

Chat Transcript

Plenary Session DNS Abuse: Consideration of the Issues
Tuesday, 20 October 2020 10:30-12:00 CEST

01:07:53 MAEMURA Akinori: Good evening from Tokyo!

01:07:58 Mary Wong: Good luck and have fun, gentlemen!

01:08:05 Elisabeth Behsudi: Hi everyone!

01:08:19 Elisabeth Behsudi: Hi everyone!

01:08:35 Matthew Shears: Hello!

01:08:39 Suzanne Radell: Good morning all

01:09:06 Mary Wong: Hi PANELISTS: Please remember to speak clearly and slowly enough for the interpreters and say your name for the record.

01:09:09 Wafa Dahmani: good morning from Tunisia

01:09:19 Brent Carey: Hi Liz and all from Wellington, New Zealand :)

01:09:27 Maarten Botterman: Hi from Rotterdam

01:09:48 Dickson Chew: Hi from Singapore

01:09:56 Mary Wong: Welcome, everyone, to this second plenary session for ICANN69. Thank you for joining us!

01:10:03 Katarina Gevorgyan: Hi from Armenia

01:10:05 Lori Schulman: Hello from Weilburg, Germany.

01:10:10 Patricio Poblete: Greetings from Santiago de Chile!

01:10:21 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evening from Australia

01:10:22 Lori Schulman: Hello from Weilburg, Germany.

01:10:25 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): TLDR - don't use zoom for anything private

01:10:26 León Felipe Sánchez Ambía: Hello from Mexico!

01:10:38 PTA Ahmed Bakht: Good afternoon from Pakistan

01:11:09 Jorge Cancio: Hallo Thomas!

01:11:14 Svitlana Tkachenko: Hello from Ukraine!

01:11:21 Herb Wayne: Greetings from the Office of the Ombudsman. The Ombuds team is hosting a virtual drop-in office for ICANN69. Details are posted in the "Conversation" forum on the meeting home page. Stay safe and be kind.

01:12:15 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): ICANN + gender diversity = fail yet again

01:12:34 Lori Schulman: @Michele - excellent point. Thanks for raising it.

01:13:00 Maxim Alzoba: @Michele, we all just pixels on the screen now

01:13:05 James Bladel - CPH: Not just gender, our hairstyle and facial hair lacks diversity as well. Thomas, Jeff and I are basically triplets.

01:13:12 Svitlana Tkachenko: @Michele :) good observation

01:13:17 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): You'd swear there wasn't a single non-white male who could speak to this topic

01:13:37 Goran Marby: Agree Michele.

01:13:39 Mary Wong: Hello Michele and Lori - the plenary sessions are organized and led by the community. That said, overall for the three plenaries we do have diversity (geographical, gender, expertise).

01:13:48 James Galvin (Afilias): @michele - sorry about that. wasn't planned but then again we didn't plan it the other way either. my apologies to all.

01:13:57 Jordan Carter: where;s the human rights angle here?

01:14:47 Lori Schulman: @Mary - thanks. On some panels very noticeable. Understand that sometimes it just works out that way but it seems to work out that way a bit more in this space.

01:14:52 Maxim Alzoba: maybe some regional perspective from different regions might be good during a session in some future

01:16:01 Luc Seufer: Michele how dare you prejudge of the panelist gender.

01:16:07 Luc Seufer: S

01:16:17 Mary Wong: @Thomas, apologies, the interpreters are saying you are speaking very quickly and the AirPods are not helping.

01:18:10 Herb Waye: Diversity, equity and inclusion is on my radar, it is good to see it being noticed and discussed in a respectful and positive manner.

01:18:34 Thomas Rickert (eco): Mary, I promise to slow down and have changed to a different headset. I hope this will make things easier for the interpreters and all attendees.

01:19:06 Mary Wong: Thanks Thomas! And thanks, all, for doing the same ;)

01:21:14 Maxim Alzoba: 10 out of more than 1000 RYs?

01:22:17 Philip Corwin: Is there a way to obtain this slide set?

01:22:21 Mary Wong: @Thomas, there are some specific questions for David - did you want to take them after his preso or wait?

01:22:54 Luc Seufer: "It means someone really wanted our initials to spell out "DNSTicker"

01:23:05 Mary Wong: Hi Phil and all - the slide deck for this presentation is available for viewing and download from the Session Description page on the meeting schedule.

01:23:26 Thomas Rickert (eco): Is it ok for me to read questions?

01:23:34 Thomas Rickert (eco): I suggest we take like two and then move on.

