

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, a lot, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is Kristine Dorrain. I'm one of the co-chairs and this is the meeting of the Registry Stakeholder Group's DAAR Discussion Group for Tuesday, October 22nd. Jim is not able to make the call today, so I'm filling in for him. We had intended to turn through the document, the Google Doc we created, with John and Samaneh and continue to get their feedback and we had intended to hear from them about where they were at on most recent data. So, John and Samaneh will not be on the call today, so we will not be able to do either one of those things.

I'm going to pre-apologize for the fact that I'm working from home with a sick child, so my younger one is having a temper tantrum in the hallway outside. Hopefully, that will not be too distracting for folks. It really is ... She's not being abused. It's really just she's having a grumpy morning.

Anyway, Jim and I had kind of thought about how this session was going to go and how the next session was going to go and that we were going to optionally – how we were going to optionally think about next week's meeting. So, I think given the fact that we don't have John and Samaneh either this week or next week, that we probably would think about cancelling next week, but pending the results of our conversation today, which I anticipate will be relatively short, we may come up with action items for ourselves. I'm not sure.

So, one of the things I thought of was just having us run through our document really quick. Not to do any line edits or anything but just to think about how we might want to tweak it before we show

up in Montreal and then to think really about what our action items are and what our takeaways are. We're kind of at a unique crossroads where we've accomplished the first part of the thing we set out to do which is to create this discussion group with the purpose of informing OCTO about changes we'd like to make. Then, from there, we needed to work with them to try to get those changes made and they're already doing some of those things.

We really have to think as a group about what our next steps are. I'm imagining that in Montreal we're going to be doing some of that planning as far as what we're going to do going forward and how we're going to interact going forward.

The other thing we need to start thinking about is how our group becomes more and more public. This right now is – the word John likes to use is embargoed. We're not really talking about this group. So, it's certainly going to be more and more [rigid]. We're going to need to be more and more transparent as we either submit this document or other documents in for discussion and as OCTO starts talking about changes that we've asked for, the community is probably going to say, "Well, what's the context in which the registry's asked?" Then we're also going to have to think a little bit more about making sure that we get the feedback of the entire stakeholder group. So, the work we're doing is essentially trying to represent registry interests, but we're going to have to get full feedback.

So, I'd like to open it up for ideas about what we think, where we think this is going to go next. There's certainly more to be done here but we're lacking some really clear direction. We've been driven by we're going to create a letter, we're going to create this issues report, we're going to have suggestions.

We'd love to see if there are any hands of people who have some feedback. Then, while you do that, I'm going to find a different document for Sue to put up on the screen and for everybody to look at in a minute. So, looking for hands to see if anybody wants to weigh in on next steps. Kurt, go right ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks. Thanks, everyone. So, in our last call with John and Samaneh, I think – and I stand to be correct, but I think John said the preamble to the DAAR report, all the prose that we've suggested a rewrite for, would be just too hard to change. The way I heard that was, because of the legal reviews and so on that have to occur before any of the explanation changes would be quite exhaustive and probably not achievable, so we should concentrate on the data itself.

So, if that's correct and I heard that correct, I think we should try to push back on that some because the introduction to the report and its explanation is, I think, really, really important because it manages the expectations of those reading the report in the right way.

Again, if that's all correct, there's a couple ways we could do that. We could write to them and say, "We heard you say this but we think it's really important to change the preamble to the report for these reasons." Then, we could give them a menu. We could give them the "how to use this report" doc that we've done as a suggested rewrite or we could say we think it needs to be amended and make these points, so that they could rewrite it themselves but reiterate and provide reasons for why – when they change the data some, they also need to change the preamble or

change the preamble as soon as possible so people are talking about the right stuff when they're talking about this report. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks a lot, Kurt. I see that Rick is next. I wanted to just drop in. I think my sense was similar to yours, Kurt, in that it was not going to be easy for them to get some changes in but that it wasn't going to be impossible. And I think their point was it would be easier to make some of the changes first and then, in parallel, as the changes are being made, I took their point to be similar to yours which is that we would be able to evolve that preface or that introductory material while the report itself was revolving – or evolving. But, Rick, you're next. Go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Kristine. Rick Wilhelm, Verisign, for the record. My hearing and recollection of that was that the legal changes were possible but would probably not be very quickly done, so therefore John was recommending that we do those concurrent with the changes to the body of the report, the content of the report, that they would be done simultaneously.

