JAMES GALVIN:	Thanks, everyone. This is our Registry Stakeholder Group DNS Abuse Working Group. Welcome. Thanks, everyone. I'm your co-chair for today. I see my esteemed co-chair, Brian, is also with us so that's good.
	I sent this agenda out this morning, and I'll just put this out there in front. Brian and I have not coordinated on this at all, so Brian gets to jump up and say, "No, Jim. No way." I guess I'm kind of thinking a little bit about sort of a pro forma agenda for us. Although we're thinking that, gee, as the first thing, we always kind of do updates on all of the action items that we have open in front of us if there's something to say, whatever the agenda is going to be for the day. There are actually I think a couple of things to say here on all these things up there. So this is the list of work items that we have, essentially. I think I captured everything. So we'll just do a quick walk down on updates on some of these things here.
	Brian, since you're here with us, the "evaluating potential outputs," I know that you actually already have been moving forward on that. Do you want to say a few words about that? You might as well throw in the PSWG update while you're talking.
BRIAN CIMBOLIC:	Sure. Thanks, Jim. The last week's meeting has sort of solicited volunteers for our A team or putting together draft outputs. So that group is comprised of me, Jim, Donna, Rowena, and Alan. I sent around a Doodle, so we should be meeting in the next week to start kicking things off. I think the subject to that subgroup's planning probably will

develop some ideas, bounce it off the full group, make sure that we're consistent with what everyone is thinking. But that should kick off in earnest sometime next week.

On the PSWG, thank you to Craig's work who's kept us honest as far as following up with our conversations with the PSWG from November. Jim, Craig, and I are going to speak to Gabe Andrews, who's the key FBI and also obviously the PSWG, sometime next week or early the following week to follow up on the low-hanging fruit we've identified and sort of brainstorm as to what a work track would look like for that, with the idea that then we could circle back with the larger Registry Abuse group with a larger subset of the PSWG. So with that, I'm happy to take any questions or anyone tell me if I didn't get something quite right.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thanks, Brian. I'm not seeing any hands. So maybe over to Keith. I see that you're with us, Keith. Do you want to say a few words about the outreach that you're doing to SOs and ACs?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Thanks, Jim. Hi, everybody. We've got the e-mail content approved for the outreach. And the first group that will be receiving that is going to be the NCSG, and then likely ALAC. Basically, it's on my list to start sending those notices or those e-mails out this afternoon. So I wanted to wait until after this call just to make sure that we're all on the same page. But essentially, the outreach is set to begin and I will start the scheduling process to ensure that we've got a good cadence,

not overloading or overwhelming anyone, in particular us, but to make sure that we've got the beginnings of an outreach and engagement plan to start collecting information. One of the key questions that we agreed to focus on was asking these various groups what sources of data they use. Basically, if they're identifying DNS security threats and DNS abuse just for us to better understand where that information or where those views and perspectives are coming from. So that's going to be a major focus of our inquiry with these groups, and then I'm sure we'll move into other discussions of the questions around DNS abuse generally and what seems to be working.

That's basically it. I'll provide an update to the list once I start getting responses and getting people confirming times. Back to you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Keith. Any questions for Keith?

CRYSTAL ONDO: It's Crystal. I'm on my Google computer, which doesn't give me all my Zoom functionalities so I can't raise my hand up. Apologies. My question is, I know that OCTO is looking at evaluating the sources that they're using for DAAR and other things. I just want to make sure, Keith, that that's something up your radar. I would love to see an update on when they expect to have that work completed.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sounds good, Crystal. Yeah. Thanks for flagging that. I'm definitely aware of it. At some point, I think as part of our outreach and

engagement, it will make sense for us to have a conversation with our ICANN colleagues, both at GDS and OCTO, on all of these. But my thinking on that was it would be, I think, helpful for us to have gotten some of the other conversations underway so we have something to speak to as it relates to our engagement with other parts of the community prior to that conversation with OCTO or ICANN. But I'm happy to take further guidance on that one as well. But yeah, thanks for flagging that.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Just as an FYI, we're doing some internal work ourselves. Looking at virus total and safe browsing, and trying to come up with what the third party list that are being ingested into both of those engines look like and which ones are more trustworthy. So that should be completed hopefully at the end of this quarter, but I would hope that when OCTO is ranking list that they also ask us about what our consideration is of this list as well.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Thanks, Crystal.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Crystal, and thank you, Keith. I appreciate you jumping up there and doing that. OCTO was actually—and we maybe didn't look too hard at it, Keith—but OCTO is not actually on your list. Like PSWG, the reason why they're down there separately is we have an ongoing thing with them. So I wasn't expecting, Keith, that you would be sending them

