ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – ccNSO: ccNSO and DNS Abuse
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hello, everyone and welcome to—

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Yes, Claudia, please.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello and welcome to the ccNSO and DNS Abuse session. My name is Claudia Ruiz along with my colleague, Kimberly Carlson. We are the remote participation managers for this session. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper forum as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session. If you would like to ask your questions or comments or make a verbal comment, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcription is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom tool bar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's Multistakeholder Model, we ask that you sign-in to your sessions using your full name.

For example, a first name and last name or surname. You can be removed from the session if you do not sign-in using your full name. With that, I will hand the phone over to Alejandra Reynoso, session chair. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Claudia. And welcome, everyone to the ccNSO and DNS Abuse session. Before we start, regarding the recent ccNSO Council statement, we will have a further discussion on this matter and we will inform the ccTLD community on the time and date of such discussions for everyone to participate and give your feedback.

But today, we are here to share our progress on the DNS Abuse topic as we promised. Please note that there will be a new mechanism for interaction today. As many community members expressed the desire to have just the feedback of ccTLDs on this matter, we have listened and have sent to our mailing list some URLs from menti.com for the polling and to be used not only in this session but in the next one on governance as well.

So take 30 seconds to go to your inbox and find this particular email sent by Kim Carlson with the subject ICANN73 polling URLs. Please be

very careful to use the first link to this session and the second link to the next session. So can we go to the next slide?

While you are looking for this polling links, let me recap what has happened since the start of this process. So we were asked to have a view from the ccNSO on DNS Abuse matters. And then in ICANN72, the council consulted ccTLDs and the ICANN community regarding well, if there was a role for the ccNSO on this and if so, what should we do or not do? Afterwards, there was a workshop where the council and ccTLDs evaluate the impact and effort required to these suggestions.

A small team was tasked to prepare a road map. The first draft was presented to the council on January, then on February, it was shared with the community. And here we are today seeking your feedback on this process and the road map itself. And with the feedback that we get from today's session, we will at the council seek to adopt the road map on Thursday when we have our council call. And if all goes well, implement such road map. And now, I'll hand it over to Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks very much, Alejandra. And good afternoon, good evening, good morning to everybody. My name is Nick Wenban-Smith on ccNSO Council. Elected from the European region and I am obviously for the .uk registry.

So if we move on to the next slide, you remember that we had an open session. It was mainly ccTLDs but it was an open session to anybody who was interested. And ideas were contributed towards what are the

ideas people have that we might do. No idea was going to be a bad idea. Just throw it out on to the table and let's have a discussion on it and we can then do some consideration.

And you'll see there was 15 I believe different ideas. Some of them were duplicates of similar ideas but we came down to 15 specific questions. And we had a specific poll amongst everybody who was participating and you can see the level of support with the blue lines on the left-hand side agree and orange being disagree and the rest being I have no opinion.

If we can move on to the next slide. So here are those same 15 categories and you can see that they've been put in order of support. I suppose from my perspective, if you start at the top of the level of support, I'm seeing here things which would classically be well within the scope of activities of the ccNSO. These are information sharing, education. Obviously, every time we talk about ccTLDs we say we are different. We are different from gTLDs. Reinforce that, share information with other points of ICANN. This is not particularly a surprise.

And then, if you look at the bottom, numbers 14 and 15 with the red, the ccNSO does not have a policy role in terms of registry operations. So it is not particularly surprising to me personally. I can understand why these were suggestions but it's not I don't think a particular surprise to see that for example global databases, audits across ccTLDs are thought to be a bad idea with a very low level of support. I think in the middle category, you can see from numbers 5 down to 13. There's

actually a majority support but not everybody, so it's sort of between 61 and 78 where we're looking at—for example, there's a lot of community efforts, if you look at number five about what do we mean by DNS abuse.

And I think you could spend a lot of time talking about definition of what is and what isn't DNS abuse. Is it content? Is it within the remit of ICANN? All of these things are very interesting but is it something that the ccNSO wants to spend its limited resources going into give that lots of other people are doing it. So would we perhaps focus on more concrete actionable interesting things to do.

