SUE SCHULER:	Okay, thanks. Okay, Kristine.
KRISTINE DORRAIN:	Hi, everybody. This is Kristine here with Jim Galvin, your Co-Chairs for the Registry Stakeholder Group DAAR Working Group meeting for March 24, 2020. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening.

So we are diving right in where we left off last week. We had… I think most people were on the call, but just as a recap, we are starting with or we are working on a document for the Registry Stakeholder Group. We're calling it our DAAR Recommendations. They may be more discussion point-y than recommendation-y. But that… We'll see what happens at the end of the day.

We started with sort of a status of where we're at and we've moved last week into some improvement suggestions that we would like to make to DAAR and we would like to run these past the Registry Stakeholder Group before we get them to ICANN. And there's two sections to this document. And that document I'm going to throw in the chat even though I'm sure somebody did already. I'm just going to do it again anyway.

It looks like Jim has gone in and done a little bit of editing as well, adding some headers and such, which is great. We have… So he's listed some assumptions and we've gone through some recommendations. There was a really great discussion last week on the recommendations. We have some notes that we have to take back and we have to do some

document editing to accommodate those notes from those calls. And so where we're picking up this week, and oh my gosh, they're now trimming trees right outside my office window so I apologize. I will be on mute when I'm not talking.

The… Where we're at is basically moving down kind of to the end of the first section of recommendations, so Recommendations 1 through 5. We had a really good discussion last week but we didn't get a chance to deep dive yet into some of the really good thoughts that Kurt put into the e-mail because we got it right before the call so we hadn't really had a chance to go through it. So Jim and I both reviewed it. Jim replied back last night. Kurt sent a couple comments back. So this is kind of where we want to pick up is looking at where we, how we feel about Recommendation 5 and specifically going back and forth on some of the comments that Jim and Kurt had made in their e-mail traffic from last night and today.

And then assuming we can wrap that up because we spent a fair amount of time on it last week, we may just have to move a couple of notes into the text here. Then we will switch and dive into the messaging and we've done some work around messaging before, but we would like to move into some actual recommendations for ICANN for messaging.

And the beauty of it is if the Registry Stakeholder Group agrees and likes our recommendations, Samaneh said when we talk to her during the ICANN 67 virtual meeting, that she would be absolutely interested and willing to hear our recommendations. And in fact, it was her viewpoint that one of the things that new updated DAAR reports was waiting for

was better messaging information with feedback from the Registry Stakeholder Group. And so we'd be looking at trying to get a call with her to run through these recommendations as soon as possible because that is one of the hold-ups for getting the reports out.

So I will stop there and I will turn this… I'm going to throw Kurt on the spot and maybe Jim a bit as well, and just ask Sue to scroll back to Recommendation 5 and then for those of you who maybe haven't checked your e-mail yet today – I know it's early on the West Coast – to take a look at that e-mail traffic between Jim and Kurt and to see what we need, what edits we need to make to the text in Recommendations 1 through 5 or what notes we need to put in here to make sure that we're gathering the information that Kurt is suggesting in his e-mails. Jim, you go ahead first and then I'll see if Kurt wants to respond.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks, Kristine. I just wanted to say thanks to Kurt. I'm caught up on his message that he sent today where he replied to my comments. He had given some quite nice detailed comments last week. And I do encourage folks to catch up on that thread, the couple of messages that he and I have exchanged. I think we've got it down to where there's a couple of interesting questions that we, as a group, need to address. Just for Kurt now, I'll say and for everyone, I'm going to work towards getting those questions into the document here for the next generation that Kristine and I ultimately come from, get to once we're all done with all this here. Thank you, Kurt. You're driving us to really a good place here and trying to highlight what it is we really want out of all of this.

I think that's all I want to say. But Kurt, fill it out if he wants to add anything to his discussion here or drive anything at the moment. But otherwise, Kristine, just so that we can get to the rest of this document here, I thought I'd just hand it back to you. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks a lot for that, Jim. So I don't see Kurt's hand up. I'm not sure. Kurt, are you interested in talking a little bit more about recommended edits to the doc or should we just go through some of the points that I see there? Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Do we want to go through all Kurt's or do you want some new stuff?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I'm up for all of it. I know that in the e-mail string, there are a couple of places where we talked about perhaps discussing today so I will throw this out there into the mix and then, Rick, maybe you can tell me if you wanted to piggyback on those or you wanted to come with something totally different.

RICK WILHELM: So let me put this in the queue for somewhere to discuss and we don't have to discuss it now. But in general, something I brought up last week on the call was the notion of the fact that these are… that the stuff that goes into DAAR is all dependent on what the algorithms are reporting

that come out of these feeds that ICANN gets. And it's not necessarily objective because the algorithms themselves change.

