

**Adobe Connect - Chat Transcript from CCT Review Plenary Meeting #58
27 September 2017 @ 13:00 UTC**

Pamela Smith: (9/27/2017 07:31) Welcome, all, to the 58th Plenary Meeting of the CCT Review.

Pamela Smith: (07:31) Please note that this meeting will be recorded. When not speaking, you may mute your phones by pressing *6. Press *6 to unmute.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:08) p11

Carlton Samuels: (08:10) Morning all

Laureen Kapin: (08:13) You are dropping in and out Drew.

Waudu Siganga: (08:13) HI Carlton. Hope teh hurricanes are over?

Gao (on Firefox): (08:14) I can barely hear Drew

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:15) I'm fine with the body and Recommendations 1 and 2

Carlton Samuels: (08:15) @Waudu: Greetings. We hope so too. Still some time yet for end of season. Jamaica had only the outer rain bands so even now we are seeing more rainfall than usual.

Pamela Smith: (08:15) He just came back in the room

Carlton Samuels: (08:16) I@Drew: I gree with language 1 &2 since the beginning. We never had any dissention

Calvin Browne: (08:16) non from my side

Calvin Browne: (08:17) No disagreement that is

Drew: (08:17) Sorry - I don't have good phone reception here - so I'll just type fo rthe remainder

Gao (on Firefox): (08:17) No disagreement from me

Drew: (08:20) I couldn't hear Kaili well

Carlton Samuels: (08:20) @Kaili: "Greater scrutiny" is optimal language seeing ICANN Compliance already has the mandate and the means to. What that language says is "step it up".

Carlton Samuels: (08:22) OK Calvin. Thats good

Calvin Browne: (08:22) (DAAR) iniatives. This should be regularly published

Drew: (08:23) I'm OK with "greater scrutiny"

Calvin Browne: (08:23) for Jean-Baptiste

Carlton Samuels: (08:26) I'm hearing you very well Laureen

Gao (on Firefox): (08:26) I am hearing bits and pieces again.

Kaili Kan: (08:30) How come my connection is sometimes choppy ...

Calvin Browne: (08:31) an answer I'd give: to give the process greater transparency

Carlton Samuels: (08:31) @Waudu: More eyes Waudu for validation and followup by community pressure. When we know we can always say get it done!!

Calvin Browne: (08:32) It gives the people an understanding that their complaints are actually heard and acted upon

Carlton Samuels: (08:32) Talk Waudu!!

Laureen Kapin: (08:33) I can gear you Waudu. There is a lag between what I say and its transmission to you.

Laureen Kapin: (08:33) Meant, I can "hear" you.

Carlton Samuels: (08:33) @Waudu: I don't think we need to breadcrumb. We dealing with C-level people here!!

Waudu Siganga: (08:34) This information should be regularly published to enhance transparency to the community. In addition the information can be used to identify....

Carlton Samuels: (08:34) I am concerned that we take some of these "I don't understand" way too seriously!!

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:35) Drew had the following message to post in the chat that did not go through because of his connection: "I was suggesting for rec 3) that we retain "increased scrutiny" but also add "high priority" so that it reads "increased scrutiny and high priority" or something similar"

Calvin Browne: (08:35) For transparency purposes, this information should be.....

Calvin Browne: (08:35) that should address Waudu's concern

Carlton Samuels: (08:35) @Calvin: OK. I can handle that

Carlton Samuels: (08:36) @Drew Use "higher" for "high".

Calvin Browne: (08:36) or just "For transparency"

Waudu Siganga: (08:36) Great. Calvin+Drew suggestions fine with me

Carlton Samuels: (08:39) How about "higher priority"? This assumes there is no priority assigned by ICANN Compliance now.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:41) modified versions of Rec 1 & 2 from Drew to be in line with the multistakeholder process: Recommendation 1: Consider directing ICANN org, in its

