

JIM GALVIN:

I'm Jim Galvin from Afiliat and one of your co-chairs. Brian Cimboric is also there. I will be chairing the meeting today. Thanks, everyone, for joining us as we are deep into entering our holiday season here. We sent out an agenda yesterday. Of course, we've had a couple of discussions.

Today, this week, we want to probably more directly characterize the way in which we can do some work. Our idea here is to have three kinds of parallel tracks that are going on in terms of the work that we're going to do. So this is a suggestion from Brian and I. I'm going to spend a little bit of time here just talking about what each of these things are, and then we'll go back and we'll deal with each one individually, just so that people know what's there and what it all means.

So we are essentially suggesting that there are three types of activities that we can do in this working group. We'll do essentially all three of these things in parallel. We may or may not cover each one of them in every meeting, but we want to start moving forward in each of these three areas.

So the first one is outreach. We had a list there of the proposed list of places, of groups, within ICANN that we probably want to make a point of reaching out to. One of the reasons for putting the outreach area as something that we want to proceed with is because the model that Brian and I were thinking about here is we want to bring each of these groups in and listen to them and hear about their pain points so that we can take all of that on board and then see what we might do with it, give us an opportunity to have some discussions, and also ask questions

---

*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.*

---

about the pain points. Let's try and understand. This gives us good visibility with other groups. Then they'll feel like they're included in part of things.

For some of these groups, we know really what their position is, but it's worth giving them an opportunity to speak directly to us and what it's all about. The idea was to get that done before the next ICANN meeting so that everybody would have felt like they were part of something before the next ICANN meeting. So that's a little bit of giving us some visibility and perception, but it also should influence and feed into other detailed work that we're going to do. So we can have more discussion about that as we get into this.

The second work item that we want to look at and address is our joint work with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We are going to have a meeting with them next Tuesday, so that probably has to be a bit more of a focus in this meeting so that we're ready for that discussion. We've put two things down here. We'll have a bit of discussion about what each of those are. They're from Graeme's list of the four items that they're working on here. We should think about what it is we want to be doing and working with them. The current scheduling is that we'll meet with them every four weeks. Again, the next time is going to be next Tuesday, so we should have some discussion about what our agenda is going to be and what we're doing so that we can prepare for the next meeting four weeks later and we can do some work in that regard.

Then the third item that we're suggesting doing is what we might want to do ourselves. This is nice in that we're trying to get ahead of the story

---

and working with others, being partners with the community, but what do we want to do in terms of actions we want to move forward with? So we have one suggestion down here for things we can do. Let's focus on some standard workflows and templates. We can speak a little bit more about that as we get into each of these.

So those are the three areas that we're suggesting that we focus [in the large] in this group. What were hoping to spend some time on today is talking about each of these things and getting a sense of the group of what you think the priorities are and what are the detailed elements inside of each of these things. Then Brian and I will take that and move that along.

With that, let me jump back, and we'll talk about these things in the order in which we have them here for right now. So we'll jump to talking about outreach. Again, very quickly, the idea here was to try and meet with these groups before the next ICANN meeting. The desired outcome for us is really to understand from them directly—that's the question we want to put to them as part of inviting them to come to our meeting. "What are your pain points? What is it you are trying to achieve from abuse?" This is not necessarily a commitment from us to directly respond to that, but it does give them a voice and it gives them an opportunity to say what they want to say to us so that we can take that on board.

OCTO is on this list in part because this might be an opportunity for us to talk about the DAAR stuff with them directly, as well as listening to whatever else they might want to add. Then the other groups are the obvious choices.

---

PSWG is not on there because we're going to treat them like the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We'll always meet with them as joint work. We're going to find some joint things to do with them. So that's not really outreach. That's actually a partnership activity. We'll deal with them separately.

We'd like to hear some comments from the group here about whether you agree about moving forward with some outreach and trying to make that an active thing. Then, of course, there's the question of, well, do you have a preference on the order here? This is a suggested order, so we can take it the way it is there. But, if you've got a particular motivation for wanting to do it one way or another, we're happy to hear that. And if you want to do something other with the agenda than just hearing them give us pain points, we'd love to hear some comments from people about what you think.

