe ICANN started up the process again in January, which was just a couple of months ago. So that is something that we are interested in and we hope we can follow through and see implementation on that.

Some of the other things with the Registrar Accreditation Agreement that we had put in there and we got answers for was how ICANN trains its registrars and how they're -- how the process of accreditation goes when they accredit a registrar. In other words, how they're doing that vetting.

So we will -- those are some of the questions. We did get some answers. But the answers that were provided, some of them were not specific and didn't answer the questions in full. So we went back as the PSWG and analyzed the answers and are requesting more information from ICANN. That actually has already been provided. The analysis, the PSWG analysis has been provided to the GAC. So that is something that we will discuss and see how we move forward with that.

The second topic -- oh, if you could just -- yeah, the second topic is the registry provisions. One particular provision that was in the 2013 GAC communique was for registries to report...

...look to see what the reports look like because that was not provided in ICANN's response. So we are interested how that's done, and to also see the efficacy of that. To see if we are achieving...

...process as well.

The third part of the Annex 1, because Annex 1 was broken up into three parts, deals with anti-abuse activities of ICANN itself.

Back and requested more information. So that was -- that was section 3.

So next slide, please, Fabien.

So what are we proposing to do at this point as the GAC? Because we are supposed to...

...one of the other things that we are considering or thinking about is ICANN has new gTLD auction proceeds. I believe it's approximately $500 million. So there is a working group now and there are some policy discussions on how that money could be spent. And one of the things I think would be beneficial as the PSWG and the GAC is to look into how that money might be used for DNS abuse mitigation. That could be, you know, for addressing child exploitation issues as they arise in the DNS. It could be helping registrars and registries, because we know some of the provisions that are out there, especially in the contractual provisions, do cost money to actually do the due diligence. How could that money possibly be used to encourage or help and assist registrars and registries, if that's a possibility?

So those were some of the things that we were thinking are -- of, excuse me, for GAC advice when we -- when we go forward.

So I think I will end there. I think I covered most of the major points. And if there's any questions, by all means.

Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Bobby. Are there any questions to Bobby on any of this?

Okay. If there are no questions right now, then, Bobby, perhaps you want to take us through the -- through the plans for the cross-community working session still.

BOBBY FLAIM: Sure. Thank you.

So on Monday at...

...session which will deal specifically with DNS abuse mitigation. And the purpose of this is to kind of move into the next phase with DNS abuse mitigation. ICANN is now independent. It's post-IANA, post-U.S. government. And I think there will be a greater obligation for ICANN as an independent body to maybe do a little bit more introspection on how this is going to be handled since they're on their own. So we're hoping that in turning this new page with this new session that we're going to have on Monday, we can address some of those things.

So we're going to have a panel of -- actually it's not going to be a panel. It's going to be presentations. We are specifically not having a panel because we want more open community dialogue. So we're going to have Greg Aaron from the Anti-Phishing Working Group speak. We've heard that 2016 was actually a banner year for phishing, which obviously is not a

good thing. So we're going to hear about that and maybe some of the things that can be done in mitigation of that.

We have Craig Schwartz who represents .BANK and .INSURANCE and the Verified Top-Level Domain Consortium and what they're doing in abuse mitigation, on what some of their due diligence policies are, and preventative measures to ensure that their namespace is clean and free from DNS abuse.

And then more importantly, we have David Conrad who is the CTO of ICANN right now, and he's in charge of the security and stability team at ICANN which handles a lot of the security threats. So we would be very interested to hear pursuant to the Annex 1 how ICANN security is actually independently looking at security threats that are on the DNS. The security team is actually quite robust. I don't know if I would say robust, but it's sizable and it is trying to address or look at some of the abuse issues on the DNS, which I think would be good for everyone as kind of a -- a way to foster greater security and also be in line with the mission of ICANN.