01:23:54 Mary Wong: @Thomas, yes, that sounds good. Either you can read or if you prefer Ozan can do it. Just let us know.

01:23:55 Thomas Rickert (eco): I don't want to steal Ozan's thunder

01:24:01 Mary Wong: :)

01:24:07 Lori Schulman: @Maxim - 10 are the worst, most active. I am sure there are more. Scale is an issue.

01:24:16 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): 170 domains is miniscule

01:24:43 Maxim Alzoba: @Lori, without numbers it is just feelings

01:24:45 Lori Schulman: Glad to see the positive action on the Covid names.

01:24:55 Ozan Sahin: So, I will read the questions in the Q&A pod after David's presentation is over. I also note that we have a hand raised.

01:25:15 Lori Schulman: @Maxim - noted.

01:25:41 Chris Lewis-Evans (PSWG): Lori's first question I look to answer in my presentation

01:25:45 Mary Wong: @Ozan @Thomas - I suggest just taking questions via the Q&A pod. Too time consuming sometimes to get attendees to unmute.

01:26:42 Philip Corwin: @Mary--thanks, now I see it

01:28:00 Volker Greimann: real facts vs. felt facts?
01:28:23 Ozan Sahin: Next presenter is Jeff Bedser.
01:29:36 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Lori - if you have data where can we see it?
01:30:44 Mark Svancarek: My interpretation of this data is not that malicious behavior has gone down - it has not - but that it is concentrated into fewer domains. Is that the correct interpretation?
01:31:32 Jeffrey Neuman: All - Please note that the attendees cannot see the Q&A pod questions until a panelist makes those questions / answers viewable
01:31:40 Jeffrey Neuman: I am not sure that panelists know that
01:35:57 Laureen Kapin: @ Jeff -- When I click on the Q and A box (next to Raise Hand), the Questions appear.
01:36:44 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Laureen - yes, but only the ones that are visible
01:36:56 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): there could be 10 more questions that we cannot see
01:38:23 Mary Wong: @Jeff, @Laureen and everyone - we have changed the setting for this session in view of the number of questions. All the questions should be visible now.
01:38:48 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): cool
01:38:50 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): thanks Mary
01:39:40 Maxim Alzoba: actions on a domain have no effect on the content itself (it is still reachable at the same place)
01:40:51 Ozan Sahin: Next speaker is Mason Cole.
01:41:15 Mary Wong: There is ONE question for Jeff.
01:41:26 Ozan Sahin: We have one question for Jeff in the Q&A pod.
01:41:33 Jeffrey Neuman: @Thomas - ONLY Panelists can see the Questions in the Q&A pod at this point
01:41:40 Jorge Cancio: there is a question for Jeff: Jorge Cancio (Sie): for Jeff: is the SSAC report going to advice any policy development effort and/or any update of contractual provisions?
01:41:43 Jeffrey Neuman: Until they are answered and made viewable
01:41:48 Lori Schulman: @Michele - numbers from members have been a challenge, I will admit that. There is reluctance to share brand by brand. It is understandable as it exposes vulnerability of any particular brand. Will keep an eye on this in terms of your request for numbers. I understand the importance of your request but a lot of the data is not yet public. The presentation we just heard is recognizing the issue with brands and I know that there are other studies underway. Perhaps we can dig deeper into that data from these reports to get what you need. We will work on this.
01:42:19 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Lori - sure - it's just from our perspective data is key.
01:42:33 Lori Schulman: @Michele - understand.
01:43:28 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Mason - a lot of the issues are NOT within ICANN's remit so that ask is ridiculous
01:43:31 Lori Schulman: Maybe Mason has some good data points here.

01:43:48 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Also who funded the Interisle thing?

01:43:49 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: I think the good news here, based on David's presentation, is that abuse is going down.

01:43:53 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Interisle* even

01:44:14 Raitme Citterio: @ICANN translate tool in channel spanish is not working

01:44:44 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: Perhaps it is a matter now to recognize the work that is happening and building off of that.

01:44:47 Thomas Rickert (eco): Any chance we can make the unanswered questions visible to all attendees as well and not only the answers?

01:44:58 Brian King (MarkMonitor): Who funded David Conrad's thing?

