

---

SUE SCHULER : Thanks. Okay, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you. This is Jim Galvin from Afilias. This is the Registry Stakeholder DAAR Working Group and we are fortunate today to have David Conrad and Samaneh to join with us, to talk about our draft findings and recommendations. We had created PDF document which we had shared with them. As folks all know, just for the complete record here, we've been working with them on and off. We've had various discussions. I'm hopeful that there were no real surprises in what we had put in our draft document. And in the spirit of continuing that collaboration and cooperation, we actually wanted to talk with them to see if all of this was a welcome set of suggestions, and also get some alignment on what would likely happen, what could happen, and in fact perhaps continue some of our experiments. I think some of our recommendations are a little more specific than what we've said before, and I think there's at least one in here which is really quite new. We're looking to work through that and perhaps conduct some experiments as we have done before with Samaneh. We might do a little bit of that in the future here.

Our ultimate goal is to take this set of findings and recommendations. We do ultimately want to turn them into some kind of formal document that does get sent to OCTO, but we're trying to get through all of that here and make sure that there's no surprises on either side when we submit it to you or when you receive it. So we really do want to work together to make sure that this represents something which is going to

---

*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.*

---

move us both forward, and the timing of when we would do that and exactly what the recommendations might look like, those are all things that we hope we can come to some agreement about here so that there's no surprises going down the road. So we do welcome some open discussion and responses from OCTO, Samaneh and David. There are some opportunities in here where we had even offered to work with you in particular on certain set of things, and so we very much want to take on board what would you want to respond to with us to and we'll work through any questions that we have along the way. So that's my opening introduction. Thank you to David and Samaneh for joining us.

Let me first see if there's anyone in the working group who wants to put a specific question that might be helpful to the introduction on the table, then otherwise I'll turn it over to you folks from OCTO, Samaneh or David, to give any opening remarks that you want to make and then we'll start sifting through things. So hands from anyone in the working group first?

Okay, David and Samaneh, any kind of opening remarks, as well as if you have any thoughts about how do you want to proceed from this point that will be helpful to get to. Go ahead.

DAVID CONRAD:

Actually, I will hand it over to Samaneh. I just wanted to say that I appreciate the efforts and the cooperation that we've received from you all on this particular topic. I look forward to figuring out some sort of at least hopefully a mutually acceptable or at least mutually unacceptable solution moving forward. So, Samaneh, if you would.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Thank you, David. Same here. I would also like to appreciate efforts that are put in this document but also all the sessions that we have discussed issues in details before. I would have two types of responses to the document going forward. I think one would be the general of how to present your feedback, and the other would be the details of the wording in the document but also the recommendations partially for me to understand if we are on the same line and understanding of what has been pointed out in the document. When we are all ready, we can begin to that.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thank you very much. Let me suggest that we focus on the substance more so than the format. I appreciate what I heard in what you said, Samaneh, was a desire to suggest the structure for what we had here and certainly welcome those comments, but I think I want to get to some of the more meaty stuff right away and, at least for me, that's really the substance. With that in mind, I would propose that we begin in one of two ways and I lead it to you to select what is the best way for you in terms of how you want to talk to us about, ultimately, the recommendation. But we do have a Findings section and a Recommendations section. The findings are obviously intended to represent our view of the state of things, our view of what things look like. So they're observations and they form the basis of how we came to the recommendations. So I think that if that there's certainly any factual information that's wrong in the findings or obviously any comments that you have about it, opinions, then it would be useful to hear that

---

too about the findings. It might be useful to do that first and then jump to the specifics of the recommendations, but I'll tell you what, I'm going to leave that open to you however you want to approach it. The most important thing is just to dig in to the substance, I think. So, Samaneh, let me just let you pick something and we'll go forward from there.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Sure. Thank you, Jim. First, I forgot to mention I hope everybody is safe and healthy. Yes, I also meant the substance so I can actually start from the findings because they are earlier in the document, and then take it from there. I will start from my comments and parts that are not immediately clear for me. Finding 1 is clear for me. I have nothing to add to it. I think it is – sorry?

JAMES GALVIN:

I think I want to add one additional point to Finding 1 before you move past it. Because I want to call out something in particular that we certainly ourselves have had a lot of discussion about and I want to make sure that you picked up on this issue and get any reaction that you have to it.

