
SUE SCHULER: Okay, thanks. Okay, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you. Today is June 2. It is the Registry Stakeholder Group DAAR Discussion Group. I'm Jim Galvin from Afilias, co-Chair. We are joined today by Samaneh to continue our discussion of our draft working group report and some recommendation that they had there.

So just a quick summary. Last week, I believe that we've gone all the way through the findings and we've gone through Recommendations 1, 2, and 3. As kind of a natural split that means that we've covered really the technical details in terms of our recommendations. So the remaining three recommendations that we had here are more about messaging and discussion and presentation, that kind of thing. So we'll pick up here with those.

I thought I would take a moment, though, first and just offer to folks if anybody wanted to jump in if you had any additional thoughts, new questions, new concerns that you wanted to raise coming up to and through Recommendation 3. That's an open question. Samaneh, if you have anything that you wanted to come back to or if anyone does, if you want to raise your hand, we'll just give that a moment here, if anyone wants to go back over anything they've done before. I don't see any hands so that's good. Let's assume we're in a good place at least for the moment. Certainly, none of this is absolutely definite yet so there's still plenty of time for some discussion as we go forward and review some of the stuff.

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

Let's pick up with where we left off. Recommendation 4 is where we had left off before. Recommendation 4 really comes out of a couple of the early findings, in particular Findings 1 and Findings 2. Because our concern here is just that the community at large really has some misconceptions about DAAR, what it's actually able to show. In our discussions, one of the phrases that we like to use here in this is that DAAR is, at best, the trailing indicator of issues in general and the presence of reported abuse activity. So I think we already had a discussion when we were talking about the findings about using the phrase "reported abuse activity" and it's important to acknowledge that that's what DAAR is really presenting and showing so it's not an absolute commitment that this is abusive or not abusive. And then generally, it's also the fact that it's based on feeds and there needs to be a bit more careful usage of how those feeds are described is kind of part of the messaging that's going on here. But we identify in this particular recommendation in the description so that three overall points that we believe are essential, they need to be carried forward into all of the reports that are generated going forward with DAAR. The first item of course is about the feeds and the quality of the feeds. That's in one of the findings above so it kind of talks about that point.

Again, the second point is about one of the prior recommendations that we've had here about being able to show – we need some kind of reflection of the persistence of abuse or that at least abuse does come and go, and we think there needs to be more that's said to explain all of that, and of course trying to make this distinction about exactly the kind of abuse that DAAR shows. The things that are out there, the notions of phishing and Trojans, and things like that are actually not necessarily

about the domains being registered maliciously. Part of the abuse activity that's reported, the stuff which is really coming out of the reports is largely about domains that are hacked in some way. It's not necessarily about malicious registration. We do think that it's important to find a way to make that distinction and make that clear and have that discussion. This is in general a recommendation about looking at the messaging in detail and really reviewing and considering if it's possible to rephrase some of that, and then use a more consistent messaging throughout. Then of course, we're hopeful that that would get carried forward into other presentations and other outreach that ICANN would do, but we'll focus for the moment on what DAAR does.

So that's what's going on in Recommendation 4. Let me first ask if anyone, if you want to raise your hand, if you want to add, say something a little different, add to what I said, you're welcome to do that. And also to Samaneh, if you want to raise your hand and jump in. Do you have any questions or comments about that and anything that we can help to clarify as far as what's written down there? Samaneh, go ahead, please.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Thank you, Jim, for the explanation. It all makes sense to me. I think that we've discussed them before also and I agree that they need to be made explicit. I think from experience and from the feedback that we've received from the community and also you guys, we sort of assumed that by specifying the things that the DAAR report can do, we sort of exclude the things that we cannot do or is not showing, but it came out that that is not the best way of explaining the message. And I think it

helps to clarify for basically the whole community that the DAAR report is not intending to do the items that listed.