01:45:00 Susan.Payne Valideus/ComLaude: <COMMENT> Jeff rightly talks about erosion of trust in systems and service providers. There are a small number of the contracted parties, there are individuals who represent these registries and registrars, who are tolerated despite it being widely known that their business models encourage, or certainly do not discourage, domain name abuse. This undermines ICANN's credibility and discourages efforts to improve standards across the board when there are no sanctions for poor behaviour. Let's tackle them. Bring them into compliance or de-accredit them and get them out of ICANN. We need to call out systematic abuse where we see it. <COMMENT>

01:45:10 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Brian - that's from ICANN and you know that

01:45:27 Maxim Alzoba: issues with the bad content are in hosters, ISPs , RIRs remit (it is reachable via IP even without DNS)

01:45:28 Craig Schwartz (.BANK): Anyone have handy the link to the Interisle report? Thanks

01:45:33 michaelgraham: Frankly, David's study contradicts our online brand's experience in which we have seen abuse increase over the past 5 years by a factor of 2 to3.

01:46:06 Maxim Alzoba: does anyone know what proactive means? is it about prediction of the future actions?

01:46:08 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: Nobody is denying that abuse exists, and will continue to exist.

01:46:19 Lori Schulman: @Micheal Graham - thank you for sharing on behalf of your brand. It all helps.

01:46:19 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Craig - <http://www.interisle.net/PhishingLandscape2020.html>

01:46:25 Jeffrey Neuman: Thanks for making all the Questions viewable now :0

01:46:27 Jeffrey Neuman: :)

01:46:29 Craig Schwartz (.BANK): Thank you Michele.

01:46:35 Mary Wong: Hello again everyone, in view of the number of questions, it will be helpful if you can preface your question by naming the presenter you are directing it to. Thank you!

01:47:02 Maxim Alzoba: there is a big difference between bad actors and most popular TLDs

01:47:02 Ozan Sahin: @Thomas - Tech Support Team confirmed that they changed the setting and unanswered questions are visible to all attendees.

01:47:23 Peter Koch: my language skills are probably not sufficient to fully understand 'voluntary'

01:48:10 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: I think the SSAC effort may put a good framework in place to consider the issues in a constructive way and look forward to teasing it out.

01:48:18 Lori Schulman: @Ashley - the DAAR numbers don't seem to comport with reports from my members. I understand that I can't battle the DAAR data point but data point but how different actions are categorized and tracked may not be comporting with reality. Liz's question also alluded to that on the opposite side of the coin.

01:48:20 kristoft Tuyteleers (.be): You have to use the sarcasm disclaimer Peter ;-)

01:48:26 Maxim Alzoba: how to identify a bad actor who did nothing bad yet - it smells like a Minority Report vision of the future

01:48:30 Ozan Sahin: Next speaker is Chris Lewis-Evans.

01:48:30 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: Happy to see stats from your members Lori.

01:48:41 David Conrad: Lori, I'd be very interested in seeing your data.

01:48:46 Justine Chew: +1 to what Mason is saying

01:49:02 Maxim Alzoba: @Lori, sending info to the sources of DAAR might help

01:49:53 Lori Schulman: @David and Ashley - I will make a concerted effort to reach out for data beyond anecdotal data. If I receive it and am allowed to share, I will. We are aligned in the goal to have the problem accurately portrayed.

01:49:57 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: It would be really refreshing if folks could look at this from a constructive perspective. Looking forward to reading more about the SSAC effort.

01:50:20 Lori Schulman: @Maxim - good idea.

01:52:12 Lori Schulman: I want to make the point that I think these talks do have a premise that we are working toward constructive solutions. All sides want to see improved security and trust in the internet. We all win on the security and trust issue. It's not a zero sum game.

01:52:53 Jorge Cancio: +1 Lori

01:52:55 Jeff Bedser (SSAC): @Lori - fully agree

01:53:19 Fabricio Vayra: +1 Lori

01:53:28 David Taylor: QUESTION to David or any of the panelists - Why do we seem to have such a discrepancy between the ICANN data you refer to and other data? For instance, the DNS Abuse in gTLDs Study we commissioned on the CCTRT found "a clear upward trend in the absolute number of phishing and malware domains in new gTLDs." That guided much of our work and recommendation 15 in particular ?

01:53:50 Maxim Alzoba: some items are in ccTLD world

01:54:36 Mary Wong: @David T - please type your question into the Q&A pod so that it can be seen by the panelists. It can be difficult for presenters to keep up with the chat when it moves fast; thanks!

01:55:24 Fabricio Vayra: +1 David T. - even ICANN CIO Ashwin Rangan explicitly stated in an August 5 webinar that DNS abuse has been "increasing dramatically."

01:55:26 Calvin Browne: Hey David, I read it as 'fewer involved Rars & zones, but more absolute numbers"

01:55:42 susankawaguchi: Radix Registry proactively reviews domain name registrations and will place on server hold it appears solely based on terms in the domain name. This prevents use of the domain name that often includes a famous brand and generic terms such as login, verification etc.