You'll notice that we talked about "reported abuse activity." It's an important phrase in Finding 1: "Reputation lists represent varying views of reported abuse activity." That phrase "reported abuse activity" is significant and very important to us as we think about what's going on. Because the most important thing for registries and ultimately registrars and others in fact to take action on abuse, they're the evidence that's present that allows you to do things. And it's just important to recognize

---

and we'd like to see a lot of the messaging and stuff actually respond to this and react to this particular phrase and use this phrase more so – without saying that the reputation lists are abuse, it's important to acknowledge that they are reported abuse activities because you're not really sharing and it's not you. They don't really share the evidence of what they had and what they do. So this is a reflection of what's visible to some set of people and we do think that that's an important phrase. You'll find that we tried to very careful in all the rest of our document to use that phrase "reported abuse activity" and I wanted to highlight it and call it out to you because we'd appreciate if along the way you would adopt the similar phrase or at least be able to demonstrate that that phrase doesn't apply. So if that's a discussion that we need to have then let's have that. If you want to take it back as a question and then come back and respond, that's okay too. Anyway, I want to call that out. If you're okay with that for now then please go on to the next, Finding 2. Thanks.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Thanks, Jim. A very important point, actually. Maybe part of the reason why there is sometimes confusions about what DAAR is and is not. Actually, I did not see the main point of Finding 1 is this phrase that pointed out. We also discussed this internally before and we concluded to use list that abuse, list that instead of abused domains. But "reported abuse activities" sounds also good to me. We could agree to use this phrase as consistent over time also in our documentation. I have no problems with it and I think it sounds good. I would need to internally discuss it with John also. But yeah, I think it's clear and it does not have the confusion that could be created with earlier phrasing for abuse.

---

I have one last comment about this finding, the last sentence before Finding 2. It mentions that DAAR has its own weighted scale that is used in calculating its scores/numbers. This confused me a bit because I wasn't sure which weighed scale you guys had in mind here.

JAMES GALVIN:

The idea here is that, at least among registries and the registrars who actively approach abuse, is we also take on board various kinds of reputation feeds. It's a similar set, not always an exact overlap to what DAAR uses. And we all weigh those feeds in a different way in terms of trying to come up with a score to identify domains that are particularly in need of attention. So some of the reputation list do a better job of maintaining them and managing them, and so they might get a higher weighted score in terms of looking for a domain name that appears on multiple lists, or maybe they'll only have to appear on a smaller number of lists but it should appear on lists of high quality from our point of view and experience versus low quality from our point of view. And DAAR of course has its own algorithm that it uses for identifying domain names in terms of how you add them up to decide where they appear and how important that name is. So that's the way that we look at it and of course we don't all do it the same. The assumption here is that DAAR doesn't do it the same way that any of the rest of us do it and it's just important to call that out. Does that help?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Yeah. That's clear. But we do not use any algorithm to weigh domains from list. Basically, what we do – and I've discussed it in presentations

---

before also but maybe it's a point I'm making note that maybe it's not clear enough, we should highlight it – is that basically if we see that the domain is listed on several lists, basically the DAAR system errs on the side of undercounting and only counts it once. By lists I mean different security threats. And for that, we don't use any weighting and neither for that nor for if a domain comes from list X or list Y. So it's just simple sum of domains and regardless of the list or threat type.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you for that. I guess my reaction is that yeah, so DAAR's weight is actually just one. Everything counts the same and you count them all equal. So we should expand on this a bit and add some of the description that I just gave about how registries tend to do different things and do a better job of stating what you do rather than just this generic statement. So we'll take as an action to edit this a bit to expand so it's more clear the distinction between what you do and what we do and the point that we're making here. Okay?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Okay. Sure. Maybe we could have a future discussion on – I'm interested to know if the registries that are doing it, if they are weighting, what kind of weighting they use and based on what do they – I mean I would like to know if there is a better scientific way to weigh it or a reason to do it. But that is I think a different discussion that we can do later.

