Report on
ICANN67

Virtual Community Forum
7-12 March 2020

Contents

Executive Summary

This first ever virtual ICANN meeting went remarkably well, in particular given the short timeline for getting everything organised.

The platform handled the large numbers of participants, most sessions managed to fulfil their essential roles, whether to share information or allow participants to share their views. Unsurprisingly, real 'discussions' were the main victim of the virtualisation of the Cancun meeting.

Overall, the ICANN team demonstrated convincingly that they are capable of managing this technically and organisationally.

The fact that the ccNSO cancelled all its sessions also had an effect on participation rates by ccTLD managers in other constituencies. In some sessions (the ALAC on abuse, the GAC on abuse, the GNSO on WHOIS access) there were many references to ccTLD practices but ccTLD managers were notably absent from these discussions.

This report focusses on the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) session and provides high level summaries and references for a few other sessions of interest.

The main topics of interest for the GAC during the ICANN67 meeting were the .org acquisition discussions within ICANN and the (non)existence of a "public interest" definition within the ICANN ecosystem.

The GAC received an update on the EPDP Phase II in connection with the ongoing discussions on coming up with a standardised and potentially centralised model for access to non-public WHOIS data for interested parties that is also compatible with the GDPR.

The GAC also received an update from the Public Safety Working Group on the ongoing discussions on the topic of DNS abuse within the ICANN community.

The ALAC made optimal use of this virtual meeting and moved forward decisively with their work on DNS abuse. The ALAC insists on reviewing DNS abuse procedures before allowing the next round of gTLDs to move forward. The release of their DNS Abuse 101 video shows that this part of the ICANN community has made up its mind for this all-important debate.

GAC report

Link to the GAC [Communique - ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum](#)

.org sale

Background

The first session of the ICANN67 - Public Forum I was entirely dedicated to the PIR (.org registry) acquisition by Ethos Capital and ICANN's remit in this debate.

Since the proposed acquisition of PIR was announced on 13 November 2019, ICANN has received many questions on the legitimacy of the PIR sale between the non-profit Internet Society (ISOC) and the for-profit company Ethos Capital, including the consequences of such a move on the .org non-profit community.

ICANN has on numerous occasions stressed its limited remit when it comes to the PIR sale and the review obligation derived from the .org Registry Agreement. Under that agreement, PIR must obtain ICANN's prior approval before any transaction that would result in a change of control of the registry operator. According to the .org Registry Agreement and ICANN's processes for reviewing such requests, ICANN is entitled to request additional information about the proposed transaction, including information about the party acquiring control, its ultimate parent entity, and whether they meet the ICANN-adopted registry operator criteria (as well as financial resources, and operational and technical capabilities). ICANN [requested](#) this additional information from the relevant parties (PIR, ISOC, Ethos Capital) on 9 December.

During the Public Forum, ICANN's General Counsel, John Jeffrey, reminded participants that ICANN is not a party to the sale of PIR, nor is it entitled to object to the change of registry operator from a non-profit to a for-profit entity. According to the jurisdiction PIR is subject to, PIR needs to receive a confirmation from the Pennsylvanian authorities in order to change their non-profit status to for-profit. Additionally, as a non-profit entity ICANN is also subject to the supervision of the California Attorney General, who is entitled to assess the impact to the non-profit community, including ICANN, of the proposed .org transfer. As part of that duty, the California Attorney General [requested](#)

additional information from ICANN on 23 February.

Due to these simultaneous reviews, ICANN has requested additional time from its contracting party PIR, up to 20 April 2020, to conclude both reviews. Additionally, ICANN has urged all parties to stay as transparent as possible during this process. Some further [communication](#) was also initiated between the ICANN and ISOC boards.