01:55:58 Ozan Sahin: @Thomas, it would be very helpful for the interpreters if you could speak a bit slower while reading the questions in the Q&A pod.

01:56:11 Calvin Browne: <but I'd have to look at the slides closely>

01:56:40 Mary Wong: @Thomas, so sorry - the interpreters are still having trouble with your speed and audio :(

01:56:48 Mark Svancarek: @Calvin, I asked a similar Q in the pod, but not answered yet

01:56:49 Goran Marby: Fab: you know that the comment from Ash is taken out of context.

01:57:29 Dean Marks: Radix also embraced Trusted Notifier arrangements for domain names of websites engaged in persistent copyright piracy.

01:57:52 Dean Marks: Donuts did as well.

01:58:44 Victoria.Sheckler: we've found that the type of diligence identified by Radix helps

01:58:54 Jeffrey Neuman: @Fab - thanks for pointing that statement from Ashwin out. ICANN - It is important to have consistent messaging on this issue one way or the other.

01:59:17 susankawaguchi: We are seeing some proactive behaviors by new gTlds and cctlds unfortunately not in legacy golds.

01:59:38 Calvin Browne: Yeah @Mark - David C's response moves away from providing a definitive answer .

01:59:46 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: I think we need to dramatically shift the focus here. Let's move beyond whether or not DNS abuse is SUPER BAD, bad, getting worse, getting better and focus instead on something constructive. I'd be happy to engage in further discussions on work the RrSG is doing to improve things and continue our efforts that are intended to address DNS abuse in areas that we can.

02:00:12 Ozan Sahin: Another question for Chris from Monika Ermert.

02:01:19 Goran Marby: Jeffrey, we have a consistent message an please do not use a comment from Ash without context.

02:01:32 James Galvin (Afilias): +1 Ashley!

02:01:37 Jeffrey Neuman: @Susan - Thanks for pointing out that New gTLDs are not necessarily the problem. It is one of the reasons that the SubPro working group referred the issue of DNS Abuse to the GNSO Council...to address DNS Abuse in a holistic manner and not to necessarily hold the next round hostage.

02:01:43 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: +! @Ashley

02:02:04 Craig Schwartz (.BANK): @Ashley - and critical to this discussion continues to be what registries and registrars can do vs. other Internet stakeholders

(e.g., ISPs, hosting companies) who are mostly outside the ICANN community (from what I can see).

- 02:02:10 Jothan Frakes: +1 @Ashley
- 02:02:16 Kaveh Ranjbar: Wise words Ashley! +1
- 02:02:16 Susan.Payne Valideus/ComLaude: @SusanK: Agree. If we are serious about DNS Abuse, however it is defined, we should start with the legacy TLDs. There were just under 150 million domains in .com in June this year, by far the largest TLD. 75% of UDRPs at WIPO are for .com domains. This needs to be addressed.
- 02:02:39 Kaveh Ranjbar: Wise words Ashley! +1
- 02:02:47 Dean Marks: +1 Susan Payne
- 02:02:52 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: Craig - absolutely!
- 02:03:06 Chris Disspain: Well said Ashley - + 1
- 02:03:18 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, when we discuss proactive measures, we are often referring to predictive analytics such as are used by .EU
https://eurid.eu/media/filer_public/9e/d1/9ed12346-562d-423d-a3a4-bcf89a59f9b4/eutldecosystem.pdf
- 02:03:30 Lori Schulman: @Ashley, your point is taken about focusing on constructive approaches to curb abuse. However, defining the scope of the issue is important in terms of how we perceive the severity of the threats, the actions being taken to address the threats and whether those actions can be tied to seeing a decrease in the trends. If we accept that the DAAR is accurate, why are the trends down?
- 02:04:04 susankawaguchi: There is not much fair use for a domain name that contains login, verification, support and includes a well known brand
- 02:04:13 Lori Schulman: And why are other entities reporting increases?
- 02:04:18 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: Again... happy to have a discussion about stats. We need to see them and make sure we are discussing apples to apples.
- 02:04:30 Brian Cimboric: @Lori - it may be that contracted parties are being more proactive, generally. Particularly with the Framework being in the field a full year now
- 02:04:35 susankawaguchi: Seems like domain names that include these terms could be considered suspect
- 02:04:35 Jorge Cancio: +1 Jonathan... there are similar measures in a number of ccTLDs
- 02:04:44 Lori Schulman: Maybe we need some sort of data summit?
- 02:04:45 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, CcTLDs have no contracts (very few have) with ICANN and in general are setting business practice and can ban domains just using guts feeling (also many supported by governments in it)
- 02:04:58 kristoft Tuyteleers (.be): You don't need to discuss stats, discuss the methodology being used (and be transparent about it)
- 02:05:01 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: But again... focus on data or addressing the problem?
- 02:05:01 Thomas Rickert (eco): I apologise. Thanks for the reminder to slow down
- 02:05:03 Russ Pangborn: Interested in the answer to the question David Taylor raised. There seems to be a disconnect in the data presented here from other sources.