---

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. That might be a little bit harder – a little harder to share, to be honest with you, because to some extent, registries build up their own experiences about the names that appear on those lists and how they work with them. Also speaking at least for myself and Afiliás’s point of view, the way that we judge some of these reputation lists is kind of our own internal choice, and we’d like to think that that belongs to us as opposed to something we would want to tell a lot of people about. Some of it is based on our knowledge about how the reputation providers manage their lists and some of it is based on our experience with them. And different registries will have different experiences with reputation lists. So others may share. So we’ll certainly ask the question, we’ll take on board here as a question that if people are willing to share that, you’d like to have a bit of discussion about that, and we’ll let you know.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Sure. Thanks, Jim. I completely see your point. I think my point was more than individual experiences. If there is a good scientific justification of using any kind of scaling or weighting regardless of individual registries, then we would like to take that into account as a part of feedback from you guys.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you. We’ll try to make that distinction and perhaps we can have some discussion about that in our next meeting, give folks a chance to think about it.

---

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Sure.

JAMES GALVIN: Before you go on, by the way, if anyone else wants to jump in, I realize I'm doing a lot of chatting here, but you're certainly welcome – for anyone to raise a hand if they want to comment on something that Samaneh is saying. I am trying to keep an eye out for hands. This doesn't have to be the Jim and Samaneh Show, I hope. Please, Samaneh, go ahead.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: About Finding 2 – I basically have no comment about this finding. I think it is correctly articulated and we've discussed earlier and also in the meetings and in the report that this is not about mitigation. And we can further clarify that more in the report.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you. Thank you very much. Good to know.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Finding 3. We've discussed [inaudible] earlier. I am working personally on this last on this week. We are expecting this to be finished soon. In our new report we will have this also. We will use median of our month period, so this will be covered in the new report.

---

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. I think when we get into the recommendations, we will see in more detail about some of this, so I guess we would like to understand – I’m sure you’re going to explain as part of putting it in the report – but it would be good at some point to have a detailed discussion about what your algorithm is, what your calculation really is and what you’re showing. We’d appreciate the opportunity to understand that and know what’s there. And if you’re willing to share any of your first looks at the report, it would be good to get a chance to see some of that before it appears in a production environment. But we’ll get to that when we get to the recommendations with some of the details, if you don’t mind.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Sure. When we go through the recommendations, I will go into the details of what is going to happen at least in terms of this in the new report. I am more than happy to share the version with you before it goes public.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: So about Finding 4 which goes back to also a point that is made earlier in the document and the summary of work part, the part that is bold, the first one which says not to present data as gTLD versus legacy TLDs. For those who recall, we have had discussions at length also a different analysis of how else the data can be sliced. We discussed earlier that the reason why we used – at the moment there is this distinction in the

---

report because it was the immediate kind of categorizing that we had in hand and we are open to change that if we find a better factor to basically group the data and present more useful results. From my understanding, we still have not reached that conclusion and I'm still open to discuss and explore more ideas. But without that, I don't have a good justification why would remove the current categorization.

DAVID CONRAD:

If I can add here, one of the reasons that there is this distinction between legacy and new is because that's what a lot of network operators are using as sort of the categorization in which they filter it right. You see people talking at setting up filters of all the new gTLDs and they are allowing all of the legacy gTLDs even though that's from a network operational perspective, sort of crazy in terms of absolute numbers. The G, specifically .com, has in absolute numbers more abuse than any other TLD simply because there's more domain names in .com. So the distinction that we're making or attempting to make in the original versions of DAAR was to show that in reality that making the distinction based on new Gs versus legacy, it isn't actually a good distinguishing characteristic if you're talking about trying to stop abuse in terms of just absolute numbers. In terms of percentage, yes, it might make a difference, but in terms which it doesn't generally matter to network operators, they're only interested in stopping the actual abuse that impacts them. So the intent of splitting new G versus G legacy was an attempt to show that actually new Gs aren't as bad as everyone has seen that they are. If this community doesn't think that's the right way of going about that, we're obviously happy to talk about other ways of slicing the data. But the question then becomes, okay, what exactly are

---

we interested in showing to the network operators community with these reports in terms of things that they may be interested in taking action on?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, David and Samaneh. Let me try to offer comments based on what I understand from our discussions about this. This is probably an area where I would welcome some other voices to respond to you too.