Some reflections from the community during Public Forum I

- Mitch Stoltz (EFF) stressed existing concerns with the "public interest commitments" (hereinafter PICs) proposed by PIR and Ethos Capital. According to EFF, these are not adequate to safeguard .org registrants and particularly its non-profit community, as these are not substantive but primarily procedural. Stoltz raised the problems of the composition and selection process of the proposed "Stewardship Council" of PIR, members of which will be subject to veto rights by PIR. Stoltz expressed its belief that ICANN should disapprove the change of control.

- Milton Mueller (Georgia Institute of Technology's School of Public Policy) stressed the need to compare PIR pre- and post-sale. According to Mueller, the fact that the Stewardship Council has been established is already an improvement in comparison to how PIR operated before. He also suggested that more PICs are needed in the areas of safeguarding freedom of expression.

- Jonathan Zuck (ALAC) highlighted that some parts of the current status quo of PIR should be maintained. Namely, the fact that PIR Board members are selected by ISOC. According to Zuck, this means that it is reasonable to expect non-profit community interests to continue to be taken into consideration.

- Kathy Kleiman (American University Washington College of Law) raised the point that ICANN's PICs, that originate from the Applicant Guidebook (2012), are different from the public interest commitments expressed by PIR and Ethos and are not designed to deal with human rights. According

to Kathy, ICANN can help encourage them to develop something more than the current PICs expressed by private parties.

- Jorge Cancio (GAC - Switzerland) outlined two pillars in the ongoing discussions that the ICANN Board needs to consider: 1) clear and enforceable safeguards to address public interests; 2) appropriate engagement with the community to promote these safeguards.

- Elisabeth Bacon (PIR) reminded everyone that the public comment period is open until 14 March.

The main topic of Public Forum I was how PICs could be enforced and made transparent. In addition, the content discussion was used as an illustration of some of the procedural issues. The main lesson is that the discussion has moved to "How are we going to safeguard registrants' and non-profit communities' interests?" and away from "How can ICANN stop this transaction?".

ICANN has also provided written answers to the community questions asked during Public Forum I.

GAC discussions

The GAC discussed the issue extensively, including by addressing the ICANN Board on the topic as one of the priority areas for 2020.

France expressed the view that governments need to keep the public interest "at heart" when following the issue of managing .org. PICs expressed by Ethos need to be reinforced, including the establishment of the Stewardship Council. France also urged the GAC to give advice on the matter to the ICANN Board.

Lithuania expressed the need to receive more clarity on the issue from the ICANN Board, as there are currently no indicators of the course of expected decision on the change of control from ICANN. The PICs by PIR and Ethos have been discussed within the community as a forum to ensure safeguards for the .org community, however no further views from ICANN have been given.

The European Commission stressed the fact that the fate of millions of registrants is at stake, including those non-profit organisations that serve a public purpose. The GAC needs to preserve the public interest and safeguards for freedom of speech and privacy in the .org debate. According to the European Commission, the full independence of the proposed Stewardship Council

needs to be ensured. The European Commission also supported the communication of the GAC's concerns in the Cancun communiqué. When communicating to the ICANN Board, the European Commission proposed asking the Board about ICANN's commitment to assessing multistakeholder input moving forwards.

The United States (US) remained sceptical of the GAC reaching the consensus needed for the GAC advice on the matter. The US also expressed the need to look into public interest definitions outside the ICANN ecosystem.

The United Kingdom (UK) also called for caution when coming up with the GAC consensus advice on the matter, due to the special format of the ICANN67 meeting and the possibility that not all GAC members were present or able to follow the discussions remotely.

What is public interest?

The GAC also discussed the (non)existence of a definition of public interest within ICANN.

France attempted to provide a definition of public interest. According to France, public interest in the context of the .org sale can be based on the following criteria: 1) affordability for registrants; 2) safeguards for the protection of privacy and freedom of expression; 3) ensuring the expansion of the .org community and the further development of the .org TLD.

Iran reminded the participants of the fact that some public interest related aspects were dealt with by the GAC in its Beijing communiqué. Additionally, Iran objected to the specific focus on non-commercial entities when discussing safeguards for the .org community.