The Microsoft Digital Defense Report (released in September) clearly states that "cybercrime is an ongoing and escalating challenge for both the public and private sectors..." But the suggestion in the data presented today appears to try to tell another story.

02:05:12 Chris Lewis-Evans (PSWG): Monika incase you cant see the QA answer data taken from here : <https://ico.org.uk/action-weve-taken/data-security-incident-trends/>

02:05:27 Lori Schulman: cc's have developed identity verification, trusted notifiers and accessible whois policies.

02:05:29 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Russ - not all cybercrime involves

02:05:30 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): domains

02:05:37 Ashley Heineman - RrSG Chair: I'd actually like to define the problem. :-)

02:05:39 Lori Schulman: The gTLDs could follow if the community agreed.

02:06:14 Maxim Alzoba: if an average TLD uses the idea - you registered a domain, but we do not like it for something with no proof added - it will be a violation of contracts

02:06:26 Jorge Cancio: best practices from ccTLDs could be collected and showcased

02:07:04 Dean Marks: @Jorge: that would be very helpful

02:07:05 Mark Elkins: Innocent Domains/DNS can also be used to hurt others - such as a DNSSEC signed domain to generate well amplified DDOS attacks...

02:07:05 Franck Journoud: @Ashley: I disagree. yes we should discuss solutions to the problem, but detailing the problem itself is not just ok but actually necessary - unless CPs are conceding other stakeholders' view of the problem.

02:07:10 Alex Deacon: @Maxim - do you mean violation of the ToS?

02:07:11 Maxim Alzoba: should there be DNS abuse statistics from ccTLDs too?

02:07:19 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, I guess I look at the .EU example as a step in the right direction, an experiment with promising results. I don't see the importance of their contractual relationship to ICANN. Please explain.

02:07:42 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, do we know the costs for EU - in development and hardware?

02:08:19 Jeff Bedser (SSAC): @Maxim several ccTLD operators have been added to DAAR via OCTO.

02:08:37 Jorge Cancio: James looks indeed very much like Thomas 🤖

02:08:44 Maxim Alzoba: @Alex, there is a chain of contracts ICANN-Registry-Registrar-Registrant (might be a reseller too), breach of a contract without a legal reason- is punishable

02:09:01 Russ Pangborn: @Michele - that still doesn't answer David T's question ...

02:09:05 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, I don't recall that from the study but it's probably public information, no? If it's a funding issue, that's something to address, for sure. I just raise it repeatedly because the results seem promising despite dismissive comments by some about predictive analytics.

02:09:20 susankawaguchi: It would also be helpful if there was a standardized approach to resolving abusive domain names. Currently, you will see the registrations

placed on server hold, client hold, suspended name servers, registrar becomes registrant etc.

02:09:33 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, also we do not know the number of false positives for the EU system

02:10:04 Luc Seufer: .EU is ran by a non profit and the verification they operate is limited to the EU. Doing it on a global scale is a tad harder and the registration fees would explode without actual effects on abuse. See .DK as an example.

02:10:09 Jonathan Zuck: Take a look at the study. Again, it's early stages but it's pretty rigorous.

02:10:41 Brian Cimboric: Susan - that's largely bc they are different tools. Only a Registrar can place "clienthold" - that's a Registrar level suspension. The analogous hold at the Registry level is "Serverhold."

02:10:55 Lori Schulman: INTA's event last fall in Montreal demonstrated the best practices of some of the better known cc's and g

02:10:59 Craig Schwartz (.BANK): Check out the DNS Abuse Framework: 2020 Retrospective at <http://dnsabuseframework.org/dns-abuse-framework-2020-retrospective.html>

02:11:06 Lori Schulman: We will do another in 2021.

02:11:26 Victoria.Sheckler: @lori thanks

02:11:28 Lori Schulman: 2020 plan were side tracked obviously.

02:11:47 Jorge Cancio: @Lori: is that info available? URL?

