

DAAR Discussion Group with OCTO

24 September 2019

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks very much. Welcome, everyone. This is the DAAR discussion group from the Registry Stakeholder Group, and we are meeting today with David Conrad and John Crain and Samaneh Tajali to talk about a document which we had shared with them which reflects our list of questions, concerns, issues, and then our notes about those particular topics.

We've obviously had a number of meetings ourselves in developing this chart that we had, and we had one prep meeting back in June I believe if I remember correctly meeting with John and Samaneh at the time as sort of a prep to getting this together.

We're setting ourselves up here to have a working session, an open, honest working discussion with the folks from OCTO about DAAR with an overall goal of trying to make DAAR just better for everyone. We do have some concerns and suggestions, and our goal here in general, not necessarily to complete today because I think there's a lot to get through, is to begin a discussion of these topics and proceed to continue this discussion as time permits.

I expect that we'll probably continue to have weekly meetings from this point forward as we begin to work through some of these topics and have some discussion about them, perhaps even leading all the way up to ICANN Montreal. But we can tackle those bits of logistics as they come up and as we need them.

We had set this particular meeting time up to work with OCTO and had given them in advance our list of topics here. And I think with that, I want to dedicate as much time as possible to a working meeting for

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.

today and see where we are. At the end, we'll try to bring our discussion to some kind of close here about five minutes or so ahead of the top of the hour so we can have a bit of discussion about future logistics and next steps as we're going through this.

With that, welcome, everyone. Again, David, John, and Samaneh. Let me reach now over to David, John, or Samaneh. I'm not sure which one of you you want to lead us off here or who wants to make an opening statement. And then I guess we're looking mostly for you to walk us through these discussion topics here. We explicitly did not numerate them into a priority order, so we're welcome to address these issues in any way that would be the most helpful to you for right now, and then we'll just see where the discussion takes us.

DAVID CONRAD:

Okay, thanks, Jim. I'll just briefly say thanks very much for allowing us to enter into this discussion with you all. We're actually very interested in getting your perspectives and input and suggestions on how we can improve DAAR. As I believe some of you know we're planning on having a DAAR improvement session in Montreal, and we look forward to any sort of constructive criticism, improvements, any thoughts that you might have on how to make DAAR a tool that actually helps.

Because fundamentally the whole intent behind the DAAR effort is to provide information particularly to the registries that will help in addressing concerns about DNS abuse. DAAR in and of itself isn't a tool that can actually do anything other than provide information. The whole intent being to provide sort of a canonical [forum] to get us away from the vendor-driven versions of information that were and are still out

there that different news agencies stumble upon whenever there happens to be a new product release or something like that.

Our intent was to try to provide something that was agreed upon among the community that would provide useful information to help people get a better understanding of what the real issues are related to the amount of abuse, or security threats to be more specific, on the Internet.

The way I thought we'd move forward with this would be to have Samaneh who is sort of the lead on the project go through the document and John or I will chime in any time we have something useful to say. Obviously, if anyone has any questions or additional comments, I guess just raise your hand or otherwise make yourself known. We definitely want this to be an interactive discussion, and once again we are interested, very deeply interested, in the input that you all can provide to help us improve the tool.

With that, I will throw it over to Samaneh.

JIM GALVIN: If I may just for one moment, thank you, David, and before Samaneh.

DAVID CONRAD: Sure.

JIM GALVIN: I will keep an eye on managing the hands that are up there in the room so that I can just moderate the discussion for folks just so that you know. With that, let me just turn it over to Samaneh to go however she

wants to approach this. Thank you. Samaneh, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Can you hear me now?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, sounds great. Thanks.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Okay. As David already pointed out, we are more than happy to receive your feedback as the ultimate goal is to have a tool that is used by you and is [perceived] useful. This process would be more as I try to get clarity on the points that are made in this document and also grasp different ways how these possible actions are possible technically but also in a higher level with you guys.