Kurt, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ:

I have a couple points to make. One is I see these as ... First of all, I'm for them. Second, I see them as a two-way conversation—so not just, “What are your pain points?” but we either need to have a script about education about what registries are doing, either to fight abuse or measure abuse or something like that. So I think it needs to be a two-way conversation. Also, I think we should solicit from them what they'd want to get out of this session. So we can manage expectations but also satisfy what they're looking for. So that's one point.

---

The second is we might think about making these interactions or outreach sessions public—in other words, allowing others to observe the discussions. I know there's pluses and minuses to that, but if there's a public registry roadshow taking on fortnightly each one of these groups where other people can listen in, there might be a lot of benefit there because we would not only be educating this group but we'd be showing the rest of the community that we're interacting and we are also taking advantage of the opportunity to educate everybody.

I understand the pitfalls of it. As an attorney, you never want to ask a witness a question unless you know what he's going to say or she's going to say. So we do need to be judicious about this. At one end of the spectrum, we could have a roadshow where people can attend each session. On the other hand, we might cherry-pick which ones we would allow observers, too. For example, if we think the session with the SSAC is going to be positive on both sides, then we might invite or make available observation to that. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Kurt. I very much liked your suggestion about a two-way conversation, so I think we can take that on board and we can find a way to make that work.

My initial reaction to your comment about making the interactions public is I like it as a concept, but I think, for the first meeting, my advice would be to not do it. I think it's important that we establish a working relationship first and also to reiterate a point that you made about, "Well, we don't really know what they're going to say, so I don't really

---

want to be in a public place and be stuck and not know what's going on." But I think that, other than that, it's a really good suggestion. Maybe in the future, as we move along here, we can take the opportunity to do that. We can certainly examine them one-on-one.

Brian, go ahead, please.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Thanks, Jim. Kurt, I also agree with Jim as far as liking your suggestion about the two-way flow of conversation. I think that's important.

I actually do really disagree on the notion of making these public. As a matter of fact, I would take things a degree in the diametrically opposed way and suggest that they be Chatham House discussions. When different constituencies get together in public fora, there is an instinct among different groups to try and dunk on each other. I don't have any interest in participating in anything like that. I want to sit down with these constituencies where they feel totally free not to be politically posturing but just telling us the truth as far as what's going on. We can answer with some degree of candor if things aren't a public spectacle. So at least for the foreseeable future, until we get a good cadence and really build up some potential trust between our group and these other groups, I am definitely not in favor of a public meeting with these other groups.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Brian. Excellent comment. That's true. Donna, go ahead, please.

---

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jim. I just want to address the cadence or the priority order. I would actually start with our biggest pain points, which are the BC and the ALAC, because if the intent is to try to have conversations before ICANN70, that's where the most pain comes for us. So I think it would be worthwhile to have those conversations first.

I guess I don't have the sensitivity about having observers listen in. I appreciate then points about candor, but I don't know that we're going to get anything that's really new from the BC or the ALAC. I think we know what the posture or the ask is from both of those. It's just finding a way to maybe appease them in some way. But I don't see anything coming out of the BC or the ALAC that will be a surprise for us. The BC has written a number of times to the Board about their concerns, and ALAC has a statement on DNS abuse as well. So I don't know that we're going to get anything that's really surprising.

But I think, in terms of priority, it would make sense to do BC and ALAC first in order to diminish the possibility that we're going to have a plenary session at ICANN70 that looks like the last plenary sessions from the last three meetings. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. Actually, on your comment about that we pretty much know the story we're going to get from IPC, BC, and ALAC, when Brian and I were talking about this—in fact, because we know that and because we know we're just going to hear about their pain—we in fact were thinking about putting them last. That's why they got ordered this way—just to say that. Your comment about, "Let's just put them up

---

front and then give us a little more time to think about it and talk about and see if there's something we can do with that," is a good point, too. That's an alternate way to look at it. We just figured, "Let's try to get a little success under our belt before we have to deal with those guys." That was our motivation for listing it that way. But either way is fine.

