Virtual Participants

1. Connect your **Zoom Audio** to listen to the meeting.

2. Turn on your **Zoom Video** to be seen by other participants.

3. Raise your hand in **Zoom Reactions** to join the speaking queue.

4. Unmute your **Zoom Audio** when called upon to speak.
On-Site/In-Room Participants

1. Do **not** connect your **Zoom Audio**. To disconnect your audio, click on the **Up Arrow** and select **Leave Computer Audio**.

2. Raise your hand in **Zoom Reactions** to join the speaking queue.

3. Use the physical microphone at your seat or in the aisle when called upon to speak.
Welcome & general introduction DASC
Update by DASC Repository SubGroup
- Launch of the repository
- Introduction email list
DASC Survey
- Highlights part 1, ICANN76
- Results part 2
- Comparing survey results with external data
- Pricing vs levels of abuse
- Findings & conclusion
What comes next?
Final Q&A and wrap-up
About the ccNSO DNS Abuse Standing Committee (DASC)

1. Share information, insights and practices
2. Raise understanding and awareness
3. Promote open and constructive dialogue
4. Assist ccTLD managers in their efforts to mitigate the impact of DNS Abuse

DASC does not formulate any policy or standards: out of scope of the ccNSO policy remit
Agenda

- Welcome
- Repository subgroup milestones
- Repository library
  - Background
  - How to submit content
  - Introduction of editorial board
- Mailing list
Repository Background & Working Method:

• DASC mandate to create a dedicated resource for information sharing
• Formation/operation of a content advisory/editorial board
• Review of new content submission
• Ongoing evaluation of content for relevance and usefulness
• Editorial Board will meet 1-2x per month to review submitted content
• Community briefings
DASC Repository and Information Library

Created by Kimberly Carlson, last modified on May 24, 2023

The purpose of the online repository is to provide an information source created for and made available to ccTLD Managers. Content includes information relevant to the topic of DNS abuse that would be useful for such managers to identify, understand, and/or plan to take action with respect to such abuse that they may encounter.

Acceptable content
Content published on the repository must be related to DNS Abuse and relevant for ccTLDs, including, but not limited to: ccTLDs, registries/registrars, best practices, definitions, acceptable content format: pdf, doc, ppt, links to publications (reviewable by content board).
All contributions are welcome; however, they must observe the privacy preferences of others.

Main Categories:
- Presentations & Reports (Identifying the source or event)
- Tools
- Definitions / Policies
- Articles/Commentaries

How to submit content:
Email content to dassc-repository-submissions@icann.org

What to include:
- Your name:
- Category (presentations/reports, tools, definitions/policies, articles/commentaries):
- Short summary (why is this relevant/why should this be included)
- Source:
- <Include any attachments>
- Link to presentation:

Process:
Once you’ve submitted the content, the editorial board will do the following:
1. Review the content to ensure it meets the acceptable content requirements
2. The board will determine the content’s usefulness and relevance.
3. If the content meets the above criteria, the board will “accept” the content and request support to add it to the repository/library (https://community.icann.org/x/3e7G)
4. The review process usually takes 14-20 working days.
### ccNSO and DNS Abuse Mitigation - resource and repository

The ccNSO and DNS Abuse Mitigation Resource and Reference Library is governed by the [content editorial board](https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg).

#### Presentations & Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Meeting</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">Link</a></td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">Download</a></td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">View</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Articles/Commentaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Meeting</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">Link</a></td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">Download</a></td>
<td><a href="https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg">View</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tools

| [Link](https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg) | [Download](https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg) | [View](https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg) |

---

**ICANN | ccNSO**

---

[Link](https://community.icann.org/x/Ege7Cg)
Poll time (repository)

- How likely are you to visit the repository for information?
  (Very Likely - Likely - Unlikely - Very Unlikely)

- Would you be interested in providing content to this repository?
  (Yes - No - Maybe)
Repository Scope - Community Feedback

Meta Lawsuit Leads to Significant Decline in Phishing Domains Tied to Freenom

Meet the Editorial Board

• Adam Eisner
• Diego Ernesto Luna
• David McAuley
• Fernando Espana
• Jordi Iparraguirre
• Mary Uduma
Dedicated email and contact list

- Modeled after TLD Ops and other ccNSO lists
- Community list and mailing list
- Information sharing
- Closed, but not confidential
- Eligibility to subscribe to the mailing list / need to authenticate
- Monthly contact list summary
Poll time (mailing list)

- Would you be interested in subscribing to this mailing list?
  (Yes - No - Maybe)

- Are you interested in a dedicated contact list?
  (Yes - No - Maybe)
NEXT STEPS and thank you!

- Invite community to submit repository content
- Promote / word-of-mouth / share with your friends and colleagues
- Subgroup will reconvene in late June
- Complete procedural doc / concept paper
  - Submit to DASC => ccNSO Council for sign-off
- Finalize logistical elements prior to launch
- Invite full DASC to subscribe and test
- Present to full community at ICANN78, invitation to subscribe
About the DASC survey

- Open: September ‘22 - end November ‘22
- All ccTLDs were invited to respond, regardless of ccNSO membership
- 57 unique responses. Estimate: representing approx. 100 ccTLDs
  - 316 delegated ccTLDs in total (ASCII & 61 IDN alike)
  - Some ccTLD managers provide services for multiple ccTLDs, but responded for 1 TLD only
  - Some ccTLD managers informed DASC they could not respond, for various reasons
  - Some ccTLDs responded multiple times: latest submission as final one
  - Some responses were incomplete
- About half of the respondents did not want their ccTLD mentioned
- Initial report presented at ICANN76
Highlights DASC survey results

part 1, ICANN76 (Cancun)
What makes ccTLDs different?

