SUE SCHULER: Terrific. Thanks. Okay, Brian.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thank you, Sue. Thanks, everyone, for joining the Registry Stakeholder Group DNS Abuse Group. We've got an agenda that sort of looking backward and looking forward. First thing we wanted to do is just touch on what we saw and sort of the tone and tenor on DNS abuse coming out of both ICANN69 and IGF. Just from my view, it seemed as though we're sort of in the space where there are still a number of folks saying that the sky is falling, that's not to minimize that DNS abuse is not a problem. But then any time there's actual data on the subject particularly helpful from OCTO, frankly. It just demonstrates that DNS abuse, while of course it's, by nature, bad, it's certainly not increasing and certainly not increasing in the same rate that certain narratives out there would like to paint with such a broad brush. At least in ICANN69, I think that that was my key takeaway from IGF. There was a number of sessions on DNS abuse, including sessions from John Crain and OCTO. I thought that the message was pretty consistent. They see that, by and large, DNS abuse is certainly not on the increase and year over year, it's actually on the decline. Those were my takeaways from those. I didn't know if anyone else wanted to chime in and see in particular if you saw something different or if you felt that the tenor had gotten more aggressive, that's something I think we should flag here. No? Okay.

Donna, please go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Brian. I don't know whether the tenor's gotten any more aggressive but there have been a few articles from CircleID so the pressure is still there. One of the benefits of not having face-to-face meetings until June is that maybe we can just get it off the next agenda for March and try to make some progress in the meantime on some of the noisy people.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Donna. Point taken. Yeah. Actually, there's an article that Maxim wanted to bring up that we've put in AOB that some of you might have seen on CircleID. But absolutely yes, the thrust isn't changing. I think that this group's existence, first of all, is a step in the right direction but also, to your point, hopefully we can actually start getting some wheels in motion. We've got four months before ICANN70 and I think there might be some low-hanging fruit out there. Anyone else on takeaways from ICANN69 or IGF? Great.

One thing I wanted to flag and full disclosure here, I'm coordinator of Domains and Jurisdiction track, but this year the contact group has put out seven documents, each one sort of in bite-sized snippets tackling finite issues. But really, some interesting and potentially helpful documents that I just put into the chat, including choice of action for DNS operators, specifically registries/registrars, some instances on what mitigation means and the impact of acting at the DNS. But the thing that was most interesting to me that I'd encourage you all to take a look over is there was an outcome relating the phishing and malware going from sort of cradle to grave from a notifier to a registrar, and then

decision trees as far as, is the domain compromised, do we take action, do we refer to the registry, and then the registry's decision trees. It could be a real asset for particularly smaller registries or registrars that aren't quite sure how to handle these sorts of things.

Just one thing I wanted to flag. That group's work is done for the year, so nothing on the horizon from that. But I did want to flag these outputs. If you get 20 minutes, take a look. I think they're worth some time. Unless anyone has any other thoughts on Internet and Jurisdiction, then I can hand things over to Jim to discuss the DAAR Working Group.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. I'm not seeing any hands.

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry, Brian. It's Martin. I haven't been able to hand up here. But if I may, I just wanted to question something on the last section you covered.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Of course. Yes, please.

MARTIN SUTTON: In particular, it looks as if you've got some good guidance papers on the Jurisdiction website. What's the steps in terms of trying to get those into the right people's hands in terms of publicity and

circulation? That might be an area that could be interesting just to understand what the intention is to broadcast that further.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Martin. It's a good question and it's something that—as I mentioned, I'm coordinator so I always feel a little awkward being the one pushing it out there—but I think you're probably right that it is worth sharing more broadly. At a minimum, I will share this with the Registry Stakeholder Group. I know Ashley Heineman is involved in it as well so maybe she can share it with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Also, Bertrand de la Chapelle, who is the Executive Director of it and was on the ICANN Board previously, came and presented to the Registrar Stakeholder Group Abuse Group. Sort of exactly at explaining document by document what they've seen, what sort of guidance they provided, and they've asked to come speak here. I was going to bring that up in AOB but I think that not necessarily particularized to Internet and Jurisdiction, but guest speakers like that I think would be really potentially of real interest and value to this group. But going back to the question as far as evangelizing the documents, that's something that's probably going to happen over the next month or so. But I wanted to flag for this group because these outcomes really just sort of the last one is pretty fresh as of the last week or so. Absolutely. Thanks, Martin.

