

---

SUE SCHULER: Start the recording. Great, thanks. Okay, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks very much, Sue. Thank you guys all for joining the Registry Stakeholder Group DNS Abuse Working Group. Jim and I, as your co-chairs, are going to swap in—alternate weeks as to who is chairing which meeting. You guys are stuck with me today, lucky everyone.

Jim and I did put together this brief agenda, but this is our first meeting together since our meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group counterpart. So, we don't want to be too prescriptive. This agenda just reflects Jim and I's ideas, and we want to make sure that we're incorporating all the ideas of the working group. At each turn, we are going to open it up to the group to see if there's any alternative thoughts.

First up, logistics and future meetings. You'll note that this meeting is not just for today, but it is a weekly meeting. We have found our time slot for this group to meet. Jim and I thought that once a week was good—if you can't make a given meeting, of course, no problem. But for us to really be able to tackle issues, we need to be working at a pretty regular clip and working on multiple issues.

Also, with that, we know that once a week we will be meeting—I'm sorry, once a month—we're going to be meeting as a whole CPH DNS abuse group. We want to be able to do our work as the registry equivalent, but also to be able to prepare for the work of the CPH Abuse

---

*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.*

---

Working Group. And I don't recall off hand, but those meetings are scheduled once a month at—Sue or Jim, do you guys recall the time for those meetings?

SUE SCHULER: It's Tuesday at 10:00am EST, so it would be 15:00.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Excellent. Okay...

JAMES GALVIN: And one other just tiny bit of clarification. It's actually every four weeks, not once a month. Little different.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Fair point, fair point. That's it on the logistics and setup of these meetings going forward. Does anyone have questions on that? No?

Getting into the substance of things. Jim and I have been putting our heads together and thought that it would be helpful for us to bucket the work that the group was doing into different buckets so that we can divide and conquer and have actual measurable outputs, hopefully in each of the buckets. Before we get into the ideas that Jim and I had, Sue, if you wouldn't mind scrolling down. Sue was helpful enough to include the items from the email from Graeme.

The CPH Working Group on Abuse, Graeme had suggested that the registrars were really focused on four key areas. One is incentivization

---

programs to address DNS Abuse, registrant protections, identifying hosts, and abuse site reporting standards. That's what they're prioritizing. That's not to say that we can't participate, join in on any of these discussions, or add in topics to consideration for the whole CPH Working Group. But Graeme made it clear that these are clearly the priorities for the Registrar Stakeholder Group in dealing with abuse right now.

Personally, the the two things I'm most interested in are actually numbers three and four, as far as identifying hosts and abuse report site standards. Identifying hosts in particular because, as registries and registrars, when we get abuse reported to us, oftentimes we'll note that the most appropriate entity to deal with the abuse, if it's content or even in certain instances of DNS abuse, would be the host or the site operator itself.

I think that that would be a really particularly fruitful potential for our CPH Working Group but I want to open it up to this working group to see if you had any thoughts on those four topics identified by Graeme for the CPH Abuse Group.

Susan, please. And then Sam.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks, Brian. And apologizes, I wasn't able to join the registrar call, the last one. I just wondered, on the incentivization program, are they programed between registries and registrars or is this more ... And if it is, then it seems like that's something we ought to be interested in, too,

---

if you know what I mean. Or is it some other incentivization program?  
And apologizes for not knowing the answer to that.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

No, it's a good question, Susan. I think that that is part of—I think it's actually taking a look at the issues across the DNS. Yes, from the registry to the registrars. And full disclosure, we have, at PIR, such a program in place that we call QPI. But I think also, in reliance on—I forget, I'm blanking on the abbreviation—but potentially incentivization programs from ICANN to contracted parties for lower abuse rates.

To be honest, I'm not sure exactly which subset of incentivization programs the registrars were talking about, something that we would tease out. But there are across the DNS different iterations of the incentivization programs. But point taken, yes, if it involves the registries to the registrars incentivization programs, yes, obviously our group should have a say and interest in that.

Sam?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Brian. To just sort of continue on what you were just saying. I got the impression from the call with the registrars, that this is something that they've just begun working on. They're still in the drafting phase of this potential paper. So I think the reason, maybe we don't know is because it's not to be known, just yet. I think it's still in development, so maybe that's helpful.