So we also can see here the DAAR. The DAAR is an ICANN initiative. It stands for Domain Name Abuse Reporting. And it kind of give you some metrics. But it's still a slightly controversial tool in some people's eyes and it requires ccTLDs for example to provide ICANN with zone files and some ccTLDs have very strong ideological and philosophical objections to this.

And then, voluntary frameworks, expectations. Again, reminder that stakeholders that ccTLDs are not gTLDs. An interesting one that we can see in number 10 when we look at our proposed road map creates a DNS abuse mitigation working group. But also to promote initiatives with [care] in the sense that policies are very different within different ccTLDs in what is a good practice or dare I say at a best practice for one registry. Take my own registry for example. We have many millions of registrations but we have 2,000 registrars. But we have no IDN scripts. We have our own specific culture, legal constitution and policy

framework. That is totally different from many other ccTLDs and we should be very mindful of that.

And that was kind of the comment and turn of the conversation as we were going through these. And you can see here code of conduct, voluntary roles. Maybe a TLD-OPS type thing and I think we'll hold that sort of thought for the moment and look at it when we come back to the road map. It's useful to see a ranking from number 1 at the top down to number 15. That's kind of the spectrum of things we ask the communities, mostly ccTLDs, this is what they told us. And I think I'll hand over now. Thanks very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Nick. And well, yes, we gathered these suggestions from ICANN72. In November, the ccNSO Council invited the ccTLD community to participate in a workshop to develop an impact effort analysis of these statements. And if we can go to the next slide, this is—the slide before. Thank you very much. We use first this methodology where we would place the statements regarding high, low, or negative impact versus low or high effort to identify the following areas. So projects we would like to consider, projects that we may not want to do, and projects that we definitely wouldn't like to do. So we can go to the next one please.

So here we placed the statements in terms of value benefit and effort. So if we can go to the next. Thank you. So here are the projects that according to this methodology we would like to consider. And then, in

EN

the next one please, thank you. Projects that we might not want to do or maybe think very much about those. The last one is projects that we definitely really will not want to engage because the impact would be negative and some of them even have a very high effort.

So if we can move to the next one, please. So we did another analysis of these statements. Again, to seek which would be the low-hanging fruit. The things that we should do almost immediately because they will have a high impact and low effort. Then we would look at the big bets. Always looking at high impact but now we have high effort as well. That's something to consider. If we look at the quadrant with a low effort and low benefit, those are maybe because again, they're low effort but then the impact is not as high. And then, the last one would be high effort and low impact. Those are the ones that we should not invest our resources in.

So if we can go to the next slide, please. So here we see again the same statements. We removed the ones that we definitely didn't want to do. And with this methodology, now we can see a little bit more clearly what we would like to do.

So if we go to the next, please. So this is the low-hanging fruit. The projects that we should proceed with which include reminding ccTLDs are not gTLDs, one size does not fit all. ccNSO as information sharing platform and managing expectations. So then we have the maybe consider which is the educational role that we already had but that could be enhanced in a way.

Then we have the big bets that are projects that could, as I said, have a very high impact but they are a very high effort. That includes share the processes, create understanding with the end-users, share facts, support community voluntary frameworks, use existing definitions. And in the middle, we have the DAAR project as well. And in the last one, we have the ones that are not worth the effort that promote DNS abuse statistics carefully. So these are the things that were considered in the workshop.

And if we go to the next slide, please. This analysis was then brought to an adopt group for them to further analyze, to make a summary, then present such summary to the council and seek feedback from the council. Then with that, they were tasked to prepare the road map with the envisioned role of the ccNSO and DNS Abuse. And then this road map was presented to the ccNSO Council in January. And now, we are here today to share with the community this road map and to seek your feedback.

With this here, we will now start describing the proposed road map. So we can go to the next one, please. So from the summary of ICANN72 and the workshop consultations, the other group identified four major components or activities that are envisaged in this road map. The first one is enhanced sharing of information. The second is messaging. The third is metrics and the fourth is the creation of a DNS Abuse Standing Committee.