a message in particular the standing that I believe we have with OCTO right now as we're waiting for Samaneh to come back to us when she's ready to talk to us more about persistence and we can add this topic on something we're going to do there with them. Brian, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Jim. Donna just mentioned in the chat, too, that she reminded me. I had a chat with Russ last week. He was just reaching out in general on some abuse questions. I filled him in generally on the work of this group. I think there's definitely an interest for GDS to come ask some questions, answer some questions at some point. But then also the specific ask I had for him last week was if we were to generate some of these outputs, how would he feel about ICANN housing them somewhere on its site, too. And he was sort of largely supportive of that. He didn't see any particular hurdles to that but that was just an initial reaction. That was sort of it. Not much of a conversation. But good reminder, Donna. That's sort of the run down.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. Thanks, Donna, for that pointer. Samaneh actually did tell us about these personalized reports when we met with her just a couple of weeks ago, that they had been doing this for ccTLDs. It came up in a conversation and she told us at that time—she actually asked us a question, would we be interested ourselves as gTLDs to get the reports. Although for those who have access to MoSAPI, you ought to be able to get your data anyway from MoSAPI. So you don't necessarily need a

report from ICANN. You could go get it yourself if you have that interaction. We kind of left it at that at the moment. I asked her about documentation about MoSAPI that explains how all of these work, and she didn't have that at the time but that she would take that back as something to think about, too. So I had not seen the blog pointer, so thanks for that, Donna. Good that they just formally announced that at this point that they're doing that. So definitely want to keep on our list in talking to OCTO about the personalized reports, and as Crystal was saying, reevaluating the data sources for DAAR. Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands.

The only other thing I was going to add about OCTO here is I actually don't have enough data about OCTO because we're just waiting for Samaneh to come back and say when she was ready to talk to us. Otherwise, we'll just keep making our list here of things to talk to them about the next time that we get them to come in and join us.

You did just say something, Brian, which is new, which is GDS. Do we want to consider GDS separate from Samaneh and OCTO in general? So maybe Russ may be one of those eight, one of those outreach things we want to do? Do you want to say something about that now or not? Go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: I'll wait for Brian first if you want, Jim.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Oh no, go ahead, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. Thanks, Jim. I actually think that's a really interesting question because I don't know how much OCTO and GDS talk to one another. This is since I got the interactions that I've had with them previously. So it would be interesting to have the same conversations with both and see where we get to. But I would think for the purposes of DNS abuse discussions, I think OCTO should be largely our go-to because—sympathetic is the wrong word—but we might have better synergies with them than GDS. But it's a really good question about how we manage those conversations with both of them. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Donna. That was kind of what was on my mind. It's not clear to me how much they do talk to each other and whether there's a distinction there, which there might be. I don't know the answer offhand. But, Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks. I largely agree with Donna on this. I do think there is value, though, in having the conversations with GDS. I think that we are going to have more candid, frank, and productive conversations with OCTO, to be honest. But at the end, I think both paths are probably pretty important. That's my initial thought on it at least. I don't know if it's separate calls or if they both join together. But I do think that, one, I agree that I don't think one hand necessarily always talks to the other but, two, while I think that OCTO is probably more important, I think it's probably still worth having those conversations with GDS as well.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Brian. Let's take a moment here just to open these questions, see if we get any other inputs, any other comments about this. Right now, GDS—Russ in particular—is not on the list to reach out to. Does anyone object to having Keith add Russ on the list? Let's see. There is one danger here. It would not be part of what Keith is doing. What Keith is doing is setting up outreach that we're going to be doing jointly with the registrars. I'm thinking, do we want this discussion to be just with us. In which case, we can think about a separate outreach. Or do we want to do that as a joint outreach with registrars? I don't know that I feel strongly but anyone have any comments they want to make about that distinction?