I'll start from the first box, the technical report issues. There is a main point that is [overall] lack of a clear stated goal and vision for DAAR. I think David already summarized DAAR's goal which is more to provide information and reliable methodology than being by itself a tool that can do anything. Of course, we during the course of the document, we will be more specific on what further to change to make it more clear, but the short answer that we have is that it is more an informative tool.

Now to be more specific on the points that are made in this box on the right side, you talk about different metrics such as speed and effectiveness of mitigating. I know that below there are also other points on that. So let's start with discussing, what do you define as speed and effectiveness at mitigating? What did you have in mind?

JIM GALVIN: I think the question that you're asking us is, what would we propose to measure in terms of representing speed and effectiveness? If I can reframe the question, is that fair, Samaneh? If you're speaking, Samaneh, we're not hearing you.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Sorry, my speaker was on mute so if you said something, I didn't hear it.
[Can you repeat it?]

JIM GALVIN: Sure. I was just in terms of clarity trying to understand your question. I wanted to reframe it a little bit and ask if what I had questioned was correct. You're asking us what we consider to be speed and effectiveness, and I think more specifically you're asking us what would we suggest for measuring or are you asking a higher-level conceptual question on what does speed and effectiveness mean? If you're speaking, Samaneh, we're not hearing you.

DAVID CONRAD: Okay, let me step in here. Yeah, I think one of the things that we're looking for is suggestions. We understand what the issues are with regards to time to mitigation, those sorts of things. It would be if you all have suggestions on how we can improve that, we're more than happy.

I mean, I'm sure you're aware that we're constrained by the data that we have available to us. So since the CZDS zone files are made available on a 24-hour basis, that means that the granularity that we can go down to is basically 24 hours. If we had access to data on a higher granularity,

then we can likely figure out ways of providing more time sensitive information. But that obviously would be a strain on the contracted parties if they had to dump zone files on a more frequent basis. So any suggestions that you all might have in this area are obviously something we'd be interested in.

JIM GALVIN:

Let me respond in the following way. I see Kristine's hand, but let me add a little bit of comment here about what to measure and what speed and effectiveness is. We have had discussions obviously here ourselves about different things that might be possible.

We should divide this problem up into a couple of key questions one of which is, what would you ICANN or any other third party ordinarily have access to so that they could evaluate speed and effectiveness? You've touched on one thing in particular which is the zone files in CZDS, and so that gives you a 24-hour granularity on that particular issue which is whether or not a domain name has been taken down or not. Is it present in the zone file?

Which brings me to a second data point which is useful in this discussion. If we go at this from the direction of the security framework document, there is the question of what actions does a registry or registrar take in response to notice of abuse. It is true that there's mitigation about whether or not the abuse itself has been removed. That's possible in some case. When you're talking about malware distribution and that kind of thing, there's the question of whether it's still present or not.

But the [gross] level option and action that's available, the only one that's there is has the name been taken down or not. And that's not a

typical action is really part of the problem here. It's an action in certain particular cases, but it's a fairly blunt instrument and we tend to work to not take that action if we can help it.

That becomes part of the measurement problem. If that's the only thing that's easy for you to see and [we're] otherwise doing things, we don't have an easy answer or at least we have not yet found one. And you're asking us for our advice, but that's kind of where we are. It would be interesting to know what analysis, if you guys have done any analysis, on what you think options might be and what would you offer for us to think about in ways of doing this.

Now having said all of that, I apologize. Let me move to Kristine and then give you a chance to respond. Kristine, go ahead.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks. I really appreciate everyone being here, and I hope you can hear me okay. Basically Jim said a lot of what I wanted to say, so the only other thing that I would add is as we're all sitting here putting our collective heads together trying to figure out how we show what it is that's happening, at the point in time what's happening on September 24 has no bearing on how quickly a registry is reacting to abuse.

So trying to reflect that, and that's really what we're trying to do is reflect how reactive are we being because we can't really control who [abuses] our zone. The only thing we can do is report it out to the registrars or the hosts or as Jim pointed out shut it down.