Now my colleagues will now describe each component starting with Pablo, please.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Alejandra and greetings to all of you. It is great to see you. So we are going to take a look at the first component of this road map which is the enhanced sharing of information. And the enhanced sharing of information strengthens the platform function of the ccNSO so that we can continuously share information and showcase ccTLD best practices. For instance, via dedicated sessions and other channels.

We are going to build a repository and point of reference for ccTLDs to access relevant, reliable, and actionable information on DNS abuse. Also, in strengthening that platform function, it should be ensured that what is considered DNS abuse is context dependent and differs for stakeholder. The one-size-does-not-fit-all principle applies in DNS abuse as well.

Information is shared with ccTLDs and awareness is built. Voluntary DNS abuse frameworks developed by the broader community will be discussed and information is shared with other parts of ICANN. With that said, please consider how do you feel and support, in favor or no action?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Oh, now is the time to use these new tools that we will be using from menti.com. So I hope you have your URLs at hand and please vote— well, not vote. Share your sentiment regarding this component. I see that so far there is full support.

Yes, Pierre. Just a quick reminder, you can go to your inbox where an email was sent with URLs for this specific polling. The email says ICANN73 polling URL and it was resent recently, so it might be at the top of your inbox right now. It was sent to the ccTLD community, ccNSO members and the council mailing list. Yes, look that it might not be in your spam folder just in case. No problem, Pierre. This is the first time we are using this tool, so we are experimenting and we hope that this is helpful.

So we will give it one more minute, so people can find it. Leonid, the idea was to keep the link in the email. Okay, I think that for this one we have enough and it is pretty evident that we have support for this component. Thank you very much. If we can move to the next one.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: So I think second one. Are we on the next slide?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Messaging.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Messaging fall to me. We can move on the next slide. This is another poll but just to explain. When we share information, maybe one of these things was the difference between a message and a sharing of information. But I think a lot of the categories which came up for discussion were around emphasizing within the ICANN community that ccTLDs are different. To try to share a repository of resources and a place where previous things could all be seen and so be integrated and coherent to manage expectations not just within registries but also obviously, we have our registrar communities which are very important to us and to try to explain to them.

And also, obviously, to the broader communities. This is part of what we always do but to do it within the context of a more focused place. Oh, I need to vote myself. I want to get more votes than Pablo did, so help me out, people. Not that I'm competitive. Right, okay. This isn't like a binding vote but this is just again helping the council when we come to look at the components of the road map at our meeting later on to see whether or not it's correct that we have community support.

And I should say, the reason why the link was sent to the cc mailing list not to everybody is because I think we're aware that this should be decision or it should—we want to take the temperature within the ccTLDs and community and that was important to us from this perspective.

How many did Pablo get? Pablo had 30-something. Come on, people.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	It's more like 40.
NICK WENBAN-SMITH:	Oh.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	We're getting there. We're getting there.
NICK WENBAN-SMITH:	I think it's poll fatigue. And by the way, it's perfectly okay to have no opinion or to not support it. And some as they say do have no opinion on this which is okay. I'm sorry, McAuley. You're a spectator for this one. If anybody feels that this is not—it's actually interesting that this has a lower support than the first poll. Some more people are agnostic, I guess. That in itself is a useful datapoint which is helpful for the council when we come to consider the question.
	Okay, 42. I'll take 42. That makes me the winner. I'm going to hand over quickly before I get someone disagreeing with me. All right, thanks for your vote.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Thank you very much, Nick. And now, please David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Alejandra. Good morning, everybody. Good day. My name is David McAuley. I'm part of the ccNSO's small team working on this, representing my employer Verisign and .cc and I'm here to just talk briefly about metrics before we ask you about that.

As Nick mentioned at the outset of this, there are two rubrics near the top that we identified, one is education and one is sharing of information. And so, what we're getting to on the metrics or what we want to do on metrics is pay respect to the age-old principle that what gets measured gets managed. And so, in that respect, we're looking at identifying instances of DNS abuse, steps taken to address DNS abuse, and results that proceed from those steps.