And on the call last week, I brought up this point that the person, I think it was from Spamhaus mentioned this in the meeting, that their algorithms change, and so therefore, the reports of the abuse change over time based on how their algorithms change. And so we need to account for this somewhere in here about our comments is that while these are crowdsourced, algorithm-based, non-objective, varying criteria, to then sort of get aggregated together and wrapped up under the auspices of DAAR and then are going to get, if we don't frame this properly, are going to get sort of an official stamp, and we need to make sure that our comments here make sure that people realize that these are only an aggregation of reports of varying quality. And this is a comment that Maxim has made from time to time also, so I know that he said in the chat that he's driving. And so we need to make sure that our comments here reflect the fact that this, that the DAAR report is really, not only as good as the stuff that's going, the data that's going into it. So we need to capture that in our comments somewhere. So we can come around to that somewhere in this chat and we can talk about that either now or we can put it in the queue to discuss later. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Rick. I think that is an excellent point. I think we have made this point in previous documents in conversation, but we have not made this point in this document. And so I threw it in just as… I actually attached it to the words "persistence" in Recommendation 5 right now just

because that's where it seemed to fit in my head. And maybe you can correct me if my understanding is wrong, but it seems to me that that's a problem for persistence as well. I mean if the metric by which you're judging whether something is abuse changes over time, how do you also then easily capture persistence? Or is that taken into account with the math in Recommendation 5? I'm not entirely sure. Jim, go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks, Kristine. And thanks, Rick. I'm writing a comment here, Rick. If we scroll up to the top there, if Sue moves further up, there is a section called ongoing issues and then improvements which replaces recommendations. There's a description of the DAAR system and I captured very briefly in that first sentence there about reputation lists are varying views of abuse activity correlated with domain names. I'm writing a comment here at the moment and when I get that done, I'd appreciate, Rick, if you could take a look at that. You can reply to the comment itself and add more detail to make sure the point doesn't get lost. I do agree with you absolutely that we need to expand on the limitations of the DAAR system. That's an important part of the messaging that I think we want to achieve, we want to recommend to ICANN to improve with respect to what's on the website, and of course, whenever they talk about the system. So we need to put that in here somewhere, this whole description, the point, and then there needs to be an explicit recommendation to them about making sure they capture this point in their public presentation.

So I guess, sorry, that's an overly long-winded way of saying "Thanks for that point. Let's just make sure we don't lose the comment for right

now and we'll seek to ensure that that's covered in here in detail."
Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Jim. Kurt, go ahead.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks. [Inaudible] comment and part of my comments, I had suggested
                          breaking our recommendations into three sections. One is
                          improvements or changes to the way the existing data displays. Two
                          would be sort of a reorganization of the data and the third is the
                          communications, the last few, the last three of our recommendations.
                          So I would think Rick's point and Maxim's point would go into the
                          communications where we are telling ICANN that they need to make
                          this clear in their verbiage. So I think the first two sections, the way I
                          have it, are just analytical and maybe should just stay analytical. And the
                          third section about communications will help ICANN tell the reader how
                          to interpret the analytical sections. And so this, I think, is where it goes.
                          Here's where the heavy grain of salt comes in and maybe this goes,
                          maybe we put the communications part up first but we're really telling
                          ICANN that they need to make this clear. So I think this merits its own
                          section in communications rather than being a footnote or a modifier to
                          something analytical. I'm trying to celebrate, separate the analytical
                          from the important messaging. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I think that's a great point and agree completely. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: I'd echo what Kurt just said that this would be a good time to actually make this clear. I would also echo something that Jim said. I think that his term, his phrasing that these are limitations of the DAAR report is a good way to phrase it. I would further, though, stress that I think that these are structural limitations of the DAAR report based on its data sources and I don't think that we should necessarily recommend or encourage ICANN to try to overcome these limitations because I think they are structural in nature. And I don't think that they are surmountable based on the way that the data is being sourced and the mechanisms by which the data is coming together.

I think that it's better, as Kurt recommended, that we encourage ICANN to explain these structural limitations, and therefore, it encourages the reader of the report to recognize the inherent limitations of the report and also we encourage ICANN, when they're writing the report, to caveat it and have the necessary flexibility in their language as they're stating this stuff to state it where the conclusions aren't framed quite as definitively as perhaps they have been to state that, for example, not that there is abuse but there are reports of abuse. And that's some of the edits that I had dropped into a couple of the recommendations as we're kind of going along. And maybe that's something that we can put as a recommendation to ICANN about how the way that they establish a different tone regarding the conclusiveness with which they share the data of the DAAR. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thank you very much and I'm really glad you could not hear the really noisy woodchipper behind me. And if you can now, I apologize. So I don't disagree with anything that's been said. The only point I wanted to make, and this is something that I got out of the DAAR Methodology paper and previous conversations with OCTO about DAAR.

So I don't want to be the Debbie Downer in the room, but they've sort of talked about this sort of algorithmic changes, I think, as a feature, not a bug. So in sort of explaining why they've crammed this down our throats to begin with, and I understand that we're not trying to… we're all in this call because we're taking the position that DAAR is here to stay. But in the process of doing that, they said, "Well basically, all the anti-virus software is using it and so we have to basically subject the gTLDs to whatever the world is looking at, and so this is sort of the real world. This is the environment we're faced with."