02:11:53 Jonathan Zuck: Luc. Where can I find out about the .DK experience. I'm unfamiliar with it. Again, if it's a cost thing then perhaps something more generalized could be created?

02:12:48 Jorge Cancio: is Finn around? for .dk

02:12:58 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Ask Peter Larsen or Kristian from Larsen Data

02:13:06 Jorge Cancio: which btw is an inspiration for Switzerland...

02:13:15 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, will skyrocketing price and drastic fall in speed of service delivery be appreciated by the Registrants? (total verification and technical advanced measures without safeguards will lead to it)

02:14:11 Volker Greimann: only 2k? that is quite reasonable

02:14:14 Mark Svancarek: IIRC .DK uses the existing NEMID infrastructure. I don't know if or why that would be expensive

02:14:51 Maxim Alzoba: also I have a feeling that we all see only traces of stupid bad guys, and we do not see smart ones

02:14:58 Luc Seufer: Also in most phishing cases the phishing material wasn't installed by the registrant or the website owner. A third party installed it thanks to an exploit. Having a copy of the registrant ID card won't solve anything.

02:15:46 Ron Geens (.be): Do you have number on that Luc ?

02:15:52 susankawaguchi: @Brian Cimboric, I understand that but suspending a domain name by placing suspended domain name servers on the registration, or doing something else in the background does not let the reporter know that the phishing has been resolved. This results in additional reporting to the registrar.

02:15:58 Lori Schulman: @Jorge, a recording was not posted. That is a lesson learned and will correct the next time. It was the first time we conducted such an event. Turnout was excellent and the dialog was open and collegial.

02:16:15 Michael (SWITCH, Switzerland): @JorgeCancio There are a lot of similarities in the efforts of .ch and .dk, but also some differences. Switzerland's Law fosters cooperation between authorities and the registry while maintaining an open registry policy. .dk focused on the quality of registrant data at the time of registration.

02:16:22 Maxim Alzoba: even a requirement of a wet ink signed agreement and being in an office in person with the ID (before COVID-19) did not solve issues with abuse

02:16:32 susankawaguchi: Browser warnings help, it appears the browser companies immediately place a warning which is a good proactive step

02:16:32 Thomas Rickert (eco): Mary - would you still prefer not to have oral interventions?

02:16:33 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, I guess I'm not certain that's the case. Given the low overall percentage of abuse, low false positives, etc., this evaluation could be nearly instantaneous. Again, if it's about money, perhaps registration fees SHOULD go up. They're pretty low today, compared to the other costs associated with maintaining an online presence. I certainly don't have all the answers but couldn't a standardized solution help to mitigate costs?

02:16:51 Mary Wong: @Thomas, by raising hands in chat, you mean?

02:17:03 Maxim Alzoba: @jonathan, any name can be used for abuse, so predicting it all is not possible

02:17:09 Thomas Rickert (eco): James - time's up!

02:17:16 Mark Carvell - Adviser to ISOC: Broader context: as reported in recent UN HLP roadmap sessions on digital cooperation, child abuse online has increased significantly during the COVID period - as have also cybersecurity attacks on hospitals.

02:17:19 Jonathan Zuck: COVID is a red herring in this discussion, I think.

02:17:30 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Covid "names" are a massive red herring

02:17:41 Mary Wong: And then calling on them to unmute? We can do that if you wish, I think. @Ozan can you confirm?

02:17:42 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): the .eu way of "dealing with it" was a disaster for customer service

02:17:46 Lori Schulman: We all agree that flat out censorship is not the answer. I used to work for a health organization whose information was constantly black listed a porn because used common terms to describe bodies.

02:17:47 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, does it mean that ALAC supports rise in prices for the potential better future?

02:17:47 Jorge Cancio: @Michael: thanks... there are differences, sure... and I feel all can learn from these experiences in ccTIDs

02:17:49 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, it's not all based on the name. Check out the study.

02:17:56 Chris Lewis-Evans (PSWG): @James Agree proactive does not have to be predictive, and scale blocking is never a good solution.

02:18:32 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, the ALAC has gone on record indicating that a rise in prices to improve the experience for individual users is fine. Yes.

02:18:42 Lori Schulman: Filters or wholesale blocks can impede vital health information.

02:19:21 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Lori - yup - some ISPs used the Domain Tools list and blocked legit sites from a number of governments

02:19:32 Mary Wong: @Thomas, in case you missed it - yes we can do Raise Hands for Attendees and then ask them to unmute, if you wish.