---

The reason I put my hand up in the first place was for what you had said about numbers three and four. And I actually think these are good places to start because I also think it's also something that maybe, not to sound very lazy, but we can just build on the work that's already being done and maybe look at potentially either endorsing or co-signing, having this be a CPH document. because I think these will be pretty applicable across the board. Or as something that we could easily adapt to a registry setting. But I think those are ... I'm just agreeing with you that those are two really good places to start.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Sorry, I started my video, trying to come off mute. Thank you, Sam. Alan?

ALAN WOODS:

Thanks, Brian. I wasn't going to drop in on the CPH call and say this but one of the things that I would love to see on the list, that we could probably work on ourselves, from a registry point of view and then work it in gently into the registrar CPH is always about the interactions between the registry and the registrar.

The escalation paths between us, where they go, how we expect responses and we [add] that, I suppose in a way, much benefit in things that like the [CSAN] Discussion Group, where we just laid it out and said, "If we were to send something like this to you, how would you respond? How would you prefer for us to get it?"

---

It's a real practical way that I think we could talk through this as the interoperability, for want of a better term, between us as well. Work on it, add it to our list, and then bring it to the CPH and cover it. It's a bit of an elephant in the room situation. But that would be really helpful from an operative point of view in the registry sense.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

That's excellent, Alan. That makes a lot of sense. I think that that is a general topic, not even necessarily something that lends itself to an output but just general discussion between our two groups on the interoperability between registries and registrars, and dealing with abuse. I think that would be a particularly helpful base setting conversation

That's something that I will bring .... You'll see, I 'll send something along to the CPH abuse list, which Graeme, by the way, intends people to really engage on that list. So, I'll kick the discussion off there with Alan's idea.

Anything else on the registrar topics? Because we did have some topics of our own. Sam, is that an old hand or did you have something else?

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Nope, very sorry. Forgot to put it down.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

No problem. So, Sue, if you wouldn't mind, scrolling back up.

---

Of course the work that we do as a CPH is going to be important in particular for progressing but also for positioning as arrows are shot at us. And with that in mind, Jim and I put together a list of buckets that we could potentially begin to work on, with the idea that some may lead to outputs, some may not. The first is for the DAAR Working Group. And I'll turn it to Jim in a moment just to give a brief outline on that. But I'm just going to run through them all, so we can consider them all, before getting into each one individually.

So, the DAAR Working Group was close to an output. Outreach to other constituencies, this is another reason why we're meeting on a weekly basis is because Jim and I had an idea that potentially once a month or so—or once every four weeks, as Jim may correct me. Once a month or so, we do outreach and invite another constituency to join us on our call. And do so in a very structured way with particularized questions that embrace the CPH definition of DNS Abuse.

So that as those conversations happen with, let's say, the NCUC, or ALAC, or IPC, we know that we are talking about the CPH definition of DNS abuse that includes phishing, farming, malware, botnets, and spam- when it's a delivery mechanism from one of the others, and not some different or broader definitional issue on DNS abuse. We had a conversation with the PSWG and there seems to be potential for low-hanging fruit there.

Yes, I know that it's another constituency, so it's sort of a subset of C, but because those conversations have already started and there is—I think the PSWG work could be almost fast-tracked with the other constituencies. Outcome documents and to the extent this group is

---

going to be putting out or endorsing materials, this is an area that I think we could really start to focus on, because there's been a lot of work already done.

And you'll see in some of the Internet and jurisdiction policy network documents I sent around yesterday, there's a lot of simple—I think almost non-controversial—work that's already been done. As Sam pointed to, it's something that we may be able just to endorse and get in front of the rest of the stakeholder group and bring to their attention and to the rest of the communities attention.

And finally, any other suggestions. That was sort of the initial list that Jim and I had discussed a couple times. So those are the potential priority working groups or working paths this group at a high level. And now, let's turn to them individually.

And of course, I want to leave plenty of time for number 2F suggestions from this group. So, with that, Jim. If you could just kick things off and give people a high-level summary of what you were thinking as far as continuation of the DAAR work?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks. Just very quickly, in DAAR there really were three action items that were left. One was, Samaneh is still interested in talking to us more about the notion of persistence of abuse. In other words, a way to capture that registries actually do take action – registrars too, ultimately—but registries do take action on domain names. So, being able to find some kind of metric to be able to post and show that demonstrates that names come and go, in terms of what is listed there.