But I want to think about someone somewhere decided that these certain feed providers that were selected were the right ones for whatever criteria were established for deciding that. Perhaps the onus

should be on them to do more than just push out badness on any particular day but then to reflect how that zone has changed and how abuse has been managed and handled. So it may not be something that I have [to solve for] or you have [to solve for].

If we're going to rely on third parties, maybe those third parties should be forced to come up with ways to measure the goodness that's happening in addition to the badness, especially if people are going to be paying them really, really good money for these feeds. I just wanted to throw that out there as a potential solution.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Kristine. Samaneh, go ahead, please.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Yes, hopefully you can hear me now.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, very good. Thank you.

SAMANEH TAJALI: My response has two parts. The first part is about I think actually it's quite an interesting discussion to have in further details of what we think is useful as a definition of speed and effectiveness because as far as I know even in academic studies this is still a point of discussion. What kind of metrics can be created to measure this, of course in different ways.

What I have previously worked on and I know it gives an overview of a portion of the measures that registries are taking is to combine the two.

For instance, let's call what we currently have in DAAR an occurrence metric, a metric that says if a security threat is present or not. In an ideal world, it would be more informative if we could combine that with a metric that represents the uptime of a domain.

Now the second point also refers back to the point that you were just making about goodness. And the responsibility on the feed providers is that some of the feeds that we are using in DAAR include this information and some not. Of course, we would be able to measure uptime through different measures like David suggested from zone files or if you guys could provide us Thin WHOIS information which is not [rate] limited or any kind of information that we could get our hands on the meta data about a zone or availability of the domain.

In some of these cases, and I'm sure you know better, that domains are [out] for a very, very short amount of time, like minutes. So if we are going to the direction of measuring uptime and we want to measure it reliably, we have to very granular data to be able to present this. This is something to be discussed with you how we can do it and how we can do it systematically basically.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Samaneh. I want to try to keep our discussion a bit focused here on something, so let's stay focused on this measurement topic and the uptime question at the moment. I want to raise a concern with the uptime measurement that you're talking about and going back to a point that I was making about the security framework talks about the fact that, at least from a registry point of view, the only real action that we have available to us as a registry is to take down the domain.

But I think that it's important to understand that measuring the uptime of the domain is actually a pretty limiting characteristic by which to judge whether or not anybody is being responsive about abuse because that's not the most common action that's taken. Registrars get the first opportunity to act on abuse, and the abuse might be a situation where it just as to be addressed on that particular website or with that domain name, and once it has been addressed it's fine.

And the domain is never taken down as part of all of that. The abuse is simply mitigated. It's eliminated by whatever means is appropriate for what's going on. If the site itself is compromised, it's just cleaned up and it continues on. So we need to be careful about suggesting that uptime of the domain is the singular metric that will properly characterize responsiveness.

That becomes another nuance in this overall picture about what DAAR is or isn't. It's a great statistic, but it has its limitations too. I think that's my key point there in pointing that out.

I was intrigued by your comment, Samaneh, that measurements in this space is still an academic interest. I'm wondering if you can say a bit more about that as we go along here. Maybe not immediately now, but it would be good to have some references to some activity that's going on in that space so that we can also review that. We the contracted parties in that space, so we can be a little closer to seeing what others are doing and maybe even get involved in some of that for some people.

So let me pause there, I'm assuming that's an old hand Samaneh, and go to David. Go ahead, please.

DAVID CONRAD:

Yeah, so the question of responsiveness and what the responses are is actually sort of interesting. From one perspective if you're a network operator that's using these RBLs to filter out spam or filter out badness for your customers within your network, the fact that it exists in the RBL is the main issue. And the uptime of interest here is actually a measure of how responsive the RBL is to their view of the domain in terms of whether it's being bad or good.

So one potential area of exploration is if there was some way of tagging with meta information [the] domain that some action has been taken that we could then see via external probes, be it through Thin WHOIS or through some other mechanism by which meta information is associated with a specific domain, then that could be included into statistics gathering associated with particular actions on the domains that are listed in the RBLs.