From our point of view, the distinction of new versus legacy is a rather artificial distinction. The concern is that – I appreciate what you said about you’re trying to show that because you think that it shows to operators that they shouldn’t use that as a distinction in their filters, but think that it’s better if ICANN doesn’t make that kind of distinction at all. From our point of view, a TLD is a TLD is a TLD. If you want to make a distinction then you should look at the data and see what it shows and then show that distinction because you’re trying to achieve a goal. I think that trying to achieve a goal of refuting what others are doing is just as easily done by showing all TLDs as being a TLD than trying to artificially separate them into groups and telling people that this is wrong because you’re perpetuating the distinction by continuing to show the data that way. I think you should take a step back, look at all the data and look to see if there is a way to pull out types of TLD.

Samaneh will recall that we had it one time, try to make a distinction between TLDs which have any kind of pre-delegation steps prior to a name existing. And so this range from as simple as a membership or a brand TLD, all the way up to things like .bank, which have very detailed

---

validation procedures that they go through. And there's a lot of stuff in the middle, so the idea that there might be something in front versus those that don't do anything in front will give a name to anybody and all of their abuse activities and mitigation strategies. Samaneh will recall that we sort of arbitrarily invented, artificially invented that distinction and found that there wasn't anything that the data showed. I think the objective here should be to show where we need attention, not where not to apply your attention would be the advice that I would say about it. I see we do have another hand up here, so let's get a voice in here. Kurt, go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks. Hi, David. I hope you're well. Thanks for that explanation. It's sort of eye-opening for me. So you won't be surprised that we have a different perspective. You're thinking about the network operators and them reading this report, we're thinking about the IP/BC folks. We're thinking about them reading this report and seeing any distinction between new gTLD and legacy gTLD, no matter what the data says, they're going to lead to a conclusion. But your comment gave me points to think and I don't know if the group wants to reconsider the position or not, but after more than a year of DAAR reports – you can lead a horse to water but you can't make them drink. So the goal was to lead the operators to this conclusion that there wasn't greater abuse in new gTLDs over legacy gTLDs. But then how do you say that in the report? How do you get them after a year and a half to say, "Okay, we've reported this way for a year, this is the conclusion we've drawn so you guys should use that." After reporting that for a year, how do we get

---

them to make that conclusion? Or how can we help them get to that conclusion?

DAVID CONRAD:

It's a good question. We are, outside of the context of DAAR specifically but in general, trying to figure out ways of interacting more directly with particularly the resolver operator community. It's challenging because it is decentralized entirely. One of our experiences when we did the KSK rollover was that it's very difficult to actually get in touch with all the resolver operators in order to ensure they don't hurt themselves. So the communication efforts that we're undertaking, the mechanisms we're trying to figure out how to discuss more directly with resolver operators sort of operational issues like this is something that we're obviously interested in any input this community in particular might have. One of the challenges that we have is that any sort of aggregation that we might come up with will likely fall apart in the face of anecdotal data. The challenge that I've personally seen and personally tried to work against where some bad guys does a massive spam run using one TLD, one registry, and then all of a sudden folks within the network operations community say, "Well, this shows that all new gTLDs are bad." One way, in theory at least, we could combat that would be to actually identify the top 10 or top 100 or top pick a number of the registries in terms of the abuse that gets reported. That has its own challenges. The problem that you state is one that we're aware of. What we're trying to figure out, as I mentioned, the reason we went with the new versus legacy split was because that's what we tend to see within the anti-abuse in the network operations community. They make that distinction. We're not necessarily in favor of it. It's just we're trying to

---

reflect the assumptions that people are making and trying to show whether they're based in any sort of fact or not. But this is obviously an area that we're happy to explore.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. I think our response to this point is to keep this as an open question that we should have a continuing discussion about. I have to agree with Kurt and I didn't really say this up front, but it was interesting to hear your explanation of why you made the split between new and legacy. But let's take some time to think a bit more about this and have our own discussions. I hope that you understand the position, the place we're coming from and you can give that some thought. We'll have another discussion about this in a future meeting here. This certainly I'm sure is not going to be the end of our collaboration as we go through these things. Let me do one last call for any other closing comments from someone. Anyone wants to say anything else or, David, do you want to add to that?

DAVID CONRAD:

No, I'm fine.