I just have one question about the last item, basically point 3 where you said that the domains were registered maliciously or have been compromised, which is clear, we write that down. There's the other sentence that says it should also be clear to define how many scores and rankings are reached such as the weighted scale currently used in the DAAR report. My question is about here. Because at the moment in the report, there is a kind of explanation and also a formula of how do we calculate the abuse percentage. My question is that by weighted scale, do you mean the abuse percentage metric? And if so, if the current explanation is not enough, how can we improve on that? If it is something else then I would like to know what is it so that I can make sure I fully understand it.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks for that, Samaneh. I appreciate the question. You recall that we actually did have a bit of a discussion about weighted scale way back up in Finding 1 and the realization that the weight that you're actually using is one, you have kind of an algorithm that you use for combining the feeds but you don't really weigh things. It's really more in the registry side that we tend to weigh the feeds. Your weight, if you will, is one and we're the ones as registries in particular that do some weighting of some of these feeds. So we should clarify that and that's a good comment. So that fact that it says weighted scale used in the DAAR report is just an artifact of the fact that we said that in Finding 1 and we do need to clarify that. I've made a note here in the comment to

ourselves in this to reword that and clarify after we [inaudible] finding above. So thank you for that.

Any other questions or comments about Recommendation 4? I see your comments in the chat, Samaneh. Thank you.

Okay. Moving on to Recommendation 5, obviously ICANN is active now in trying to produce webinars and discussion about DAAR, but this is just particularly a recommendation since we're talking about some things that we're going to add here and in the phrase there – features and limitations. We're talking about trying to add some additional clarification and some additional messaging around what DAAR really does represent and what it doesn't. We just want to specifically call out a recommendation that ICANN should do, what it does now but it should add to that specifically, calling out what you've changed and being more explicit about limitations and features and what DAAR means. So in essence, this is just capturing all the things that we've talked about up to this point. We do want to make sure that ICANN does create some kind of outreach program to make sure that it does its part as best it can to present to the community, make that information explicitly and directly available to the community. We do all understand that you can lead the horse to water but they don't always drink. But nonetheless, we do have to try and this is just a request to do that. Any questions or comments about that? Anybody in here who want to add? Samaneh, do you have any questions or comments? Go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: No. It's quite clear. It's good to hear that you guys, the thing that we should organize more webinars around it by all means, and also make sure to include the new messaging. And once we have the embargo lifted also the fact that we are having discussions with you guys, and some of it is based on the feedback we received from you.

JAMES GALVIN: Good. Thank you. In fact, your last comment there about embargo take us directly to Recommendation #6. A reminder that last week, one of the questions that we had closed the meeting with was the logistical question of what does future collaboration look like and what does it mean to do that? I mean, on the technical side, it's fairly straightforward to imagine that you're going to start doing some sizing across the data and bring some of those results to us and show it back and let us have a peek at what you're doing and how things are looking. We thank you for that opportunity to be able to see what's going to go into production. But this is more generally also about messaging. ICANN is really especially good at creating these lovely infographics and we're thinking that they really should be an infographic of some sort that talks about abuse and the various components of the reporting process and all the elements, essentially putting DAAR in context and what all of that looks like. We really want to offer to work with you to do that as we're doing all the rest of the technical details and what the report look like. Then the more broad question that I had left us with last week is the discussion here and now about what does it look like to continue to work together, especially with respect to messaging. As we had put on the table last week, we do recognize that you, Samaneh, and the rest of OCTO don't fully control everything that goes on the website. There are

other people that have to get involved. We have flagged this particular draft report that we've given you as not the redistribution. Clearly, there's going to have to be some exposure to some other, and then what does it mean to collaborate? How do we get together and do that? What's the mechanism by that would be most helpful to you? We have in the past tried to give you some representative messaging but that didn't seem to really get folded in, those words didn't seem to get absorbed. I'm not suggesting that that's on you because we do represent that you don't really control that. But we need to talk about and imagine what it means to work together. Who else has to be involved and what's the right way to get that process going?

