

---

MARIO ALEMAN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Teleconference on Monday, 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

Today we have on the English channel Dev Anand Teelucksingh. On the Spanish channel, we have Aida Noblia, Humberto Carrasco, Alberto Soto, and Vanda Scartezini. We have no participants on the Portuguese channel. And on the French channel we have Nikenley Severe.

Apologies have been sent by Renata Aquino, Silvia Vivanco, Maritza Aguero, and Sergio Salinas Porto.

Today we have Claudia Ruiz, and Heidi Ulrich and myself, Mario Aleman. I will be managing this call.

Our interpreters today on the Spanish channel [are] Veronica and David, in Portuguese, Bettina and Esperanza. On the French channel, we have Camilla and Aurélie.

With this, I would like to remind all participants to please mention your name before speaking, not only for the transcript but also for the interpreters. With this, Humberto, I give you the floor so that you can begin with the call. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Mario. I would like to say that Maritza Aguero and Silvia Vivanco are participating in the inauguration of the school of governance in Peru together with Rodrigo de la Parra and some other

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

persons there. So this activity is being carried out right now, that's why Maritza is not here, and Silvia.

This is one of the events that is being organized in Chile very soon on November the 22<sup>nd</sup> in the city of La Serena. Rodrigo de la Parra will be present there, as well as the Chair of LACNIC and some other persons as well. So this is good news for us. And now we will proceed with the approval of the agenda.

First of all, we will have a presentation by Harold Arcos. He will be providing an update on the public ALAC consultation.

Then our new ALAC member elected by the NomCom, Ricardo Holmquist will speak.

Then we will have a presentation by Rafael Lito Ibarra. He's member of the ICANN Board. He will be speaking for 15 minutes.

Once we're finished with that, we will have a presentation by Carlton Samuels. He will be presenting on the working document about the DNS abuse. He is member of the CCT RT Working Group.

Then we will also have a presentation by Rodrigo Saucedo. This is an update on the Latin American and Caribbean regional strategy.

Sergio Salinas Porto presented his apologies. He would be talking about the Governance Working Group, but we have other business to deal with during this call.

---

With this, we approve the agenda, and I would like to give the floor to Harold Arcos for him to provide an update on the ALAC public consultation.

MARIO ALEMAN: Sorry for interrupting you, Humberto, but Harold is not on the call yet, nor Ricardo. So could you please proceed?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Do we have Lito on the call? That would be great. So let's give the floor to Lito so as to make the most of the time.

MARIO ALEMAN: Humberto, we can proceed now with Lito's presentation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. We would like to Lito Ibarra, he's a member of the ICANN Board. Lito, thank you very much for being here with us and thank you for your presentation. These are the hot topics for the ICANN Board. So dear Lito, you have the floor. Go ahead, please. Lito, we are not hearing you. Can you hear us? Mario, do we have any audio issue on the bridge perhaps?

MARIO ALEMAN: Lito, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Mario, we are not hearing Lito.

MARIO ALEMAN: I know his mic is enabled on the AC room already.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Perhaps we have some audio issues on the AC room. Is it possible to have a dial out to Lito, please?

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes. He's providing his phone number.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay. While Lito is reconnected to the call, I would like to speak about something of interest.

Today, Diego Acosta is traveling to Cuba by means of the CROP program. He received an invitation letter, and he's taking that to the Engineers Association in Cuba. They will be applicants to become an ALS in LACRALO.

So that is one of the objectives that was assigned to Diego Acosta, so he's taking an invitation letter signed by me, and if we can get that new ALS, if we can get the new applicant from the organization as an ALS in our region, that would be good news for us. Is Lito connected on the call?

---

LITO IBARRA: Hello, can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello, Lito. Welcome to the call. You have the floor. Go ahead, please. We can hear you. Go ahead, please.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you very much for the invitation. It's a pleasure for me to be here with LACRALO. On this occasion, I would like to tell you very briefly about some topics on the ICANN Board agenda. We discuss a lot of issues, but these are the most important ones for us. These are relevant for our community. So please, let's proceed with the presentation.

Thank you very much. Okay, there we go. As I said before, we have goals for the fiscal year 2018, so the ICANN Board has been working for some months in defining five categories or five areas, and we use this classification to prepare our agenda for the workshop.

As you know, we have Board meetings, and these are the topics that are being discussed under these areas. And this is a good advantage for us, because this helps us with the discussion and it also helps us with the organization of the different topics.

So we have this classification, the one that you see on the screen. We have five areas or five classifications, and we define the ICANN Board goals. Of course, the organization has its own goals as well as the CEO of the organization, but these are the goals of the ICANN Board.