Unless anyone has questions on I and J then, Jim, take it away on DAAR.

JAMES GALVIN:	Thanks, Brian. We've actually said this multiple times so maybe this is the last time we'll sort of purport out on this and it's time to make it real. The DAAR Working Group has kind of lost its wind and, unfortunately, there are a couple of open action items inside that group. We had some nice recommendations, OCTO had welcomed all of that, some changes to DAAR are coming. I'll report here that what Samaneh had told me is that the November 2019 reports were being revised to take on board all of our recommendations. I didn't ask her why they took November 2019 but, in any case, they're going to have something soon. Maybe she meant to say they're going to publish the November 2021, now that I think about it, coming up here with some new stuff in it. But in any case, some follow-on tasks which we still never really completed, and Samaneh has some questions for us. So this is actually kind of a nice lead-in into the next topic of initiatives where we want to shut down the DAAR Working Group and there's not a lot of formality associated with that but just declare it done and absorb the remaining tasks into this group, which then brings the question of initiatives. What is this group going to be doing and what is our focus going to be and where are we going to head?
	We put four items here on this agenda, just something for us to think about. We did have a brainstorming session three weeks ago, four weeks ago now. Now we're trying to pull this in and figure out what our structure is and how we want to do these things. I think the first way to open before we talk about what these for things are is to observe. One of the things we mentioned before, even Brian and Donna and I had talked amongst ourselves at one point, and so here's a position to propose to the group

here, is this is a very large group, probably too large for having the whole group working on everything. We might seek to structure ourselves so that a few key people who are interested in something would be the ones who would take something on and progress in moving forward and then bring it back to the whole group for review afterwards. So I'd like you keep that in mind as we talk about some things we might work on in this group and what they might look like. Think to yourselves, if that seems like a sensible way for us to work, it just becomes a little bit of a management thing for Brian and I at this point to keep track of who's working on what. We'll probably have to figure out a little bit of logistics about how people are going to get time to work on things or maybe they'll just do that amongst themselves. But something to think about as a way to manage all of our work in the set of broad things that we do here.

So just to briefly say something about what these four things are—and I'm going to tie them actually to item 4 on the list here, which is long-term initiative, which you notice it doesn't have anything in its sub task list and that's because we're starting with some things that we know we want to figure out how to address and maybe we can choose to just move them into long-term initiatives or we'll come up with some other things. So this is about tracking our work overall. Maybe there's not much to say in this meeting about long-term initiative unless people have suggestions.

First item, registry positioning. I think it's fair to say that one of the primary motivations for creating this group is because DNS abuse is just, in general, a topic which is not going to go away and it's time for us to figure out how to get organized and what it means to

get in front of these discussions. There's a lot of stuff happening around us. We are all actively doing our part for abuse mitigation and yet we still get caught off guard by plenary sessions that get planned and we don't seem to have a lot of influence in trying to manage that. We did manage to sweep this last one into something a little better than what it was originally thought of to be. But again, we got the next ICANN meeting coming up. You know somebody is going to want to talk about DNS abuse in some way. We really have to think about what it means to do that.

In general, there's always this question of more. Everybody seems to want more from registries and registrars alike. We really have to sit down, I would think, and either figure out what else we might be able to do and begin to think about that, maybe work towards it and develop that and then message it. Or we at least have to have a better story and get in front of offering this story more generally about the fact that everybody seems to want something else from us and we need something to say to them and we've got to have a consistent story and we have to do our own evangelizing of that story to get in front of things like plenary planning and what goes on there. That's what those two things are. I'm going to pause there for a moment rather than jumping into the other two, in part because I see a hand up there, my co-Chair Brian. Brian, why don't you jump in?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Jim. Very well put. As far as the plenaries and to Maxim's point, we know that there's always going to be a plenary on DNS abuse, it feels like at this point. If we know we're going out to dinner, we might as well pick the restaurant. So I feel like this