The last person that we have as a speaker is Maguy Serad who is in charge of ICANN contractual compliance. As I stated earlier, some of the answers that we had received to the Annex 1 didn't quite pinpoint some of the issues that we were trying to reach.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

And that maybe our own fault in how we address some of the questions. So this will be a good opportunity...

...complaints. What they do about them and how that is -- how that is recorded and what can be provided to the community to ensure that transparency and accountability.

So we have that coming up on Monday at 13:45, 1:45 p.m. It's an hour and 15 minute session. Cathrin and myself will be hosting that. We hope to see all of you there and we hope it's going to be a very good and robust discussion of all the things that pertain to DNS abuse. And more importantly, we're hoping to get to a next stage as we had a DNS abuse high-interest topic session at the last meeting which was very, very good. We had registrars, registries. It was very cross-community. So we're hoping to build upon that. And the purpose of this is maybe to come up with more specific objectives in how we -- how we treat DNS abuse. And we hope to get some good -- good feedback from the community.

So thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Bobby. And we're very much looking forward to seeing all of you there. We think this will really be a

great way of moving from the policy considerations that we covered at the last ICANN meeting in Hyderabad to very concrete examples of what has worked, what perhaps is not working perfectly, and also to hear from other parts of the community on what they see as the needs and requirements in terms of effective abuse mitigation.

So please all come. It's right after the lunch break on Monday. And there's not much else on the agenda, so you have no excuse.

[Laughter]

Thank you very much, Bobby.

I would now turn it over to Laureen for an update of the CCT review team.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Cathrin. I'm Laureen Kapin. I'm an attorney with the United States Federal Trade Commission and I focus on consumer protection issues. And I wear a couple of different hats in the ICANN community. I'm a member of the public safety working group and I'm also serving on the review team that's looking at competition, consumer choice, and, for our purposes, safeguards and consumer trust. So I'm going to give a high-level overview, but I also want to invite everyone to come to the public forum tomorrow to -- tomorrow morning at 9:00, I

believe, where you will be able to hear a much more detailed presentation about the preliminary report which has just come out. And I know that was circulated on the PSWG list, but that came out on March 7th. And I urge you all to -- to read it. If you don't want to read all hundred-plus pages of it, there is an executive summary. There's a list of recommendations. And there will be these presentations. So there's all sorts of modalities for you to gather information about that. And of course I know all the members of the review team, including myself, would be delighted to chat with you.

There's also a public comment period that I want to focus your attention on, to the extent you support, have improvements, disagree, have any input whatsoever on this preliminary report, we urge you to get your feedback to us in writing via this public comment process which will close at the end of April.

So with that said, I'm going to launch into sort of an overview of the report, focusing on the consumer trust and safeguards issue.

So these are some of the -- the findings that has informed some of the recommendations we're giving. Regarding consumer trust, what we observed through two surveys that were taken by the Neilsen group of both consumer and users, folks like you and I, and registrants, was that there hasn't been a huge impact on

consumer trust; i.e., there has been no indication that trust has diminished after the launch of the new gTLDs.

In terms of more specific findings, what we found is the public has a link between how much they trust a gTLD and how familiar they are were that gTLD, how aware they are of that gTLD and the reputation of that gTLD.

And also these are all things that we're all concerned about in this room. The adoption of security measures. Folks are concerned about getting ripped off. They're concerned about their information being stolen.

--- as to protect their information. That leads to more trust also.

But what we did observe is that we could use even more information -- we as a community, we as a review team -- on why consumers trust gTLDs. And for new gTLDs, in particular, what we saw

--- about trust.

One of the things we're going to be recommending --- in general. Why do people go -- behavioral indications do we have that we can study about trust in new gTLDs; i.e, are consumers providing personal financial information or health information to, say, a dot com more than a -- more than a new gTLD? So questions like that we think could be delved into even more to

provide some guidance and insight about this whole issue of trust and why the public trusts new gTLDs.

Regarding safeguards, switching to the safeguards, the new gTLD program implemented a host of new safeguards that didn't exist before. And that, in and of itself, is certainly an improvement over the status quo.