---

I'm not going to delve into this, but this is just to mention that we are working on five different areas, and I just wanted to mention these five areas because these are the hot topics. We have divided our goals into these different areas, and we also use this classification for preparing the agenda for our workshop. When we speak about Internet governance, about financial issues, we also deal with these categories. That's why I wanted to mention this as a way of improving the internal work of the ICANN Board. This is important. This was something possible because we have been discussing based on these five topics.

When it comes to the KSK change, we all know already that this is a very technical issue. These are changes for the DNSSEC... was planned to be on the October 11<sup>th</sup>. There was a great deal of outreach for this, but one week before the rollover, there was information about certain servers that were not ready for the rollover, so this was not in fact a decision made by the ICANN Board, but in fact it was something decided by the executive management. So we decided to postpone this change so as not to risk Internet working, and to avoid any problem with Internet, and to be able to troubleshoot some issues that may come up. So the tentative time would be within three months until we can solve all the issues.

Hello, can you hear me? Okay. Next slide. Hello, can you hear me?

When it comes to ICANN61 meeting in Puerto Rico, as you may already know – perhaps you have seen the posts on the blog – even though this is a decision to be made by the organization, by the executive management, we discussed this topic on the ICANN Board, because of course we know the situation that Puerto Rico is undergoing and some

---

of the disasters that have affected the country, but since we have good communication with our colleagues there and we have people in Puerto Rico working, we are in close contact with all of them. We are receiving support and we are providing support to keep the meeting.

So the support for our colleagues and friends in Puerto Rico is really huge, and the idea is to continue with the meeting in Puerto Rico in March next year. This is something important to mention because as you know, we have been affected by some meeting rotation in the past, and of course, I wanted to mention this. So far, as I said before, the intention is to continue with this meeting to be held in Puerto Rico. ICANN61 will be held in Puerto Rico next year. Next slide, please.

GDPR, or the Global Data Protection Rights, or Regulation. This is the data protection regulation, this is a regulation issued by the European Union. As you already know, they're discussing this issue in that part of the world, and this is impacting all the world, because there are many businesses that are being carried out together with the European Union. So that's why the impact will be for the whole world.

There is a direct impact when it comes to ICANN. This is impacting on the WHOIS and who will be able to access the WHOIS data as a whole, or in general. As you know –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dev, could you please mute [inaudible]

---

LITO IBARRA:

The approval of this regulation in Europe is also affecting on improving or promoting the advancement of discussions in relation to the WHOIS and the RDS for the community. So this topic has impact on our discussions in ICANN, because we need to take into account the fines and the actions to be taken by Europe, or the sanctions being imposed by Europe to those who are not complying with these regulations.

So this is a very important topic for us. ICANN – as you know – has some working groups working on this topic. And of course, we will have their feedback. I just wanted to mention this because this is one of the topics the Board is also considering. Next slide, please.

New leadership. Well, as you may know, the prospective – because the ICANN60, the meeting that will be held in Abu Dhabi will take this into account, there are new names for the Board. Cherine Challaby will be the new Chair of the Board. Chris Disspain will be the new Vice Chair. Steve Crocker is the Chair, and Cherine is the Vice Chair nowadays. This will be changed. These are the new roles that will be in effect after the Abu Dhabi meeting.

And as you know, Steve, Asha, Rinalia, Marcus, and Thomas will leave, and we have Avri, Sarah, León, and Matthew – we know León – and someone from the GAC will be the new members for the ICANN Board replacing the outgoing members. So this will be effective as of the general meeting in Abu Dhabi. Next slide, please.

This is an update in relation to the committees and working group. As you know, the ICANN Board works through the committees and the working groups, and there you see the names. We have committees



---

nowadays, the Board members participate in these committees appearing on the slide.

We have the Governance Committee, which is now divided into governance and accountability. Then we have the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, the Auditing Committee, Risk Committee, Financial Committee, Compensation Committee, and the most recent one that will be presented in Abu Dhabi is the Technical Committee. We have a technical group, but we decided to create a committee with a specific charter. The idea is to have a mechanism to deal with different technical topics. We have plenty of these topics, so the idea is that this committee deals with these technical topics.

Then we have the working groups. We have the Internet Governance Working Group, the IDN Working Group, Confidence or Trust Working Group, and then we have the Board and GAC Joint Committee.

Additionally, within the Board we have five leaders. They're in charge of planning the workshops. Each of these members is in charge of coordinating the different topics or negotiating, if you will, the time each session will take for each topic. For example, they organize different workshops, and as I said before, they prepare the goals of the Board for one specific year. So this is a better way, or a way of improving the activities of the ICANN Board, and I wanted to share this with you.

The other figure that we have within the Board are the liaisons. Like other working groups – and let's remember that we have [too] working groups. Some of them are well advanced, but in each of these working

---

groups, we have a liaison representing the Board. So with this, I just wanted to give you an overview of our working plan of the committees and the working groups. And the most recent one is, as I said before, the Technical Committee, and these are the members of this new committee.