I see Brian in the chat room. You're saying, "An invitation to one of these." So I'm thinking, yeah, have them come to one of our meetings and let's have a joint meeting with them first ourselves and see where that goes. Brian, you have your hand up. Do you want to add to that?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Jim. I think I'm on the same page as you. I'm sorry. I keep talking in this meeting. GDS, though, is one—since they're sort of the piece of ICANN that really we engage with on a contractual level, I think unlike the other stakeholders or SOs and ACs where it makes sense to sort of jointly discuss things as a CPH because they say, "It's registries and registrars aren't doing enough on abuse," that kind of narrative. I think GDS just given the different contracts and the way that we interact with them, I think it might make sense to actually do it in

separate SGs so that we have time with them because the concerns might be slightly different than what registrar concerns are. In fact, it might not even be that slightly different. They might just be different. So I think that inviting them to one of these sessions, we could think of some questions in advance but I don't think it needs to be as structured as the outreach to the other SOs and ACs, but perhaps just a chance that we can sort of informally discuss what concerns they would have, what concerns we might have, but keep it in the lens of just registries.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks for that, Brian. I'm seeing Keith in the chat room agreeing with you. It sounds like Alan is kind of indirectly agreeing with you, too. Let me suggest here that the action is that Brian and I as co-chairs will take an action to do some outreach to GDS, Russ in particular, and arrange to bring him to one of our meetings so we can have a discussion here and just see where that takes us. We'll figure out our next steps after we have that first interaction. Anyone objects or want to add a little more colors to all of that?

Donna is saying in the chat, "We should think of GDS and OCTO as partners but not so much as the other outreach that we're doing with the other SOs and ACs." I think that's a good extra detail to add in here. Meeting separately with them is fine but let's keep in our mind that they're partners when we're talking to them. We should probably assume they're talking to each other, even if we don't think they talk to each other as much as they might like to.

Okay. I think that's it on the updates. Did I miss anything or anybody else want to drop anything out here for an update on a work item? Okay. I'm not seeing any hands. All right, so let's jump to the topic at hand.

Two weeks ago, when we had a discussion about this "mapping the domain names to registrars," of course, we had a discussion with the registrars directly when we had one of our joint meetings, I had taken the action. I had agreed to an action to write some words to talk about the various solutions. I did start to do that but it occurred to me, I'm thinking that I really want to split this discussion into two parts, which is the way I wrote it out here. We really did have a discussion first about whether or not this is the path to go down. Because when I started to write down some discussions about the technical solutions and what's there, I realized that there are real technical discussions to be had here. None of the solutions is perfect. They all involve varying degrees of work on the part of registries and varying volumes of work, varying effort on registries, depending on how you do things. I've gone back and I've looked around and I talked to folks. I know a little more about how these different things work—RDDS, DNS, and CZDS—with different people and I realized that there's a real technical discussion to be had here. If we're going to do this, we really do need to sit down and talk about the details and think about which one we really might want to support, if any, more than others because we ought to give due consideration to the broad spectrum of smaller registries to larger registries. Because each of these things impact different kinds of registries differently and it's worth having that discussion, which is why my item C down there was to remember that—and I don't know how

EN

many folks here really remember this—there is actually a separate RySG TechOps mailing list. There is the joint mailing list. But when that joint mailing list came into existence and we started that a few years ago, at least for me, I found out that there was actually a registrar list on their side, and so they created this joint list for us to do things together. And I realized that we didn't have one on the registry side. So we actually did create one. I actually asked for one. Sue had created it a couple of years ago and it has essentially no traffic. There's been nothing there because we've never had a reason to have it. But this feels like a very good thing to have there. We might need to resurrect awareness of that and move the discussion there if we're going to do this. I really think the question that we need to have for ourselves—because registrars are having this question for themselves too—is do we want to do this? Do we want to support ICANN and the Internet community at large, the ICANN community at large, being able to readily map a domain name to its registrar of record in bulk? That fundamentally is the problem space that we're at here. Do we want to support that? Because each of these solutions really supports the Internet community at large, not just ICANN. I think that we should have a position about that. That's really the question that we have to decide for ourselves, whether or not we want to get involved in this, and why or why not? Registrars are going to have that discussion.