But, even though there are a slew of safeguards that have been implemented, there isn't a whole lot of information about what impact these safeguards have had on the public and the entities that are tasked with enforcing these safeguards. So one of the things we're recommending -- and, in fact, one of the things we're doing as a review team, is collecting data that focuses particularly on DNS abuse, trying to look for correlations of levels of DNS abuse in legacy gTLDs compared to new gTLDs. And another one of our key recommendations is aimed at getting more transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints reported to ICANN compliance.

ICANN compliance actually does a great job providing a lot of information to the community. They have a lot of reports that are regularly available. But we think they could be even more effective by providing more specific information about the subject matter of their complaints.

So, for example, there is a category of complaints that's labeled abuse. But we don't know what kind of abuse. Is it a theft of personal information? Is it someone who has been stolen from? Is it an IP issue? There's a whole lot of specificity that we could actually gain a lot of information and insights about if ICANN systemically tracked information about subject matter and then reported that out to the community. So those are some of the high-level issues that we've identified.

Next slide, please.

I'm going to go over the rest of the slides more briefly, because I don't want to -- I don't want you to hear the same thing tomorrow morning, because I know you'll all be there.

But, just regarding the trust issues, for example, I do want you to know that we did focus very carefully on these Nielsen surveys to inform our findings.

And one thing that I didn't mention in my previous discussion that I want to highlight is that there was a correlation found between registration restrictions and trusts. And that relates to another issue that I'll discuss briefly, which is the sensitive regulated and highly regulated gTLDs. Those gTLDs, like in regulated industries, for example like charities, like pharmacies, banks -- those types of industries have certain regulated requirements. And, when the surveys asked the public what do

you expect in terms of registration restrictions for various types of non-generic gTLDs and, if there are restrictions, would that increase your level of trust, there were affirmative responses. And those responses actually improved -- well, not improved. But the percentages increased between 2015 and 2016. Next slide.

So there were several recommendations that came out of our -- that came out of our focus on the consumer trust issues. And there are three of them on this slide. Two of them are studies to really look into why people visit new gTLDs and why. And the last one we have this existing consumer end user and registrant study. But that's a baseline. And we would hope that that would be repeated. So, as our experience with new gTLDs grows, we can measure how things are changing. And then the recommendation in the center really focuses on trying to create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations.

And this isn't a mandate. This is really a recommendation to think about how can we raise the bar? How can we raise the playing field to meet user expectations about the safety and security of their sensitive information for one example?

Next slide, please.

For DNS abuse, we were specifically tasked with looking at the issue of DNS abuse. And we looked at the safeguards related to DNS abuse. And what we were struck by is that there isn't any comprehensive study that really tries to delve into the baseline measure of abuse rates in new gTLDs compared to legacy gTLDs. And this really builds on a lot of the work that the PSWG is doing in this very ICANN meeting by focusing on DNS abuse.

So one of the things that we're doing is launching this study to serve as a baseline. And my colleague Drew Bagley will talk more about the specifics of this study tomorrow morning.

Next slide, please. I'm going to skip to the next slide. Great.

Moving on to safeguards.

As I said, there were a whole slew of safeguards. And we looked at the goals of each safeguard, how it was implemented and then tried to highlight certain issues. It would be too lengthy for me to go through all the different analyses we went through in our report. But two highlights are the recommendations that arose out of our look at WHOIS safeguards and the safeguards in sensitive regulated, and highly regulated strings.

Next slide, please.

I'm not going to go through this in detail. But what I will say is that there is an ICANN initiative that has been focusing on

studying WHOIS accuracy. And WHOIS, in general, is one of the largest complaint categories that ICANN receives complaints about.