One of the challenges that we face as an industry is that the RBL providers are independent. They provide the information that they feel is indicative of behaviors that they think are wrong. We have no control over them at all. Even folks who are paying customers generally have very little control over these guys because they have a bunch of customers and one customer won't make that much difference if they get pissed and run away.

So what we're trying to relay with DAAR is the state of the world as seen by a select set of RBL providers that abide by certain rules and behaviors as an indicator to the community that here is the canonical world. It's obviously inaccurate. It's obviously an estimate of what reality is because it's impossible to actually get the real reality for a whole bunch of reasons, not the least of which is the amount of time it takes for a response to actually be undertaken as well as noticed.

So there are some limitations inherent in the way all of this stuff works that we're going to have to struggle with, and we want to reiterate that we're looking for suggestions on best ways of addressing that.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, David. I want to tease out two important things that I believe I heard in what you said. One of course is you're working within a system where the only metric that you currently have available is presence or existence on a reputation list of some sort. That's what the community sees at large. That's what the community works with, so that's what's there however imperfect that is. So you're just making an observation that that's the baseline.

The other thing that you said is you were commenting about is there a way to create – I'm going to use a word that you did not use, but I think this is what you meant – a feedback loop in which we could improve the quality of what the reputation providers are offering.

There was a comment in the chatroom here from Maxim about RBLs do not remove the info instantly. Part of that, of course, is because they don't generally know or they probably don't have direct access to information that facilitates that kind of action. And therefore, a missing piece in this ecosystem is some kind of feedback loop.

What could that look like? What might we do there? I think I heard asking for that. Is there a way to get some meta information available about a domain so that in addition to being on a reputation list we know something about what action may or may not have been taken and some set of details about that.

Let me just give you a quick opportunity, David, to say yes or no if I properly characterized what you said, and we'll go back to the hands here.

DAVID CONRAD: Yes, that's a reasonable characterization.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. Okay, John Crain, you're up next.

JOHN CRAIN: Yeah, David said a lot of what I wanted to say, but I'll just add to that that some of the major RBL providers have now started showing up in our stratosphere if you'd like and seem willing to have discussions about how they can improve their feeds.

They're in the risk mitigation business. They're feeding data to limit risks for network providers, etc. So it's not always their highest priority to remove something from the list, but they do want to have them as good as they can.

Maybe we can start more discussions with those people as they come into our stratosphere about improving their data so as to reflect this. So not only that we know it, ICANN, so that the world knows via the RBLs that stuff is actually being cleaned up.

JIM GALVIN: Great. Thank you, John. Appreciate that. Samaneh?

SAMANEH TAJALI:

I would like to add to the points that John and David made which is of course something that I also think we need to do to give feedback to the blacklist providers. It's also useful for us to be able to know the reputation data better.

I think a feedback loop to ourselves [through] the methodology we are using for DAAR is also useful from you guys and the rest of the community in this specific case because what we have is the data that is there. Until the time that they improve it and they are using the best ones and they are working on methodology to continuously evaluate the feeds, what is useful to do is to be able to identify the limitations of the data that we are using and be able to create the best methodology that we can given the limitations.

This will be a continuous process. Even in other kinds of research, everything that is published wouldn't be the ultimate best thing. It would be something that people would comment on and get reviewed and it would be better and better. And every time it has limitations.

I think part of this it would be really useful for DAAR as a tool if part of the discussions that we will have here would happen knowing the limitations that we have that are imposed on us by the reputation data. Some of the things that we cannot do much about but can create workarounds for them.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Samaneh. I do have a response, but I've been doing a lot of talking here. Let me let Rick jump in here. You have your hand up. Rick, go ahead, please.

RICK WILHELM:

Very good. Thank you, Jim. Along those lines and trying to stay concrete and wanting to offer a concrete suggestion in the spirit of what Samaneh was saying within the bounds of what the data provides.