The GAC could not identify an existing definition of public interest agreed upon within the ICANN universe.

During the GAC exchange with the ICANN Board, Iran raised the question on the existing definition of (global) public interest as envisaged by the ICANN Board.

Avri Doria from the ICANN Board explained that there is an ongoing project on the matter that aims to look at the statements of public interest enshrined in ICANN's articles of incorporation and to map any existing recommendations that have been made in this regard. Instead of picking one definition, the project is aimed at collaborating with the community to put together a framework, according to Doria. The framework is

envisaged to be communicated to the public after ICANN67.

Switzerland asked for the latest status of the project and for any relevant documentation. According to Avri Doria, the draft framework already underwent a round of public comments. After ICANN67, the ICANN Board will discuss how to incorporate the feedback received. No definite timing was communicated.

GAC exchange with the ICANN Board on .org

During the meeting with the ICANN Board, the GAC stressed the need to properly safeguard public interest while assessing the change of control of the .org registry within ICANN's remit. The GAC also urged ICANN to demonstrate its commitment to multistakeholder input on this matter. The GAC also wished to hear the ICANN Board's views on which criteria are being used to assess the PICs communicated by Ethos and PIR, and how ICANN is going to engage with the parties to improve the PICs and ensure the public interest.

Maarten Botterman (Chair of the ICANN Board) expressed ICANN's commitment to consulting the community, which is evident from the continuous exchange on the matter with PIR and the organisation of the Public Forum on the matter during the ICANN67. ICANN also encouraged PIR to seek input from its community. With regard to any interim results within the process of assessing the change of control, nothing can be communicated at this stage. There will be only one final result at the end of this process. According to Botterman, all options are currently on the table when it comes to ICANN's respective decision.

The European Commission raised the question of the PIR-driven consultation, including PICs. The European Commission inquired about ICANN's primary channel for receiving input from the community and whether any more structured dialogue within the ICANN community was going to happen to help ICANN assess the .org transaction.

Maarten Botterman stated that the ICANN Board is looking forward to the results from the PIR public consultation. ICANN CEO Göran Marby chimed in by stating that if contractual provisions are added to ICANN's contract with PIR, then ICANN will hold a public consultation on the changes to that contract.

GAC Communiqué: As a result of its discussions during ICANN67, the GAC agreed on sending a letter to the Chair of the ICANN Board, commending and encouraging the ICANN Board's engagement with the ICANN community to ensure that the views of the community and the .org community are properly taken into account. Furthermore, the GAC expects clear and enforceable safeguards in the contractually-binding Public Interest Commitments (PICs) to be duly put in place to protect the public interest. The GAC also welcomes the reassurance from the ICANN Board that all options remain open and that the Board will consider the public interest in its decision-making.

Relevance to ccTLDs

The GAC discussion on the definition of public interest and the GAC's role, as governments safeguarding that interest in gTLD management, is relevant for ccTLDs in the context of their own governance. As with .org, national ccTLDs are often used by entities serving the public interest, including governmental services themselves. As a result, specific TLDs and their management can become a matter of national importance.

WHOIS and Data Protection

Background

On 20 May 2019, the [Temporay Specification on gTLD Registration Data](#) (hereinafter Temp Spec), which was intended as a temporary policy in response to the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) was replaced by the [Interim Registration Data Policy for gTLDs](#) (hereinafter the Interim Policy), a consensus policy that implements GNSO policy recommendations concerning data protection requirements for gTLDs. The Interim Policy requires gTLD registry operators and ICANN-accredited registrars to continue implementing measures that are consistent with the Temp Spec on an interim basis. The Interim Policy is supposed to be replaced by the Registration Data Policy.