As I said before, the idea is to have a closer relationship to deal with technical issues with the Advisory Committee, for example, with the RSSAC or with the Stability and Resiliency Working Group, or with some other technical groups. So the idea is to deal with these technical issues.

And with this, I know that I have 15 minutes. I think that I have already covered some of the topics that we have on the ICANN Board today, so I believe these are the most important topics, that's why I wanted to tell you to update [inaudible] and any question, of course, I am at your disposal. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Lito. Listen, Lito. First, Alejandro Pisanty has raised his hand. So Alejandro, you now have the floor to ask your question.

Alejandro, we cannot hear you. We cannot hear Alejandro's question. Perhaps it's possible to call him on the phone bridge.

Okay, so Lito, let me make two comments while Alejandro Pisanty changes his microphone. First, we as leaders of the different RALOs had a meeting with Göran, and Göran said that in effect, our idea is to continue with the Puerto Rico meeting, precisely because it is one of the

---

best ways to help them, is to invest money in the organization in Puerto Rico. That's a good way to help the country. So we all agree, and we all [inaudible] in that sense, at least.

Secondly, with regards to regulations on data protection, I know Carlton can explain a lot about that to us, but we did have a conversation with the NIC Chile people. This is our ccTLD, and they're very concerned because they have a system where there are some European [inaudible] .cl domains, and they will still have to adapt. They will have to adapt the ccTLD in Chile to the European regulation. So it doesn't only affect ccTLDs, but it also affects registers that are in Europe.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Do you have any other questions that You'd like to ask Lito now? We're still waiting for Alejandro to change his microphone. It seems now he is ready.

LITO IBARRA: I hear him on the AC room.

INTERPRETER: We cannot hear Alejandro. Again, we are not hearing Alejandro speaking.

---

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: There's something that's important to convey. With the current liabilities, we don't really have the same actions capacity, the delegated capacity they had before the IANA function work. And one of my remarks – because I participated in that – is it's no longer possible to have users depending on the organizations. They all go through the leaders of the SOs/ACs. And this is probably causing problems actively in things such as the stability advisory and resiliency reports. You probably saw the letter that Patrik Fältström sent on behalf of the SSAC. I think there's something that's a lot more structural, and not just something that is temporary. And this needs to give way to the transitions [than] the CCWGs to become something more related to the accountability to the SO and AC leaders.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Alejandro. I fully agree with both of your comments. It is true, we did work on the Technical Committee, we defined a charter, and that is ready. And with respect to the other issue, it is true this is something we are seeing both on the Board as well as the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. We need to take that review and consider all the other issues that are happening, and to try to sort of normalize it and to bring it to review standards.

As Alejandro is saying, one of the changes happened after the transition, and this is part of the price that needs to be paid. We need to work after the transition. Thank you very much, Alejandro.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Lito. I see there are no more questions so far, so if that is the case, I'd like to thank you for your very clear presentation, very interesting presentation.

INTERPRETER: We can no longer hear Humberto. Once again, we cannot hear Humberto speaking.

MARIO ALEMAN: Humberto, we cannot hear you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me now? Yes. I just was thanking Lito Ibarra for his very good presentation, and I now would like to give the floor to Harold Arcos so that we can resume with his presentation.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Humberto. I hope you can hear me. Thank you, Vanda. First of all, let me thank you because it is important to say that on this very interesting presentation, Lito updated us especially on those issues that Carlton is going to deal with.

Now, in these brief issues we have here regarding the comments we are making, well, ALAC is closing one of them today precisely, and this is the presentation of the Operational Budget Plan for the PTI, one of the new issues in this fiscal year, and the budget proposed for the 2019 fiscal year.

---

So far, October 16, until today we had the opportunity to send questions for this document, and this is in the context of the transparency processes that are happening now, the review and assessment processes of the whole At-Large community in this Budget and Operating Plan. But especially, the new ones that are the PTI ones. The idea now is to include the comments, to include any of these comments or suggestions. We expect ICANN to provide us with some clarifying responses by October 23 according to the schedule.

And based on the time zone for each of us, you will have probably the opportunity to give your input or to send your questions. The justification, the rationale is still in process. Updating the rationale for the reserve funds in ICANN is extremely important. Let us remember that in 2007, ICANN established that 12 months are necessary for the operating expenses, but the realities of 2007 to present have of course changed. The profile and the organization have changed as well, and this implies that we need to provide the rationale of the criteria for these target levels. That is, the criteria to use these reserve funds. So based on the comments we received, we expect to assess the criteria for governance of the funds, that is, earmarking the funds to provide some reviews and everything that is related to that.

Now, in order for us to be updated on this in LACRALO, we are still working on this. We are working on the individual issues. In ALAC, we are conducting a track record of the individual members so that we can provide a report of their recurrence and the statistics. This is interesting because we here in the region and especially in the governance group, we've been discussing what are the implications in our RALO on the issue of individual members. This is something we all know about.