That's kind of the follow-on question that's going to come from Recommendation 6. This 6 is really just about creating an infographic that captures all of this context about DAAR and DNS abuse and reporting. Then going to that, this discussion of the logistics of what follows. Let me pause here for a moment and see if anybody wants to add anything to that. In particular, Samaneh, does Recommendation 6 at least, as it stands, make sense to you? I'll come to the question of what the next steps might look like.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Yeah. Let me ask a couple of questions to make sure that I understand it fully. So when you talk about infographics – I think there are several points discussed in this recommendation but also in what you've mentioned. When you talk about infographics, are infographics about abuse in general and abuse reporting in DAAR? Are you talking about kind of flowcharts that explain the process of what happens from the

beginning where we get the data sources until the end when it becomes a DAAR report? Or more something like having a kind of text together – I don't know, what do you call this – kind of animation let's say or video that explains what happens, like explains more than having the process outline in the flowchart that explains step by step what do we do in DAAR? Is it specific about DAAR or are you recommending something more generic about abuse reporting? I'm still not fully clear around this.

SUE SCHULER: Jim, if you're talking, we've lost your audio.

DONNA AUSTIN: I see Jim put a note in the chat that he'd lost his audio.

SUE SCHULER: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see that.

DONNA AUSTIN: And it looks like Samaneh – Samaneh, I don't know whether your audio has cut out or you just can't hear. Okay. Samaneh can hear me. Jim can't hear anyone by the sound of it.

SUE SCHULER: No.

DONNA AUSTIN: So we may need to get Jim. Jim's on [inaudible]. Okay, Jim is going to reconnect. Sorry for the break in transmission here, folks. Hi, Rick. We have a bit of a break in transmission because Jim has lost his audio so he's just reconnecting. So can you take over from here, Rick? That was a joke. I've only got a quarter of my screen at the moment, so I'm not really sure where we are. Sam, go ahead. Thank you, Sam.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Donna. I'm just vamping out, trying to stall some time until Jim gets back. But I figured I'd help you out a little bit.

JAMES GALVIN: Can you hear me?

SAM DEMETRIOU: Oh, we have Jim back. Jim, we were trying to solve all of the problems in the world.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Donna. All I heard was Donna's last words which was, "Sam, go ahead." So I had no idea you were leading us, Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Filibustering I think they call it, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. I'll jump in here for a moment. I didn't hear the end of what you were talking about, Samaneh, but rather than have you go back through it all, what I'll offer is at least my comment – the first half of what you said that I heard was that yes, all of that. I think here, our recommendation in general is about an infographic that could be several infographics and it's probably worth the discussion as to exactly what we would like there. I'm sure you're used to the cliché, "A picture is worth a thousand words," and in this spirit of a fair amount of misconceptions about abuse and DAAR and things like that in the community at large, if we can sit down and think about what are we trying to show what do we think is important for the community to see. Then let's find a picture or two for making that just immediately visible to the community. We touched on a couple of the things here with this notion of roles, capabilities, and limitations. I heard you talk about abuse in general and abuse reporting in general, and then of course the process from the feed through the DAAR. I think I found the table. We tried not to be too specific here because it really is an open question. Let's sit down together with an appropriate set of people and think about what we're trying to achieve and then we can talk about the infographic that should be there. So let me first ask if that was completely responsive to you, Samaneh, or if I missed something else that you asked about that we should respond to. Thank you.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

No, no. That was it, Jim. Actually, one more thing was – you are right. We can discuss the specifics. On the general idea, I fully agree. It's a nice idea. I think it will help people to get a quick grasp of what is and isn't there. The second part of my question was about whether this

recommendation is about DAAR specific or is it about abuse reporting in general?