In its previous advice, the GAC has noted on several occasions that the Temp Spec fails to meet the needs of law enforcement, cybersecurity researchers and IP rightsholders. The need to ensure third-party access to WHOIS data was not dealt with in the [Final Report](#) of the GNSO Council on the EPDP (in the so-called Phase 1). The adoption of the Final Report immediately set in motion the work of the EPDP Team on Phase 2 which aims to develop a system for standardised access to

non-public registration data (hereinafter SSAD).

Phase 2 updates

On 7 February 2020, the [Initial report](#) of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2 was [published for public comment](#) (before 23 March). The final recommendations are expected to be published in June 2020. The Phase 2 Initial report outlines the proposed access model for access to non-public gTLD WHOIS data.

The key proposals in the Phase 2 Initial report on SSAD are as follows:

- Centralisation of data access requests and decentralisation of responses

- A possibility of continuous evolution of the model, towards increasing automation and standardisation

- Mechanism to be established to advise on evolution and continuous improvement

- Accreditation for public authorities, with oversight roles for ICANN Org

- Automated disclosure for law enforcement requests

- In case of urgent requests: disclosure within one business day

- Confidentiality of law enforcement requests

However, some open issues remain:

- Details of Data Controllership ("joint controllership" between ICANN and contracted parties seems to be decided)

- Definition of mechanism to advise on continuous improvement of SSAD policy

- Extended scope of automatic disclosure and jurisdiction criteria for automatic disclosure in response to law enforcement authorities' requests

- Distinction between legal and natural persons in WHOIS

- Ensuring accuracy of WHOIS data for purposes for which it is processed, including disclosure in response to lawful requests by third parties with a legitimate purpose

- Impact on use and accreditation of privacy/proxy services

- Preserving the possibility of reverse lookups

- Cost to public authorities

In parallel with the community efforts on the SSAD, ICANN Org sought advice from the European data protection authorities on its proposed outline for the so-called Unified Access Model (UAM) for gTLDs that considers a consolidated responsibility for the processing and disclosure of non-public WHOIS data within a centralised system. In essence, ICANN Org sought advice on whether the GDPR permits ICANN to take on certain responsibilities for a central gateway for data processing and disclosure requests, away from its contracted parties (registries and registrars) as a "joint controller" under the GDPR. According to ICANN Org this is intended to "inform the community's work on a Standardized System for Access/Disclosure that is underway in Phase 2".

ICANN Org approached the European Data Protection Board on 25 October 2019. On 4 December 2019, ICANN Org received a [response](#) from the Belgian data protection authority that clearly states that in the case of a "joint controllership» between ICANN and its Contracted Parties, «parties to a processing operation[...] are not free to simply «designate» which party shall be deemed to act as a controller or joint controller[...]". In essence, the Belgian DPA clearly stated that it is not possible to remove any data protection responsibilities from Contracted Parties, in a centralised gateway model proposed by ICANN Org under UAM. After meeting the Belgian DPA representatives in person, ICANN continues to [refer to a view](#) that "a centralised model is worth exploring and seems to be a better, «common sense» option[...]".

GAC discussions

During the EPDP status update for the GAC, the EPDP team urged the GAC to "strongly urge ICANN and contracted parties to swiftly develop and implement a standardised form for these requests to improve the efficiency of the current interim system".

There was little discussion on this topic from GAC members during the session with the EPDP team. Russia raised the question of whether any alternatives to the centralised model have been considered. Laureen Kapin (US Federal Trade Commission)

explained that the SSAD that is currently proposed is a hybrid model that is not fully centralised. In particular, the way disclosure is being decided on remains the responsibility of a concrete registry in the majority of cases.

During the joint meeting of the GAC with the ALAC, Hadia Elminiawi (ALAC) specified that the hybrid model proposed for the SSAD envisages a "central gateway manager" to automate some data access and disclosure requests in urgent cases, while referring other requests to contracted parties. The urgent cases that would require an immediate, automatic response are the following: 1) imminent threat to life; 2) imminent threat of a serious bodily injury; 3) threat to the integrity of critical infrastructure (online and offline); 4) child exploitation. In these cases, the response needs to be immediate and will be handled by the "central gateway manager". The relationship between contracted parties and the central gateway manager is envisaged to be managed by the respective Service Level Agreement.