And so, under the education idea, we believe that there should be steps taken to create an overview of existing metrics. And that might be to create an awareness of and an understanding of DAAR and what the domain abuse activity reporting tool or system that ICANN has developed in which some ccTLD managers participate.

Under the information sharing, looking at inviting ccTLDs to voluntarily share metrics on DNS abuse steps as in when they do that. And we will ask you a question about it in just one moment. Let me just say a little bit more about DAAR because we believe there should be an invitation to participate in this. Again, it's voluntary.

DAAR is a methodology that ICAN created to analyze security threat information with a view to creating information that's useful in making informed policy decisions in the community. It makes use of aggregated

ICANN|73
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

data, anonymized data. It makes monthly reports. One of the information sharing that we might get into is sharing of information from those ccTLD managers who do participate as to what their experience is like. In any event, that's the metrics part of the road map. To try and get useful, factual data that ccTLD managers can look at, participate in if they wish, and make informed decision based on.

And so, do we go to—I believe there's a question relating to this. It will be the same question and I need to get ready to vote myself whether you support the idea of gathering and sharing metric information. I'm going to step away and vote.

So you can see there's a fair amount of support for this but there should be—I'm encouraging more votes please amongst the ccTLD community. I like to see the blue bar heading up. As I said, we in this small team believe this is an important part of the road map of the effort going forward. Appreciate Pierre's comment. And Nick and Alejandra, I'm not sure how long we'd give these but I'm hoping—I'm trying to encourage folks, get out your voting URL.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We're giving time for people to vote as much as possible. And I see Frederico's comment in the chat that he supports this effort but not if it means only through DAAR. And definitely it's not only through DAAR. That's one of the projects that should be considered but it's not the only metrics that should be available.

DAVID MCAULEY: Alejandra, could I add one comment to what you just said

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, sure.

DAVID MCAULEY: What you just said is absolutely right. There's a number of sessions during ICANN73 at which DNS abuse is being discussed. And amongst those discussions including yesterday, there's some representative from groups that are keeping very good statistics. And so, as you say, there are other sources. And in our information sharing I believe the DASC, if it stood up, the Domain Abuse Standing Committee, if it in fact stood up, will be sharing information and links to organizations like this with plenty of good ones. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, David. And if possible, I would like to ask if people voted with no support if they can share with us why? I see that only—I think it might not be ideal. And we have said that it won't be. But if there is anyone else who would like to speak up, please do so and telling us why you do not support this. Okay, I don't see any hands up. Yes, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, I mean, to be clear, I did put them to support here because I am a firm believer. Actually, David expressed it very nicely around you don't find it easy to manage what you don't measure and track. I suppose I

can understand that some people might not take that view because first of all, there's the whole thing about DAAR participation and that requires ccTLDs to provide those zone files. And for many CCTLDs that's kind of a red line and not going to happen, so I understand that.

Myself I'm not a very enthusiastic supporter of DAAR. I like I think what it's trying to achieve but I can understand why some people don't think it's the right way and that's the thing of tactics, I suppose rather than the principle.

And so, the other thing is that, when it comes to the thing about ccTLD distinctiveness, the metrics that you get—because obviously, if you get metrics, then there's going to be tables and who's better than who and you're looking at comparisons. That has to be taken in context because an open registry with millions of domains is a different set of circumstances and context. From a small ccTLD with a very tight geographic nexus.

So I can see that people will interpret this out of context. I suppose that might be a reason why there's some skepticism around metrics is the thing. I suppose my response to that would be, I totally understand that and it's really incumbent on us to make sure that any metrics done are presented objectively and that we do our very best to make sure that where there are comparisons, there's essentially distinctions and reasoning behind it so that people can clearly see why it is that some numbers are different.