JAMES GALVIN:

I would say at first that we should keep our scope to be about DAAR. I suspect that there might be some bleed over into talking about abuse in general, but let's let that evolve naturally and organically rather than saying that sort of scope. I do want to focus and keep our scope specific about DAAR and we'll see where that takes us. It might be that we need a different group of people that – if this process of doing something about DAAR is successful and we identify some more general abuse things that we could do, it's probably the different group of people that might want to sit down together and do that. So let's approach it from a DAAR perspective to start and we'll see where that takes us.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Sounds good to me.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. I appreciate that. With that then, Donna, you had picked up where I dropped out. Is there anything that you were moving towards that I'd missed at this point that we should cover?

DONNA AUSTIN:

Absolutely not, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. Thanks. I want to make sure I'm on track here. Okay. Then let me summarize this stuff so far then we'll come back to the question that I had gone on earlier on all of this. I think the success at this point is that we have actually reviewed our draft report here with some findings and recommendations. We've got some good comments back from you, Samaneh. Thank you. There's some work for us to do and perhaps reshaping some of this a bit, some clarity to add, and editorial exercise, if you will. We definitely want to do that. There will be down the road a bit of formality about how to deliver this report, but I don't want to focus on that at the moment but stick to the substance.

So the actions coming out of this are – now what are the next steps? That's really where I want to take the discussion at this point. I had left that as an open question last time. I will put out here that for the moment, my thoughts are that there's two things that we could be doing more or less in parallel. One, of course, is continuing to look at the reports and analysis in that, and I think at the moment the action here for that is on you, Samaneh. So this is a question to make sure to see that you're in agreement. You're going to go off and try and develop some of these things that we're talking about here in the early recommendation in the analysis and bring that back for discussion here in this group for all of us. So I believe that that's one action very broadly stated. So let me ask if you accept that, if that's correct, if you understand that. Otherwise, let's nail that down. Go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: No. That sounds good. For the recommendations that we agreed that the action is clear and it can be taken immediately and doesn't need further discussions. That sounds like a good idea.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Then let me also ask – I'll put this on you – when do you want to meet with us again? When is the next time? When do you think you'll start having something that you want to show us? Do you want it to be in a week? Do you want it to be in two weeks? Or do you want to wait and come back after a time when you're ready? Can you give us a sense of what your expectation is here?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yes. I think how I envision this to go on my side is that – because I'm in the process of updating the DAAR report with the other stuff that we discussed. So I think it would be on me to finish that together with the new stuff based on this document and basically come back to you guys and share with you the draft, then we take it from there. That would be my suggestion.

As for timeline, I would suggest to keep it a bit loose so that we have time to internally discuss the changes and we have time for a couple of rounds of back and forth discussions. I suggest that you wait until you hear from me. I would guess that my estimate is about four weeks or three weeks minimum. Then once I come back to you guys then I'm open to your suggestions for when to meet. Basically, we are ready on our side to discuss. Does that make sense to you?

JAMES GALVIN: It does. Let me test a bit that you're saying four to six weeks, basically you're pushing it past ICANN68 is the next time that you're expecting that we'll get together at least on the technical side. Would that be fair?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: I didn't say four to six. My estimate was four. But one option could be that we meet during ICANN. I'm not sure if you guys had planned to meet already then. We could already specify a time for that week, for instance, from now. I'm happy to do that.

JAMES GALVIN: Right. I'm not sure if others here will have a different opinion. I think I would suggest that we keep our regular time slot. I don't think this group is going to meet during ICANN68. This group itself, we will have a working meeting during that week. What I'd rather do is just plan to meet during this regular time slot a week after rather than meeting on Kuala Lumpur time and trying to find a slot in there. Samaneh is saying, "Sounds good." So that would be good.