Iran expressed its concern with the tight deadline to provide the GAC with feedback on the Initial report, which runs out on 16 March.

In the Montreal Communiqué the GAC advised the Board to instruct ICANN Org to ensure that the current system that requires "reasonable access" to non-public WHOIS data is operating effectively. The ICANN Board accepted the GAC advice by instructing the ICANN Org to educate key stakeholder groups and to collaborate with the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups to develop a voluntary standard request form. During the meeting with the ICANN Board, Chris Disspain reiterated that ICANN cannot oblige contracted parties to use a particular form for access requests, however ICANN is willing to work with registries and registrars to develop and adopt it on voluntary basis. This collaborative work has yet to start.

GAC Communiqué: The GAC emphasises that the creation of a standard request form for access to non-public WHOIS information is the most efficient way to ensure consistent access to non-public data for parties with a legitimate interest. Reasonable access to this information is essential to allow public authorities and other relevant entities to serve objectives such as law enforcement, cybersecurity, consumer protection or the protection of intellectual property. Such access remains a high priority for the GAC. The GAC also strongly encourages the contracted parties to make

every possible effort as quickly as possible to ensure the creation and adoption of a standard form across all registrars and registries.

Relevance to ccTLDs

ccTLDs are deeply rooted within their local jurisdictions, and their policies adhere to local laws. ICANN's overly eager plan to insist that their proposed Unified Access Model, built on the accreditation of legitimate groups for automatic access to WHOIS data, as an answer to all privacy laws around the world might increase pressure on ccTLDs to revise their own data governance models. Additionally, if the gTLD space were to be centrally managed and "unified" by ICANN under their interpretation of a regional law like the GDPR, it might also result in conflicting interpretations of the GDPR in the ccTLD space.

DNS abuse

The Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) presented its Work Plan 2020-2021 and encouraged the GAC to consider encouraging the relevant public safety agencies within their countries to join the work of the PSWG. One of the strategic goals of the PSWG, as identified in its Work Plan, is to "develop DNS abuse and cybercrime mitigation capabilities".

Each strategic goal identified in the Work Plan is further broken down to "work items". One notable work item that is relevant for ccTLDs includes the "Survey and Review ccTLD Best Practices for adoption in the gTLD space". The goal is to review the "best practices" in the ccTLD world that are aimed at mitigating security threats such as "abuse prediction, registrant validation and verification policies", with a view to "promote their adoption and to elevate contractual standards in the gTLD space". This work item is led by the European Commission.

Chris Lewis-Evans (UK National Crime Agency) endorsed the Framework to Address DNS Abuse that was published preceding the previous ICANN66 meeting in Montreal and presented by a number of registries and registrars as a joint commitment to tackle DNS abuse. By 12 February 2020, 56 registries and registrars had signed the framework that has inter alia been developed to promote "DNS safety and security by disrupting abuse in, with, and around the DNS".

In addition, the PSWG highlighted the recent [Letter of Intent](#) (LoI) between ICANN and Verisign (.com) to collaborate with the ICANN community to "develop best practices, related to contractual obligations, tools and metrics to mitigate Security Threats". Considering that .com represents 72% of all gTLD domains, an intent to develop "best practices" for registries to address "phishing, malware distribution, and botnet command and control" and potentially "other threats" is seen as an important and significant step forward to increase public safety online. The LoI is accompanied by [Amendment 3 to the .com Registry Agreement](#) that aims to incorporate requirements on "analysis and reporting of Security Threats" into the existing .com contract. According to Laureen Kapin (US Federal Trade Commission) current registry contracts do not have specifics to deal with DNS abuse.