For example, I don't know, some people include spam as an abuse metric and others don't and that could lead you to widely different interpretations as to what you do. But I do think that measuring and getting a grip on the problem is the first step to understanding it and mitigating it. So I think that's a really interesting thing and thank you everybody for voting. Actually, thank you for the people with no support as well. I think that's really important for us as we go forward and evaluate on the next steps. Thanks.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Nick. While you were speaking, the support tally went up to 32 and I think we've leveled off and back to you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, David. And thank you all for your comments. We will take those into consideration very much. And now, we will move to the fourth component and I'll give the floor to Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Alejandra and hello, everyone. So I'm going to talk about the fourth component, fourth pillar of this road map. And what we propose here to put all these efforts, to connect all these threads that Pablo, Nick, David, Alejandra were talking about in terms of coordinating the efforts. Having ccNSO the platform, having dedicated forum for this coordination and discussions and information

sharing is to create a DNS Abuse Standing Committee. Next slide, please.

So the idea behind this committee is that this would be this unique dedicated forum repository of resources that can coordinate and contribute and to raise an awareness and understanding of the problem and of the efforts the ccTLD managers are taking, promote dialogue within the ccNSO community but also to some extent with the outside community at ICANN of course. Consideration of these metrics David was talking about.

And a very important point here that this is not a committee or a body or anything to develop policy. So this is a platform and a forum. It is voluntary, so there is no obligation to participate. It is going to be open to ccTLD representatives, not limited to the ccNSO members but to broader ccNSO community and it will also have liaisons within ICANN community.

How it is going to function? The standing committee is going to organize and participate and dedicate sessions and have a mailing list for exchange of information and building up on its tasks, in its mandate. Next slide, please.

So what you will see now is the outline of the very short-term, medium-term and long-term goals at the first phase of the work of this committee. At this ICANN73 meeting, we are trying to introduce this plan to the community. You [ascend] terms of references for the

committee and we are seeking feedback on both of these terms of references and on the road map itself.

We do hope that this committee will be created in March 22, so just this month. And it will start its work following the ICANN73, so prepare messaging ideas with other groups, create a mailing list, establish this channel of communication. And we'll start with the steps to create a repository. We expect also as the short-term goal for ICANN74, the committee would [inaudible] the platform through various efforts for example tech working group.

As a phase two—next slide, please. We expect that by July 2022, after ICANN74, this committee will keep these ongoing activities and start executing messages, maintain the mailing list, we hope it's going to be on a full swing by then, build metrics and expand repository. So these are medium-term goals.

And another medium-term goals are in the phase 3. Next slide, please. So by September 2022, post ICANN75 meeting, we expect or propose the committee to develop documents and practices. So [inaudible] its work. In the long-term, as phase 4 by March of 2023, so a year from now, by ICANN76 meeting and after, there would be effectiveness review and the committee will develop a playbook to mitigate DNS abuse.

I hope that this is not much of information overload and I hope that this—outlining the steps in phases gives you a good idea, a clear idea what we envision this committee to be and what the next foreseeable steps are.

Next slide, please. I would really like to ask you to vote on this. I'm not going to be promoting like yes, please, vote, support, no. As we heard before, we really appreciate also the votes of no support because it gives us a good sense of the temperature in the room. Of course, it would be very much appreciated if those voting for no support can explain why and what their concerns are. Are you concerned with committees? Are you not happy with some of the steps of function? So is it more about the forum as an idea? Is it about the way it functions? Is it more about the timeline and plan?

An interesting question here on the chat. Will the committee have to define DNS abuse? I believe that we already have this idea that there is no one-size-fits-all solution. And I believe that the definition might indeed be—and again, I cannot speak for the entire small team in this regard but as far as I understand from how ccTLDs function and how they are regulated and their national jurisdictions, their definition of DNS abuse might be very different from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

And correct me if I'm wrong, Alejandra and Nick, Pablo, but I do not envisage the task for this committee to define DNS abuse. But I think there is some common denominator, some common understanding the ccTLDs might coordinate, develop and share in this regard. Nick, please go ahead while we have the voting.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah. In the 15 questions, I think there was a very—not a very, very strong majority or unanimous position. But certainly, a majority who