group should be in the position that we can suggest something on behalf of the registries or CPH. Because I've found these last topics on the plenaries were—even though it was somewhat salvaged at the last minute in the last plenary—still very broad DNS abuse is bad discuss. So I think that there might be an opportunity if we can come up with sort of a concrete list of potential topics we can discuss and use that specific issue as a potential plenary on abuse then we may be spared just the general, you know, everyone yelling at each other saying how we think abuse is bad and contracted parties say, "We agree," and to which we get a response of, "Yeah, but we don't think you think it's bad enough. So I think if we want to get this to be fruitful discussions that actually move the dialogue along, they should be focused on specific tasks. Immediately something along the lines of, this is just brainstorm, but there might be interest coordinating with the PSWG on discussing something like domain generating algorithm that may be too specific of an issue but something where we know that there's already cooperative relationship between us and another constituency like the PSWG, that we're going to frame the discussion around specific topics that we are very well versed in than I think that we're going to be better served for it.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. Excellent point. I will summarize it with one sentence as a question to the group here. Let's prepare a list of potential topics that we're prepared to talk about that we can use to influence all of the rest of the discussions that are going to certainly be called out on us. With that, Sam, go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU:	Thanks, Jim. This is definitely building on what Brian was just getting at but maybe taking it a slight step further. Should we consider whether there's some actual action that we, as the registries, can undertake? Like some work product that we can start developing—and I don't know what that looks like. Maybe it looks something like our own version of some best practices. Like taking, for example, the I and J stuff and repackaging it for an ICANN context, or maybe it's something about clarifying some reporting requirements for registries as it's under Spec 11 3(b). Something that we can all agree is valuable that will sort of push the community a little bit forward in terms of working on DNS abuse. I think doing that will help us accomplish two goals. One is that when these conversations come up about plenary planning for ICANN70, we have some grounds to potentially say, "Let's not have this conversation now because work is being undertaken and we want to wait until a little bit later and actually have something concrete to talk about." But also I think it serves the purpose of getting us out in front of some of the stuff because it gives us something to point to when we're hearing those complaints or hearing calls for registries to "do more" without really any specificity around that. Again, I'm not really sure exactly what that looks like but I think it might be worth us taking some time to think about whether this group can actually start producing something and whether that can buy us some of these benefits that we are discussing now.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. I'm sorry. I'm looking at the hands up list. I saw Donna's hand. Thanks, Sam. I do know you apart.

I took two specific suggestions out of your words and I just want to highlight them and capture them here. I very much like the idea of developing our own version of best practices and your other suggestion about clarifying reporting requirements. I'll observe that that is something that was related to some discussions that happened in DAAR reporting requirements. To make it concrete, we had talked about the fact that DAAR depends on reputation providers to say things. One of the weaknesses of reputation providers is they don't have a way of knowing whether or not registries or registrars have actually done anything because they're dependent on Internet users to report to them. So in the terms of this, clarifying reporting requirements, I'll just put out there that something for us to think about is, do we want to engage in something which moves that along so that DAAR can more quickly and better reflect what's going on with us? Just something for us to think about that we had at least something that's brought up there.

I also observed—I see Alan's got his hand up next and I'll call this out. Alan, of course is part of the SSAC work party and this DNS document Abuse paper which they've been talking about producing imminently, although Jeff Bedser did talk about it during the ICANN plenary just last time about some of the stuff that's in there. But there are a few suggestions in there, some ideas for stuff to do, and in fact this idea of best practices and stuff is there, and maybe Alan can say some more of that as well as whatever he was going to add there. So, over to you, Alan.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks very much, Jim. I suppose to jump straight into that point that you're talking about there, I know that the SSAC paper has gone through, shall we say, a process ever since we finished our formal work on those, and I'm so waiting to hear what the current status of it and I know that there's some SSAC discussions going on internally that I'm not privy to. That's fair enough. That's what the SSAC is doing. But yeah, within that—again, I'm very bad for the ceremony of the SSAC. I don't know what is and what is not kosher to say until the product comes out. One of the examples in that is something very much focused on the creation of interoperability standards and also the suggestion that somebody who's not ICANN who is a third party could stand in or be created in order to help educate and to help guide people through that process. I think that's certainly one of the things that's going to work completely off of what we said in the DNS abuse framework. When we're talking about creating best practices as well, I know there might be [inaudible] term for many people but the DNS abuse framework is something that is out there and is, as far as I'm concerned—obviously I'm one of the people assigned up to it—but it is a good basis and it is something that we've been able to rely on and being able to say to people when they challenge us saying, "You're not doing enough," and saying, "Actually, we are and if you want to be educated as to where a registry actually can or a registrar of course can act or be actioning, just look at them. Read this document. Refer them on to it." I think there is something already there we can build off form that.