---

I just wanted to remind people that if you were in the DAAR group, then you know what that is. I won't spend a lot of time on that unless somebody wants to get into it now. And she's interested in continuing those conversations, because it's not an easy problem. But she's interested in helping to make that work.

Samaneh did want to talk to us about adding ccTLDs and what that really means to the overall picture of things and what it is. I haven't pinned her down on exactly what she wants to ask us about that, but I mentioned it here because she at least has been reminding me that she still wants to get back together.

There was a third action item, which was the last three of what I think was the seven recommendations that the DAAR working group had in its final output, which were really about working with ICANN to talk to them about their messaging. What they really do on their website, how they present the DAAR stuff, and things like that. That's been languishing, I get the impression that since Samaneh and John aren't really into that, it's really their communications team that does it. It's not clear to me that that's going to go anywhere, but I mention it for completeness, because I figure if we're going to not do that and don't want to pursue it, I want to at least make that decision with our eyes open and just say that's where we are. We made the recommendation. We'll leave it to them.

I want to expand a little bit too on the PSWG work. I want to list three things that we had gotten from our brief discussion with them just for people have an idea what's going on there. And then open discussion

---

here. They did talk about wanting to add a little bit more formality and structure to dealing with DGA, Domain Generation Algorithms.

We actually have gotten to a pretty good place in an ad hoc way with ICANN with dealing with those kinds of things. [inaudible] was the first one years ago and there've been a few others along the way. And those of us that are into this do this with them. But it was suggested that they'd really like to have a bit more of a well-defined process for it, rather than having to essentially take each one up individually.

So, that's just one of those things that might be useful to do, might be easy to do. I suspect ICANN would get into that with us and maybe that's a good thing to do and check off our list. They also made a comment about wanting access to accurate data. And for me, I think what really is behind that is focusing on the access part, is some discussions about trusted notifier. Now, there's a lot that goes with that. I won't even get into it. But at least I just wanted to call out that's an action item. Accurate data is this whole separate thing and I don't think that belongs near, but the notion on behalf of abuse, to want to be able to get at, identifying who owns a name, and stuff like that. There's this notion of trusted notifiers and something for us to think about.

And the last item that I got from our meeting with them was about ISAC, the Information and Analysis Center. Some kind of thing like that. They had actually proposed specifically ... Now Craig and Maarten have already done some additional work in the recent past, building on some stuff that was done earlier and information sharing and giving some thought to that.

---

Information sharing in general is sort of a topic area for us to get into. The specific thing that they wondered about and asked about is might there be a way vis-à-vis a reputation list mechanism where we could keep track of domain names and second-level labels that are popularly used as threats and be able to share that fairly readily. Would there be some kind of mechanism we could build up around that?" Information sharing has its own set of deals with respect to confidentiality and privacy, but that was one particular item. So that complete picture of things there and for us to think about. That's it. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thank you, Jim. Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks. So, Jim went through a lot and I had latched on to the first couple things but it seems like that whole list should be enumerated in some way, so it can address them because they all seem like important issues.

With regard to working with OCTO and specifically working with OCTO on the DAAR, it seems like we should—and bringing some of the recommendations to a close, it seems like we should revive the rump of the DAAR working group. Others could join too. But maybe meeting with OCTO once a month to close out that work on persistence to see if it will pay off.

And I was thinking also on the communications part too, although that might involve a different part of ICANN and I was thinking on

---

communications. The DAAR team made some fairly specific recommendations. I think how we might approach it is that this DAAR team might act as the conduit between ICANN and this group on communication issues to run the communication issues past this team here. So, reviving the DAAR for infrequent but regular meetings to try to bring those items to a close. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thank you, Kurt. Something Jim touched on and that Craig mentioned in the chat—and we’re bouncing around between the topics but that’s totally okay because this is just an initial list. But the PSWG work. It’s interesting and there is the low-hanging fruit that Jim and Craig both mentioned and that’s around domain generating algorithms. It’s an area, too, where I think that there’s an opportunity where ICANN is ready, willing, and able to jump in and be cooperative and helpful.