And our observation is it would be very helpful to know what type of complaints specifically are forming this large body of WHOIS complaints; i.e., are these complaints about accuracy, or are they complaints about something else? If they're complaints about accuracy, is it about syntax? Is it about operability? Is it about identity? And, if we have that information, we can make more informed goals about the ARS project, which right now does not include identity. But, if it turns out, for example, that there are a lot of complaints about identity, that might be information that's relevant to the ICANN ARS project in deciding whether or not to pursue that next phase.

Next slide, please.

For sensitive and highly regulated strings, again, there's a recognition for those safeguards that those safeguards have higher risks to the public.

And so there were safeguards focusing on complying with applicable laws, which there are a range of and also a very specific recommendation about treating sensitive information in a secure way.

COPENHAGEN – GAC Public Safety Working Group Meeting

EN

Next slide.

So here this specifically is the safeguard issue that really led to our recommendation about more transparency for ICANN consumer complaints. If you're going to have a safeguard that says comply with the laws explicitly, these types of laws, then it would be very helpful to know, when ICANN receives complaints, what type of law violation is being complained about. And, if there's an obligation to protect sensitive information, it would be helpful to know if there are complaints about that.

Next slide, please.

And for highly regulated strings, these perhaps are the most sensitive area where there is a high level of trust that consumers expect. If I see a .ACCOUNTANT or a .MORTGAGE, I may think that I'm dealing with an actual accountant or mortgage company. It's perfectly fine to give my account or financial information over to them. So these have the very highest levels of trust.

Next slide, please

So our recommendation is to make sure that the actual safeguards that are in place are being enforced. And there's a safeguard requiring registrants to say that they possess the necessary credentials to operate in these gTLDs. So we're

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

recommending that there's actually some audit mechanism to make sure that registrars and resellers offering these gTLDs are complying. And, when I say "audit," I'm not saying that everyone should be audited. I'm saying there should be an assessment to get a sense of whether the safeguard is actually being complied with and also other recommendations that we have are looking at the level of complaints regarding this particular topic. Next slide.

For public interest commitments, my colleague Drew will be speaking more about this. But for this area, there was a recognition for the review team that was actually very hard to even figure out all the different public interest commitments that exist and then compare them to one another just because of the way that ICANN collects this information. So one of our threshold recommendations is make this easier for the community to look at all the public interest commitments together and be able to compare one another. Because, when we engaged in that exercise, it actually was quite challenging.

Next slide, please.

So our recommendations talk about improving the accessibility of the public's ability to get information on the public interest commitments and also a recognition that there should be an

obligation for gTLD applicants to state what goal they had in mind when they included their public interest commitments.

Also we were sensitive about timing. The last round of public interest commitments happened rather late in the process. There was a recognition that, if these were going to be required, there should be sufficient time for everyone to consider them, including the community.

Next slide, please.

That's it! But wait, there's more! And you can hear more tomorrow in detail. I encourage you to come to our session. And, if you have any questions, please feel free to approach me or any of my colleagues. Thanks.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Do you have a question?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, quick question. In the course of the work, did you experience some sort of typology or taxonomy or different types of abuse that can be used more generally in discussions?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm not sure I understand your question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: When you talk about abuses, there are many different types of abuses. It can be abuses of the DNS itself , things like phishing, malware or so. Or it can be other things that are related to the nature of the content. It can be the fact that the person doesn't have authorization to run this kind of business.

Have you established some sort of taxonomy?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We haven't established a taxonomy. But for the DNS abuse study itself, we did attach that to the contractual requirements which prohibit very specific types of abuses, for example, phishing, malware, command and control, those sorts of issues.

So we really tried to keep our focus on the actual safeguards as they were implemented into the contracts.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, please. I'm sorry, can I ask you to introduce yourself for the record.

JAIFA MEZHER: I'm Jaifa Mezher. I'm the GAC representative of Colombia. And I have a question.

Do you know if there are policies or procedures to limit or what are the policies or procedures that limit the IP abuse, the intellectual property abuse?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's actually a fairly big question. And my colleague, David Taylor, focused on a lot of the rights protection mechanisms that are in place. But I can tell you there are very specific contractual requirements which prohibit IP abuse in various forms. And those are in the contract. I know there's also been a lot of discussion in the community about how robustly those are enforced or not.