I also wanted to point out as well—and it's by positioning ourselves—the one thing I've seen—and this is why I'm trying to get involved in the framework is why I want to be involved in the SSAC DNS abuse thing—is I still think that people see the registries, not necessarily the registries but ICANN, as the path of least resistance to get what they want. Not because we are not putting up a good enough fight but probably—and apologies to all our lovely ICANN colleagues—because ICANN don't put enough fight. They do not establish themselves as best as they could. They do not delineate the powers that they have. They do not delineate the powers of the registries and the registrars have. And those people who want to get something done quickly, fast, cheaply, be it [TM] through phishing, they will go to the path of least resistance. And as far as they're concerned, that is the ICANN process at the moment. So when it comes to the registries, I genuinely think what we need to do is just be a little bit stronger. I think we need to be not just stronger but definitely we need to be a little bit more forceful in a very respectful and open manner. But actually talking about things like the I and J and what they're trying to do is establish what is the proper point for a registry or a registrar to get involved. What is the appropriate point? Again, that's echoing things that are hopefully going to come through in the SSAC paper and of course echoing what's in the framework as well. I think that is probably the biggest skew that we could do and that is ensuring that we are positioning ourselves, not as the path of least resistance but as a path who's putting up some resistance now and just on the basis of appropriateness and referring to all of these efforts that are currently out there at the moment.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Alan. Very good point. I appreciate that. So that just becomes an overall task for us in probably getting back to my item 1 up there about registry positioning. In addition to trying to figure out actually what we can do, we really do have to package that up and then maintain that. Position that, present it, maintain it, and stick to it. In general, all of that is going to be helpful to us as we do specific things that we can put in that package. Donna, go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. I went back and listened to the DNS Abuse plenary and also the other one on the GDPR. I think part of the challenge that we have is that when we say DNS abuse, we have a specific understanding of what that is and we put that out there what our definition of DNS abuse is. I think within the community there's a much broader definition around that, and that makes it difficult when we have the conversations because we're not talking about the same thing. It's a little bit going to Alan's point about ICANN's role in this. It's a little bit disappointing that ICANN can't come out with a definition of what's DNS abuse and what fits within their remit.

So I think that's part of our challenge. I think the best practices and all those sorts of efforts will be really helpful but it's not going to necessarily address the noise because we're not all talking about the same thing. Maybe one of the things that, Jim, if we do break into smaller groups, is just explore that a little bit and try to address some of the different definitions because there are other

definitions out there. Maybe just explore that and see if there's some way we can counter or respond to, "This isn't DNS abuse from where we refer to it." So I think that's part of our challenge, too, it's the terminology.

It was pretty obvious in that GDPR session. I think it was Lori Schulman—or maybe it was the DNS abuse one—but Lori Schulman was saying that she had stats that aren't consistent with OCTO but couldn't provide them. I think it goes more to the definition we're talking about than the actual stat. I think that's a conversation that it will be helpful if we had that amongst ourselves to see what we can bring forward in responding to that. Lorraine will often say that to address abuse, we need registries to take on verification of registrants. Now, obviously, that's not something that we're going to do. But how can we respond to Lorraine because she's not going to shut up. She's going to keep saying that and we're going to keep hearing it from the GAC. The IP interest, if I understand that correctly, that's about the registration of names at the second level that are related to businesses or trademarks. So how do we respond to that?