It reminds me a few years ago of the security framework, or the Registry Operator Security Framework to address security threats. There was basically a jointly penned document between the PSWG and the registries with ICANN serving in a facilitator role.

I get the sense that they would be willing to do that again and it may be worth having that conversation both with ICANN and the PSWG around systemizing DGAs. And for those of you that haven’t had to deal with one of these before, it involves creation of domains that didn’t previously exist. It involves getting contractual waivers from ICANN, which is through this process called an ERSR. But ICANN is in a position that they could proactively issue those, once they got notification from

---

the PSWG which would cut down lag time, which would cut down administrative time, and get the botnets taken down even quicker. So it's something that I think that we should really consider discussing jointly with the PSWG and ICANN. It would be a combination of GDS and OCTO staff. Donna, I see your hand's up?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Brian. Just on the [ARSR], I understand the importance of it, but I just wonder how many others have actually been in that situation of having to use it? Because I don't think .... I don't know that .biz is being impacted in the last 12 months or so. So I would just like to understand if it's something that impacts all of us or is it just a few of us? I understand the urgency and I think it's a worthwhile thing to work with ICANN on. And I appreciate that part of it, but I just wonder how many registry operators does it actually impact on a regular basis? So that's just following on from that.

There's something I wanted to note separately. I think there would be benefit in us doing some information sharing amongst ourselves? I'm very conscious that over the last couple of years, we've had ... I'm going to say the usual suspects but I say that affectionately that have been the mouthpiece for registry operators when it comes to engaging at ICANN meetings or others. But I think it would be really helpful if we can get those that are a little less reluctant to speak about what they do on abuse, to encourage them to be more engaged in this conversation. I wonder how we can address that in some way.

---

And it goes to something that I think the registrars are also doing in the education piece of registrars. I know we're getting a long laundry list and we're going to have to prioritize in some way, but I think that information sharing and understanding what other registry operators are doing beyond the ones of us that usually do the talking, I think it might be really beneficial to our discussions. And also, the optics of how it works in an ICANN meeting about where the problems really are. Thanks, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Donna. I think that that was a really good addition. And I think Jim who has his hand up and I'll turn to in just a moment, that we will agree that the laundry list is getting long but each of the additions has been really worth consideration and I think our next choice will be exercise in prioritization. These are all great ideas, keep them coming and we will continue to expand the list and recirculate to the group. Jim?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Brian. I just wanted to touch briefly on Donna's question about how many registry operators have had much to do with ESRS and DGAs. And I'll tell you, I don't have hard numbers to offer you off the top of my head. It's good that Craig said in the chat room here that he's asked ICANN for some real data there. But from my perception, just based on interactions is just that you're right. There's a very limited set of TLDs that seem most affected by that.

---

I mean, a DGA itself will be all about one or a very small number of TLDs and they just have an algorithm which generates names. And somewhere along the way those things come into existence in the right TLD. So it's entirely possible that most people have not been involved in that. But the way to think about that work is not about how many people it affects, but from my point of view, it's one of those high impact things that's good to do. I think that the pressure is going to come with respect to abuse on shortening the timeframe between when it's noticed and when it's mitigated. That's where the pressure's going to come from, from the security community, in trying to emphasize that activity.

And with that in mind, being able to streamline this process, this is a high impact kind of process to streamline. It's one of those things which, you're right, not that many people need to know about it or be involved, but if it was very smooth and streamlined, then you'd get high impact, you'd get a lot of names that suddenly are dealt with out of the mix, good security step, good security feature. It's a low-hanging fruit, high impact kind of event. And that's the way I see that particular thing. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Jim. The other thing I'd add to that, too, is that just even if it's a small number of operators that had been impacted before—to this point—doesn't necessarily mean that's the scope of actors that will be impacted in the future. Who's to say whether or not a DGA starts going across new and additional TLDs or even focuses exclusively in those TLDs?

---

And I can tell you the first time that you're faced with one of these, it's a little daunting. I remember the first time they came across my desk, my reaction was something along the lines of, "Jesus, what the hell do I do with this?"

To the extent, we can systemize or make this a process, then the first time it does come across a new—that's not to say new TLD but someone who hasn't dealt with this before, that the work has already been done for them, I think would really be helpful for the future. Just a thought.