So let me just open the question at the moment and see if folks want to talk about it and see where we go. Donna, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. I agree that it's a conversation we need to have, but the other thing that occurs to me too—we're currently going through the RA amendment process, how do we make this anything but voluntary? Because this will be a change. So does it require some change to our agreement if it needs to be done? So it becomes a requirement or obligation rather than something that's voluntarily done by a registry? I think that's the other potential fly in the ointment here. Certainly we need to understand whether this is something we want to do, but there's a secondary question there of how do we make it more than voluntary? My concern is that it would have to almost be a change to the Registry Agreement. But others may have a different view so I'm interested to see what others think. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you for that, Donna. I agree with you. That is a really good question. What I've had on my mind when I think about that is many things, if not everything, that we do here is ultimately voluntary. So what is the value except for those who are in the space doing the right thing? I think that it's a risk for everything that we do in this working group is that if it's successful for those who are doing it, I can imagine that they will become pressure to how do you make it more than voluntary? We're going to have to ask ourselves that question about everything we do.

So I just want to add that to sort of the content here, too. I think that's an important question but I don't think it applies just to this particular thing. I think that's a serious risk for everything that we're going to do in this group because ultimately everything we're talking about here is

voluntary. Donna, do you want to still talk? Go ahead. Is that a new hand?

DONNA AUSTIN: Same hand, Jim. Sorry.

JAMES GALVIN: Alan, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks. It just kind of occurred to me there and I've been noodling this over. I think specifically when we're talking about how this would interact with DAAR and how would it bring registrars into line in the DAAR metrics, that specifically is kind of an "all or nothing" just purely because if it is only a driven drive of a registry here and there, I can't see any outcomes from DAAR being very useful for anybody. I can't see it because it will have major gaps and that won't be the point. So I probably would draw a line between that. And other efforts that we can do which will be more voluntary because it doesn't specifically—you know, we can reap the benefit of individual voluntary efforts but when it comes to DAAR, unless it's everybody, it just would fall flat. So I think it's a very valid concern. Donna hit the nail in the head there. This is a big ask from a contractual point of view.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I'm just going to jump in. I would almost argue—and I put it in chat here if people want it—but the current BRDA language in my understanding

is they're looking at using BRDA to identify the registrars. It does give ICANN the permission to get this data in order to ensure that operational stability of Registry Services and "facilitate compliance checks" on accredited registrars. How you read that is not a capital C. I could see ICANN taking the position that they already have the permission to do this. So to some extent, whether we give it to them or what that looks like, I don't think they need a contractual amendment to use this data myself. But we'll see how that goes. It would not take a change is what I'm saying. And there's no operational change either. BRDA is something we're already doing. So again, there's not much of a change there from a technical perspective either.

JAMES GALVIN: My only comment about this BRDA stuff, at least the OCTO group, the path that they're going down is they're trying to only create a solution that others in the community can repeat. That's the hold out on the BRDA stuff. They don't want to use special access that only they have to make things happen. But that doesn't have to be our problem. The point still stands that you're making, Crystal, they have the data, they want it, they should go do that. Of course, the other point that's been made, which is absolutely true, this is a unique case. I think Donna's question actually matters more in this particular case and other things we might do. Thanks, Alan. If we don't all do it and not everyone does it, then it certainly does make the DAAR report less useful if it doesn't include all TLDs and only includes some of them. That's not really fair either. It's not fair for us and nor is it there for registrars. Brian, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Thanks, Jim. So I see that point. It's often I think a trap in ICANN land that if there's a push to having something be all or nothing—and I recognize that having not every TLD participate would cause some issues—but if you think about even just the registries on this call— Verisign in particular is quite large—you get a number of the people that are participating on this call to permit ICANN to use the BRDA data just to map to DAAR, that a significant chunk of the DNS. And yes, it may not be a complete picture but I think that if it's either allowing for this sort of good but imperfect solution in a streamlined way versus some sort of required potentially contractual amendment route, I'll take the good over the perfect any day of the week and I think that it could lead to some maybe caveated but helpful output in data.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. Excellent point. Rowena, go ahead, please.

ROWENA SCHOO: Thanks, Jim. This might be a potentially tough question but I guess I'm still a bit unclear on what we're trying to achieve with this or what the purpose of doing this mapping would be and what the data would be used for. I appreciate maybe a bit of enlightening. And then the second point is just to flag that probably for ccs, it will be a little bit mixed in terms of the ask and it might be a bit more challenging. Thanks.