But for the simple question are there prohibitions in the ICANN contracts against IP abuse, the answer is certainly yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Maxim.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Also a question about the slide with the contents and, yeah, the goal to bring names closer to the contents.

Two slides --

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I'm trying to find that for you. So that's going to be slide 4.

Yeah? Yes?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you consider spam to be the kind of content you want to avoid?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So your question doesn't connect to this slide in my mind. So I'm going to talk to your question and then tell you what is intended by this slide.

So, certainly, spam is a type of -- is one of the levels of DNS abuse that our study is going to attempt to track. Because spam could certainly be a gateway, and often is, to phishing and other types of abusive behavior.

In terms of this create incentives, this really, in terms of context, relates to our consumer trust findings and also expectations that the Nielsen survey found between consumers' expectation that the name of a gTLD is going to relate to its content. So, if you have a .PHOTOS gTLD, you would expect to see photos or photo-related material in that gTLD, not a gTLD about typewriters.

So this has nothing to do with spam. I hope that answers both your questions.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Thanks for the answer.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: All right. In view of time, I would propose that we now do three really quick updates on ongoing policy processes. And we can continue discussion on these and other topics at our next working group session.

So, for the first of the three quick updates, on the security framework, I would now give the floor to Iranga.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: Thanks, Cathrin. So we will briefly go over this. For those of you who aren't aware, we've been working with the registry operator community to create a framework on how the registry community can respond to security threats. We've gone back and forth about three or four times, and I think we've made really good progress. I'm very optimistic on it. And I think -- we had a meeting this morning. And I think both sides are pretty close. The document has been pared down significantly. So it's just a few pages.

To give a brief outline, it starts with -- we're going to get into this in more detail tomorrow I believe at 11:00. There's a PSWG

session. So for those members who want to look at the paper and comment and work on it, please join us.

But we have a brief overview and a scoping and the definition paragraph that tells what the document is and isn't trying to achieve. And then we lay out a number of categories with which registrars can respond that are mutually acceptable and mutually agreed upon general practice type things.

Then we go into some recommendations in terms of how they can respond, what criteria to use, and some mutually beneficial best practices in terms of how to categorize and respond to those so that both parties are clearly communicating with each other and mitigating abuse in the best way possible.

But, like I said, I won't go into the content of the document as much because we can discuss that tomorrow.

What I will go into is the -- the process. So, like I said, the two sides are pretty close. I think we can aim to have some sort of text that we can agree upon by the end of this meeting, and then cognizant of the GAC, we want to bring it to the GAC for -- for GAC approval prior to public comment, notwithstanding any other processes that I may or may not know about. But to the best of our understanding, we're hoping to bring it to the GAC, get it looked at and then passed through. I don't know if that would be possible at this meeting or afterwards, but either way, getting

it through the GAC and then, after that, putting it out for public comment. And then, of course, following any edits and amendments following public comment, one last review by the GAC, and then moving forward in that way if possible.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Iranga. And let me just remind everyone, the documents have been circulated by the PSWG mailing list, and we're going to make these slides available online, as with all ICANN materials. And you see that there's a number of further links to find more background on this process where we stand at the moment so that you can actively participate in the discussion on Tuesday and also tomorrow.

Please please go ahead.

IRANGA KAHANGAMA: And so the registrar -- the registry community is also meeting tomorrow morning, and they are going to be sending, if they make any, edits to us so that we can have the most updated version. So I will be sure to pass that around once I receive it, and that will be the working copy for tomorrow's meeting and going forward.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Iranga.

Now I propose that we turn very briefly to the current status quo on the privacy/proxy services accreditation.

Nick.

NICK SHOREY: Thank you.

So privacy/proxy services enable registrants of domain names to use replacement data in the WHOIS database.