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay. I think with that, we'll just leave Finding 4 as an open thing at the moment and, Samaneh, leave it to you to pick up from there.

---

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Okay. Thank you all for your comments. Moving on to Finding 5. I understand the point of the finding and they have discussed it. The last paragraph of the finding is not fully clear for me. I know that we discussed, we rephrased some of the wording of the document to make it clear, what it does and does not show. My point is that maybe if you explain what was the discussion behind this paragraph then it is more clear for me what is the meaning.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Samaneh, for the question. There are two things going on here with Finding 5 from my point of view. The first is just make sure that we actually have a record and record the fact, as you said, we do agree that there is a messaging problem about DAAR [indicating] the At-Large, and I think that although you have made some changes to some of the messaging that's in the documents on the website, you'll know from the recommendations further down, we really would to take a deeper dive into that, which is kind of the second point. Although we're making forward progress, we do think that it's important that we all have an aligned messaging about what we want the community to know about DAAR. And so we'd like to dig in on that a little more going forward. That's embedded in a couple of our recommendations here toward the end. As long as you're willing to have that discussion and then we'll consider what our options are and what we can do there and how we can work together on some of that, Finding 5 is just about an acknowledgment and recognition that there's work to be done here, and I think that's sufficient. If that makes sense to you then we're okay with Finding 5. If that makes sense to you then hopefully you're okay with that too.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah, definitely. I think there can be lots of improvements made on the messaging. I still do think part of the misunderstandings of the community is that maybe the reports are never read even or some are not carefully read, but that doesn't mean that we should not improve our messaging. The point that is made in this last paragraph that made me pause was that the sentence that DAAR is trying to show that there is a systematic abuse problem although registries are taking actions, which I thought were two different points. And also something to discuss further is that is DAAR trying to show there is systematic abuse problem? If not, what is then DAAR reporting? This is something that I would like to discuss with you further when we go to the recommendations.

JAMES GALVIN: Right. So let me make an important distinction on your question and that is that there's a community perception that DAAR shows a systemic abuse problems. And we believe that at least some of that perception is motivated by messaging that could be tightened up a bit. I think that in our discussions and in working with you, I think that we at least agree that DAAR doesn't really show that, it definitely shows some reports of abuse activity and that gets us to that starting phrase way back up at the beginning. It's just important to be very tight, very explicit about that kind of messaging. That has to carry into a lot of the sub-elements that are covered when talking about DAAR. This is about the fact that the community at large has a misperception and we believe that part of the influence of that is the messaging that is present and we just want a

---

further opportunity here to work on that and to talk about that with you and try to advance that presentation a bit so that we can better align the rest of the community. Does that help?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yes. Definitely.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Would it be fair then to say that with that explanation, do you accept Finding 5, or would it be helpful to add something to it and could you say something about what you'd like to see changed that would be helpful?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah. Actually, I would need to think more about it, but what I am not fully comfortable with is that ... I agree, we should be quite crystal clear on the fact that we are not doing any kind of magic ourselves. It's just what is reported on the lists, we are reflecting that, and using forms that were suggested in earlier findings in this draft and other types of clarification. But what we do see from the report is that consistently over time, there is certain level of recorded abuse. I would like to make that clear in this paragraph that maybe we make a distinction between recorded versus app you validated or some kind of distinction. But as I read it this way, I read it in a way that DAAR is not showing any kind of abused trend, which I don't think is fully correct. DAAR is showing report of abuse trends.

---

JAMES GALVIN:

Okay, that's fine. Please, David, go ahead.

DAVID CONRAD:

I just wanted to say that I think one of the things that we might want to look at is how to more effectively reflect the actual percentages of DNS abuse relative to the total amount of domain names. Because I think there is a misperception that there are, particularly in the context of new Gs that it's just completely filled with abusive domains, which isn't the case. We're talking in general, less than 1% in anything but spam and spam is 1%, right? I think one of the challenges that we've had is that depending on the community you're in or the sub-community that you're in, you look at the DAAR reports with a set of preconceived notions that aren't actually reflected in the data if you look at it as a whole. I think we probably be a little clearer in putting the data in context.