I just want to throw that out there. I think it's great. We've got to get on the front for best practices. Stuff being done by I and J is really good but I think we're not talking about the same type of thing as abuse with the rest of the community is. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks very much, Donna. All very excellent points and I agree with you completely. My concern is that we will always be challenged by the definition of DNS abuse. We do have a

definition of DNS abuse and we have our own as well as other elements in the community. I guess my caution here is I'd like to elevate the discussion away from the definition of DNS abuse, although we're also going to have to look at what everyone is saying, what everyone is doing. And we have to figure out how to make our definition be a better one and create a story around it that pushes back in all the other stories. People have a reason for motivating their own story. I'll only pick on the last item that you mentioned there about registrant validation. You're right. There are a lot of stories that suggest that DNS abuse goes down by a great deal if you have registrant validation. Well, that's only true up to a point. There are certain kinds of abuse that go away if you have registrant validation. So that's not a full picture and not a complete picture. Then to agree with everything else that you said, we don't have that story to offer and there's no real discussion of that part of the story. That's something that we do have to dig into and we have to get into. If we don't have a story about that, we should all recognize that registrant validation is something that's going to come down on us. It's already going to become partly an issue from the EPDP in this discussion of legal versus natural people because you want a display of legal person data. So there's going to be some validation that's going to come around that registrars are going to be affected, we'll eventually have to support as part of our publication of data. These things are all related and not an easy space, and so there's a lot of discussion to be had there to work through. So thank you for that.

A lot of hands going up here. I guess I should talk less. Brian, go ahead, please.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Jim. Thank you, Donna. I think that's a good framing of things. The one thing I would say is that I think we should be careful not to sort of validate the other definitions of DNS abuse by engaging on too much discussion on them, to be honest. It feels very much an abuse analogy before like a discussion around climate change and climate science. There's not a both sides on this, in my opinion. There is DNS abuse and then there's website content abuse issues that fall well outside the scope of that. Even discussing DNS abuse that would fall outside of the real DNS issues is just, at a bylaw level, outside of ICANN's remit. So I think that any definition of DNS abuse that is basically anything bad on the Internet is just on its face absurd. I think we should start treating it almost accordingly that we are the actors that are out there identifying and mitigating DNS abuse. Here's what it is, this is what we take action upon, and I think Jim is saying a story can really help sell this. One potential story—and this is pulling something back to what Alan said—is if there is some sort of unity around best practices, we could potentially rally around the framework in one way. So I know that the framework has website content abuse questions on it. We could sort of segment the DNS abuse framework and say that potentially registries endorse the DNS abuse framework as it relates to DNS abuse. Then the questions on website content abuse are outside of ICANN's remit so we're not going to comment on that that's reached individual registry/registrar. If we had something like that, I think that can really help move the ball in getting the saner definition of DNS abuse potentially used more across our discussions. To me, there's not really a both sides as I'm on this. Anyone that's

suggesting that pure website content abuse is DNS abuse is either over their skis or they know what they're doing and choose to do it anyways.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. I think that Donna kicked us off here with an excellent topic for us to find a little subgroup and find a way to work with this. I could very broadly call it a discussion of everything around the topic of the definition of DNS abuse and this gets to the issues of, should we be talking about it? Should we not be talking about it? What do the stories really look like around it? All of that. A very broad topic area, contractual obligations versus the DNS abuse framework proposal that the Registry Stakeholder Group has adopted as a position—there's lots of stuff in there as we try to figure out exactly what to do with that and I like it. And I like your comment about maybe we don't say anything. By speaking to it, we kind of give it credibility and we have a path to find a different way to deal with that. I like that, too. Kurt, go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ: I'm sorry to be following Brian because I'm going to change the subject a little bit. So I'll say what I have to say but then we should get back to what Brian brought up because I thought it was right on point. Beyond the definition we're fighting at the structural problem that's almost impossible to overcome and that is that the people that are representing IP owners that participate in our process are in ICANN and they're so raised on [inaudible] is to have this discussion on DNS abuse and keep hammering on this

now. My vision is the IP owners huddle up and somebody says, "You go over and go to ICANN and you go over to do this," so the participants in the ICANN world have one tool and that's to hammer on registries or registrars and come back to their bosses with CircleID articles or plenary sessions or statements made in the sessions or to hammer on ICANN. There's no incentive. Their only incentive—their paycheck is dependent on that. And the only way I see to get out of that really is to say if you really want to fight DNS abuse or total abuse that occurs is to do it in the most ineffectual spot. So I don't know if we can point to other places where people can have a lot more success fighting DNS abuse more cheaply, more effectively than just hammering on the same thing where registries and registrars identified their areas are responsible and neither addressing it. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Kurt. I agree with all of that. You're right. We are suffering, if you will, from a particular community which only has a hammer to offer and everything looks like a nail, in particular us. We have to talk about what's really going on there, what we think our options might be to respond to them.