Okay, anything else on the DAAR or PSWG work? No? Okay.

So 2C, and I introed this early on, what does the group think about the notion of being proactive and extending olive branches to our friends and partners in the other constituencies to include ... Keith made the point, we want to make sure we reach out to ICANN itself and maybe even have that be a separate track which is a good and fair point. But also, NCUC, ALAC in particular we know is very zeroed in on DNS abuse, PSWG, registrars we're already dealing with, but just making sure that we've done some outreach, one, to really know what the pain points are, understand where people are coming from, in a good faith way. But, two, show that we're not just brushing aside the problem. That we are working across the aisle. That we're trying to understand the various points of view here in a way that, taking a step back, registries and registrars are sometimes painted with an obstructionist brush that is I think most people on this call would think is not fair or accurate but doing what we can to chip away at that perception.



---

Craig pointed out SSAC. Absolutely, SSAC would be one of the very first constituencies that I think we would want to reach out to. And Alan, in a very timely way, since he's working on the SSAC paper, Alan, if you could chime in?

ALAN WOODS:

Yeah, sure. Thanks. I think it's the second day in a row that this has occurred. Just what I was going to say before the SSAC came up with—and it was actually in relation to the work that I'd done with the SSAC. It's very interesting to see how people are coming at the exact same points but with a slightly different color. And it does change their perception of what we're doing on our own individual basis.

I personally think it's an excellent idea to reach out and have that regular contact because where as we're doing something and the PSWG—not the PSWG, the NCSG might turn around and say, "You're actually dealing with content regulation there," even though we're thinking it's obsolete, nothing to do with content regulation. And instead of us just all piling into a room and having it out at an ICANN meeting, virtual or not, that we can actually just diffuse all that, by having that regular contact and actually getting pointers. Maybe we're going down a wrong path, I'm totally with that. I don't really want to go, I suppose out of turn on the SSAC thing, but again one of the main things is people who just don't understand where we're coming from but also we need to listen to them and see where they're coming from a little bit more. And perhaps we can meet in the middle.

---

And I do think the current stall of the SSAC paper is along that lines where there's two separate paths. They're never between [inaudible] at the moment. And I think it's finding that common ground, to where we go, "Okay I actually understand you're point, you understand our point and we're a little bit happier. Let's build on that," as opposed to us all just walking in separate distances and separate places. I can go into this SSAC later, when we get to AOB if you want, but for the moment, I think that's good.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Excellent. Thanks, Alan. J.C.?

J.C. VIGNES:

Sorry, never know how to unmute. Yes, I wanted to second that. I mentioned the IPC in the chat. I think the key point is regular contact. IT's going to be an investment for us but I think it's the only way we go past having abuse front and center at every ICANN meeting, the way we've seen it for close to a year now—if not more than that.

If I can share a personal story. A couple of weeks ago, a major financial institution reached out to us because they had some phishing cases in one of our extension. We were amazed at how unprepared they were and how little they knew about how the whole system works. And I'm talking major financial institution in 2020.

It was really a shock for us, but it shows that the education is key. And education doesn't happen one hour every quarter when the mood in the room is really divisive, it's really registries aren't doing enough, or

---

registrars are also not doing enough and so on. I think we need to embrace it and have regular discussions with yes IPC, ALAC, and build bridges. It's going to take time and effort, regrettably it's still needed right now as again we realized all too recently. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Excellent. Thank you, J.C. I totally agree. It's going to be a two-way flow of information. It is, like I said, feeling the paying points. But also, education. Not just as far as the basic what is phishing, how does the DNS work? But what can the registries and registrars do? What constraints and impacts of acting via the DNS.

As we have those conversations, I think it's a good opportunity for us as the registries and registrars to get in the habit of politely keeping the conversation on topic with DNS abuse. Reaching out to the IPC, for example, would be a good test of this. Just reinforcing each time as things get outside of the definition of the CPH endorsed definition of DNS abuse.

Just saying, "Okay, I understand that's a paying point for you, but we're here to talk about DNS abuse." Asking that same question with regards to phishing. How can we help you there? Just getting into habit of bringing things back to the definition of DNS abuse that the CPH has endorsed that seems to be gaining some traction, because we don't want to be in the position where we're debating what the definition of DNS abuse is when some of the alternatives out there are frankly just anything that's bad on the Internet.