---

We've been working on this for several meetings, and with the help of our staff, we are reviewing what is participation, who is participating, who is connected and participating on each of the teleconferences.

At the same time, our President, our Chair for ALAC, Alan Greenberg, he has opened the voluntary process for updating the document on the expectations on ALAC members appointed by NomCom. We are also working with staff to provide some kind of schedule to schedule some roundtable in the next meeting with ALAC representatives, with committee representatives so that we can provide an update on the expectations.

I also wanted to say – because I do think this is important – even though these are issues that are within the schedule, these are issues that will be taken into account soon. The transparency processes are always very related to funds, and we will very soon see more comments, as we can see there, on improvement on the recommendations for ICANN jurisdiction, recommendations for one of the offices that one of our colleagues has mentioned [that is] on the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is important. We need to have some improvement on transparency.

There is a new figure that has appeared on the recommendations. We do remember the recommendations that were provided on the ALAC review in connection with the transparency and accountability mechanisms for staff, and there's also something that Carlton will discuss with us. This is the consumer trust and consumer choice agenda.

These are comments that are now in progress so that they can be provided to the public at large. As you can see, each and every topic that we mention here are mentioned in the Work Stream 2, and we believe this is important. We have heard some audio there. So in LACRALO, we will need to have a review so that we can get an informed opinion and provide our input.

Finally, in the spirit of reviewing some new issues, let me share two big issues that we have been discussing in the past time that are related to us as a RALO. And these are the criteria for ALSes. These will be dealt with within the governance group agenda, I suppose, and this is something that I remember in the presentations of the proposals that we provided in Morocco. We've been dealing with the At-Large community for some time. We need to assume this, because it is one of the aspects that will define or redefine our internal dynamics with respect to the work we are conducting in user associations.

We also need to consider the clear and tangible involvement of all the members who individually provide their input without a need to be affiliated with an ALS. And this is extremely important, so it makes this issue a lot more relevant within the time that ICANN is going through a review. We are actually going through a process of assessment to see how to implement these reviews.

And now as a retrospective, we will post an initiative on the Confluence wiki to leave it there so that it can be fed by other members in the region. This will be an initiative for all of us to provide a discussion of the events. This is a space or some kind of newsletter where each of us

---



---

would provide comments separately to different colleagues in our region.

I have asked them to provide me with some issues so that we can work them there, and the whole region should have a tool to nourish, to be fed. It should be a very well informed criteria of the people who are working on the most important topics throughout the At-Large community. So all of your opinions are important there, and once it is open on the Confluence wiki – I’m going to ask the staff to help me with that – one thing we will have the opportunity, as in every work space, to provide with our comments.

So these are the main issues, the most recent issues, the one that is closing today. So I urge you to be active in this working group. And I don’t want to abuse my time, I will try to be very brief. These are the most tangible, the most important, significant issues right now, and I would like to provide more time to the next presentations that are very important, because everything that we have seen in the past ICANN meetings, I’m sure we will require and share a lot more information. Thank you very much, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Harold. Thank you for your presentation, and we still have some presentations. I would like to ask Mario if Ricardo Holmquist is here or not.

MARIO ALEMAN: We do not have Ricardo here yet online.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, so I now give the floor to Carlton Samuels who will deal with the DNS abuse. Carlton, you now have the floor. Please go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you all. Good afternoon. I hope you're hearing me. Are you hearing me?

INTERPRETER: We do hear you. Please go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Wonderful. I'm going to talk a little bit about the DNS abuse and what we have found as part of our work in the Competition and Consumer Trust Review Team. I have some slides. I hope the slides are available that you could put up. Yes, the slides are there. So I will go to the first slide, talk a little bit about the background.

DNS abuse. Before the New gTLD Program was approved, ICANN invited feedback from the cybersecurity community on DNS abuse and the risk posed from the expansion that was then imminent in the DNS namespace. We had feedback from several groups, and you have a list of groups there: the APWG (Anti Phishing Working Group), the Registry Internet Safety Working Group, as well as our own SSAC and a lot of CERTs (Computer Emergency Response Teams). We got responses from the banking and financial sector, and generally, the concerns kind of bundled together in four buckets. The first one was how with the

---

expansion would ICANN ensure that bad actors – criminals, actually – do not run registries.

Another area of concern that was generally shared was how we would ensure the integrity and the utility of registry information. And registry information you see mentioned time and again as registry data services, RDS. And the other area was, how do we ensure a more focused effort in combating identified abuse?

Remember now the legacy systems have thrown up several areas of abuse, DNS abuse. And the concern was that this abuse would have been increased with the increase in the namespace. And finally, there was great concern about how we provide an enhanced control framework for high level domains where there is potential for conduct.