Okay. Brian, I'm going to assume that's an old hand along with Kurt and draw a little bit of line into this and jump to the next two initiatives a little bit. It's labeled SSAC pressures. I put that on there but it's really more about pressures broadly from the community. Kurt very nicely mentioned the IP community pressures. ALAC has its pressures. I do myself, I think about SSAC and what they're doing. I'm sure that most people here are familiar with the Interisle report which just came out. And of course

although it is an Interisle report, there are a couple of SSAC members who are authors of that particular document. SSAC has generally been on a certain side in the DNS abuse idea. They really do have their own agenda to push in this place, representing security researchers and abuse mitigators in general and wanting to press on that. And they're getting support from others. So this is more about, again, maybe this is just a little sub-piece of the registry positioning at the top. There are a lot of people beating on us and looking for something. We need to create some kind of package of, "This is what we're doing," maybe we can add some new things to that. We've got to create a story around what other people think is right. And maybe what Kurt just said about trying to point people in a different direction, where else should they go? "We're not the nail that you're looking for. We appreciate that you have a hammer but there's nothing that we can do for you." I'm not quite sure how we promote that kind of message but it feels to me like that's something as registries that we need in the space.

Then moving on to the DAAR task, I think that we did a pretty good job and we have a lot of success in working with Samaneh. Now, we haven't seen all of those changes come true yet in the DAAR report. Samaneh seemed to suggest that they were coming and she has opened the idea that she wants to talk to us about bringing ccTLDs on board and reporting on them, and of course they also have an idea about reporting on registrars which they'd like to use and do something similar with respect to registrars that they do with TLDs. There is a technical issue with being able to report on registrars. I won't really talk about that here right now. But I think that as we examine and continue to think about what else we could do with DAAR since that now is clearly something

the community is going to depend on and is going to use, right now it's reflecting well on us. I think it's an opportunity that we should not let go of. We should continue to think about how we can keep it as a positive influence and a positive representation of what we're doing. I think that is a topic that we should stick with and continue.

We have a good relationship with Samaneh and John Crain. Let's see what else we can do there, what more we can develop. The open tasks that were there were more on the messaging side. We made a number of specific recommendations about how ICANN should reword their reports and also the website some broad recommendations about them improving their messaging with all of these. Not clear where that's going to go. They said that they've taken the recommendations on board but that's something for us to follow through on and see what we can do with it. There's an opportunity for us to have an influence more directly on messaging as part of our larger messaging initiative, trying to package up our position and make it look very positive in the large.

That's the four initiatives that are there. That's trying to put a little bit of structure on our discussions here. I tried to capture some notes while we're talking and I captured points based on what I've actually replayed. As people talk, I tried to play back a couple of key points that I heard, and that's what I captured here. Brian and I will take those on and again try to make them a little more task-oriented or actionable and use that as an agenda for our next meeting. He and I will try to get a little more organized, get a step closer into being very structured about what we propose that we

do. For me, this falls into the longer-term initiative. I don't really have anything to add to that particular discussion. It's on the agenda that call out for us that it's something for us to do. These initiatives can fall into short- and long-term categories and as part of us getting organized, we can put stuff there. If anybody wants to add anything, it's going to fold long-term initiatives into the AOB kind of area. Anything else comes up to you along the way here while we're in the rest of these discussions, please feel free to jump out, offer it up. We'll add it to the list and figure out how to get organized around it.

I think with that, one brief opportunity for anyone to raise a hand if they want to. Otherwise, I will hand it back to Brian to jump us into a discussion, our working with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and their subgroups.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thank you very much, Jim. So one brief note before I get to that on the long-term initiatives just as an example. I just want to encourage people that it would be great if people used our [distro] as a place where we sort of can bounce ideas off each other. We don't have to wait for our meetings, which will become regularly scheduled, but I think that we shouldn't have to wait between meetings to get some good ideas going. So just one plug for the mailing list.