I'm interested in whether or not anyone else has got any other sense of which way they want to do it. I'm not getting a good sense here of ... I'd like to hear a little more majority, just a couple of voices, on ordering these things.

So a couple more hands. That's good. Crystal, go ahead, please.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Just an FYI. Sorry, it's not directly to your question, Jim, but maybe tangentially related. The IPC and BC have started a smaller group to deal with abuse. Not surprisingly, it's being led by Mason and Dean Marks. So I'm not sure we want to have full meetings with their whole constituencies, but there may be some value in having higher-level discussions with just the smaller abuse group that they're forming.

I would agree with Brian that I think there's huge value in having it off-the-record, just very honest kinds of conversations before we open it up the public. I saw Sam said that same thing as chat. So I definitely agree with that.

Regarding your question about if this the right order of talking to them, we've spent a lot of time talking to ICANN about abuse, since before Bryan Schilling was with ICANN and we do all of this. I'm just not sure



---

what we're expecting to get out of OCTO that we don't already know. If we can't answer that question, I'm not sure why we'd suggest the meeting.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Crystal. Good points. I appreciate that. Sam, go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jim. First off, I agree with Crystal on the idea of meeting with subgroups or groups that are focused on DNS abuse specifically as we go through, I would say, all of these meetings, not just even BC and IPC.

But to your question about the order, I raised my hand to suggest that maybe there's a way to thread the needle of the points that Donna brought up. We [inaudible] that we have conversations with ALAC and IPC/BC because we know they're the ones who may be pushing for plenary events or plenary sessions at the next ICANN meeting.

But also [on] the other points raised that we might want to have some more "friendly" conversations first, I think there's a way to thread that needle and address all the concerns by doing an initial outreach to the leaders of each of these groups all at the same time and saying, "This is our intention. We want to talk to you. We want to get your thoughts. We want you to have the opportunity to hear from us," and then go through the stated goals but then deal with the scheduling point, so they know that it's coming and it's not like, "Oh, we're getting to the end of the end of February, and the ICANN meeting is coming up," and they haven't heard from us.

---

So I'm agnostic about the order. I think, if you guys believe in the order that you've laid out, I can definitely get behind it. But I think there's a way to balance all the different [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Sam. I see some support for your comment about that we should be inclusive. Let's let everyone know upfront that we're going to meet with them and then deal with scheduling as a separate thing. I see support there in the chat for that, and I like that myself also.

Susan, go ahead, please.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Thanks. It was just a really quick comment about the SSAC. I don't feel strongly about the order generally, but it's now a long-awaited output from the SSAC that was supposedly going to be there for ICANN69. Then it was going to be for a couple of weeks after. We've had some updates obviously in the last few weeks that indicate that it's taking the SSAC longer to come up with their output, but it seems to me that it doesn't make sense for us to meet them until we have that.

It was unfortunate that ICANN69 ... Obviously, they had anticipated that they would have something published, so they were out talking about. Yet, it still hasn't materialized. So we obviously will have questions once the SSAC output is out. It makes sense to try and find a time where we schedule a meeting with them where we know we'll have that output from them. That was what I was going to say. But happy to help with outreach to the IPC/BC if I can.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Susan. Excellent comment in terms of scheduling with SSAC, not meeting with them until their document comes out. Yeah, they had their own internal process, as we all do, about production of things. So certainly, from a scheduling point of view, I agree with you. That would be a good thing.

Alan, I'll let you get the last word here. Then I want to try and draw a line under this and move onto the next item. Go ahead.

ALAN WOODS:

Sure. Thank you very much. Apologies if there's background noise. Just after what Susan was saying there, yeah, I just want to give you a very brief update on that document. I said in the chat there that we have literally gone through for the final time. I feel for the SSAC in this particular point, just purely because they were dealing with one member. This is all really about one member's comments. [We] tried to get this document. ICANN69 is when they wanted to get it through, and it cynical person would say there was a concerted effort to stall it. So it didn't get out at ICANN69 so that another document could get in front of it. But I'm not cynical, so I would never say such a thing.

But I will say is it is expected hopefully sooner rather than later, but I do agree that it probably should wait until after we get view of that document, so we can have a proper discussion as to what is the impression, what is expected, from that document.