urged us to not spend more of our valuable time and resources looking at our navels and arguing about definitions of DNS abuse because many of other people have had a go. And anyway, there's no real point because we're not going to create any policies which by [inaudible] definition. That's a waste of our time. So I think we've got that loud and clear and if we didn't make that loud enough and clear enough, then that's our fault. I want to take the opportunity to make it clearer. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Nick. And please, those of you who haven't voted yet, please do. Anybody wants to add anything here? And if not, Alejandra, back to you for taking these responses further. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Tatiana. And yes, I would like to ask the audience specifically those who said no support, if you could please clarify why because this will help us take your views into considerations. So yes, Pierre, please.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much. I'm not against the idea but I voted against because I would like to have guarantees that outsiders from ICANN and especially law enforcement or the EU Commission for instance will not engage directly with this standing committee and come back to us saying that there is a position or there is a consensus of the community

because this is what a lot of executives are currently looking for, to have a global partner to discuss with that. So I'm not against it but really, I would like to make sure that in no way this committee will engage with anything that looks like a political or public authority outside ccNSO.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Pierre. And definitely this won't happen. The idea of this committee is to have liaisons but with the aim of sharing information from us to the outside world because that was the main kickoff of this conversation is that people wanted to have a way to connect to the ccNSO on this matter and to see what ccTLDs are doing regarding DNS abuse.

So the idea of having these liaisons is to inform them of what ccTLDs are doing and to promote the good things that are happening that might be hidden from others that are not closely related to those ccTLDs. Nick, you want to add something more?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I was just going to say, the terms of reference I think is pretty clear that this is for participation from ccNSO members. So it is not for external bodies and I hear you loud and clearly here and I think you make a good point. I suppose my substantive response is more why we should do it is that—what I'm concerned about is if the cc community doesn't appear to have a position or to have a voice on this, then it leaves a vacuum and others will step in to this vacuum and start to say, hey, you should be doing this or you don't do enough of that or what is it that the

cc's are doing in this respect or in this area. And it's helpful for us in pushing back against those sorts of things if we can have a demonstrable repository of activity announcements and as you say, education explaining that these are not gTLDs. We're not ICANN Contracted Parties.

The policies and procedures, the size scope and geographic jurisdiction for all of these things is incredibly diverse and you need to approach all with a degree of caution. But of course, we step up our responsibilities and we don't ignore it and ignore problems if there are problems and we try to engage with people and to educate and understand them. If there's something—I may not speak for myself but if somebody can say, in respect to my own registry, you're missing something that you should be doing, then it's interesting to hear it. I don't have to do it but I think it's a good place to exchange information and ideas and that should be the overwhelming purpose of that committee. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Nick. And also, just to go back a little bit on the other component that we were looking at, it's the messaging. So the idea of this committee would be to share that one-size-does-not-fit-all. So that's something that we are very aware of. Also, that ccTLDs are not gTLDs. And definitely, that the ccNSO cannot make a policy regarding these, so all ccTLDs should comply with it.

So definitely these are the messages that this committee will have to convey to everyone consulting or sharing the table in this committee. Pierre, does that answer your question?

PIERRE BONIS: Yes, it answers my question. It doesn't quite convince me at the end but it answers my question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Is there anything else that you would like to hear?

PIERRE BONIS: Just because talking with each other is always [inaudible]. I recognize that but I would like to be sure that this is not liaison committee. That it's a working group within the ccNSO. If the idea is to engage with external group talking about the cc community, I mean, it's useless. But [inaudible] to say, the cc community is diverse, so go back and ask to each and every cc. So we are in the middle of this problem. People are talking with very good intentions to lawmakers saying that they think that or they think that and at the end of the day, the cc, the individual one in his own country is at odds with what other people say.

So I'm not convinced that we have a need as the ccNSO to engage, as the ccNSO with other parties. The council is here for that. The ccNSO itself is here for that. And if there is a working group that want to go deep on abuse, I welcome it but not to liaise with anyone else.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, Pierre. Definitely this group will not have the voice of decision. So with regards to DNS abuse, but I hear what you're saying. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, thank you very much. I fully get Pierre's concern and I think that this is something that we should go deeper and think better about. Pierre, it's just because to move forward I wanted to ask you a question. Do you think this concern, Pierre and others—I'm just trying to find a solution. Can it be solved by removing the functions of liaison or whatever or can it be solved by inserting very strong safeguards about positions of these liaisons and communication with wider community vis-à-vis this group making it more belonging to ccNSO.