I guess the other challenge that we face is, as Samaneh mentions, we're not sure people are actually reading the reports, right? There's a small number of folks who actually pay attention to these reports but there are folks who have a lot of preconceived notions about reality and are somewhat reluctant to allow data to intrude on those notions. So that gets into how we communicate more effectively, which is obviously an internal thing. Although we would be happy for input, similar to the previous discussion on how better we can communicate to the various communities, what the data is actually showing versus what they think the data is showing.

---

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you for that, David. I just want to build a little bit on your last comment there. I think there's a two-part thing going on here from our point of view. One of those parts is the context in the reports, the context that's provided to the data, and the messaging that's in the reports themselves and on the website that goes with it. I mean, there obviously is a set of people who do read this stuff, and everybody tells somebody and somebody else, somebody else, and all of that. You know how telephone tag works. All of these things just tend to carry forward and turn into a mess. I think that part of our comment here is about a desire to want to tighten up all of that.

I think another piece of what you just said – and I'm just separating this out explicitly – is we should find a place where once we have very tight messaging, then we can each leverage that. You can leverage it in terms of your communication with specific communities within ICANN, another external thing that ICANN does as part of its ordinary outreach and education, and we would leverage that too as part of our discussions in DNS abuse and what it means and what's shown and what's reported activity and what the trends look like.

I think we're all in violent agreement here about a desire to get some very tight messaging and some alignments and all of that. Then we can all go forward with the activities which we are trying to do. And as you say, some people don't hear the message even when you give it to them and some people don't go get the message even when they know they should, they're not looking at the report. You can't win everything but at least you can start from an agreed upon foundation and the rest just has to play out and hopefully the right thing takes over with time. So thank you for all that.

---

I am going to capture here that in Finding 5, it's worth a bit of an exercise for us on our side to consider how to expand this item in a way to better reflect this point, this distinction between the fact that DAAR does show something and the community perceptions of what it shows. We really are just trying to get at that distinction and try to make sure we've got a very tight presentation of what it's supposed to be and then hopefully the community has something to build on. So take that as an action for now. We can have good discussions about it. Then as Samaneh was just saying, she wants to still give this some thought about what she might say, and that's fine. There'll be plenty of opportunity to come back and speak to this. We're not making any final decisions here as we get through this.

So let me ask – I'm just taking note of the time here a little bit. Samaneh was there anything else that you wanted to say about the findings overall, any one of the five of them? Same question really to anyone, is there anything that you'd like to say about the findings or any further discussion to have about them that we've had here? Samaneh has a question in the chat, "Would you say it's good to have those in the report or an announcement about the report?"

What do you mean by report? Samaneh, I think you're saying that we want to have some suggestions and talk to you about the presentation that's used, the context that's used in the reports that you produce and any messaging that's used on the website. Yes, in that sense, that would appear in your report. If you're talking about these findings being in our report, then yes, these findings are going to go in our report. I don't know exactly what form our report is going to take but it will somehow be reflecting all these findings and all these recommendations once

---

---

we're done talking about them. I hope I've answered your question. And if not, do you want to come to the microphone and expand? That'd be helpful.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah, I was reflecting on the suggestion that was made by Kurt to draw attention by using phrases like "note to the resolver operator" or "note to Internet users." I was just thinking practically because the reports are generated automatically, I do a manual check of every report before it goes published. Given the fact that we are not sure how much the report is read by specific parts of the community and in line with the discussion you guys had and also with David earlier to get the messaging more clear and to different parts of the community, I asked, "Do you guys think it's better to highlight these things in the report itself, so the monthly report, or to develop announcements around it?" Or as we discussed earlier in earlier sessions, if you recall, adding addendum to it when we see specific trends or specific things that we want to discuss.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, thank you for that. I apologize I hadn't gone backwards in the chat room to realize that you were doing that and trying to talk to Kurt there in the chat. I agree with Kurt's point about maybe there's some restructuring that can happen to the reports themselves that you create that would better enable and draw reader's attention to appropriate places in the right way. But that's a discussion that we can have I think at this point. We don't have to make any decisions now. As long as you're willing to have an open discussion about different ways in which

---

we can do this, then we'll have that in a future meeting here, I'll capture here as a question for us that we can have that discussion.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Yeah. Totally.