02:19:35 Jonathan Zuck: The CCT report even suggested that a rise in prices was called for, in some measure because price caps on legacy TLDs creates a kind of unintentional predation for new entrants that lack economies of scale.

02:19:53 Lori Schulman: @Michele - all of this is ridiculously hard but we have to keep pushing for good solutions.

02:20:06 susankawaguchi: @Jonathan, agree on a rise in prices

02:20:27 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Lori - I don't disagree, but I find the broad sweeping statements from some people incredibly unhelpful

02:20:45 Jeff Bedser (SSAC): +1 Michele

02:20:49 Lori Schulman: Agree that price should be a factor in the discussion. We may have to pay for a more secure and trusted internet.

02:20:51 Maxim Alzoba: trusted notifiers - are per TLD, and in general it is just a term describing a status of a party

02:21:19 Michael (SWITCH, Switzerland): @JorgeCancio- Definitely, both shows possible good practice that have an visible impact. But it also shows that there is no solution that fits all.

02:21:21 Matt Serlin: Maybe the panelists could address Jeff's question as I had the same observation...great sessions, but what now?

02:21:23 Maxim Alzoba: @Jonathan, it is not just slight rise, it is a multiplier

02:21:45 Jeffrey Neuman: @Jonathan - Due to the various anti-trust laws (at least in the US), some of us may be unable to discuss specific pricing.

02:21:58 Lori Schulman: @Michele - noted. One of my own challenges is getting the data that you are requesting in a useful format.

02:22:41 Jorge Cancio: @Michael: ideally a toolbox with different tools would be offered to relevant actors - it seems that we are still not at that stage...

02:23:01 Brian Cimboric: The CPH has adopted the definition of DNS Abuse contained in the Framework.

02:23:06 Jonathan Zuck: @Jeff, I'm not talking about price fixing. I'm talking about letting the market fly so prices find a legitimate place, rather than one based on caps.

02:23:22 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, I'm not sure it would be a multiplier but that would require some study.

02:23:41 Jorge Cancio: maybe the IGF could be a place to involve the whole value chain in order to develop such DNS Abuse Toolbox...

02:23:42 Jeffrey Neuman: I would really love to hear all of the panelists respond to the "What's next" and "where do we take this from here".

02:23:46 Volker Greimann: prices only know one direction: down...

02:23:55 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): +1 Jeff

02:24:00 Dean Marks: @Maxim--agree with you about Trusted Notifier arrangements. It's up to each TLD or each registrar that may be involved with multiple TLDs to decide whether or not to work with a Trusted Notifier. Please know that if any CP would like to discuss a Trusted Notifier arrangement with respect to domain names associated with sites dedicated to commercial level copyright piracy, I would be happy to help. It has worked well with Donuts and Radix. :-)

02:24:01 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): cos these panels are pointless

02:24:05 Mark Elkins: +1 Jeff

02:24:18 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): "Hey we spoke about it"

02:24:57 Javier Rúa-Jovet: Silence!

02:25:45 Maxim Alzoba: @Dean, it is per jurisdiction also. so mostly notifiers are limited to clusters of countries, in which the particular TLD is based

02:25:57 Stéphane Bondallaz: @Jorge and Michael: Definitely, we have a pretty good regulation for our ccTLD in Switzerland ! :-;

02:26:11 Jonathan Zuck: Of course Michele, there are those who do not want a plenary to lead to any concrete action. A plenary will never take the place of a PDP or even action by contract compliance. Many continue to believe that CC doesn't do all it can under current contracts to address wholistic issues.

02:26:30 Maxim Alzoba: it would be nice to see all ccTLDs to use same standards also ;) but it is not possible

02:26:36 Elisabeth Behsudi: THE CPH at ICANN KL also adopted the DNS Abuse definitions contained in the Framework with specific attribution to the Internet & Jurisdiction Policy Network

02:26:45 Mark Carvell - Adviser to ISOC: + 1 Jorge regarding IGF, bearing in mind in future it will be more action-orientated in its outputs e.g. on addressing online abuse and promoting trust-based access in support of sustainable development goals.

02:27:08 Brian Beckham (WIPO): 1) In terms of a "positive" path forward, and perhaps as a way to build on the DNS Abuse Framework (in a MSM way ;), could inter alia measures undertaken e.g., by DK and EU (which seem to be recognized as effective), be put forward as best practices (perhaps this fits the idea of incentives that has been floated) for signatories to strive for? If not, why not?

2) It could be useful to see (also perhaps under the DNS Abuse Framework rubric) a home for a information on a global holistic issue-reporting flow, i.e., we often hear about how the party better suited to address a particular issue is a webhost, etc., so how do you best arm reporters to know where to place their concerns, and get those in front of the most appropriate party (should webhosts be a new ICANN SG)?