So can your concern be solved and at the same time we can have challenge of communication or can your concern be solved only by [locking] this group within ccNSO? So is there a middle way? That's what I'm trying to understand. I hope that I ask my question clearly. But if not, please feel free to ask for clarification. But this is the question to Pierre or to whoever has the same concern.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Tatiana, I see that Pierre puts in chat, yes, exactly. Narrowing the terms of referencing in terms of liaison would be a solution.

TATIANA TROPINA: Okay, good. Good to know that there is way for—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. So are there any comments or questions on any of what has been shared so far? Anything you would like to add, suggest? I see that in general terms we are okay to move forward with the road map and present this in to the council for approval. Yes, we will take into consideration what has been said here to narrow down the terms of the liaison in the terms of reference.

And also, we have received thru the mailing list because this was shared in advance, some other observations. For example, regarding the mentioning of best practices, it's better to keep it at practices in general because what can be best for one ccTLD might not be best for another. So we should keep that always in mind. We are a very diverse community and we know we are different and we should keep that always in mind as in one-size-does-not-fit-all. Thank you. Thank you very much.

We also take into consideration the comments mentioned regarding DAAR. So yes, we will also add this to—for our report back to the council. I see there's a question in the chat from Eric Ziegast. Not everyone will agree on what is abuse or the current definition of types of abuse that your country registry agree with. Is there a coordination that can be done in DNS of standing committees so that reporting a specific type of abuse becomes easier for a registry to accept and process so that there is hope that they are actionable?

Well, we touched a bit on this. We will not seek to have our own definition on what DNS abuse is. I see David has his hand up? David, would you like to chime in on this?

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Alejandra. David McAuley speaking for the record. I was actually going to speak to the terms of reference modification vis-à-vis liaison, so maybe I should wait.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Wait just a second. So we will not define our own definition of DNS abuse because again, considering that we are a very diverse community, we should not lose ourselves or resources in that. But we will consider common ground for it. But once ccTLD consider DNS abuse and another ccTLD considers DNS abuse should not be necessarily—how to put it? Should not complicate the work of the DNS abuse committee. So I hope that answers your question, Eric. You're welcome. David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you so much, Alejandra. Hi again, everyone. It's David McAuley speaking. I wanted to speak a little bit about the point that Pierre made in the modification of the terms of reference with respect to the liaison role. And I fully appreciate the point that was made and Pierre made the point very well. But I should note a couple of things. One is, I personally—I'm an employee of Verisign representing .cc in the ccNSO.

I also participate in the registry stakeholder group and I have actually personally been participating in this small group, this ad hoc group on the ccNSO side and in the small group on the registry stakeholder group side.

And my hope is that when we develop the terms of reference with respect to liaison, we will be able to maintain within the ICANN community, even if only on an informal basis, not representing the ccNSO as the ccNSO. The ability to maintain that kind of relationship or participation in so far as it helps to share information, to get ideas on best practices, etc. And so, I was hoping that—and of course, this will be subject to this community's shaping of the standing committee if in fact that happens. But I would like to express and say, we ought to try and keep some form of that if we can, keeping in mind the point that Pierre said about making liaisons to entities in a more formal way. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, David. So I think we have a way forward. I'm reading the chat just to see if there is anything, any other question or comment here. I don't see any for the moment. So in that case, I would like to thank you very much for your participation. I would like to take just a minute or two of your time just to ask you if these new way of interacting with the menti URL was a good idea. If you could let us know, maybe in the chat or with the green tick or the red cross just to see if this was something that you would like us to use more in the future.

We will be using it in our next session that will start at 16:30 UTC in the governance session. But still, having some more minutes here, I think it would be nice to know your thoughts. So I see a few green ticks and comments that this was a good idea and that this should be used more. And again, this was from feedback received that there was this desire to have only the ccTLD community expressing their views in these sessions and this is our first attempt on doing so.

So with that, I thank you all for joining and please do come to our ccNSO governance session at 16:30 UTC and be ready to use the polling tool again. Thanks all, stay safe. See you soon. Yes, the slides will be posted.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]