---

That being said, it seems as though there is widespread favorability for reaching out to these constituencies. We can put our heads together and figure out where we would start, who we would start with, potentially reaching out. Maybe SSAC or depending on the timing of that paper, or an NCUC or someone that there might be some more natural alignment with starting there. Anything else on topic 2C? Nope? Okay.

Moving on then. We've already touched on 2D, the PSWG work. But if anyone wants to jump in, let me know.

But 2E. So, the outcome documents. I don't think we need to go through and pull up the Internet and jurisdiction documents. And nor do I mean to suggest that that is the universe of documents that are out there that we can pull from. But it's something that Sam has mentioned, and others have mentioned. We don't really need to reinvent the wheel here. There are a lot of materials out there that if they have a reasoned and thoughtful approach on things like working through DNS abuse, what to do when a phish comes across your desk as a registry or a registrar.

That could be really potentially impactful if we're endorsing and putting on the Registry Stakeholder Group Abuse Group seal of approval on something as an output and showing that we aren't just dealing with these things on an individual basis, but that we're sort of helping and instructing the other registries and registrars as to what to do and showing that we're actually taking some actions for the rest of the community to see.

---

I would encourage everyone to take a look at those documents I sent over, and more importantly, invite the group if you've seen anything that you believe falls into this bucket of helpful, implementable, and potentially endorsable materials for our group. I think that this is going to be a really potentially important work track that can actually show some outputs from this group.

With that, I will open up the floor if anyone has anything to specifically contribute or any thoughts on the I&J documents. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN WOODS:

Just purely because, apparently, I love the sound of my voice. I just wanted to briefly step back to the SSAC documents and say that in support of the I&J documents, the SSAC document makes reference to both the security framework from the different registries and registrars, but also to the I&J as being ... They referenced the definitions that are in there. What hopefully will come out from the SSAC is supportive of the approach taken and I thought this is one of those really important things from an SSAC point of view as well, particularly because it's taking a new path.

It's talking about norms. It's talking about interoperability as opposed to slapping contractual obligations and I think that's a very key element of these documents. That it's encouraging, it's not shackling. It's that guidance that's so very important. I just wanted to drop in the SSAC there as well as potentially another one that will help support the I&J direction.

---

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: That's excellent, Alan. I think that's going to be a really key document too. We just need to be able to read it at some point. Jim, go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Brian. I too am a big fan of the work that I&J does, having participated in all their conferences to date. I just want to flag for this group, during the last ICANN meeting, during the bilateral between the NCSG and the ICANN Board, some members of the NCSG actually leveled a broadside against I&J, asking the ICANN board at what level are they participating, why are they participating. It came out left field.

I'm raising it only to put everyone on guard that, while many of us do like the work that they do, it's not universally loved within the ICANN community. And this was the first time I'd actually heard this raised. And to be honest with you, I don't know what triggered it. If you want to go back and listen to that session, it's worth noting.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks very much, Jim. And this is just my own opinion based on nothing at all, but just the mannerisms and demeanors. There seems to be almost a potential territoriality between ICANN and I&J in this sphere. I don't think that that should necessarily hinder our work, I think it's really important that you brought it up and I'm glad you did. But at the end of the day, if we're going to be endorsing something, we're going to be endorsing the thoughts and the approaches more so than any individual organization that did it. But It's a point very well taken. Keith?

---

JIM PRENDERGAST: I agree. It's just when we go there, there's a landmine or two, just be careful of that.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Totally makes sense. Keith go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Brian. And thanks everybody. Really great conversation here and I like the list of the work paths that you've put forward here. I have just an observation and then it'll lead into a suggestion for another possible work path. But obviously everything that we're talking about here is voluntary engagement, best practices, even some of the stuff that Jim mentioned earlier associated with DAAR.

The desire of ICANN to systemize and engage on DGAs. The discussions around trusted notifier and then information sharing. All of those fit well within best practices, right? And I hear Elliot's voice back in Montreal, saying, "Look we have a lot of latitude within our current agreements and a lot of—we have ability to do more and to do better, within the confines of our existing agreements. "

There's not a clear need to make contractual adjustments at this point. But at some point I think there is an expectation in parts of the community and maybe even in parts of ICANN, that at some point there may need to be some contractual adjustments or amendments, or improvements, enhancements, whatever term you want to use.