Something concrete that I believe would improve the report is that rather than providing the data at a point in time on a particular day of the month, publishing the point in time data [on a] particular day of the month, if the report would include the daily data published on a trend line throughout the month summarized over the month publishing the daily data and show 30 days, 31 days, however many days it is in a graph to show the ebb and the flow of the data over the course of the month.

And then provide various statistical summaries in addition to the 30-day flow of the data. Things like mean, median, average, that sort of a thing. Statistical things like standard deviation and whatnot.

I think that would be a way to improve the data because as I've stated in previous discussions on DAAR right now the point in time snapshot does not give the best information that's available based on the data that ICANN is getting. So I think that's a concrete suggestion that I think could improve based on the current limitations of the data that ICANN is getting. Maybe that's something that we could discuss. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Rick, if I may, I think what you're suggesting here, I want to bring this conversation to a bit of a summary here. I think we're all agreeing that the presentation of the presences of abuse is a useful characteristic and so we're willing to agree that's a useful thing to do. Our concern at the moment is that, our primary concern, is that it's really just a point in time and that's just not sufficient to show. [inaudible] more information

would be available to those who are looking at this is we could actually see statistics on a daily basis.

So let's see the presence data, a daily show of the presence data perhaps just for the last month. And then you could do averages and medians over that month and use that to show month-to-month trends and use that data to show that kind of reflection. That would be much more representative of the overall presence of abuse if that is the metric that we're trying to go for.

Let me give Rick a chance to comment on whether that is a summary that he can [live with], or did you want to tweak that, Rick?

RICK WILHELM: That's basically what I said. I was hoping that Samaneh could comment on that or David or John. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, so thank you for that. Samaneh, you have your hand up, so go ahead, please.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Yes, Rick, your point was taken. I remember we had this discussion in Kobe, and I followed up on it very much. We asked our provider to give us more granular data, and we are working on this to input this into the new report. So you will receive an update on that in Montreal on how would the new report look like. And that I very much agree with.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, so in terms of wanting to be able to tick off a box here on coming to a conclusion about something, we are [generally] all okay with these counts. The presence of abuse is a useful indicator to show, and expanding that to show it daily and then using some kind of average and median numbers to show month-to-month trends would be interesting to see that and [show] all of that [show up].

I see David saying in the chatroom that we'll look into that. More pictures and less words will definitely help. [He says] we know people tend not to read, so it just has to show the story and the true story and that would be a good thing.

So that's one technical issue that we can I think close off for the moment. And we look forward to being able to see another view of this. You're suggesting that you'll look to have something by Montreal, but if you've got anything sooner that you want to show as a draft form, certainly happy to look at that as we go along and that would be great.

I do want to come back to one point that we were talking about which is uptime of the domain. More generally, other measurements and other metrics. I think we're going to have to have a continuing ongoing dialogue about other ideas for other kinds of metrics to get because it is not an easy problem and it's not obvious and straightforward.

We have been tossing around the idea about uptime of the domain is certainly an interesting metric to keep, and I think that to the extent that domain names come and go in the zone file tracking that uptime and reporting on it is probably interesting. But it is important to recognize that even that is a limiting metric because takedown is not typically the first and foremost action that's taken given the presence of abuse. So that's an issue.

So certainly measuring uptime is a useful thing. The Anti-Phishing Working Group does that a lot, and they've been doing that for years now with respect to phishing domains. But that's not a metric which carries to all abuse is the issue. So we just need to be careful about that. I want to put that out there for [review].

Other measurements, David had suggested and I don't want to lose track of this idea about is there a way to have some meta information associated with a domain which has been put on a reputation list? Is there some way to provide a mechanism, some kind of feedback or whatever that allows judgment on the fact [or] which allows third parties to notice that action has been taken and that mitigation has been taking place?

That would be something new, and that would be new work and new information. It would probably be interesting to have a continuing conversation about that issue. I don't want to lose that open question as something that deserves further discussion. So I just want to docket that particular question at the moment, give us all time to think about it, and maybe have a continuing discussion the next time around or in another meeting.