- **Region**
- **Governance Model**
- **Registry Model**
- **Number of Domains**
- **Number of Employees**
- **% Domains Exposed to DNS Abuse**
- **ccTLD has Abuse Officer**
- **ccTLD is Affected by DPL**
Highlights part 1 (continued)
See ICANN76 recordings

● Where do respondents take action?
● What are the DNS Abuse mitigation trends?
  ○ Mitigation methods, outreach & education to registrars
  ○ Trusted notifier arrangements, type of action when abuse is detected, reporting mechanisms for the public
● Tools & feeds
● Combined results: mitigation methods vs region, registry model, size
DASC survey results

part 2, ICANN77 (Washington DC)
Summary

● Pre-registration
  ○ Which information is being collected?
  ○ Do respondents perform pre-registration verifications?
  ○ Do respondents perform checks at time of registration, and if so, for which data?

● Post-registration
  ○ Methods: manual vs automated
  ○ When do post-registration verifications happen?

● Mid-cycle
  ○ Type of action when abuse is detected, based on: Feed, LEA request, due diligence verifications
  ○ Measures to keep registration data accurate over time

● Renewal
  ○ Do respondents perform verifications?
Verification: a tool to tackle DNS abuse

What do ccTLDs say?

Checks are performed:
- “within 24 h after registration and in case of complaints”
- “monthly and upon complaints”
- “when something arises”
- “upon complaint or based on random selection”
- “randomly regardless of the time of registration”

Manual and automatic verification:
- “We have a lot of manual checks of registration data. Each summer we have a lot of students helping us out with looking through data.”
- “We are currently implementing a system that runs automated risk checks on newly registered domain names. We will then manually select high risk registrations for a manual verification”.

ICANN | ccNSO
Verification: At time of registration
Verifications: if so, when and how?

**Verifications: yes/no and when?**

- Pre-registration
  - Yes
  - No

- Renewal
  - Yes (40)
  - No (5)

**How?**

- Manual (35)
- Automated (15)
- None (15)
Action when abuse is detected: post-registration

Type of action

- We immediately suspend the domain name: 10
- We immediately delete the domain name: 1
- We give notice of suspension: 15
- Our approach depends on the results of our risk assessment: 30
- We take no action: 5
- We have no capability to detect abuse: 20

Following government request

- We do our own due diligence first, before considering further verification from our end: 18
- We execute the request, without potential actions: 16
- A combination of both: 14
- None of the above: 8
Comparison

DASC survey results with DNAI data
Many respondents unsure about level of Abuse in their TLD. Hence, comparison with DNS Abuse Institute (DNSAI) data.

DNSAI Compass data refers to phishing and malware only.

Vast majority: less than 0.05% of abusive domains, less than 20 names reported as DNS Abuse.

DNS Abuse rate of 0.05% means: only noticeable number (e.g. >100) for ccTLDs with large domain portfolio. This may explain why respondents were unsure about levels of abuse in their ccTLDs.
Pricing vs levels of abuse

Following up on Q&A ICANN76
Pricing variation across ccTLDs

- Largest ccTLDs in terms of volume of names generally in the low price range
- No discernible correlation of price with the level of DNS Abuse
- Data based on registrar and ccTLD registry pricing, where publicly available (44 ccTLDs)

**Legend**
At retail level

- High: > 100 USD
- Medium: 21-99 USD
- Low: 6-20 USD
- Very Low: < 5 USD
DASC survey Findings

- Overall, relatively low levels of abuse for ccTLDs
  - Many ccTLDs do take action, despite respondents saying they have limited resources, and do not have access to tools
  - Different types of ccTLDs do perform checks, regardless of their region, governance model, registration model, domain portfolio size, number of staff.

- Checks could happen prior to registration, but are more often done at the time of registration, or when abuse is being detected
What comes next? **Ongoing work**

- **Repository**
  - Manage & Expand Repository
  - Launch Email list

- **DASC survey**
  - Rich results, highlights presented to date: Do you want more?
  - Next DASC survey in 2024?
Poll time (survey)

- Would you be interested in a post ICANN77 webinar presenting with in-depth analyses of results?
  (Yes - No - Maybe)

- Would you participate in a next survey in November 2025?
  (Yes - No - Maybe)
What comes next? **New work items**

- Do data validation and registration policies for ccTLDs relate to DNS abuse, if so how?
- How can ccTLDs effectively work with registrars to mitigate DNS abuse?
- What are the tools and measurements ccTLDs can use to mitigate DNS abuse?
- Do ccTLD governance models and regulatory frameworks impact DNS abuse?
Poll time (new work items DASC)

- Are the proposed work items of interest to you?
  (Yes - No - Don’t know - No opinion)

- What is your preferred order to hear more about the topics?
  (tools and measurement - data validation and pre-registration policies - collaboration with registrars - Impact Governance Models on level of DNS Abuse - No Interest)
Thank you

Next: ccTLD News Session