I would certainly agree with Kurt that any changes to the body of the report certainly need to be accompanied by with changes to the introductory matter because, otherwise, that introductory matter would fall badly out of synch with those revisions to the content. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Rick. I agree completely. Maxim, go ahead. You're next.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Actually, since the last time when I listened in face-to-face to [inaudible] presentation about DAAR and actually Goran was there, because it's kind of a traveling circus with the [advertisement] of dangers of DNS abuse. My feeling is that CTO office is [formally] saying truth about DAAR but not all truth and the staff is [inaudible] abuse. ICANN [inaudible] that, yes, but there is a universal [golden bill] called DAAR and those registries, they not listen to us.

Our position, as I understand, is to politely educate people and I think that in the current picture we might be seen as someone trying to explain why they're not as bad as they are. Just side note. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, Maxim. Yeah. I think the doc that we're working on was really a piece of that polite education bit that we were just talking about, that you were just mentioning. I think that John agreed with us on one of the most recent calls that the messaging needs to be better, that people have a misperception. To be honest, I think one of my chief complaints about the CCTRT recommendations and final report is this idea that I don't think that the CCTRT understood what DAAR was and wasn't, so this idea that it's this one big tool that's going to answer all the questions is not ... And I think that's the misnomer that we're trying to correct as a group. So, I think continuing to do that is going to be kind of important and continuing to say – and this is, as our document says, what we're trying to do really is help people understand that the DAAR report is really just a starting point for investigation and learning more information. It's not the end point.

So, other thoughts? It sounds like we do have some momentum to continue editing this preface. It also sounds like ... And Sue, if you'd like to put that up on the screen, I'm happy to look at that whenever people are ready. I'm switching ... I'm moving this to the other screen. Nope, I'm not moving that to the other screen. Okay, now I'm moving it to the other screen. There we go.

So, what we found from last week – and we don't have to go through this at a high level but I think this is what I heard Kurt saying as well. We do want to tweak this – and what Rick said as well. I think what we want to do is we want to tweak this a little bit, so that we remove the snapshot problem. Apparently, the snapshot problem is going away, so we really need to remove that.

I have some different notes in a different notebook that I left on my desk – I'm working from home today – that [inaudible] John and Samaneh and I think a couple of other people had added some information about what they perceive the data shows. So, I think we can definitely add that in.

Then, I think we need to really run through this, what the data doesn't show. I took a point last week about, if you scroll down to number five, sub five – Sue, right there, yeah – talking about the true trends and anomalies. I took a point that wasn't maybe the right language. It does show something about a trend, even if it's not the trend that we think is super useful, so maybe we can do some wordsmithing there.

I think we definitely could spend some time tweaking and I think we do agree that ICANN is going take and edit this and their lawyers are going to look at it and it's not going to be in its current form. It's going to be edited.

So, I feel like we have some good momentum to continue to work on this in Montreal. I think the other thing we have going on in Montreal is OCTO has agreed to come talk to us to explain a little bit about, a little more deeply about what DAAR is and isn't and how it works. They wanted to do a deep dive. I remember that Rick, I think it was – I'm going to put Rick on the spot. I believe Rick was the one who had a specific question for them about the details. Maybe it wasn't Rick but I feel like it might have been. And that was one of the questions they were going to answer.

So, as we get ready for that meeting, I think we can send them our list of questions about what we would like to know about DAAR and maybe that's one of the other things that we can add.

Maxim, go ahead. Then, if anybody can remember precisely the question that we had asked them to tell us, drop it in the chat or raise your hand and I can capture that and make sure that they're prepped for that when we meet with them. Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

I have a note about question six, which we see on the screen. Item six. Effectively, this text creates impression that DAAR gives us domain names which actually they don't give us domain names. In presentations of CTO, they say we share information with registries but they just send you number, like we have five bad domains or we have two bad domains, but we do not know domain names. It's not clear from looking. It should be a clear path.

Unfortunately, when DAAR relays, gives information to registries, they give only number. They don't give any names. So, a registry doesn't even understand about which domain name they are talking about.

The second thing, they do not make sanity check of the incoming information. They just [pass] whatever comes from [inaudible] and that's it. Basically, they give statistical information without any particular points where we can at least check what's going on. Thanks. And it's quite important because, without it, everybody thinks that they give us domain names and we, as [inaudible], do nothing. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Yes. Okay. Thanks, Maxim. I appreciate it. I did actually capture that. If you look up at what the data does show, it does say I think up in here somewhere it does say that the snapshots talk about ... Maybe it's not in here. There was something in here I thought about "as defined by the registry" or by that feed, but I think we can absolutely add that in there as well. It's their own internal definition. Then, I just basically pulled the fact that the domains might not be registered. I run that up into the fact that there's no underlying information provided to the registry operator because I think that makes more sense up there. I think that's what you're talking about.