The final policy recommendations developed by the community for the accreditation of these services contain several elements of concern to the GAC, and we raise this in our advice to the ICANN Board in 2016.

These included issues of jurisdiction and the confidentiality of law enforcement requests.

In response, the ICANN Board has asked us to resolve these issues in the implementation of this policy. We have several GAC representatives who are members of the Implementation Review Team who asked the Public Safety Working Group to develop a proposal for a disclosure framework in which these outstanding issues would be resolved.

So we -- we've got a -- we've got a small team now within the -- within the PSWG. Small but perfectly formed. And we've been reviewing the PDP final recommendations alongside guidance by the IRT who have recommended the intellectual property disclosure framework as a template for us to work from.

We've looked at this and agreed areas that a law enforcement framework would need to cover. Areas of compatibility and incompatibility. And we started to develop a draft document which I shared with the Public Safety Working Group mailing list this morning.

I updated the IRT on our progress during a meeting today. They've encouraged us to work as quickly as possible. They have a very tight timeline. But I think we're taking good progress already. So I'm confident that that will continue.

As regards next steps, I've shared that document on the mailing list. We're continuing to discuss it within our little team, but I'd encourage everyone here to take a look at that and share your comments back to us.

Ideally, if you can, before our meeting on Tuesday so we can get a lively debate going, if you're not on the PSWG mailing list, come and find me or drop me an email, and I can share that with you. And then ideally, we might have something to -- to share with the GAC on Tuesday. We'll see how we go. But the

objective is to get this proposal to the IRT as soon as possible so we can debate it in earnest with them and hopefully resolve these issues.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much, Nick.

The final point we want to provide you with a brief update on is the Registration Directory Services Review which is about to start. Some of you may know this under the WHOIS review label. So now we've moved from calling things WHOIS to calling them Registration Directory Services, but really we're still talking about the same thing.

The first of the these was reviews was -- and it was a report that was published in 2012, and the reviews should take place every five years.

What is the purpose? Why are we doing this especially at a time when a lot of policy processes are looking at how we can improve the current system?

So the rationale behind this is that given how complex and complicated the system, it's very likely that we will still be working under the current framework for quite some time to come. And so it's extremely important to also look at how things work under the current framework and to make some further

recommendations as the whole environment as evolved, also to the ongoing policy development processes on what lessons can still be learned from the work ongoing under the previous framework.

So just on the process, there was a call for volunteers for the GAC. Three members of the Public Safety Working Group have put their names in the hats: Thomas Walden, Lili Sun and me. And we were officially appointed by the GAC recently.

Now, I already mentioned there is a lot of work going on on RDS in general, and for those reasons and also for a general concern about the workload of all of the community in the context of all these different parallel processes, a suggestion was made to limit the scope of this review exercise and really to focus on a postmortem of the 2012 report to assess whether the recommendations that were made in that context had been implemented.

However, this raised some concern across all parts of the community because it was felt that just looking at the implementation or not of those recommendations was not sufficient to really assess how things worked within the current framework. And so there were several suggestions to ICANN to not limit the scope of this review; notably, from the GAC and also from the GNSO, which advanced a detailed alternative proposal

on issues of concern that they suggest that this review process should look at.

Next slide, please.

So what was decided now and what we would really appreciate your input on, not today but going forward, is going to be the first task of the review team to define the scope of the review. So instead of having a mandate that's already set out ready to go for the review team as it starts its work, the first task of the review team will be to consider the scope of this exercise.

And some elements this should be considered in this context are listed here. There's also further elements in the GNSO's scope proposal which we find very helpful.

Now, since we won't really have time to go into this today, what I would encourage you to do is to take a look at -- at this and at other -- at the elements of the GNSO's scope proposal, and for us to have a discussion on this on Tuesday because we would be very interested in your views on what the scope of the RDS review should be going forward.

The GAC has already said that it should not be limited, but we can still put forward more specific recommendations as to what exactly should be included that we on behalf of the GAC could advocate for as the RDS review team starts its work.