You should have seen an e-mail from me where I forwarded on an invitation from Zoe, where the Registrar Stakeholder Group Abuse Group is meeting next Tuesday and they've invited us to participate. This is the first, obviously, joint meeting between our

two Abuse groups but certainly not going to be the last. The registrars are obviously under largely the same pressures that we are, more so because they're typically the more appropriate actor to take action on abuse. So it's good for us to be aligned in a number of ways.

There's two things on the agenda next week from the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Since we're being invited, they set the agenda. First is an academic is presenting a case study on DNS hijacking. I don't know much more about it other than that. So that could be potentially interesting. Second is Graeme, who's the Chair of that group, floated that they want to discuss potential best practices, standards, consistency on the location of and content upon abuse reporting sites. That would be smaller chunk of potential best practices, but to the extent the Registry Group or the Registrar Group have recommendations that can be endorsed by the counterparts and make them full CPH positions, I think that's definitely going to be in all of our collective interests.

So if you can, the meeting is next Tuesday at 10:00 Eastern. I believe that's 16:00 UTC. I'll provide a read-out afterwards to this group but I encourage you to make it so we can foster that relationship between the two working groups and move from there. Sam just corrected me, 15:00. Sorry about that. Any questions on next Tuesday's meeting or our relationship with the Registrar Stakeholder Abuse Group more broadly? No. I'm not seeing any. Then I will hand it back to you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN:	If you wish, you can take us out. I don't think there's anything else to say about long-term initiatives since you had Maxim's article on your mind.
BRIAN CIMBOLIC:	Yes. Then before we get there, I just want to again cease out the definitional issue. It is something that we should probably, sooner rather than later, I think get a position on what our posture is on that. I think that we put out a really coherent joint position from the CPH on DNS abuse that's been shared by both the framework and Internet and jurisdiction basically endorsed full-throated by both. I think that we're in the position that we should be driving the discussion on definitional issues and not necessarily validating other potentially less good faith definitions, but that's just my own thought. As far as long-term initiatives I would see that as a potential focus, making sure that our definition is the predominant one.
	Okay. AOB. Maxim, you had an article that you wanted to discuss. He just posted the link to the CircleID in the chat. Here's Maxim.
MAXIM ALZOBA:	Do you hear me?
BRIAN CIMBOLIC:	Loud and clear.

MAXIM ALZOBA:	The idea is the article itself is just typical repetition of what we hear during those sessions. I think it might be a good idea to add something as a comment, for example, that they use proactive a lot and nobody explains what proactive is beyond, somehow understanding what's going to happen in the future, which I don't believe is in our hands.
	Also, the reason to talk about it—actually, I tried to use my login to add the comments but failed miserably because the database doesn't accept me as a valid user. So I think it might be worth to spend a few minutes maybe discussing over e-mail what should we add there because it's a good point to explain what we do usually and how we do. Also it might be used as a reference later somehow. Just thinking out loud. Also, I'm not well constructing the train of my thoughts. Thanks.
BRIAN CIMBOLIC:	Thanks, Maxim. Thank you for flagging it. To the extent that you guys haven't taken a look at that article, I would encourage you to do so. It comes back to that definitional question of DNS abuse. This piece purports to be sort of data driven but the data that it claims to demonstrate increased DNS abuse is just the number of UDRP disputes. Literally, potentially it had nothing to do with DNS abuse. If it's trademark issue, there's two consensus policies or at least community mechanisms that exist to deal exactly with that. So it's another example of sort of FUD in my opinion, but it's something that we should be aware of because it's an article that I know is getting sense around. Sam?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Brian. I think this article is a hot mess. I think you're absolutely right. It really feels like they just tried to hook it into DNS abuse because DNS abuse has become like the topic du jour and the hot topic within ICANN, and that was going to be the thing that CircleID could put in the headline that would get flexed. So I don't know that we need to do anything with this article except let it exist in its inherent ridiculousness. But going forward, I think it probably is a good indicator of what you and Kurt and other have pointed to, which is they're going to continue to be conflation of DNS abuse and IP infringement, and the best thing I think that we, as registries and our friends and colleagues in the registrars, can do is just say those are different things and just hold the line. But I don't know that we really need to spend too much time on this article or really do anything to give it any creams because it's just a bunch of word salad. I don't think it actually makes any concrete and worthwhile points. Sorry, that was very frank.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I'm here for it. I enjoy that very much. Martin and then J.C. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN SUTTON: Thanks, Brian. I concur on that. I think a lot of these things make a bit of noise and if you respond, it just amplifies it further and potentially not in you're in favor. Reading underneath all of these, though, is the fact that where it is global brands that service millions of customers every day, we got to understand that one incident of a particular type of DNS abuse can have a major