Samaneh had qualified that to suggest that even if we could make the feedback be something that ICANN had so it could incorporate it into the DAAR presentation might be interesting. My only caution about that is one of the things that has been stated about an ideal objective for DAAR is that whatever it does and however it does it, you want to be transparent about all of that. And the most important characteristic of that is that a third party could repeat it and show that they get the same data and have the same pie charts. That they could actually repeat it and create it.

So the problem with only providing meta data to ICANN is then you make it not something that can be verified by a third party. And that's just a characteristic for us to think about. That might be okay, but it's important not to forget that. But again, just docket a question there and how to deal with that.

I think that's everything we've talked about in this measurement category. Have I missed anything that we've said? Oh, I'm looking back at notes that I took here. John had specifically focused on maybe there's an opportunity for us to think about engaging directly with reputation providers. So maybe this feedback that we're talking about we should also consider talking to them directly since they're now coming around in ICANN. They are interested in improving the quality of what they offer.

So maybe in this feedback mechanism that we invent here and talk about, we should think about whether or not it's possible to provide feedback to them directly that they might act on to make their data of a higher quality and we get the benefit of then better quality data being used in DAAR for what it does. So that's just a characteristic for us to think about in all of this open question.

Let me pause for a moment here in my attempt to summarize our measurement discussion with our open questions there and ask if anyone wants to add to that. I'm going to take silence as, at least for the moment, tacit agreement that we've properly captured that.

Is there something else that we can then focus on? I'm looking now to David, John, and Samaneh. Is there another topic, an issue in here that you'd like to spend some time talking about? I might ask the question if

you can talk about this, bit of a leading question here, the DNS measurement list. Samaneh, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALI:

I was actually not going to talk about the list yet. I was going to talk about another point in the report. But I'm confused now. Are we moving forward, or are we paused here to talk about the list first? Because there were other points in the report that were short and we already have input that I think we can just comment on that right away.

JIM GALVIN:

No, please, Samaneh, go ahead. The topic is yours. I was offering a topic out there just to spark some conversation, but happy to go through the list of issues. If you have something, please do jump in.

SAMANEH TAJALI:

Yeah, perfect. Okay, so there was another point about different cuts of the data, basically how the data can be presented as in the individual variables of DAAR. I very much agree with the suggestions. We can look. We can have different cuts of the data. What is important for the report and also for us to know, what do you guys like to see? What kind of metric, independent variables do you find useful to have in the report? Obviously, some of them we can create, some of them not. But more important is what are your suggestions?

JIM GALVIN:

Let me jump to John Crain right away. Part of the answer that I want to give to you, Samaneh, is just that any suggestions that we had would be in our notes and suggestions over there. If we don't have anything

already written there, then it is kind of an open question even from our point of view. So it just becomes a dialogue that we have to work through together, and we were looking for you folks to provide some suggestions beyond anything that we might have written down here.

So with that, let me go to John. You have your hand up.

JOHN CRAIN:

Yeah, I was just going to say something similar. I think that's a discussion we can have. I think what Samaneh is saying here is we're completely open to that. Let's figure out over the coming months which cuts of the data are the most useful so that we can work on that. And we of course [can] make suggestions too, but we should work together to figure that out.

JIM GALVIN:

This question, which cuts of data are most useful? Could we characterize that question a little differently and reframe that? I want to try to be a little more specific about the goal that we're going after. I think, if I may, let me try a reframing and test that this is what you're really asking.

What could DAAR usefully show that would be informative to the community at large? Is that what you're asking? Or are you asking of the data that we know we have, what other ways can we present it that would be useful? Those are two slightly different things. Could you speak about that a bit?