Out of all of this – next slide, please – we’ve got nine safeguards recommended from community feedback. And the first one was, well, if you’re going to ensure that we do not have bad actors run registries. We should vet registry operators. And there is a whole process of vetting registry operators. Those of you who want to see the details, you could look at the Applicant Guide for the new gTLDs, and you will find it all there.

The second one was that we would require DNSSEC deployment which would ensure security and assurance of the DNS information, and the third one was to prohibit wildcarding. Wildcarding the ability – it would disallow persons from getting a domain name by looking for it unless you had an exact match. And card removal of [inaudible] records are parts of the registry information that you could have – if you look at the

---

SSAC definition, you would probably get more information there. I'm sorry I can't go into the details of this.

And you should require Thick WHOIS records. We should centralize zone files access, we should document registry and registrar level abuse contact and policies, and we should provide expedited registry security request process. Finally, we should have a high security zone verification program put together.

So these were the safeguards, and there are a bunch of activities that went into implementing these safeguards. So we have the CCT RT now. Next slide, please.

Look to see whether or not these safeguards... [inaudible] able to see the safeguards were effective. And that's the [government] of what we did in CCT RT. We wanted to see what the safeguards. If the safeguards as implemented were effective, and whether or not we needed new safeguards or needed implementation changes to the safeguards.

We look at the data. Looking at the implementation and compliance data, that's the first place we looked. And then we also commissioned a quantitative DNS abuse study. And that study, we want to look and see if we could find a relationship between the levels of abuse and the implemented safeguards. So that was what the study was [supposed to do.]

When we look at the [inaudible] the report that came back, we had a real issue, because up until that point, there were still challenges in determining what was DNS abuse. We found that for the most part, abuse was in the eye of the beholder, or the jurisdiction, because the

---

legal frameworks were different for different jurisdictions. DNS abuse [inaudible] track through the legal framework.

We didn't have enough data, that's for sure. Where abuse is alleged, we just did not have enough data to definitively say it, and we could not find especially enough comparative data. So we couldn't say for sure what the level of abuse was in the legacy gTLDs versus the new gTLDs.

All that aside, this is ICANN environment, ICANN org. We were challenged for data, but it seems to us when we look at what was happening on the outside, that some outfits had lots of insight and lots of data. And these were typically the abuse organizations that were working actively against abuse. Next slide.

We got some information from looking at the Spamhaus reports, and in the Spamhaus reports, the new gTLDs were listed as the ten top abuse domains. And this is based on the ratio of the number of domain names that were recorded in that TLD against the numbers of domains that were used for abusive purposes.

Architelos was another one, and the Anti Phishing Working Group were looking at the .com abuse, that is to say the legacy abuse in the legacy domain, and they were of the view that a large number of domains associated with abuse were still in the legacy domains. And then you had PhishLabs who were showing that the new gTLDs were generating a lot more phishing sites and it was increasing in the new gTLDs as opposed to the legacy domains.

So we have all of these reports. A mixed bag, as I said. Some were suggesting that the new gTLDs were the source of more DNS abuse than

---

the legacy. Some were saying not. Some were saying it was the same across the board.

What was important to get from all of these reports is that we were not looking at DNS abuse across the board in the same way. Because of the variety of registration rules and the safeguards that were implemented in the hundreds of new gTLDs delegated, it was very difficult for us to have the buckets of DNS abuse that we were used to. It was uneven across the various gTLDs because of the various policies that were implemented there. So it was very difficult for us.

So then we went to the study groups. Remember, we were not getting very good information, definitive information from looking at existing reports, so we then commissioned a study, and this study was done by SIDN, several entities led by some Europeans. And we decided that they were going to do a study for us in which we asked them to find for us what the abuse rates were in the new gTLDs compared to the old ones.

The methodology of the study is very important – next slide – because we asked them to look at zone files, WHOIS records, and we had some domain name blacklist [seat] and we asked them to take all of that data together and to calculate the rate of DNS abuse from the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2014 through to the end of December 2016.

We asked them to look at abuse associated with privacy and proxy services. We asked them to see if they could find any geographic locations associated with abuse activities just to ensure, were we getting abuse from Latin America and the Caribbean? Were we getting

---

them mostly from Europe? Were we getting them mostly from Asia?  
And so on.

We asked them to make a distinction between abuse that originated from maliciously registered domains versus domains that were properly registered but were compromised into malice. And then we asked them to see if they could figure out from a statistical analysis whether or not the security indicators and the structural properties of new gTLDs actually provided any relief from abuse, whether or not these things were incidental to reduction in DNS abuse.

They came back with the study results, and the study results were quite interesting. First of all, the study showed that the new gTLDs did not increase the total amount of abuse in the gTLD space. We also found from that study that the safeguards, those nine safeguards that were implemented, they alone did not guarantee a lower rate of abuse in each new gTLD in comparison to any legacy gTLD.