JAMES GALVIN: With that in mind, again I'm looking at the time here, we're getting up towards five minutes of the hour. Rather than jumping into the recommendations, this just seems like a good breaking point here. We've gone through the findings, had a good discussion about it and hopefully we now have some understanding. We do have a couple of open questions with respect to the findings. We should each take some time to have a discussion amongst ourselves and then we can come back and talk about them. I would like to take some time to go through the recommendations. So in the same way that we did the findings, let's at least get some alignment that we understand what they all mean and capture questions that we want to dig into, and then we can have future meetings where we can dig into the open questions that we've identified in what we have. With that in mind, I'm inclined to move towards a journey here. Let me first just open up and just ask if anyone want to suggest an alternative, something to the recommendations next time? Donna, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please. And you took your hand down, Donna. Or if you're talking, we're not hearing you.

---

**DONNA AUSTIN:** Sorry. Thanks to Dave and Samaneh for joining the call. I guess it's not so much related to the recommendations or findings that we've put in front of you but just a general question about DAAR and its evolution and whether you're having similar conversations with other parts of the community or independently reviewing the reports based on some of the feedback you're getting back. I guess what I'm trying to understand is whether from your perspective, you are evolving the DAAR reports to take into account other things that you're hearing from parts of the community.

**SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:** Hi, Donna. Yes, we are certainly planning to have a next version of DAAR report. All of it, it's at this stage of ideas. If there was a Cancún meeting, I was going to have a session to discuss this with the community openly to receive actually ideas, to present what our ideas on our DAAR version too and also have your opinion about it and have a discussion about it. We plan to have webinars now with the current situation, to have webinars soon to discuss the further progress of the of the DAAR project.

The ideas that exist now is to have some kind of – first to improve the points that are at the moment issues about reputation lists about messaging and all the things that we discussed. We considered ideas of rather than having PDF reports having that dynamic platform for different filters that can be customized. We would also put DAAR Version 2 for bidding again so we would like to see what will come for that. Also we want to hear what the community think how the system

---

should evolve and what is more useful for the community. I think that's it.

DAVID CONRAD:

If I can quickly add, the intent of DAAR has always been to provide information to the community to help in policy-related discussions. So it will constantly evolve over time. It'll be modified in order to more effectively, hopefully provide the information that the community needs in the context of DNS abuse, however that's defined. We have been obviously in contact in discussions with Registry Stakeholder Group and other registries. As you're aware, some ccTLDs have been interested in participating in DAAR so we've been speaking with ccs. The anti-abuse communities are obviously interested in DAAR. We're trying to get the network operators communities more interested in DAAR so that they can actually see what reality is, as opposed to what they believe reality to be. The direct answer to your question is that, yes, we are receiving input from multiple communities and we do plan on evolving DAAR in the future.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, David. Donna says thanks in the chat room, too. So I guess part of the question that I would add is, if you were formally having any kind of interactions just as you are with us, with community members or if you're working towards that. It sounds like you at least have been taking input because you've been listening to discussions and you're thinking about the future opportunities of how you might more directly take input from the community, but you haven't been having any kind

---

of formal discussions really to date, except for the ones you're having with us. Would that be fair?

DAVID CONRAD:

Yeah. I think the Registry Stakeholder Group is the only one who sort of had a formal interaction with us on this topic. We've been mostly subject to friendly suggestions from various individuals within various communities. Although we actually believe we've requested sort of semi-formal interactions with ccNSO, I believe we have had some interactions with the Registrar Stakeholder Group. But nothing has been formalized with the level of the RySG has, and for which I actually thank you all.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, David. I'm conscious of the fact that we're at the top of the hour, one last quick question in closing. Are you and Samaneh and/or John available next Tuesday to continue this discussion, pick up with the recommendations, or should we take that discussion offline?

DAVID CONRAD:

I'm not sure about John. I probably would be available at this time next week. And I don't know about Samaneh.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB:

Yes, same for me. I will be available.

---

JAMES GALVIN:                    Okay, thank you. Then let's plan on all of us getting together next week so that we can go through the recommendations. Thank you very much again, Samaneh, David, for joining us. Everyone, I apologize for running a few minutes over here. We'll see you all next week, same time. We're adjourned.

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

MICHELLE:                        Thanks, Sue. Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**