---

But, when it comes to generally speaking, I can see it on my screen—the order. I agree with the order as well, so I would be [led by] [inaudible] and Jim and [those two]. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Alan. I appreciate it.

So my takeaways from this discussion here is people are generally okay with outreach. We've had a good suggestion that we should ... Let's develop upfront what we want to get out of this thing. So we'll spend some time on the mailing list. The Chairs will take away an action item here to develop what we want to do in terms of an introduction and question list that we want to make to the other SO and AC Chairs that we're going to reach out to. So we'll develop that message that we want to use, but we'll tell everyone all at once that we'd like to meet with them. So we'll take, as a separate step, scheduling. We've gotten some clear parameters here on what we can do about the scheduling. So we'll see who gets back to us and map that against what we have, and we'll have that discussion about the scheduling—the details of it—as it unfolds on the mailing list. So thanks for that.

Okay. Let's move to talking about our joint work with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Alan, I'm going to assume that's an old hand, that, because it's your phone ... I know how it is working with the phone app here and getting those things to do the right thing. You go through screenfuls.

On the Registrar Stakeholder Group, Graeme had given us four items that they were doing. There were two that they were actually working

---

on and two that were activities to come. One of them stood out for us at the moment here, which was the incentivization discussion that the Registrar Stakeholder Group was working on. We really don't have any special insight about that is and what's going on there. They did say that it was nearing completion when Graeme had his note. We thought it might be useful to ask them if they would be willing to say more about that, perhaps even share some of the work that they're doing. We could explicitly ask the question, "Is there room for us to comment or participate in whatever you're doing?" [to] open the door for getting engaged with them on that topic but, in any case, have them have a discussion with us about it coming up on Tuesday. So that was one item suggesting to deal with the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

The registrant protections item is—

CRYSTAL ONDO: Before you move on, Jim, can I just jump in? It's Crystal.

JIM GALVIN: Sure.

CRYSTAL ONDO: They have a full dock. It's like four pages long. So I'm sure Graeme is willing to share it ahead of that meeting if you guys make the ask on incentivization.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Excellent. Thank you. Yes, we would make the ask. I just didn't know what the limits were of their sharing and exposing things. But thank you for that. So we'll certainly do that. If folks here agree that this is something to reach out and get close to, then we'll do that, absolutely.

The registrant protections was one of the items on their list. The reason it's here is because there's one element of registrant protections where registries have a role. Since they haven't actually started that work yet, the idea here is maybe this is an opportunity for us to call that out and ask them where they want to go with it.

I'll offer two comments. One is that, in terms of registrant protections, SSAC has actually published several documents making suggestions that registrars could do with respect to providing additional levels of security and such for registrants.

On the registry side, the piece that actually directly affects us is this notion of registry lock. Many of us—not all registries, but many of us—support that registry lock service, and there are interactions that have to happen with the registrar in order for that service to work and to be offered to registrants. So one potential area of discussion here is, what would that look like? Maybe we can seek to create standardized workflows and definitions as far as that's concerned. So that's why that made the list and why that's there.

So these are suggestions for what to talk about next Tuesday on the agenda—invite them to get more involved with us on the incentivization, and there's a suggestion for future work (registrant

---

protections). I'm interested in any thoughts from folks about what to do.

It now occurs to me—I'm not seeing any hands at the moment—that I probably should remind people what all four of the items were. The other one that they had not started was identifying hosts, and the fourth one was abuse supporting site standards, which we'll actually get to in the next item here for ourselves. But we wanted to focus on registrant protections right here in this section.

Any comments? Any pluses or minuses on this?

Oh, and Brian, why don't you ... Yeah, go ahead, Brian. Say what you just said in the chat there.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Jim, I'm not positive about this, but just in different conversations with Graeme, I know that this is something they were working on—taking a look at registrant ... I think that they meant registrant protections in the sense of registrant recourse mechanisms, both at the registry to registrar level but actually just directly from the registrars. So, if a registrar suspends a domain name, what protection does the registrant have [and] what ability does the registrant have in order to either ask the registrar to reconsider its decision or somehow appeal that decision?