So we looked at the safeguards in new gTLDs by gTLD and compared the abuse rates to the legacy gTLDs. And we found that the safeguards alone did not ensure that we were going to get lower abuse rates. We found that there were factors such as registration restrictions, price and registration specific practices that affected abuse rates. We also noticed that there was a trend in abuse migrating to new gTLDs. And I'll give you some example there that in the last quarter of 2016, the rate in legacy gTLDs the sum was lower than the rate of sum in the new gTLDs per 10,000 registrations.

We also found that there was a slight edge in the vector of using compromise DNS names as opposed to registering a new domain name for malice and malicious purposes. So it was more likely for properly registered domain names to be compromised then used for malicious purposes, than for a domain name at the outset to be registered purely for malicious purposes.

We also found that abuse was not universal. It was not across the board. In fact – and I mentioned this before – registration practices and registry policies actually have an impact on the level of abuse. So we found that in these gTLDs, .top, .wang, .win, .loan, .xyz, they were the highest source for malware in new gTLDs. And we also found that the selling price of a domain name was a common factor in these new gTLDs that were high in DNS abuse.

We also found that even though it was important to recognize that compromised registrations tend to be the largest source for DNS abuse, malicious registrations were increasing in the new gTLDs.

I already mentioned that the abuse was not random. It was very closely connected to registry practices, registrar policy, and the cost, the price of a domain name. So where there were registry business models with restrictions on registrations, there were tendencies for lower rates of abuse. Where the price of a domain was low, there is a likely, a good indicator that that TLD would be the source of lots of DNS abuse. And we also noted that we could track back the domain names that were used for abuse to specific registrars. We could actually identify the registrars.

---



---

So that in total at the high level was what we found from the study that was done by the CCT RT. Given the results of this study and when we correlate what we found from our study with the information that was available from the abuse fighting organizations like Spamhaus and Architelos and so on, the Review Team came up with some recommendations that we thought on top of the existing safeguards would provide better assurance for reducing DNS abuse. And if you go to the recommendation slides, you will see them there.

The first one was that we thought that amending existing registry agreements are in negotiations [when] new Registry Agreements [with] subsequent rounds, we should include provisions to provide incentives – including financial incentives – to registries to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures. If you recall, the abuse was not across the board. Some registries, based on what their policies were and based on what the practices were, seemed to be able to eliminate DNS abuse from their registrations. So we thought that would be useful in any new agreement or to amend existing agreements to incent registries to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures such as those that would have been seen in certain registries.

The second recommendation was again to negotiate amendments to Registrar Accreditation Agreements and Registry Agreements to include provisions of preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. So this one is a little bit involved. The idea here is that we have come to recognize that DNS abuse can be traced to certain registrars. Rogue registrars, we call them. But right now, unless you do the kind of [details] that we do, because registry abuse is reported 1:1, it's difficult if you are not tracking carefully to actually connect a set of

---

---

domains to a registrar. So we are promoting this idea that we have in the Registry Agreement some mechanism for certain registry and registrars to enable bulk reporting of abusive domain names associated with that registrar, and then there can be some preventative measures put in place that will penalize and get rid of that registrar from the marketplace as quickly as possible.

The third recommendation was that we would study – and this is ICANN org would study – the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars and DNS abuse with ongoing data collection, and then use that reporting to publish it for public consumption and to make that data available to outside [researchers.] It's a kind of name and shame approach to abuse so that if we see that there are registrars that are predominate in registering domain names that are abusive, we have a way of identifying them and reporting them to the community so that the community will know who they are and take appropriate steps.

There is also a fourth proposal, recommendation, but I did not put it here because there is no consensus from the team about this recommendation. Suffice to say, these three recommendations based on what we have gathered from the DNS abuse study do have consensus support from the team as part of the recommendation.

You might have heard Harold earlier on say that we are still waiting to put out a report that will attract another round of comments from the community before we finalize the report for the CCT RT review team. So I'm sure I'm out of time here. That is just a high level of what we found in the DNS abuse study. I'm available to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Carlton. I see Alejandro Pisanty had a question for you, Carlton. I don't know if you can read that question.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I see the question, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: The question is, "What [do you sense] the group's balance between user rights to free, open to all domain name registrations and to limiting abuse?" And Ricardo Holmquist is asking about the measures that ICANN should take, if it is ICANN the one that should take actions, not the community. Carlton, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. Thank you, Alejandro, for the question. So Alejandro's question, the group's balance between user rights to free, open to all, domain name registration and to limiting abuse.

Yes, Alejandro, that's a good question. I will tell you you're familiar with these Review Teams. The team was intended to be balanced, but there is definitely a lot of tension in the team between those who believe that you should have user rights to free, open access to all the data, and those who feel that maybe we should have less and do what we have to do to limit abuse.