---

And the reason that I'm flagging this now is that you all have heard me say this before, is that there is also an expectation that the GNSO Council at some point will pick up work on DNS abuse related matters, particularly because the CCTRT recommendations from SubPro have been referred back to the Council for consideration, holistically, across all TLDs and not just future TLDs.

At some point, I think we as this group, and probably working with our registrar colleagues eventually, need to start thinking about if there's going to be policy work related to DNS abuse at the GNSO level, where would we want to—how would we want that scoped? Right? We need to start thinking about that. So, I think we're on the front foot when that conversation starts to happen at council rather than being reactive.

Just a thought there, I think there needs to be perhaps another work path on looking ahead and preparing for any possible PDP or policy work that might impact our contracts. And again, that's probably not a top priority and it may be a bottom priority, but I think it's important for this group to consider. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks very much, Keith. That's excellent. And I think it's certainly very important if ... To your point, if it's not the most pressing concern, just from a time perspective, it may be the most important concern long term and should certainly ... We should keep it in mind in basically all the things we do so that we're positioning ourselves well for if and when those conversations ever come down the pike. Donna? Unless Keith, I don't know if that's an old hand? Yep, okay. Donna?



---

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Brian. I agree wholeheartedly with what Keith has just said and I think maybe one of our objectives for this group should be when we think about prioritization is what's going to serve us best in trying to mitigate that DNS abuse PDP.

But I think, Keith, from what will be helpful, given your intimate knowledge as just stepping down as chair of the GNSO Council is what would help most in thinking about that. So, what are the things that we need to address to try to mitigate the possibility of that abuse PDP coming down the pike?. I think that's an important consideration for us.

I just wanted to touch on the I&J work. I think we need to pull together a compendium of, whether it's best practices or information about how to deal with abuse and not so much seeking endorsement from the stakeholder group because that can be challenging to get endorsement. But certainly, a compendium of documents that are helpful in responding to DNS abuse as we have defined it. I think I&J is a good start, and if there's other documentation out there that we can draw on, I think that would be helpful as well.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Great. Thank you, Donna. Jim? Go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. I want to build on something that Keith said and actually say out loud what Alan is writing there in the chat at one point about reinforcing the need for outreach. I think the notion of a PDP on DNS

---

abuse really scares me a great deal, and I'm sure it does others here on this call. And for me it's about always constantly being under the microscope, and as we're all aware, we get a lot of pressure, we get a lot of beatdown about our "failure" to do enough. And I worry about that a lot and I think Keith's point about we need to start to create a story, we need to be ready to scope that work and figure out what it's really going to turn into.

That's one of the reasons why the outreach stuff that we have up here, it really fits for me. I like that concept a lot. For me, in terms of having a specific agenda for why we meet with these groups. The initial discussion with them should be about letting them tell us what they think their paying points, and hearing that out and taking all that on board. Because we know that's the kind of stuff that's going to get driven into or attempted to get driven into any kind of PDP work.

We've said to ourselves before, we used to say this in the DAAR group, and I think we've said it in a few of these brainstorming discussions here about DNS abuse. We have to create our own story, we have to create our own picture about what we are, who we are, and we have to get in front of this stuff. And I know I am preaching to folks who are all on page with that and then I'm just saying that's what's important to me here in this group and the direction that I want to go down.

And I'm really excited about the outreach step here. I think the place that we're going to get here in a little bit with Brian is how do we now prioritize this work and how do we organize ourselves to get this work done? And I think it's important to have—let's figure out some low-

---

hanging things that we can actually get done to start showing some progress, start to look good.

We also need to have a small group of people really thinking about our future and all the elements of what that is and starting to put that together and having a story for ourselves and collecting that information. That to me is a priority item and one of the things that excites me about this group and getting involved here and getting prepared for that. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Jim. And briefly before I turn to Alan—and Alan don't worry, I will turn to you in just a moment. I think that to Jim's point, there's prioritization that needs to happen but I also think that just off the cuff, we're looking at I think multiple working groups in here with potential different themes, one focusing potentially on operational low-hanging fruit, to focusing on longer-term initiatives like the positioning that Jim, Keith, and Donna have all alluded to.