That's not to say they wouldn't be open to a broader conversation or anything like that, but I think that's my understanding of where they're headed on that particular track, unless anyone else has any idea on that.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks for that. I'm guessing that's new information that you got since the last time we talked, which is fine.

Maybe the right thing then for the agenda on Tuesday is really just to focus on incentivization since they were saying that they're nearing completion. We can have an open-ended discussion about potential work items. They have their other items on their list. Maybe we should try to have a little bit of an open-ended discussion about what we might do with them on any of their other items. Or maybe we should reach out to them and suggest to them, "Gee, with respect to your other items, is there anything that you would suggest to us that we could do with you on in those items?" I don't think that we're prepared to offer anything to them at the moment, but we should invite them to be explicit about what we could do with them and give them the opportunity to make an ask or at least have an open discussion. I think that would be my takeaway from this at the moment.

Okay. Not seeing any additional hands going up here. So that's my takeaway. We'll invite them to talk to us about the incentivization, share their document ahead of time, and then ask them an explicit open question about, do they have any ideas for how registries could work with them on the items that are on their agenda? We'll try to give them a heads up about that today so they have some time to prepare for next Tuesday.

Okay. So that brings us to the third specific work item here. Our suggestion here is talking about standard workflows and templates for



---

abuse. I think this is an opportunity ... I'm going to let Brian ... I think we had said you were going to jump in here and talk about this. This comes from the I&J stuff. Now, they do have some documents and templates. Is there a way for us to consider how to standardize these kinds of workflows? We have some documents from I&J that I'll let Brian jump into and talk about here. We also know that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has created a template that they have published for abuse reporting for use by other registrars. This might be an area where, if we can decide that we want to work on this and maybe create some standardized templates and workflows for ourselves, then we can reach out to the registrars and look to standardize those interactions between us and them. That might be something worth doing. And we have some leverage that we can lean on here.

Brian, do you want to jump in and say a few words about the I&J stuff?

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Sure. Thanks, Jim. Yes, the I&J (Internet & Jurisdiction) Policy Network put out their seven outcomes in 2020, as well as previously put out their longer document in 2019. The long name of it now is escaping me.

But there is, between that and the registrar work that has already been started on this ... A lot of the groundwork on putting out templates or standardized abuse reporting flows has already been done. So this was an area to the extent we, as a registry stakeholder abuse group, or combined with the CPH group, want to put out some sort of actual outcome to show that we're actually moving the needle in a concrete way for the DNS. That might be good place to start—taking a look

---

(we're not going to obviously do it here and now) at those output documents, seeing what's reasonable, and liberally borrowing from, citing, relying on—whatever it is—somehow putting our, if not endorsement but something close to it so that we have a document that shows that the registries are doing what we can help to make abuse report easier, to make the whole process more understandable, and actually maybe even move the needle on abuse mitigation. So that's the lofty goal.

I think, in one of these calls, if not a separate subgroup or work track, we should actually dig into the meat and potatoes of those documents, see what we're willing to stand by, and see what may be a bridge too far. But the point is that so much of this work has already potentially been done. We just need to assess and see what makes the most sense for us.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Brian. Comments from folks about ... Let's try to leverage something that ... We've got a good base to start from. This just feels like somewhere where we can get maybe some good success relatively quickly because we have a good base to work from. Then, also, it's an opportunity for us to reach out to registrars and maybe expand that so that it becomes something we've done jointly and get a good credit, a good win, on our side here relatively soon.

Donna, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

---

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Jim. I think the consolidation of information and ... To the extent that we can provide templates and pro forma information, I think it would be really helpful. I am trying to work out who's the audience for that. Is it intended for registry operators, or is it broader than that?

But the other thing that I wonder whether is helpful to do—Brian, you talked about this very early in the piece when we first had calls on DNS abuse ... I think it would be helpful for us to understand—particularly members of this working group, but perhaps more broadly for the Registry Stakeholder Group—is, what's your approach to dealing with DNS abuse? Because I appreciate that we're trying to develop something that is coverall approach for everybody. But would it be helpful to understand what approaches are actually being taken by registry operators? Maybe that helps us in understanding where there's gaps or what would be helpful because sometimes I'm concerned when we say "we." Who do we mean? I've raised this before—that we have the usual suspects that speak to this topic. And that's not disrespect to anybody. To some extent, it's about who has the resources to contribute to these efforts. That goes across the board in any effort that we have within the Registry Stakeholder Group.