---

What I can tell you is that the people who represent the Intellectual Property community on the Review Team are very strongly in favor of doing everything that we can to limit technical abuse. As you know, there is still no consent in the community as to what should be properly called DNS abuse. For some of us, it is anything that is using the DNS that is contrary to the intended purpose is abuse use. To others, that is not quite the case.

So yes, we do have some tensions, and yes, we do have a tendency for the people with Intellectual Property Constituency and the Business Constituency to come down heavily in terms of things that will restrict and eliminate DNS technical abuse, but there are social buses that they're not really much concerned about, to be quite frank.

The other issue is from Ricardo. Yes, Ricardo, the recommendations from the Review Team that I noted there are for the ICANN organization. And thank you for asking for the clarification. I should have noted that it was to the ICANN organization, and all of these recommendations are considered high priority. That is to say that they should be implemented before a next round, and as quickly as possible if renegotiations with existing agreements are going to take place. Thank you for that question. Any other questions?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I see Harold. Harold, you have the floor. Go ahead, please, and be brief.

---

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much, Humberto. Carlton, I would like to thank you for your work and your research on this important topic. Your presentation was really clear. And you mentioned the difficulty, the challenge that based on the jurisdiction or something that might be considered a DNS abuse in one jurisdiction may not be considered such in some other jurisdiction. So there is a difficulty that we find. So in this sense, Carlton, do you think there is any chance of solving this at a global level, or in the future, we will have to take into account each jurisdiction's rules and the challenge will be to solve these issues by region? How do you see this challenge? Depending on the jurisdiction, this might be taken or considered DNS abuse or not, so how do you see this? What is your opinion?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Carlton, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Humberto. Thank you, Harold, for the question. Very good question again. You're quite right, we have a challenge because of the way DNS abuse is defined and what it actually means in practice in different jurisdictions. One of the things, Harold, that we've been looking at is to see if there's a common set of abuse that is global and across the board. And what we're trying to do in the Review Team is to identify those and make a statement.

There is a greater concern though, and you hinted at it. I think you have a fairly good sense of what that is. The general, the rubric that it is the stability, the security and the availability of the DNS that is the highest

---

level of concern that we have. And that is [inaudible] from the ICANN remit that we should be concerned about. And when the stability, the security and availability of the DNS runs up against a practice that might be okay in a local jurisdiction, then it should be the stability, security and availability of the DNS that is paramount. There's a whole other tension around this. There's still talk around that, and we are still not sure how this is going to pan out.

In my own view, you have to make some kind of rule that is at least acknowledged that there might be some tension with local jurisdiction laws and relations, but I still think in my view the stability, the security and the availability of the DNS at the global level is still paramount and a priority. And I know it is hard and a little bit difficult to strike a balance, but that is where I think all of us should be looking towards. We can't just assume that what might be good in one location – and for example in our region – is best for everybody around the world. And that's a tension that we face in doing this kind of work.

You raised one other issue earlier on, and I think you're at least sensitive to it. And this is how, for example, the data protection laws will impact what we do here in terms of mitigating, in terms of arresting DNS abuse. The GDPR, the General Data Protection Regulations in the European Union, most of you – and I know you mentioned it earlier on – is that there are more than 120 countries with data protection laws. Jamaica, for example, just introduced a data protection law that is very much [patterned on] the GDPR. And what you see around the world is lots of data protection laws that are actually embracing the tenants of the GDPR. So in a little while, you're going to see at the global level some

---

general principles that are accepted globally for data protection. That will have an impact on how we deal with DNS abuse.

So you're quite right, the tension is not going to go away anytime soon, but in my own view, as [inaudible] my view, I think that anything that [in yours] to the stability, resiliency and availability of the DNS is in our global public interest, and that is where we should start the bar. Thank you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Carlton. There is another question on the chat room. It's a question by Alejandro Pisanty, but unfortunately, we have no time for this and we cannot give you the floor for that because we still have some issues pending on our schedule. So thank you very much for your excellent presentation. And please, if you could answer the question via e-mail, we would appreciate it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, but just for a quick one, Alejandro is asking, "Would it be productive to triage [tax abuse]?" Definitely, it would.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Ricardo now has the floor. We cannot hear you, so I propose that while Ricardo is improving his sound, I am now going to give the floor to Rodrigo Saucedo so that he can provide us an update on the Latin American and Caribbean updates. Rodrigo, you now have the floor.

---

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: I hope you can hear me.

MARIO ALEMAN: We can hear you. Please go ahead.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Mine is very short. I would just want to invite you to a webinar that we are preparing for Wednesday the 18<sup>th</sup> at 23:00 UTC. As you all know, in 2013, we launched the regional strategy, and the working group that prepared this original strategy was made up of 16 members. After almost four years of the launch of the strategy, many of those members are no longer active or they're not involved in the working group.