consequence for users. So I think I would caution everybody in just holding the line on DNS abuse. We've got to appreciate that these brands are dealing with their incidents day in, day out, as I used to, and it affected millions of users around the world. So a mark of one incident is not necessarily a good indicator of impact of that incident. So if there are ways and if there is indications here in the article about proactive activities, I think there is already a lot of proactive activities that go on, especially within registries. But being able to illustrate that without exposing exactly what you do and making that vulnerable in itself, maybe something worth investigating as well so that the proactive work is also shared and revealed more generally so that people can actually acknowledge the work that is being undertaken. I think we've gone some way down the line of we're already trying to do that in some of the sessions that we've held to ICANN and elsewhere. I just wanted to flag a couple of those points now. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Excellent. Thank you very much, Martin. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Brian. Just a couple of things. It might be a good idea for us to start to—I can't find the words—try to establish a better relationship with the BC and IPC. I know that's not our natural cause but I think it might be worthwhile to do that. I think it's also likely that Mason Cole is going to be the next Chair of the BC. A number of us know Mason. I know we think he's on the other side of the isle now but some of us do have relationship with Mason, so maybe it's worthwhile having a few conversations with maybe

Mason and Heather and see how we can have a few open conversations about the problem and see if we can work the noise somehow in that direction. I think Martin is right. I think some of us are probably—I shouldn't say us. There are some registries that are proactively doing some work that's trademark related. So maybe we can work on that as well. Let's cultivate some relationships that we wouldn't normally do and see if we can take some of the noise down and some of those structure relationship issues that Kurt was talking to.

The other thing I just wanted to mention is just a reminder that Martin and Craig did quite a bit of work for us back in February on a trusted network and perhaps it would be good to hear from Martin and Craig at some point and just bringing those out a little bit. Thanks.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thank you very much, Donna. Great points. Sam?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Brian. I just wanted to jump right back in in response to Martin and apologize if I sounded like overly dismissive of the legitimate concerns and impacts of problems that run on the space because I did not mean to do that. And I think as we're talking about engagement with the BC and IPC and working to improve relationships there, I think that one thing that can be potentially useful is making very clear how seriously we take threats of like phishing and malware and other kinds of issues that really do have measurable harm on consumers. Because I think

that's very common ground. That's like the Venn diagram overlap of what we're talking about when we talk about DNS abuse and what brand owners and IP interest are talking about when they talk about the harms that can be caused by this kind of bad behavior online. So I definitely think there's a lot of space there and I totally agree on positive relationships. I just was being a little bit snippy about this particular conflation of items in the article. So I apologize that I sounded a little militant on that front.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thank you, Sam. I may have done the same. I think it's a fair point, though. All of us when we're talking about phishing or malware, yes, we are going to take action upon it. Frankly, regardless of whether or not it's trademark infringement, that may lead to be a factor in determining whether it would qualify as a phish, but certainly not all phishing is trademark infringement, not all trademark infringement is phishing. So I think that we can certainly recognize the legitimacy of the issues for those brand holders without seeding ground as far as conflation of the brand infringement versus necessarily meaning DNS abuse. I think we're all on the same page on that, just to be clear.

Anyone else, any interventions? This is the last piece unless anyone had any other AOB. Okay. Well, if not, then thank you very much, from both Jim and myself, for joining. Please, if you can try and join the session with the registrars next Tuesday and we will set up a follow-up meeting for this group as well. Awesome. Thank you very much, everyone.

SUE SCHULER: Okay. Thanks, Brian. Thanks, Jim. Nathalie, we can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]