We'll put our heads together, Jim and I, and suggest some ideas to the list but I think it's important that we get this started sooner rather than later. Alan.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you, Brian. When Keith was talking there, and also when Jim was talking there, it brought up a few things in my brain. It actually goes back to something. Think way back when you said Brian, when we were having this concept, it was back at the GDD in Bangkok, where the

---

question was what does ICANN need to achieve their goal? And their goal of course in this, [inaudible] called for so long is merely enforcement. And I think that's where the PDP and where we should be considering steering this.

Well, what does ICANN actually need in order to be the low water mark here. Because this is much bigger than just ICANN. This is not just about us, the gTLDs, this is about ccTLDs, this is about all their infrastructure providers as well. And I think we need to be very, very clear that ICANN is just a part of this puzzle, and we need to help them fulfill that part. But we should always have [long-term] goals. I know we all have our self-interests in trying to make sure that we tick our boxes when it comes to the contracts.

But also, we want to be out there saying DNS abuse is a problem that we can all rise to, not just necessarily the contracts or the things that we're focused on. I think there's a separate and distinct conversation there at making sure that ICANN—well, we're helping ICANN achieve their goal and also that is just a smaller part of our wider goal as well.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Excellent. Thank you, Alan. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Brian. Just to follow on from something Alan said. And this has come back to me. A couple of years ago, when Goran was really pushing us hard on, "You have to do something about DNS abuse because governments are getting ready to regulate for it." Now, he's moved

---

away from that rhetoric, but I really think it would be helpful if at some point in the future—I don't know whether we have a conversation coming up with Goran or maybe with the GDS team, but I'd really like to understand whether ICANN is keeping tabs on what's happening from a regulatory sense across national governments to understand whether that is actually happening or whether that is starting to happen.

I am aware that the Australian government is actually looking at legislation that's associated with critical infrastructure and they're looking at bringing .AU into that and auDA, so that infrastructure, which to some extent makes sense. But we may have registries ... When I say we—GoDaddy registry—may have TLDs that may end up being collateral damage from that.

Now the Australian legislation isn't that bad. They can't take control of anything, but I'm just wondering, I'd really like to understand whether ICANN is monitoring that and whether they've seen any movement in that regard because I think that's really important for us as well.

I understand we want to keep to the definition of DNS abuse that we have, but if we have national governments that are starting to legislate for content, and we're going to end up as collateral damage to that similar to GDPR, we need to understand that that's going on.

So, I'd like to just put a pin in that. Let's have a conversation with ICANN to see whether they're monitoring that and what information they have for us. Thanks.

---

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Donna. That was a very good point and I think we're all curious about that ourselves. Without having talked to Jim about this—or any of you in fact—maybe the first outreach session we have is with ICANN itself to ask exactly these kinds of questions. That's something we can work out on the list, but framing the conversation and directionally where we're going with ICANN might be a good first step here. J.C., I see you raised your hand?

J.C. VIGNES:

Yes, briefly. Thanks, Donna. I fully agree and living in France I know a thing or two about a ccTLD controlled by the government. But I would rephrase slightly what you just said. I don't think we should ask ICANN if they are aware, I think we should tell them that they should be aware. The GDPR situation was a debacle because ICANN chose not to be aware of what was years in the making at the European Commission level.

I think that because you know what could happen in Australia—and I see in the chat, someone mentioned Europe is the same, it's all of our duty to go to ICANN, and say even though it's more at the ccTLD level, you should very much get involved and be aware. That's all.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks very much, J.C. We're coming up about five minutes left. Does anyone else have any other thoughts here on this or any other topics and/or do we have any AOB?

---

Not seeing any, I think that Jim and I's next steps will be to put together the new list of items and potentially come up with some ideas as far as how we split this work up, whether it's working groups or however that may be, but just keeping these conversations going. We'll be back here next week. And looking for emails from either Jim, or Sue, or I, in the meantime on the expanded list.

Anyone else, anything before we close this out? If not, I will give everyone a few minutes back. I think this is going to be a really productive group. It's well attended, it's a nice subgroup of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I thank you guys all for your really good ideas. I think we're going to get a lot of good work done here. Thanks everyone. With that, we can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**