I think all of those are good and I think those are tweaks that we should sit down and make. What I'll probably do is take another crack at editing this because we have talked about this and we have come up with some changes we'd like to make and there's no point in making those part of our face-to-face meeting.

I'll circulate that ahead of time, and then what I think we can do is, if we like it on the list this week, we can even circulate it to the registries for some feedback and that will give us even some more information to go on when we meet in Montreal. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks Kristine. Just to point out something that Maxim frequently says, is that a lot of these sources are crowdsourced, so therefore the data is not really verified or verifiable. It's various persons' opinion that exists out on the Internet, so it's information that's given but not really verified. That's just something that, as Maxim was talking it came to mind as an opinion that he's offered before but I want to make sure it gets amplified as far as things related to the information that we get.

Then, as far as something, since you had mentioned my name earlier, one of the things that's on my mind is exactly when is this report going to get iterated and improved? Because we've been bringing this up for quite a while. It was brought up pretty vigorously at Kobe in March and it's obviously ... We've gone through Marrakech over the summertime and now it's back. We're going to be gumming here to November and it's been well over six months and we don't have a concrete plan or date and we've only seen the barest of information about possible revisions. It's been a considerable amount of time. The kinds of things that we've been talking about, switching from a monthly snapshot to monthly averages are not that really sophisticated improvements that we're talking about.

So, I'm really kind of curious as to exactly when is anything going to change? That's one of the things that's going to be top of mind to me as I get on the plane heading to Montreal. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, a lot, Rick. I think it's important – you're right – to really pin them down. Now, last week on the call – I think you were on and I think it was just in passing, but Samaneh did mention that the plan was to roll out, to show it in Montreal and with the idea

that the new reports, as of January first, or January report which I suppose is the end of January, I guess – but the January report would have the new averaged data. But I was not clear as to some of the other rollouts. So, I think you're right. I think I would love to see what their rollout plan looks like for these various pieces. I think that's helpful. Thanks. Maxim, is that a new hand?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Yes, it's new. I just wanted to add one important bit to what Rick said about the crowdsourced sources. We had a station where our landing page for TLD was marked by five individuals as a fraudulent website and I personally had to just clear this information. Yes, all five accounts were registered by the same time. They were kept offline. Then they simultaneously confirmed that it's fraudulent.

So, they don't have very well working methods against coordinated fake attacks. I don't know how to say it but it's crowdsourced and with all benefits of that, they are full of downsides of that method. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, Maxim. Rick?

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Kristine. Plus one to what Maxim just said. And regarding the point that you had made about we would, perhaps the point that Samaneh made around seeing something in January, that sounds good but, for this starting after March and it being October and January being as close as it is, the stuff that we saw last week in the demo of those [Jupiter] notebooks, that

was awfully raw for that to be ready for a January report which would be published sometime in December, especially when one considers the amount of progress that one would be expecting to make during the months leading up to the holidays and such.

So, if they get some improvements for the January report, that's great, but that's still awfully raw, given the amount of time that's gone by, based on what we've seen. So, we'll see. I'm hopeful and I'm anxious to see more in Montreal. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, a lot, Rick. I think that's right and I think it's right for us to push on that a bit and ask for a more definitive timeline. I'd like to see benchmarks. Which pieces are they going to roll out when?

Anybody on the list remember that specific ask? I'm going to go through and try to find it, but if you remembered what you asked for and it was somebody on this call wanted some more technical information about the feeds themselves or about the way the feeds are ingested, as I recall, is that triggering anyone's memory? No? Okay. I'll go back and look through. I just want to make sure that we've got our notes in one place about what it is that we're looking for.

So, then, next we will ... So, there's a couple of action items. If you have other questions, we have the one backlog question which was about the feeds and then we have this new question about timelines and benchmarking. I think those are the two main questions we're going to have for OCTO in Montreal. All our work will be a combination of I'm going to edit this document on the screen in front of you and then we're going to ... Hopefully, I'll do that this week and we can get it to the registries and everybody can take a look at it before we get to Montreal. It would be great to

have large group feedback. We may also have visitors. We may have people from the registries that aren't generally on these calls, to that tends to slow the work down a little bit as well because people aren't as up to speed on the day to day. If there's going to be the demo from John and Samaneh, then I think we do want to open it up to the entire stakeholder group because I think it would be useful and interesting for everybody to hear. If we don't have a demo, then we'll try to rein it in and keep it closed.

What I want to share now, not seeing any additional hands or arguments, is I just want to remind you about a doc that we have going. This document isn't anything we have to spend a lot of time on but this document is something that Jim and I have talked about revisiting and we'll probably try to do that this week before Montreal just so we can do an update.