Another ongoing DNS abuse-related activity within the ICANN ecosystem is the [Security Stability and Resiliency (SSR2) Review Draft Report](#) that is currently available for public comment until 20 March. The Report aims to assess the "effectiveness of various instruments" within ICANN systems and processes, like contractual compliance enforcement and Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) amongst many other things. The Report also specifically calls for "including ccTLDs in the scope of anti-abuse efforts in coordination with ccNSO", and recommends an "independent study" of the security, stability and resiliency implications of DNS encryption technologies.

Comments from the community on DNS abuse during Public Forum II

- The UK asked the ICANN Board about the implementation of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review team's (CCT-RT) [recommendations](#). These recommendations inter alia include measures such as encouraging the adoption of proactive anti-abuse measures; inserting contractual provisions aimed at preventing the systemic use of specific registries and registrars; adopting thresholds of abuse at which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered; and requiring publications of entire chains of ownership. The UK pointed out that the GAC has advised the ICANN Board not to proceed with the round of new gTLDs until the CCT-RT recommendations are implemented. In its response, the ICANN Board deferred the matter to the GNSO who is responsible for leading the

respective policy development process for the new round of gTLDs. However, the GNSO has stated that the CCT-RT recommendations on abuse are outside their remit. The UK questioned the Board on this matter and inquired about the future of these developments, as it seems that "nobody in the community is taking responsibility". Becky Burr (ICANN Board) reiterated that policy development lies with the community. The Board is waiting for the outcome of the policy development process on subsequent procedures to decide on further prospective in this regard.

- Maarten Botterman (Chair of the ICANN Board) outlined that the topic of DNS abuse is of high interest to several ICANN constituencies and that the Board will be looking into this matter in the months to come.

- Merike Käo (SSAC Liaison) pointed out that the SSAC has established a work party on DNS abuse that intends to study several potential areas within this topic to provide guidance for policymaking. The SSAC does not intend to provide any formal definition of abuse. Some of the potential study areas for the SSAC work party on abuse, according to the SSAC [Activity Report,](#) include 1) the evolution of the threat landscape and current threats; 2) abuse patterns across TLDs and registrars; 3) the examination of successes and failures in dealing with abuse under current policy; 4) the study of effective anti-abuse practices by contracted parties.

- Mason Cole (Business Constituency) claimed that ICANN is in a unique position to mitigate the "quickly raising rates of DNS abuse" and asked the Board whether ICANN is planning to enforce current contracts. ICANN CEO Göran Marby stressed that the ICANN community has a responsibility to define what abuse is and to decide how to fight it. Marby also reminded the participants that not all domain names are subject to ICANN policies. Hence an increased cooperation within the ICANN ecosystem is needed in order to tackle DNS abuse. Marby also expressed a need to look into the underlying data of claims such as increasing abuse rates.

- Jonathan Zuck (ALAC) highlighted the need to launch an educational campaign for end-users on the topic of abuse and how to protect oneself online, as there is a significant amount of

social engineering behind these attacks. He also suggested for ICANN to look beyond contracts when addressing abuse mitigating measures and to look into technical innovative measures like predictive analytics and real-time detection of abuse.

GAC Communiqué: The GAC acknowledged that relevant CCT-RT Recommendations were passed by the Board to the GNSO and from its Council to the Sub Pro PDP WG. The PDP WG Co-Chairs indicated that the current recommendation text would refer DNS Abuse to a separate policy development process or other effort, which would address the issue holistically (i.e. not only for the next round). GAC members expressed concern with this approach, highlighting the importance of the CCT-RT Recommendations and the need to implement them in light of the GAC Montreal Advice on this matter.

Relevance to ccTLDs

ccTLDs and their practices in tackling abuse (that are primarily voluntary!) are continuously considered to be the champions of keeping their zones secure and free from abuse within the ICANN community. More and more voices are calling for the gTLD space to adopt similar measures, by re-opening contracts and making these part of contractual obligations (read: mandatory). The discussions over the definition of DNS abuse are also increasingly moving towards content moderation, blurring the lines between "technical" abuse and "content" abuse. While registries cannot adequately assess or control content abuse, it is evident that there is more pressure to adopt preventive measures when addressing abuse at DNS level.