CRYSTAL ONDO: My understanding is that ICANN and as well as most people have a hard time pinging WHOIS or RDAP or whatever process in order to actually see which registrars are the registrar for a domain, just given the sheer volume of queries and rate limiting that they hit. So they're just trying to look for a way to systematically determine which registrars or the registrars for specific domains. So that's kind of the issue they're hitting. I think you're absolutely right, ccTLDs are outside of this ask. And DAAR right now with ccTLDs is fully voluntary so I think it would be same thing with this, with ccTLDs voluntarily giving information if they were so inclined.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Crystal. Rowena, the reason why RDDS doesn't work for them is precisely because of registries and registrars that, even in my personal opinion, have very draconian rate limiting rules. So one of the things that happens is we don't have a standardized policy in ICANN about rate limiting. So that's always a risk, too, to be thinking about if they decide maybe that becomes some pressure too for many reasons.

Okay. Donna, go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. Two things. Someone mentioned in chat, maybe the CPH TechOps group. Is it the place for this discussion? I'd be interested to hear a little bit more on that. But the other question I have is if we did agree that the information is available via BRDA and ICANN collect this in that way, do we still have to have a conversation with the Registrars?

Is there still a Registrar Agreement necessary for ICANN to have access to that?

JAMES GALVIN: Good question, Donna. I don't know the answer offhand. Maybe one of our lawyers here has some insight on that particular issue. Brian, you have your hand up. I don't know if you want to answer that question or add something else.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: I don't know the answer but I at least have a thought on it. From a legal basis, my read would be from a strict contractual basis, we wouldn't actually need their permission, but they're obviously our biggest partners. So if this represents some fundamental "don't you dare touch that button" type of issue for them, it's something that we would need to think about. So we did cue it up in our last CPH Abuse meeting, which now that I say that, our next one is probably only in five days. I'll nudge Graeme over Skype to see if they thought about it, and if not, if they can get some thoughts so that they can come talk to us about it on Tuesday. So I think it is to Crystal's point in chat, it's a business issue. So if it's a real problem for registrars, then that might be enough reason for us not to do it. But short of it being some fundamental problem—and I wouldn't think it would be—that I think it's an easy thing for us to do to help, and we should.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Brian. My personal view in general here and we are trying to put this here to the group and get a lot of input so that we can see what kind of consensus we have, I want to just agree with Brian's last comment. I'm generally okay with trying to facilitate this with ICANN but I'm also sensitive to the downstream consequences of, gee, does this now become a contractual issue? Although, as Brian said, maybe we just leave it be voluntary because solving 80% of the problem really gets us pretty far and we should be okay with that, and ICANN should be okay with that, too. Then we are being sensitive to registrars. So we're not expecting them to walk and jump up and down saying no, but we certainly have to give them the opportunity to do that. And then if they say no, do we want to go ahead anyway or are we going to back down, too? That's where I'm at with this. Sam, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jim. I definitely agree with everything that you all said about collaborating and working with the registrars and getting their thoughts before we decide to plough forward or something. But I'm almost wondering if this choice between like BRDA as a solution for just ICANN and then potentially on CZDS- or DNS-based solution for the larger community, maybe we don't need to think about them as a binary. Maybe it's not an either/or question. Maybe we could think about them almost as phases. So if we decide to go down the BRDA route for ICANN, see how that goes, see how that works, and if it's successful, if there's value in it, then potentially we can revisit the conversation of making it a little bit more universal which would obviously bring in the questions of contractual requirements or if it's voluntary or things like that. I'm

just thinking, we don't necessarily need to shut the door on that if we want to move forward to BRDA solution sort of in the vein of Brian's like grab a low-hanging fruit where we can and won't worry about the higher out-of-reach stuff later, but we don't have to just completely take it off the table.

JAMES GALVIN: Sounds good. Thank you, Sam. Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN WOODS: Thanks. I just wanted to be clear. From my point of view, the contractual issue when it comes into play on the CZDS thing, I think Crystal is very right in pointing out what BRDA is and why we give it to them. The way I look at this is that it hits one of those instances where the ball is kind of in ICANN's court. We shouldn't be actively giving them permission. We can give them the idea, certainly. But the easier path might be just to say, well, of course, you have that BRDA. And let them see if they interpret it that way. Again, looking at path of least resistance. And I fully appreciate what Brian is saying and the fact that we should have some. Some is better than nothing. But BRDA is kind of the ready-made issue. I don't even know if we would ever need to push the CZDS because, again, that data that they're looking for is already in that BRDA. Again, if we're just looking at the path of least resistance, I'd say BRDA is the way to go.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Let me try and see if I can get a sense of the room here, make a statement and see if anyone wants to jump up and down and say, "No, you got it wrong, Jim." So let's try a little something here.