Originally, when this group was put together, we kind of had a parking lot. We had a list of things we wanted to do, action plans, data that we were going to get, work product that we were going to create. I put the link in the chat so you can scroll at your own. We're throwing ideas in under this idea of no bad ideas. Maxim disagreed, that one of his ideas was bad.

Basically, these are some of the ideas that we captured and I think it's probably time to go through this and see. And I would like to do this as one of our action items in Montreal, unless people feel like they can do it now. Not on this call but in the next week or so, but to really go through this list and make some comments about where we feel like we're at on this work. I think specifically, at the end, we have captured a couple of notes from recent calls. Most recently, we talked about the feedback mechanisms. Jim and I had a prep call recently where we added to this list this idea of – and we talked a little bit about this with John and Samaneh –

about how do we provide feedback about DAAR to either RBLs or to ICANN. Then as we provided that feedback and as things iterate, do we maintain or lose the reproducibility of DAAR to the extent that we value that?

So, I wanted to draw people's attention and remind people we had this parking lot. I'm going to go through, like I said, and update it to make sure that it's reflective of where we're at. But, I think, ultimately, at the end of the day, I would love to just see if there is anything else that we needed to add. This group doesn't have to exist longer than it needs to, but I want to make sure that we've done all the work that we've set out to do. Any thoughts, questions, comments about that?

Not hearing anything, then I guess the last thing is – Maxim was mentioning this at the beginning of the call. He had sent around some information about ... I believe there was a meeting – and maybe Maxim can just do a short recap – CTO, others came to I think maybe a forum in Europe where they presented on DAAR and DNS abuse and Maxim sent some notes around. I remember looking at them and not being particularly appalled by anything. It seemed like it was more of the same. Oh, the DNS Forum in Armenia. That's right. Okay.

So, if everybody had a chance to look at that, if you had any questions for Maxim. Maxim, did you want to give us the two-minute ... Was there any takeaway from that, that you wanted to make sure that we were aware of, in case we missed something in the notes you sent around?

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Yes. Actually, the interesting bits were information that basically everything is done by the particular company, and in the slides,

you can find which one. Yeah, the note from [inaudible] that they basically just relay information from RBLs. It's in the LDR record and in the ledger you can see the hour and minute of the record.

Basically, just look at three or four slides of Samaneh's presentation. They have information about what they say, how they advertise DAAR, if I may say. Thanks. It was two or three minutes of time.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thank you. I think, is it iThreat or iCyber Threat is the name of the company, I think, as I recall from other data. Okay, good. Thank you for that. If you didn't see the information Maxim sent around, let us know and I'm sure we can recirculate that again.

I think that's it. Like I said, our whole agenda went away when John and Samaneh said they couldn't make it. So, unless anybody has anything else, the plan I think will be to cancel next week's call, for me to send some updated documents around to this group for a final review and looks and then maybe get that preface doc out to the Registry Stakeholder Group to get a glance and some feedback there, and heading into Montreal, we'll review that, the parking lot, and hopefully get a demo from John and Samaneh.

Okay. Seeing no hands, I will give you 30 minutes back of your day. Oh, Maxim, go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Sorry for taking your time, but does anyone know when DAAR is going to be applied to registrars? Because it's going to be a circus and I don't want to miss that. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yeah. So, Maxim, apparently, according to what they've said is unless the registries are willing to give out the names of which registrars register which domain names, they don't have any way of mapping a registrar to a registration or something. Apparently ... Somebody jump in and correct me if I've misstated that, but apparently they don't know which registrars or the registrant of a domain name easily without doing a manual lookup. So, it's going to be a while. Yeah. They have WHOIS, but I don't think there's a good way to parse that or something. I'm not sure.

MAXIM ALZOBA: As I understand, they have information and if they are not able to parse WHOIS, most probably they need to be replaced with someone who can. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Well, don't tell them that. Let them think they don't have it then. But I agree. I think that that's – and I'm going to add that actually to our stable right now of things to remember. This table is really about keeping in mind things that we need to think about, and many of us operate registrars in addition to registries. I think it's a good idea to keep that in mind as well. I'm going to add that to our table of things to remember.

All right, everybody. Thanks so much for joining. We'll see you all in Montreal. Watch your email for documents and updates and things to weigh in on and I appreciate some feedback. It shouldn't be a big heavy lift, so when I send stuff around, I would really appreciate if you'd spend ten minutes, review it, send me a

thumbs up, thumbs down, or make some edits as it comes through.

Thanks, everyone. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks.

SUE SCHULER: You can end the recording, Michelle.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]