But I just wonder whether it would be worthwhile seeing if people in this group or, more broadly, within the Registry Stakeholder Group would be willing to just provide an outline of what they do when they're dealing with DNS abuse to understand where it would be helpful for us to develop materials. Thanks.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks, Donna. I've captured the point that you're making, and it's a good distinction because I want to say more clearly what I think I meant—well, what I meant—by standardized workflows versus, I think, the distinction that you're making.

When I was thinking about standardized workflows and templates, I really was thinking about interactions between registries and some other party—so not an internal look at workflows in terms of what we're doing. I think that's the question that you're raising. You're suggesting that we should include in this work item here, or you're asking if maybe we should include in this work item here, a discussion of, what do people actually do with respect to abuse internally? What do registry operators do? Is there room for us to create some kind of standardization about how that works or maybe just some agreed-upon guidelines, a framework, to help those that may not be as proactive about it as some of the rest of us are per whatever resource constraints they might have?

So I think I've tried to capture that into two things—workflows in the sense of interactions with others (registrars, community at large). Whatever comes out of review of the I&J document, we have to look at all that and decide and then have a discussion of what we do internally. If I've got that wrong, please jump in and correct me on that. But that was my takeaway from that.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Jim, I think it's just to understand who's our audience here and who are we developing this information for or what's the purpose that we're

---

doing it for. But I really do think that there would be value even if it's a short survey that we do within the Registry Stakeholder Group to ask the question, "What do you do in responding to DNS abuse?" That was the outstanding issue from the Compliance audit. That was the piece that ICANN wanted to get to but wasn't within the remit of the registry agreement. But I think there would be real value in doing that because I think we're making some assumptions here. Perhaps we don't have the data to ... that it's accurate. I'm not sure that I'm being as articulate as I could be, but hopefully you get the sense of what I'm trying to say.

JIM GALVIN:

Let me try to capture that. You're asking the important question of who is the audience, which I think always applies in any kind of work item. Let me try to capture the work item you're talking about. I'm probably going to get this wrong, but I see we have a couple of hands. Let me do this as quickly as I can.

There's a comment left over from the DNS audit that we all "participated in" a year ago, and that was trying to get a better understanding of what everybody does with respect to abuse. I can see some value in that with respect to being able to tell our story as part of our outreach and other future discussions. I'm not sure at the moment that I've captured what you otherwise might want to do with that, so let me just leave that hanging for a moment. I'll let you come back and speak again if you want, but, Sam, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

---

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Jim. I don't want this to come off as being super against what Donna has said. I do believe that, in certain context, there is value in capturing and highlighting the things that registries already do and the good work that is already done there.

That said, I think that's one side of the coin of the larger work that this group is trying to do. I think there's another side that is very important here. It's in response to what we keep hearing, which is that you guys here in the room aren't the problem. The challenges we have and the issues that we're facing are for the other people who aren't here in the room.

When I think about the purposes of some of these best-practice-type documents or workflows and the chains of where an abuse complaint should go and the escalation paths—those kinds of documents—I think one of the very important audiences for that is actually other registries so that this group and the Registry Stakeholder Group in general is out there saying, “We are hearing you that there are other parties out there who aren't doing everything that they maybe “should” be doing,” so want to help give them the resources that they need in order to be able to do that. We know that there are some registries out there—some small registries—that don't really even know when to start when it comes to taking a more practiced answer or doing more work to mitigate DNS abuse.

So I think that, by putting these out there and having that be the intended audience, that's a big step in the direction of making this more of a community focus as opposed to just hearing people talk about, “We

---

have concerns around DNS abuse,” and the response being, “But here what’s we’re already doing.”