discussions with registries to negotiate amendments to existing Registry Agreements, or in negotiations of new Registry Agreements associated with subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, to registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures. Rationale/related findings: The new gTLD safeguards alone do not prevent technical abuse in the DNS. Abuse rates are strongly correlated to domain name registration prices and as well as registration restrictions imposed on registrants. Some registries are inherently designed with strict registration policies and/or high prices. However, a free, open, and accessible Internet will invariably include registries with open registration policies and low prices that must adopt other measures to prevent technical DNS abuse.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:41) Registries that do not impose registration eligibility restrictions can reduce technical DNS abuse through proactive means such as identifying repeat offenders, monitoring suspicious registrations, and actively detecting abuse instead of merely waiting for complaints to be filed. Therefore, ICANN should incentivize and reward the implementation of proactive anti-abuse measures by such registry operators to reduce technical DNS abuse in open gTLDs. To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG. Prerequisite or Priority Level: High. Consensus within team: Yes. Details: The ICANN Board should consider urging ICANN org to negotiate with registries to include in the registry agreements fee discounts available to registry operators with open registration policies that implement proactive measures to prevent technical DNS abuse in their zone.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:41) Recommendation 2: Consider directing ICANN org, in its discussions with registrars to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. Rationale/Related Findings: Current policies focus on individual abuse complaints. However, registrars and registry operators associated with extremely high rates of technical DNS abuse continue operating and face little incentive to prevent technical DNS abuse. Moreover, there currently exists few enforcement mechanisms to prevent systemic domain name abuse associated with resellers. Systemic use of particular registrars and registries for technical DNS abuse threatens the security and stability of the DNS, the universal acceptance of TLDs, and consumer trust. To: The ICANN Board, the Registry

Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Prerequisite or

Carlton Samuels: (08:42) I've lost all audio! ANYbody home?

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:42) Priority Level: High
Consensus within team: Yes
Details: ICANN Board should consider directing ICANN org to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. Such language should impose upon registrars, and their affiliated entities such as resellers, a duty to mitigate technical DNS abuse, whereby ICANN may suspend registrars and registry operators found to be associated with unabated, abnormal and extremely high rates of technical abuse. ICANN must base such findings off multiple verifiable reliable sources and such findings may be rebutted by the registrar upon sufficient proof that the finding was inaccurate. The following factors may be taken into account when making a determination: whether the registrar or registry operator 1) engages in proactive anti-abuse measures to prevent technical DNS abuse, 2) was itself a victim in the relevant instance, 3) has since taken necessary and

Jonathan Zuck: (08:42) now I can't hear anything

Jonathan Zuck: (08:42) oh, you're back

Carlton Samuels: (08:42) Now I'm back

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:42) appropriate actions to stop the abuse and prevent future systemic use of its services for technical DNS abuse.

Calvin Browne: (08:44) Ok - are these now changes suggested to rec 1&2

Calvin Browne: (08:44) suggested changes?

Carlton Samuels: (08:44) @4: We should distinguish that with the call for a consensus DARP we identified the critical elements to be addressed by that policy: establishing a benchmark for level of DNS abuse lthat would trigger an intervention and b) an element of the process that once triggered for resolution.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:47) I still think we should deal with this type of edit across all Recommendations later

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:47) before the final report but not now

Kaili Kan: (08:50) @Jordyn Agree

Jonathan Zuck: (08:50) Agree with Jordyn on the normalization of the recommendations

Jonathan Zuck: (08:51) and with laureen on pushing this

Calvin Browne: (08:51) <phew>

Jonathan Zuck: (08:52) that's right. they seem uncontroversial other than the normalization. Rec 4 is the truly controversial one

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:55) I remain opposed to the principle

Gao (on Firefox): (08:55) Cannot hear you Laureen

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:55) I remain opposed to the principle of v4

Carlton Samuels: (08:55) @Laureen: Can we just go over why we need this?

Carlton Samuels: (08:58) Questions: #1 - Do we now agree that there is in existing policy and resolutions the tools to respond to DNS Abuse?

Waudu Siganga: (08:58) jsut for the flow of the language, eliminate in the first instance"

Carlton Samuels: (09:00) Question: #2 - Do we agree that there are sufficient remedies now in place to stem abuse at a) the Registrar Level b) The Registry Level c) ICANN Compliance?

Carlton Samuels: (09:01) Question: #3 - Can we describe a gap in remedy for DNS Abuse at any level per #2?

Jonathan Zuck: (09:03) Jordyn, check which microphone is being used and check the microphone volume inside adobe connect

Carlton Samuels: (09:05) @Calvin: The Registry Base Agreement has Spec 11. It obliges the Registry to add ANtiabuse requirements on the Registrars.