Other Sessions of interest

At-Large Advisory Committee talking points - abuse

This was a particularly useful session format for virtual meetings. The ALAC shared its talking point on the high priority files at the start of this virtual meeting. For the ALAC, DNS Abuse is the number one issue for the Individual End Users (those who use the internet and who do not engage in ICANN or in the TLD business).

Any new round of new gTLD applications must wait for a substantial DNS abuse reform to take place.

The ALAC recommends:

- abuse thresholds for domains
- holistic tools for contract compliance: this avoids everyone just checking their box, but allows for an overall approach
- research into machine learning: .uk and .eu can predict with 80% accuracy if a registration will be used for abusive purposes. ICANN should take the lead and invest in research.
- increase friction for bulk registrations: randomly registered lists of names are typically used for abusive purposes
- decrease friction for access to registrant data: related to EPDP, researches, reputational databases, IP folks and consumer protection agencies

The ALAC also supports enshrining the DNS Abuse Commitments in PIR's public interest commitment (PIC). According to the ALAC, the EPDP (Expedited Policy Development Procedure) is an issue that needs to be addressed urgently as access to registrant data is restricted. Researchers and Law Enforcement Agencies need _automated_ access.

In an ALAC session dedicated to 'DNS Abuse', the following material was shared:

- ALAC DNS Abuse 101 video
- ALAC and DNS Abuse resources

Relevance to ccTLDs

While ccTLDs are not directly affected by the DNS abuse-related discussions at ICANN, the indirect impact is significant. Firstly, ccTLD practices are regularly mentioned as setting best practices, and therefore gTLDs and governments will be closely studying how ccTLDs have kept their abuse rates so far below gTLD averages. Secondly, the ALAC's position could be indicative of the views of Local Internet Communities. Thirdly, the ALAC's outreach and educational material suggests a more active approach to tackling a wider range of DNS abuse than what is included in current ccTLD practices.

ICANN's open data platform

ICANN has revealed its long-awaited Open Data Platform for users to freely access much of the publicly available data ICANN maintains on registrations, registry operators, regional statistics and others.

For data junkies, ICANN has not traditionally been the go-to for cutting edge data accessibility, so this release is certainly a big step in the right direction. At a first glance, the platform seems promising with an intuitive layout along with popular features such tabular/charting tools, a quick export function (csv and JSON) and of course an API which will no doubt be very useful for many.

There are 32 datasets available at the time of this report with information such as domains by region, registry activity, registrar transactions, DNS root traffic analysis and contractual statistics.

Overall, it is a great improvement in the transparency of the organisation and will surely help push research in the community.

Relevance to ccTLDs

CENTR will be connecting with the platform and capturing the relevant data in order to complement and enhance our understanding of the domain market.

DoH/DoT

The DoH/DoT session provided a good recap of previous discussions. Paul Hoffman (ICANN) presented the ICANN OCTO paper on encrypted DNS, and SSAC provided a high level summary of its DoH paper.

SAC109: The Implications of DoH and DoT

OCTO paper: Local and Internet Policy Implications of Encrypted DNS

CENTR is the association of European country code top-level domain (ccTLD) registries, such as .de for Germany or .si for Slovenia. CENTR currently counts 54 full and 9 associate members – together, they are responsible for over 80% of all registered domain names worldwide. The objectives of CENTR are to promote and participate in the development of high standards and best practices among ccTLD registries.

Rate this CENTR Report on ICANN67

(Thank you for your feedback!)

☆☆☆☆☆

CENTR vzw/asbl
Belliardstraat 20 (6th floor)
1040 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 2 627 5550
Fax: +32 2 627 5559
secretariat@centr.org
www.centr.org

To keep up-to-date with CENTR activities and reports, follow us on Twitter, Facebook or LinkedIn