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks for that, Sam. I like that context that you’re suggesting. So, yes, for us, maybe one of the audiences that we can focus on here is others of us who are not in the room. In a way, that helps Donna’s suggestion there about, if we get an understanding of what people are doing, then we can use that to create an appropriate best-practice document that would work for others. That’s just me brainstorming out loud here, trying to connect some dots to see if that resonates with people. Please feel free to jump in and tell me that I got it wrong.

Alan, you got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN WOODS:

Thank you. I’m sitting here contemplating my life choices. Why did I put my hand up after Sam? Because she pretty much said what I was thinking on this one. I think there’s merit and there’s obviously a point from which we need to think about Donna is talking about in the sense of that there is value in us being able to establish what do you do in these instances.

But we do need to look at, I suppose, the broader, bigger picture that’s just outside of the registries as well in the sense of, how are people going to report to us [inaudible] is going to be given to us so that we can effectively apply those internal processes and procedures that aren’t necessarily best practice but that we can build around, knowing that

---

what we're going to get is quality, that the way it's going to be provided to us in the best possible means known, and that those policies and processes should come from that.

So I would rather focus on fixing the playing field as opposed to trying to go in and—I'm trying to think of a better word—almost suggest in a micro-manage-y way of how we would do internally it because, of course, there's many approaches that could be absolutely as correct that could absolutely contradict each other but ultimately end up with the same result. So I think focusing on things like evidence and escalation paths at the moment and then feeding down and helping people in that would be more focus for us as a group.

Again, I agree. I know it's the same people who always talk in these things, but at the same time, it is up to us to also consider those people who are not on those calls. I think that's probably one of those points that we need to actually focus on as well. That's by focusing on the broader playing field and not necessarily what those big players are doing ourselves.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks for that, Alan. I agree with you. The best practice documents and what they ... I heard you talking specifically about what some of the content might be in those kinds of things and agreeing that that would be useful thing to do. I like that. That was my takeaway from your discussion there.

Okay. Not seeing any other hands at the moment here. Our registry's specific work—



---

JC VIGNES: Sorry, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, JC, please go ahead.

JC VIGNES: Sorry. I wanted to give time to others to speak. I wanted to talk briefly about what UNR does because we're actually working with other registries. Some of them are actually in the room. So it's not a sales pitch by any means, but it's another way of looking at the problem. I thought might be helpful to say a few words about it, if you don't mind.

JIM GALVIN: Sure. Please go ahead.

JC VIGNES: So you talked about pain points earlier, and I think one of the biggest pain points from companies is they already make a difference good guys and bad guys. A registry is a registry is a registry. More often than not, when you reach to a registry, it's because the problem has happened. You have phishing and you need to deal with the issue after the fact.

So what we're putting together in our project called [Unify Block] is a way to be proactive. It's a way to have companies and right holders go to us and ask us to protect their rights—be it trademark, be it a company name, or DBA—and avoid the string to be registered as a

---

name, not simply as a word-for-word match but also variations. And we deal with the abuse we see every day on our registries, and we nurture [inaudible] to make sure that those typical variations are stopped at the registration level. It's work in progress. We intend to launch that in 2021. But we have many registrars interested and many key brand holders and financial institutions that like our approach.

So the reason I'm talking about it here is we're trying to work with as many registry operators as possible to offer a unified front, to have a one-stop shop to, again, get rid of the pain points.

So apologies if it sounded salesy, but I think it's the right forum to just briefly talk about it. We'd love to hear feedback from others and see how we can work together.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks for that, JC. I think, in the context of us trying to get an understanding of what kind of practices are out there and what kinds of options we might suggest to registry operators, it certainly fits into that category of things. If we're going to start talking about standard workflows and even internal operations, we don't necessarily have to have the best answer, but we can have some suggestions for folks. It sounds like this is something that could be on that list as we get into this work.

JC VIGNES:

Thank you.

---

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Let me try to summarize what I think I've gotten out of this here and make some suggestions, which is just coming from me. So I haven't obviously coordinated this with our Co-Chair here, but here's an opportunity for folks to think.

In general, I believe that no one has objected outright to these three paths here that we would try to go down. So we'll take the actions as I had previously talked about with the outreach and the joint work of the registrars.