JOHN CRAIN:

I think it's both. As an example, one of the issues that was raised was that we are displaying data [inaudible] the newer TLDs by implementation date versus the older TLDs or the new versus previous rounds. And the question that I saw raised was, are there different ways of displaying that data beyond that? By TLD type or who know what by? And I think all we're saying is, yes, we're open to those discussions, and I don't think we need to solve it on this call.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, thank you for that. There are actually some suggestions as you say along the way here in some of our notes. I don't remember exactly where. I can go into my copy of the document here and perhaps scroll through and find it. I don't know if Sue can find it in there too, where we do talk about the fact that it might be useful to – it is not at all clear to us how the distinction between legacy versus new TLDs is a most interesting characteristic.

But certainly it would probably be interesting to look at the types of TLDs, the types of registration divided up by registration characteristics might be an interesting view. [Use restrictions], geography, various other kinds of requirements for being able to have access to a [name].

Yes, now she has it up on the screen there which is good. We've offered some ideas there. I think if I were to turn this into a next action, these are the things with us just talking about it seem interesting. It would probably be helpful if you folks could actually go through and create some draft pie charts that look at it in this way. Let's see what that data looks like. Let's get a look at whether or not that shows something or doesn't show something.

Again, as in all of these things, it's not immediate obviously that this is the right way to show the data. But it does seem to us at least to be a better division than just legacy versus new. It would seem to be more informative, and we'd like to see that. Would that be an action that you would be willing to take on to create some stuff to look at that we could then evaluate together and consider whether this works better and maybe we can derive other ideas from that? So question to David, John, and Samaneh. Samaneh, please go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALI:

It's definitely an idea that we can look into some of these suggestions. Basically internally discuss it and present some of them after going through how reliable we can present them. I think we will work on it and see when and if we can get it ready by Montreal to get feedback or before. That would be a possibility.

JIM GALVIN:

So just to tag you on this, Samaneh, what is the possibility? Is the possibility that you will try some of the ideas, or is the possibility that you'll get it done by Montreal?

SAMANEH TAJALI:

No, first of all we need to discuss it internally to see which of the factors are more useful, and also I'm guessing with you guys, and what kind of data we have to be able to produce the characteristics that you point out here and how we can do that. Now going through these steps, I was planning to have one different metric to present in Montreal, so definitely not all of them. But, yeah, in short, there is a high possibility that I will be able to present at least one different metric than what we

already have in Montreal and get feedback on that. And from there, we can go forward.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, so thank you. Let me just tease this part into two actions just to state them clearly to make sure that we're all in agreement here. The first action is just to consider whether or not other characteristics can be used to divide up the data and to show the data differently. As opposed to new versus legacy, we've given a few different options here on ways to do that.

So we're looking for you to go back and think about whether or not you can make these distinctions in the data easily. Do you have enough information available and then consider whether you would be able to do that on a regular basis. So there's the question of whether it's possible to do this based on what you have or if you could get data that would allow you to do that. So that's one action.

Action two then is once we get to a point of deciding what you can do and what you might do, the next action would be to start to create some of these graphs and charts and such. And then we'll look at them and see what they show and actually see if they really are helpful or not. Is that fair, Samaneh?

SAMANEH TAJALI:

Yeah, that sounds good. I just made a note in the chat that the suggestion box does not include methods how to do these different cuts. That's why I suggested to start with one because I know even cutting the data in terms of one of these metrics would have some downsides and upsides, and there need to be discussions around that.

So I need to look into the ways to do it and hopefully have one ready by Montreal.

JIM GALVIN:

So that's fair. Thank you for that. I mean, I guess as you proceed through your analysis of what you can or can't do and we have a continuing dialogue here in these meetings, it would be useful just to get a status report from you. You've investigated this and, yeah, this looks possible and now you're proceeding with it. You've investigated this, and we don't think we can do this. Here's why. Maybe we can examine whether there's something that we can do to help you down that path or not.

But since we have a number of ideas here, as you examine these ideas it would be useful to get a status report from you week-to-week or so on how things are going if that's possible. And, yes, thank you, David. Montreal is not that far away. So I do get that a lot of things can happen between now and then.