02:27:22 Jorge Cancio: @Mark: maybe sth for a newly established DC? 😊

02:27:35 Jonathan Zuck: For example, Verisign has earmarked \$20mil got ICANN to spend on research on this issue. Let's make some proposals for those funds.

02:28:04 Jeffrey Neuman: I like a debate format for panels.....

02:28:05 Dean Marks: +1 Jonathan

02:28:26 Lori Schulman: There is a new IGF DC on Data and Trust. First meeting is November 5th. Feel free to reach to me for details. lschulman@inta.org

02:29:02 Luc Seufer: @Brian to tyour second point, I think it's called RIPv6 ;-)
without an IP there is no hosting

02:29:14 Russ Pangborn: +1 Mason

02:29:15 Alex Deacon: So what is ICANN's role in all of this? Just DAAR?

02:29:30 Jorge Cancio: @Lori and @Mark: hope you can cooperate closely
👍

02:31:13 Susan.Payne Valideus/ComLaude: definitions are important, certainly, but building on both James and Mason's points, we do have the Framework definition. Even if some may not agree it goes far enough, I think everyone does agree that the items in the Framework definition are abuse. So, we can start from there even if this is not an AGREED definition

02:31:22 Mark Carvell - Adviser to ISOC: @ Jorge - good idea to consider if establishing an IGF dynamic coalition involving ICANN experts would be a channel for global policy incubation, promoting and implementing best practice, and adopting common definitions etc.

02:31:34 Goran Marby: Alex, ICANN org role is to provide information to the Community. We also have the compliance function that enforces what the Community has decided.

02:31:47 Goran Marby: And as

02:31:50 Maxim Alzoba: time for 🗨️

02:32:12 Goran Marby: You have seen we have invested a lot in these new systems over the last years

02:32:19 Jonathan Zuck: Agree with @Susan on starting with the def in the framework

02:33:20 Ozan Sahin: @Thomas - We have 4 minutes to the end of the session.

02:33:45 Javier Rúa-Jovet: From all the discussion, at least at ALAC, it would seem we are under a massive DNS Abuse crisis. Stats are critical.

02:34:03 Maxim Alzoba: a massive without numbers is just a word

02:34:11 Brian Beckham (WIPO): Any utility in parsing out "abuse" into more nuanced sub-categories?

02:34:17 Thomas Rickert (eco): I will close in a moment

02:34:18 Mary Wong: @Alex, pasting here @Goran's response to your question about ICANN's role: Alex, ICANN org role is to provide information to the Community. We also have the compliance function that enforces what the Community has decided. You have seen we have invested a lot in these new systems over the last years.

02:35:15 Javier Rúa-Jovet: Good conversations here. Happy to have heard.

02:35:18 Jonathan Zuck: @Maxim, agree on the need for numbers.

02:35:48 Mary Wong: @James, question from Brian King in the pod for CPs.

02:36:17 Vincent Guillard: Very interesting and informative session. It was great to see the views of so many communities described and explained. Many thanks to all!

02:36:39 Jeff Bedser (SSAC): Volumes of abuse are a bit of a false flag. Those runs the domain based scams are constantly adjusting techniques to avoid detection. Thus the fluctuations are both volume and detection

02:37:00 Afia Faith: great presentations

02:37:29 Javier Rúa-Jovet: We should get that very effective email Crown Prince to help us learn some basic DNS Abuse techniques.

02:37:35 David Conrad: If you have further questions or suggestions on DAAR, please send to daar@icann.org

02:37:53 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: bye for now

02:37:58 Polina Malaja - CENTR: Thank you to all panelists and the moderator for a great session! :)

02:38:06 Wafa Dahmani: very interesting session thanks to all speakers and moderator

02:38:10 Mary Wong: Thanks to our panelists and moderator, and thank you to everyone for attending today's plenary session!

02:38:11 Javier Rúa-Jovet: Great great chat. Thx Thomas!

02:38:11 Maarten Botterman: Thanks for a good session. Important to progress on this - and great exchange!

02:38:12 Finn Petersen (GAC - Denmark): Definition and data is importance - Verification of registration is better – at least in Denmark!

02:38:13 Jeffrey Neuman: Yes, this has been interesting, but would really love to see from plenaries more of a focus on the goals for these sessions, proposed outputs, milestones and deliverables.

02:38:13 Bikram Shrestha: Thank you

02:38:14 Herman Ramos: Thank you