Maybe what we do – why don't we explicitly target that date for Samaneh for you to join us to talk about wherever we are with the techno stuff. We understand this is going to be iterative. I don't expect you to have a complete solution or anything like that. You might not even get it all done, but why don't we say June 30 we'll make that our next joint meeting? Does that sound good to you? If anyone want to raise their hand –

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, good. And suggest something different. Okay. So that takes care that side of it. Kurt, go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ: I want to take time to make two points. One is on a tangent a little bit, but I remember, Samaneh, this meeting has been primarily about messaging, and when we first talked about this a couple, a few months ago, you had told us that messaging or changing the wording around the report would be difficult for you and for ICANN because it had been carefully selected. So I just wanted to mention that I think – and I think we think that the messaging is a really important part of this, and it was brought home to me by – two meetings ago when David Conrad mentioned the reason we separate new gTLDs from legacy gTLDs is to demonstrate that new gTLDs are not a problem. From our viewpoint, from our perspective, it's getting hit on the head lessons in here. So we're very cognizant that just putting the data out there does not lead people to the right conclusion, and so when you're discussing the messaging with your colleagues, both inside OCTO and particularly outside OCTO, I just want to stress that this is a very important part of the recommendation. So that's one comment.

The other comment is that we've really appreciated the candor and effort that's gone in to this sort of behind-the-scenes effort and for us ...

well, for me – and this is a topic I just want to bring up for our group so I’m not speaking on our behalf – when is the time to start talking about this effort publicly? I bring this up for two reasons: one is I think it’s really good work and it will be beneficial for the Registry Stakeholder Group and for ICANN to say we’ve been working on this pretty darn hard with that analysis back and forth and stuff like this. So it would be beneficial to show that we’re putting a lot of work into DAAR, which in turn is a lot of work into DNS abuse. So I think that would be good.

Secondly – and others on the call might speak more to this – but we’ve planned a couple of webinars prior to the ICANN meeting. I think naturally, this topic in our work together is going to come up in some way. So from my viewpoint anyway, I don’t want this to be a surprise to you or to ICANN after working together collaboratively this long, we should talk about whether this report in its current form could be published. If you guys think it’s all constructive and with the understanding that not 100% of it is going to be implemented or implementable but it’s a demonstration of the work we’ve done or just for this group with you in the room to talk about how to start talking about the work we’ve done publicly. Thanks. And thanks for taking so much time to make just two points.

JAMES GALVIN:

No, that’s okay, Kurt. Thank you very much for that. That’s a nice segue. That’s actually the perfect segue into the second half of the discussion that I didn’t want to have here in the remainder of our meeting which is: what are the next steps on the messaging side here? You laid this out very nicely for us, Kurt, and where we want to go with that.

Instead on my jumping in here, with that, Samaneh, you had your hand up so let me let you jump in and respond to Kurt, and then we'll see where the discussion takes us.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Thank you, Jim, and thank you, Kurt, for your points – both very valid points. I completely agree and I would like to acknowledge all the efforts that was put from your side into discussing this internally within yourselves and also provide feedback with us and going step by step. I personally really enjoy having conversations about the things that we have less insight on which is your side of this whole abuse reporting tool and also how you perceive the documents and the work we are doing.

On the messaging side, to answer your comment about the messaging, indeed my point about changing it being difficult was more on the side of Legal. The Legal is being pretty tough on us on every technical document that we are working on on clearing out the message, etc. That doesn't mean that they are not open to change. I think the process on our side is that we would provide them with this is how we are going to do with and they will provide the recommendations on how it should be better legally or cannot be. It is also in our favor and that's what we want to hear from your side as an outsider perspective that what is not clear as it is in the current format. So what we want is also clear – almost everything that is not clear. So we would go with every recommendation that would improve that. I can speak of that and I think David and John would agree with that too.

On top of the points that are already in this recommendation document maybe it's good to know – are we only talking about DAAR as in the monthly reports or are we talking about DAAR as in everything that is currently published about DAAR, the website and also the previous documents, the methodology paper, etc.? That's one thing.