Okay, I'm being a little conscious of time here. This might be a good time to think about how we're going to go forward. Actually, Samaneh, is that an old hand, or did you want to speak?

SAMANEH TAJALI:

That was an old hand.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you. We've had a really good discussion today. A couple of actions here on your side, David, John, and Samaneh. I guess I'm just going to say Samaneh. I think, David, you indicated that she is going to

have the lead and the point here. So I'll focus on using her name as we go forward, and we'll go from there.

Kristine in the chatroom, I have no idea what that means. I guess it's just a – yeah – pushed the button. Yes, we all have those problems with technology. We love it when it works, right?

Okay, I think on our side what we can do is consider for ourselves we can continue to have discussions ourselves. And we do have a mailing list in which we can continue our discussions and discuss what other kinds of measurements and metrics might be interesting that might be easy to get at and useful so we can continue to broaden the set of things and we can offer ideas for Samaneh and team to investigate as to whether or not it's possible. So that's one thing.

A second action coming out of this is that Samaneh and team are going to consider some of our ideas for different ways to slice the data they do have. She'll begin to do that analysis and report on that. With any luck, we'll find one that's relatively straightforward to do. At least one anyway. And we can see some real change by the time we get to Montreal.

And then a third thing that we talked about here is whether or not there is an opportunity to provide some kind of feedback loop. There's a number of things that are inside of that. That feels like a much larger topic. Maybe we won't come back to that one right away, but there's feedback to ICANN. There's feedback to reputation providers. There might be feedback to the community at large.

This is really a very broad, open question on whether or not it's possible for the contracted parties to provide feedback in a way that provides better data for DAAR or at least is responsive to the community in a way

that suggests that DAAR is a better product than at least it appears to be now. So I'm trying not to be overly proscriptive and definitive about what feedback really means. It really is an open question.

That's what I have in my notes here for today. Let me first ask. Samaneh, do you have other things? There was a quite a long list of things there. You have other things that you do want to talk to us about, right, and bring up from that list? Is that true?

SAMANEH TAJALI:

It's true.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, so what I'd like to propose at this point is that we do continue to meet weekly with Samaneh and team and that we the parties on this call plan to do that. We are really just the registries at the moment. But let's continue that discussion and we'll come back next week and we'll continue to move on. Let's make that our agenda going forward here. If we need to do something different such as maybe if we the registries do want to have a meeting with ourselves, we'll just declare that from week to week. But for now, we'll meet next week here with Samaneh and team.

Just a reminder to folks: we do have a meeting slot that will be provided to us for a working group meeting at ICANN Montreal. If we are still meeting with Samaneh and team, I'd like to put on the table that we allow them to join us at that meeting too so that we can simply continue our meetings, assuming we're continuing to have productive meetings which I know that we're going to continue to be productive

here. If they extend into that, then that should be something that we'll do.

Sue is telling us in the chatroom here that we now know our meeting is Monday from 5:00-6:30, if folks want to make a note of that on their calendars. It would be good to block out that time. I think I'd like to suggest that we ask Samaneh and team to block that time also so that they can join us during that time. If we're still meeting then, they should plan to come.

If anybody has any comments or questions about that, we can raise them here. We have about one minute left. Or we could also continue the discussion on the mailing list or certainly next week.

Okay, any other business? Samaneh, please go ahead. If you're speaking, Samaneh, we're not hearing you.

SAMANEH TAJALI: What kind of time zone we are talking about? That 5:00-6:30, which time zone?

JIM GALVIN: That would be local to Montreal.

SAMANEH TAJALI: Ah, okay.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Anything else from anyone else?

DAVID CONRAD: Just wanted to say thanks for the discussion.

JIM GALVIN: Yes, and thank you, David and John and Samaneh, for making time to meet with us. We really appreciate that. We really do appreciate the opportunity to work together and make all of this a better thing for everyone, for ourselves as well as the community at large. So looking forward to continue productive discussions.

I think with that, thanks everyone for coming today. We're at the top of the hour. We're adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]