With the registries' specific work, I guess the sense I'm getting is that no one is opposed to the standard workflows. There's some discussion as to what exactly that means, and that's a fair question to ask. We've had some good advice about perhaps doing a survey or in some way trying to get an understanding of what people are doing. Who's the audience for this work? I guess that depends a little bit on what work we choose to do in the larger, broad category of just standard workflows and templates.

So I think the action here is to begin digging into the details of what this could be. If we accept that doing standard workflows and templates is a sensible thing, let's drill in here and take some time to consider what we could be doing in this space. So part of it is leveraging stuff from the I&J. Part of it is understanding best practices. Part of it is the survey that we've talked about here.

So I think what we'll do is we'll plan for our next meeting here in this group. We should have two agenda items, I think, at least. One is a debrief to ourselves after the joint meeting next Tuesday with the

---

registrars. Then let's dig in here. Let's spend some time and try and dig into what exactly this could be and what it would look like and where we could go with that. I think, unless anyone wants to suggest something different, your Chairs will take as an action to try and fill that out a bit and give us something to talk about next week and leverage with that.

Yeah, Brian, you'll be chairing next week's meeting also in any case, so that'll be the topic. You and I will sort out what we want to dig into there. We can then obviously do a bit of an overview and presentation on the I&J documents and see where else we might want to go.

Kurt, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ:

I have a suggestion for other RySG-specific work that may or may not be included under the standard workflows. I think we should establish a metrics group that concentrates on metrics or data or data analysis. That's always a powerful tool that we have to explain what's going on. So we could establish a side group or some sort of effort that concentrates on that that provides the ammunition for all of the rest of these activities—the outreach and the joint work with the registrars and registry-specific work.

JIM GALVIN:

Well, I'll say for myself I actually like that idea, especially coming off of all the DAAR work that, Kurt, you were certainly actively involved in, with myself, along with many others here in this group. I think that

---

would be an ideal thing to do. And you're right. In addition to just spending some time talking more about metrics, perhaps a particular deliverable out of that group could be identifying and then gathering and then maintaining some set of metrics. We'd have to think about how that compares to DAAR. We don't want to duplicate work. But let's find a way to represent ourselves and what we are doing. We can use that as part of our normal or regular story with outreach and with others. So I like that very much. I'll certainly make a note here about doing that, and Brian and I will figure out how to fold that into what we got going on here.

Okay. So I think that's it. I've tried to summarize where we're going to go here. I'm looking at the time. Yeah, we still have eight minutes until the top of the hour, but I think that really does end that.

If we want to make use of the time that we have here, it turns out Donna has—I'm assuming, Kurt, that's an old hand—actually put on the bottom of the sheet here that she has displayed—not Donna; I'm sorry; Sue—on the screen. She put at the bottom here the issues list that Brian had captured and sent out to the list earlier this week—I think yesterday or the day before. If folks would like to take a few minutes to go through that, we could do that. Maybe we'll let Brian jump in here and say a few words about what's there and see if that sparks any conversation. Then we ought to be able to end here at the top of the hour. So, Brian, do you want to say a little about what you sent around?

---

BRIAN CIMBOLIC:

Sure. Thanks. This is really just an action item from last week's meeting. We had put together the initial potential list of issues. I went back and listened to the recording and tried to incorporate all the additional items to scope out what we're focusing on. It maps to the three buckets that Jim had described earlier. The one that we didn't talk about as explicitly today is more the specific thought to long-term strategy, thinking about potential PDPs, and monitoring legislation and things like that. Obviously, that's something this group is going to be engaged in long-term, but to the extent that there's the three work tracks, that's just something to keep in mind. But I don't think we need to go through it here, but please do take a look at it, everyone. If there's additional scope of work that you'd like to add to the list, please just respond to the e-mail.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Thanks, Brian. Not seeing any questions coming up. If anybody wants to jump in and add anything about that.

I would say that brings us to the end of our agenda and to ask for Any Other Business if people want to add anything else.

I'm not seeing any hands, and no one is talking. So, with that, let me thank everyone for your time. We'll see you on Tuesday when we meet with the registrars, and, of course, next Thursday at the same time for our own meeting. We're adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**