On the going public about our efforts, yeah, I think up to now we agreed mutually that the document should be on embargo. Once two things happen, I think from your side it's fine to publicly talk about it and the modifications that we discussed in these meetings are made on the document, I personally have the power to comment on the fact that we are fine with publishing it as is but I am positive we need to internally discuss it, and then maybe come up with some recommendations for changes or nothing. I'm not sure how will that go but what is clear is that we are fine with publicly and more than fine, we are happy to publicly announce that you guys have been working with us very hard and for a long time to improve this platform, and this is kind of final recommendation document in whatever format that it end up to be.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you, Samaneh. Let me try to take all this together here. I believe that – and, Kurt, I'm assuming that that's an old hand – we have two questions on the table and try to have some discussion about and if we can, maybe we can come to a consensus about. But I had asked the general question up front here about how do we work together on moving forward on messaging? And we can split that into two parts. Kurt brought up a very important question here which is a piece of that

but I want to separate out, which is when do we go public? How do we really make it public about this work?

There a number of ways to make this public. One is, as Kurt pointed out, the contracted parties in general are planning a couple of webinars leading up to ICANN68 where we're going to talk about abuse and various elements of it and what it means to us and what's happening. As Kurt suggested, we should expect that as a natural part of that, reference will be made to the fact that we've been working with you. Maybe that's as much as we wanted to say about making it public. So this is kind of an open question here for the group to thinking about. We just need to all know that that's going to happen and be comfortable with that. So, Samaneh, that becomes part of the question to you.

But a piece of this question is whether or not we get formal about these recommendations and findings and what exactly that means. I mean, I'll let Donna speak to the specifics of the formality but, ultimately, right now this is just this working group. In order for these recommendations and findings to be formal, we'll need some more in-depth review by the full stakeholder group and then we got to figure out the mechanism for how to make these recommendations and findings public to the community at large. So there will be some logistics and administrative side of that.

We have not actually said that we do ultimately plan to do public and to publish this in some way, but exactly what that means has not been determined yet. I'm opening the door here for a little discussion on this point about the publicity side of this. I don't know if anyone wants to

have a strong opinion about it. I'll put a recommendation on the table. Maybe I'll let Donna speak before I make a suggestion. Donna, go ahead, please.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jim. I guess the question to this group – and I understand it's not all of the group – but what's the downside? I don't necessarily see any downside here. I think the fact that it's been good cooperation with OCTO, we've been very thoughtful in putting together these recommendations, so I don't necessarily see a downside and that's not withstanding we need to get this – if we're going to make this public, then we do need to manage that within the stakeholder group but I don't see that as a big problem. I also necessarily don't think that how we publish this or make it known to the rest of the community. I guess the responses might be interesting but getting that out there, that's not going to be a hurdle either. No, I don't necessarily see any downside of putting this out there so I'm just interested to understand if folks have a different view. Thanks, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. Anyone have any points of view on a downside to moving forward on publishing this? I mean, it is fair to say that this set of findings and recommendations, at least this set here, certainly do represent consensus in this group, which is a good thing. And now that we've talked with Samaneh, I think we're comfortable that we have a good collaborative notion of this also having consensus at least with

OCTO so there's no surprises. Whether or not everything is achievable is still kind of an open question but at least there's no surprises.

I'm thinking at the moment that unless anyone wants to object and I guess in fairness, we really need to take this to the mailing list because we certainly don't have everyone here. Probably the right step is to suggest what we need to iterate on the document. We definitely need to iterate on the document because there's some updates based on comments that we've gotten to do that. But then the next step would be to bring this to the stakeholder group and then make it something that, Donna in particular, we just sort of figure out what the publication process is for this from the broader stakeholder group. So we make this our consensus report and suggest that we move forward with publication and making it visible. Rick, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Jim. Actually, between the time that I put my hand up, you got to what I was saying. I was just going to say that I think we ought to take it in front of the stakeholder group and make sure that they're okay with the concept of publishing it. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN:

Great. Thank you. Donna asked in the chat room there to you, Samaneh, if you in particular have any concerns about publication of this and if you want to take a moment or a day – well, certainly you can have more than a day, actually – it will take us a day or at least a few days and probably have to meet at least once next week for ourselves to iterate

on this document. But then we'll bring it in front of our stakeholder group and move forward with it. So you have a little bit of time to confirm that, at least from your team's perspective, there's no issues or concerns with this being published. If you want to speak to that, Samaneh, please go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah. I think it would make sense if we review it one more time internally after your revision on the document before it goes public, if that's feasible from your side.