Deal with registrars separately, so focusing for the moment on the registry point of view. Barring an objection from registrars. I think I sense that we're willing to tell ICANN that "You should just go use BRDA, that what you need is there," and let them go do that and tell them they should do that as their short-term solution. We can leave the door open for a longer-term solution of something else that's available to the community. But step one is let's tell ICANN that the way to move forward is to use the information out of BRDA. Anyone want to suggest something different? I'm not seeing any hands. Oh, Crystal, go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Just to say when you say "barring objections from registrars," I guess I wouldn't want to give too much—"power" is not the right word but I'm having kind of a blank at the moment—but you wouldn't want a few bad registrars—not bad, but you know what I mean—being able to hold this whole thing hostage. I think we definitely have to have a discussion with registrars to see what their temperature is, but having a few objections from registrars wouldn't necessarily stall the whole thing, in my mind.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Crystal. That was going to be my question, too, is exactly that point. My sense of our discussion here—since no one objected to the BRDA suggestion, I'm going to assert that my sense of the room

here—and folks should please speak up if you disagree—that we're going to listen to registrars, but for the moment we're generally in favor of this. So we're certainly going to hear them out but unless they have some kind of new dramatic information to add, this is really our choice to make and we're probably still going to go ahead with this. Anyone want to characterize that a little differently? I think I said it a little differently than what Crystal just said.

Donna is making the point in the chat room, "We should make sure the registrars know that BRDA is a solution." Yeah, when Brian and I reach out to Graeme, getting ready for next Tuesday, we'll put that out there for Graeme just in case they weren't thinking about it.

Yeah, Crystal is pointing out one of the other particular things for us to keep in mind is if it's BRDA—ICANN really doesn't need our permission. They just have to decide to go do this. Basically, what that's coming down to is solving the problem for the general Internet community isn't something that we have to get involved in. The way that OCTO is approaching this at the moment is they want to create a solution that would be applicable to anyone. That's nice and maybe we want to do that but we don't have to decide that now. We can let them do this in a way that serves their needs and we can see where it goes, and see what happens. Let me use BRDA first, and then we'll see where that takes us. As Brian brought up before, let's try to solve as much of the problems as we can initially and we'll bite off more later and see what that turns into. Sam is giving me a plus one with that comment. A little bit a time. Let's not create work for ourselves if we can help it. But we also don't have to close the door on the idea that we're willing to cooperate with

them. Just let them go do something first and demonstrate that this is valuable and useful, and we'll get a sense of whether it's any good, too.

Now I'm just sort of rambling on here. I think I'm saying the same thing over and over again. All right, let me take a moment here to summarize this one more time because I think if there's no detailed comments about my summary then we can draw a line under this.

I think our position at the moment, our consensus at the moment, seems to be that we will wait to hear what registrars have to say. Hopefully, they won't have any significantly new information that raises a real objection from our point of view, but we'll certainly take on board what they have to say. We'll remind them about BRDA also so they're aware that this can happen anyway, and then hoping that nothing dramatic comes out of that discussion and taking that on board. The answer to ICANN is the recommendation that they should go use the BRDA data and that's how they should approach their problem space. That's the solution that they should use. And they're trying to solve for the Internet community at large and we should suggest to them that they should do that as the next phase, not do that initially.

So that's my summary. I'm looking for any hands or comments. I'm not seeing anything in the chat. No hands going up. Okay. Then we'll draw a line under that for now and that's our big topic for today. It looks like we're going to end a little bit early today, and I think that that's fine.

Let me do Any other Business here. Anybody have anything else they want to bring up or suggest? I'm not seeing any hands. So with that, thanks very much, everyone. You get back a little more than 15 minutes

to your day. See you all next week, and on Tuesday we're joint with the registrars.

SUE SCHULER: The meeting with the Registrars is three Tuesdays from now, Jim. It's on February 9, just so that people are aware and not try and join next week.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. I missed that. Thank you for that clarification, Sue. Excellent.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Jim. Julie, we can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]