We also need to lack at how we ensure full involvement of the GAC and full information to the GAC at all points of the process. And there we would really like to learn from other processes such as the CCT review team to see how we can best keep the GAC involved.

And for this, we have also put it on our list for discussion with the GAC plenary to make sure that we have the full input from the GAC on this going forward.

And with this, I would propose that we now skip to the very last slide and come to the other points on Tuesday.

So for you to -- Do you want to just go to the last slide which has the agenda for Tuesday. Yeah.

So this is not the end of it. There will be another opportunity to meet with -- with all of us this following Tuesday at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday. We have an hour session where we will cover the points that we didn't conclude on today, but also three additional very important points on child protection, on the new gTLD subsequent rounds and very importantly, also on defining a strategy for the Public Safety Working Group going forward.

There is a certain feeling, I think, now in many parts of the community that we're extremely event driven and that there's so many ongoing processes that we're just running after work to

be done but not really setting any agenda of our own. And in this, we are conscious of the need not to lose sight of the overarching goals that the GAC has set for this working group, which is really to ensure that public safety interests are taken into account in policy-making. And there we should make sure that we have a strategic approach rather than running after each event. So that's going to be part of the discussion on Tuesday as we hope.

I see with great pleasure that all of the documents that we brought as introduction to ICANN for law enforcement have already been taken. So I just want to remind you that these and all other documents that were mentioned in this session are available online on the Public Safety Working Group part of the GAC page. So I encourage you, if you didn't get a paper copy, to consult them there. Also, if you want to take a look at our newsletter or at the update that we provided to the GAC, or get more information on the processes that were mentioned today.

The second quick note. We mentioned the Public Safety Working Group list today several times. If you're not yet a member of the group, we would encourage you if you're interested to contact your national GAC and to get yourself nominated to become a member of the group. We would welcome your participation, and then you would have access also to all the documents that are shared through the mailing

list. And as a very final point for my side, Alice and I would very much like to thank all the topic leads for the extremely important work that they're doing and all the time they're investing. And last but not least, our excellent support, Fabien, who is really doing a legendary task of supporting our work.

Thank you to all of you.

Alice, would you like to say?

ALICE MUNYUA: And I'd like to thank you for having chaired this meeting very effectively and efficiently. It's good for me to at least rest and just simply listen. But I want to reemphasize once again the very important issue of diversity that the GAC in general has been discussing and is engaged and quite keen to ensure that we see a level -- a certain level of diversity, even at the working group level.   While the GAC is one of the most diverse advisory committees I think within the ICANN ecosystem, I think we need to see that reflected in our working groups, and specifically the Public Safety Working Group.

So I would like to urge all of you, especially those from underserved regions, region countries, to please nominate your law enforcement agency's members and representatives to the Public Safety Working Group.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

We had a very successful capacity-building session in Nairobi where we had about 15 or so law enforcement agencies from the Africa region, and I'm hoping that most of them are probably going to be joining and will be joined, for example, by the South African police from tomorrow. But I think I'd like to see more, we'd like to see more from underserved regions' law enforcement agencies so that we can see a great level of diversity in this working group.

So thank you again, Cathrin, for chairing, and thank you, everybody. Good evening.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much. And just to underscore this last very important point that Alice has made. The newsletter is really also designed to enable those of you who cannot participate on a regular basis to stay up-to-date with the work and to identify key opportunities for participation also between sessions or instead of sessions. So we really hope that this will also enable those communities that cannot be present on a permanent basis in these meetings as they move around the world to participate actively in the work of this group, which we believe is really important.

So to close, we would like to thank you very much for the time you've taken out of your evenings to be here with us, and we will

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

very much welcome you at the next session on Tuesday morning and at the cross-community session on Monday after lunchtime, and at the many other opportunities that we will have to provide the GAC with more information on the Public Safety Working Group work during the course of this week.

So thank you, and enjoy your evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]