JAMES GALVIN: Sure, we can certainly accommodate giving you a chance to have a look at what's going to be published. I mean, just as we've done here, I don't see any issue with that. We could certainly circulate that to you. And if you have any questions or concerns, then we can certainly plan a discussion. But giving you an advanced look, I don't see any issue with that. That would be fine.

Okay. I think that at least settles that question. My takeaway from all of this is that as a working group, we'll move forward on seeing this thing to publication. The steps along the way that I see are iterating on the document, making sure that we've all had a chance to – in this working group and including OCTO just had a chance to see it one more time, so kind of a last call amongst ourselves. Then it goes to the stakeholder group for their review, and at that point then Donna would get ownership of that process. We'll see what happens in the stakeholder group. And so we need their review and approval and then we'll have to

figure out what the process is for publication but we can do that on the stakeholder group side.

So those are the steps I see along the way. Anyone want to jump in and suggest something different or tweak that in any way? Okay, all of that's looking good. I'm not seeing anything. So that's good.

Now we have the larger question of how to work together on messaging. Actually, Samaneh, even from last week – I hope this was clear last week but even this week, I'll just call it out explicitly, I'm kind of looking for you, OCTO, more generally to suggest what the best path forward is on working together on the messaging side of it. We certainly have our own ideas about actual words and phrases. We have given you one set of things once before. But what's the right way to move forward on that? To answer one of your particular questions – you made two comments earlier that I want to speak to here. One is we do acknowledge, obviously, you don't fully control all of this and you were pointing out that in particular, Legal review is a big part of whatever is developed and whatever happens there. So we'll certainly do our best to work with you as you work through that process on that side of things. I would hope that at least the substance of what has to be presented is something which comes primarily from you folks. So we want to work with you to sort of walk through that and see what's there. Then the details of what that turns into on the publication side, we'll just have to iterate on that process as it evolves. So that was one point.

The second thing is you did ask about whether our messaging recommendations are just talking about the DAAR reports or what else

might they refer to. What I want to say there is from our point of view, at least just talking about the DAAR reports and the website, those two major parts that go with it. But in fairness, it applies to whatever is public. We have, at least in our discussions here, primarily been focused in the reports and what's visible on the website but I don't want to exclude anything else. So it's about DAAR quite generally and everything related to DAAR, and in fact everything that's public related to DAAR, the opportunity to at least consider if there is an update or a better way to do some of those things. We'd like to be able to open those documents and all of that phrasing and have a discussion about it. We are willing to have a couple of people who can sit down with you and a couple of people and have a discussion.

In a way, this is kind of a shame that we're not having an in-person meeting, that ICANN68 would be the perfect opportunity to get a small group of people together to really dig into this and have a little working session. But absent that, I think that's what's required. We need to figure out who the right set of people is and then set up some time to sit down and start working through that. Have a smaller working group discussion session where we can work through what that needs to be.

I guess from your point of view, as I understand that, Samaneh, there's the question of wanting to have broader exposure of these recommendations. Since we're now going to go down a path of publishing them, I think that particular problem is going to take care of itself. So there's just the timing question there at the moment and what gets released. What are your thoughts, Samaneh, in particular on how we work together and what we do going forward to look at the messaging side of this? Thanks.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Thank you, Jim. I would suggest – I was just thinking while you were talking about this point. What I understand from what you guys have already provided up to now is certain general points that can be applicable to both the monthly report and the communication that has been happening on the website. Things like replacing terms. What we haven't discussed yet is, for instance, whether we use security threat or abuse but we sort of started adopting security threat to the rest of the documentation so I think we would go on with that unless you guys have objections and for others.