So of course, there are now several new active members in the community who are very interested in participating in the regional strategy. So we are providing an update. Actually, this is a restructuring of the strategy. We will appoint new members for this council. It was called a Steering Committee before. It will be called a council now, and we will have an implementation council for the new members of the community who will participate actively in the different projects. So this is basically what we will deal with on Wednesday. I invite you all for this webinar. We will send it on the e-mail list, and thank you very much for this very short space on your monthly call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Rodrigo, for the record. Ricardo, do you have sound now?



---

MARIO ALEMAN: We are trying to call Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I hope you can hear me. This is Ricardo Holmquist speaking. I am an electronic engineer. I've been working for more than 30 years, so I've [repaired] networks throughout the 30 years. I started working when TCP/IP was just starting and we were dealing with other kinds of networks at the time. We would install things that nowadays have nothing to do – I'm sorry, Mario, if you could please hang up the call. I think this is no longer necessary. I can use the Adobe Connect room.

So in these 30 years, I've been working with multinationals. In the past 10-15 years, I've been working with my own company. As for management, I was the Chair of the Venezuelan Chamber of Technology Information Companies. These are people who sell copper, who sell hardware and who provide services in Venezuela. I was also a manager in 2003 and 2007, then I was the Chair of the Internet Society chapter in Venezuela between 2007 and 2014, and I was also Chair of another organization [this year].

For ICANN, I attended for the first time an ICANN meeting in ICANN34 held in Mexico City. That was the ATLAS I meeting at the time, and that's why I was invited. Then ISOC Venezuela was enrolled as an ALS in 2014, and I've been the main representative of ISOC Venezuela as an ALS.

---

I was in ICANN57 in India and ICANN59 in South Africa. I think we need more than three meetings, but there we go. And I've been attending regularly these LACRALO meetings, and I've started to participate in the ALAC meetings for the last three months, and I've been attending all of the At-Large trainings lately.

I am also a member since 2016 of the Technology Group that was formed in South Africa, and have been part of the Cross-Community Working Group Subgroup that was the transparency group, and also there was a general group. In the transparency group, I've been more active than in the general group.

As you all know, I've been chosen by NomCom as an ALAC member to represent Latin America and the Caribbean. I hope to contribute with my technical experience that is more than 30 years, my managerial experience – it's been more than 15 years now as a manager – and within that managerial experience, I was not only a manager but I also work in finance.

If we see this today, there are three representatives that Latin America has in ALAC. Two are lawyers, and the other one is me as an engineer, and so both the Chair and the Secretary of the LACRALO group are lawyers. So we had too many lawyers actually there, we needed someone who understood something in the numbers field.

And we do have a good representation of users now in Latin America, but in the past we had it from Venezuela through ISOC Venezuela. Perhaps understanding the user not only the user as the user who is behind the computer, but actually a software developer that allows the

---

Internet to work, to be able to solve [his] solution to a customer. So I am now open for questions in case you want to ask them.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Ricardo. Unfortunately, we do not have time for questions, but we will leave them for the e-mail list. We congratulate you for having been chosen, and we wish you the best for the good of the region.

Sergio Salinas Porto was going to speak about the governance group, but because he was excused, I'm going to give the floor for 30 seconds to Alberto Soto to provide us with a summary of what is happening now with the governance group. Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: I will take 26 seconds. Even though meetings were tough and long, we have agreed on the type of meetings that the RALO will have. We have been convinced that we need to define only the type of meeting and then the contents to be dealt with in each of them. These contents will be detailed with a quorum, etc. And we have started to deal with the individual users who we'll have in the next meeting next week. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. There are other issues of interest. I see Dev has posted something on the governance group. He has posted a link for us to follow. I just also wanted to say that Alberto has asked the floor to deal with Cuba. Before this, LACRALO was provided a report on one of these

---

activities. This is something we conducted together with LACNIC. This is related to defending users in Chile with NIC Chile. Today, we have more than 100 lawsuits to defend users against trademarks. This is experience we've had in Chile, and we will talk about this experience in our Abu Dhabi meeting at the LAC space. This is just for us to consider. Alberto, you have one minute to talk about this other issue.

ALBERTO SOTO:

With regards to the trip to Cuba by the union of users in Cuba, I have already provided my report. I am in contact with the Chair and the first Vice Chair – who's [inaudible] [Alfonso Suarez]. I've been in contact with them by phone and personally as well I talked to her at the LAC IGF in Panama. You already have a link to generate the certification, and very probably, they will submit it next week. This [inaudible] to discuss this issue. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

I think we've reached the top of the hour, and I would like to adjourn this meeting. But before that, I'd like to thank you for your participation. It was an excellent meeting. We always need some more time when there are such interesting issues to deal with. So thank you very much for your participation. Good afternoon, good evening and good morning, and we will meet in Abu Dhabi or we will actually hear each other. So thank you very much and have a good [rest]. This meeting is now adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**