Carlton Samuels: (09:06) The RAA 2013 has anti-abuse obligations answerable to ICANN Compliance directly.

Carlton Samuels: (09:06) It is a closed circle. What we have is failure to enforce!!

Carlton Samuels: (09:08) And from the Registry side if the antiabuse obligations in the RRA that must be addressed. And ICANN Compliance has the ability in contract to review ALL RRAs and direct compliance.

Carlton Samuels: (09:09) I will continue to insist the PLAIN Language of the Registry Agreement say so!!!

Calvin Browne 2: (09:09) Carlton - yeah - I tend to agree with you - recommendation 3 goes to the problem

Carlton Samuels: (09:11) @Jordyn: You say it right. It is the Registrar that has the relationship with Registrants! And simple rule, you go to surce to deal with problems at the source.

Carlton Samuels: (09:12) What the Registry Agreement does is encumber Registries to respond to credible cases of abuse by virtue of the Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA).

Jonathan Zuck: (09:13) of course, we DO have that in a number of instances

Carlton Samuels: (09:14) You now have THREE bites of the apple to engage abuse at Registrar, Registry and ICANN Compliance. It is an enforcement problem.

Calvin Browne 2: (09:15) old

Calvin Browne 2: (09:15) old

Gao (on Firefox): (09:16) Is it still just me who is having issues with audio? I can only hear Lauren intermittently.

Calvin Browne 2: (09:16) can hear her fine Gao

Calvin Browne 2: (09:17) nothing stops the community from doing this anyway

Carlton Samuels: (09:17) I'm not opposed because it conveys a methodology for considering how to gain force an 'enforcement'.

Carlton Samuels: (09:17) But it is an aspiration!

Carlton Samuels: (09:19) @Jonathan: I think so too. This gives further gumption to the previous recs!

Carlton Samuels: (09:20) @Jonathan: The rec is for developing a consensus policy. So it's well within the remit of the RT

Carlton Samuels: (09:23) Two facts converge here: 1) We know enforcement if DNS[anti] abuse is lax or non-existent 2) Ordinary folks still getting the shaft. And this rec seems to say do something above and beyond.

Calvin Browne 2: (09:31) I have a question on recommendation 17 (that I've sent by email)

Waldo Siganga: (09:31) Yes let it be open. I need to do a little more research

Carlton Samuels: (09:35) @Lauren: WHOIS is in scope because it is directly referenced in Safeguards: +1

Carlton Samuels: (09:36) @Calvin: Maybe you've seen my emailed response?

Lauren Kapin 2: (09:36) I saw your response and thought you raised good points.

Calvin Browne 2: (09:37) carlton - your response never went to the question I was asking about scope

Carlton Samuels: (09:37) @Calvin: The NCUC's gripe is sooo cockeyed I am gobsmacked! Where do you start in identifying DNS Abuse if not ID'ing the abuser?

Calvin Browne 2: (09:38) Carlton - they're saying there's a separate review team on whois/rds

Carlton Samuels: (09:38) @Calvin: I was saying you don't even need it!

Waudu Siganga: (09:38) thanks bye

Pamela Smith: (09:38) Thank you, all. Have a great day, wherever you are

Kaili Kan: (09:38) Thank you. Bye!

Carlton Samuels: (09:38) I do not see a claim to review, just to know details of what is now!

Calvin Browne 2: (09:40) <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https->

[3A_www.icann.org_resources_reviews_specific-2Dreviews-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_reviews_specific-2Dreviews-)

[23aoc&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH5498](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-23aoc&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH5498)

[0u4nTPfwdloDLY6-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-0u4nTPfwdloDLY6-)

[6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=JvhM2psFtE4CphjODccg81qPPBa9GTqTBfYfmrMLP20&s=KvL1f](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=JvhM2psFtE4CphjODccg81qPPBa9GTqTBfYfmrMLP20&s=KvL1f)

[tQmkeM3FL7vaoWTY1bwmNME4pqxW-9D7lopPbs&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-tQmkeM3FL7vaoWTY1bwmNME4pqxW-9D7lopPbs&e=)

Calvin Browne 2: (09:40) They're say we're c, and we're intruding on d's turf