We will do a series of modifications to the monthly report and later to the documents that are already generated. Let's discuss this in the meeting that we have in a month. In that, hopefully the report that I will be providing there would be new messaging and more comprehensive. Then we can take it from there. I am not sure if by then we have already been through obstacles that we normally have such as Legal review, but at least we can have our own discussion and then we discuss it internally afterwards or maybe before. Also, it would help us to see if the new messaging is clear enough for you guys, or there are still points that you think should be improved. That's it.

There's one more thing that I would like you guys to just think about it and it's not relevant to the messaging, that I would like to say before this meeting is finished is that one of the thoughts that we have and it's only at the level of idea for the next versions of DAAR is to have kind of a dynamic web content or platform in which we do not have static graphs as we have currently in the PDF format in the monthly report but

we have filters that one can select what to see based on the data that is on the backend of the platform. This means that we would not only have one category such as legacy versus new. We would then include several things. This is an idea and we are still exploring it. Basically, we are planning to explore it internally. We still haven't even started on exploring. I think it's useful if we get your insight on it and if you have any recommendation or other feedback, it will be useful to hear it. This is something for the future, for the next steps just for you guys to think about it.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay, thank you very much for that. The action that I took away from the first half of what you said is before we begin work on messaging, let's wait for – you're going to be producing some revised reports that will go into production. And you would like to be able to bring that in our next meeting that we have on June 30 that we're targeting here. So you'll have that core review and you're suggesting that that's a better baseline to start from if we want to review messaging and consider what might change in it.

I think that's a good plan. I like that plan. I wanted to call it out explicitly and give anyone else a chance to comment if they think that we should do that a little bit differently. So that's one piece of what I heard. Let me pause there and see if there's any comments from anyone on that particular step forward. I think that's a good thing for now.

The second half of what you said was some new idea that you have with respect to DAAR, you want to make DAAR a bit more dynamic. You want

to look for a way to create some dynamic exposition to the data. You haven't begun that yet. It's just an idea at the moment, but as you begin to explore that and plan for it, you're interested in any insight that we might have with respect to that. So we'll certainly take that back to the question that we can explore and maybe there's an opportunity at some point in the future here. We can certainly have some discussion about that together and see what we can add to your process when you get to that point that you're ready for all of that.

Okay. I think with that, I'm looking at the time here, we're getting towards the top of the hour. I believe that there are two things that are going to happen here – well, three things that I'll call out here. One is that I will take the pen on revising the document, and with the goal of our group meeting next week internally, just us, so that we can review the revised document. I'll distribute that to the group here and also to OCTO so that Samaneh and others can have their own look at it and send any comments that they want about it to us. But ideally, we will, in this working group come to a consensus on the substance of this report so that we can then decide to hand that off to the stakeholder group for a broader review and discussion of what how to publish it. So that's one.

Two is we'll meet on the 30th with Samaneh again. We're going to target that meeting and we will have available then I guess two things. There'll be a look at some new analysis based on our recommendations, you're going to start that process and hopefully you'll have something to show us as far as that going forward. Also, you'll have a new baseline that should be available, a new baseline set of reports so that we can then begin a discussion about how to move forward on updating your

messaging. Of course, we will then have had the experience of the stakeholder group messaging in the webinars that we will have soon. There'll also be the ICANN meeting that will also have been discussing abuse. So we'll have a lot of inputs to take advantage to apply to reviewing the new baseline report. Those are the actions as I see them. Let me first ask, Samaneh, are you comfortable with how I captured the actions for you?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah, perfectly captured.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Any comments from anyone else? Also, I'll throw out Any Other Business? I'm not seeing any hands go up and no one's jumping to the mic. Okay. Then thank you, everyone. I appreciate your time. Thank you, Samaneh, again. I appreciate the opportunity to work with you on this, and we are adjourned.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks Jim. Michelle, we can end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]