I don't know that we are going to talk them into explaining that the use of the changing algorithms is actually a problem for us and a problem with the way that the information is communicated to us and it's kind of a moving target for us because I think they view it as a feature. And I see a hand from Maxim so I'll let Maxim go while everybody else can think a little bit as well.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Do you hear me?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yes, we can hear you but you're kind of far away so just speak up.

MAXIM ALZOBA:	Okay, I will try to do it louder. One of the ideas is that effectively, they are saying that we have to comply with search party requirements based on not yet known for the algorithm. Why not giving them power [inaudible] to act on our behalf? Because it's going to be a full equivalent. So… and nothing prevents search party anti-virus [inaudible] provider from making mistakes in the algorithms. I've been a programmer. I did it. So why they are not going to do that?
	In the end, we can comply with something we can touch with something based on evidence and with something predictable. Because complying with something unpredictable will just lead to legal disaster. Thanks.
KRISTINE DORRAIN:	Thanks a lot, Maxim. Appreciate that. Yeah. I think that's kind of part of my concern and I'm looking a little bit to a little bit of a reaction to Kurt's point that this is mostly a communication issue and not a math issue or a technical issue. And so my question maybe for Kurt or someone else would be that… So I do agree that it should be brought up in the communication bit and I take Sam's point that maybe we start with the communication bit. I'm not sure. But do we… Does this present a problem, the fact that the algorithms change, does this present a problem to the math and the technology in the parts that we've already discussed to date? Is anybody… Rick, go ahead.

EN

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. Yeah, it does because the math, it's moving underneath us. And as we saw in the previously, abuse rates as reported in DAAR can change. Reported abuse rates in DAAR can change based not necessarily on anything that any registry operators or registrars are doing, but based solely on what the algorithms are doing. It's sort of akin to metaphorically, as if the Nielsen ratings company changes its sampling methodology among households or the way that it calculates the TV ratings and then starts giving back different rating share numbers and people start doing different advertising rates calculations based on that even though the quality of the TV shows or something like that has not really changed underneath it. It's sort of akin to that.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yeah, that's what I was thinking. That's what I was thinking too, Rick, but I wasn't sure. Kurt, go ahead.

KURT PRITZ: So I think this is all right. But I think our wording can be done constructively. So there's certain things that we cannot rely on the data presented in DAAR 4, DAAR for, preposition, for which we rely on DAAR. But it can also be useful. So we're not saying that DAAR cannot be useful. In fact, the first two sections are all about making the data more actionable or useful to those who are studying this problem. So we're recommending these improvements to make it more helpful to us and we're pointing out the problems with it. Here are some of the problems. Here's where the data changes from time to time under our feet, but

that doesn't mean we can't make use of it. We just can't make use of it for certain things.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Okay. I think that's really helpful. I think that gives us some good information. I'm taking some notes. I hope that Jim and others are taking notes as well so we can make sure that we incorporate all of these into the next version.

I want to jump into… Kurt, there's a couple… I want to just kind of run through that e-mail train because there's a couple of places where people said, "Let's discuss with the group." And I would love to save 20 minutes for the messaging bit only because we've already kind of talked through some of the messaging so I don't think that we're going to have as much of a deep dive on that as well.

So scrolling down, I don't even know how to be useful on this e-mail but basically, scrolling down right above the paragraph where Kurt responded this morning about "These are the right questions", so right, yeah, stop Sue. Back up. Right there.

So there's a question in the text that says, "First question. I agree that an ordered list of over 1,000 TLDs is problematic and I also agree that choosing ten as the top list number is arbitrary. With that in mind, I rather like the idea of a Pareto chart. You break the data down into 10% or 20%, also a semi-arbitrary choice, and this gives you a very good sense of where the majority of the issue actually lies." So for the group, the question is whether we agree this is a better presentation. And that's the question. Is this a better presentation? And then Kurt does

respond that yes, it's better. The Pareto chart will suggest the right number of TLDs to be examined. Kurt, please go ahead.

SUE SCHULER: Kurt, you're still on mute.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Yeah, you might be muted, Kurt. You're probably saying something incredibly important.

KURT PRITZ: I know. It was so good. I can't believe you missed it. I'll never be able to say that again. Yeah, so this is the question of whether we use a top ten list or not. And as a way around that, I'm suggesting using this Pareto analysis that identifies which, what's the percent of, I'll call it abuse density in each registry as we go along. So the idea is that if you identify the top ten, first of all, I don't think that's going to satisfy the community that we're solving the problem because they're going to say, "Oh, you're only dealing with 10 instead of 2,000 registries." And top ten is just a rock and roll arbitrary number. It's not a thoughtful picture. But a Pareto analysis allows you to stare at the picture and say, "Oh, this looks like the most significant bunch right here. It looks like the 30 or 5 or 3 or something like that, registries are something we should look at." And then the end game of that is that allows you to break these off into bite size chunks and maybe instead of naming the registries, we just say, "These 5% of registries right here have 80% of the abuse. What are the constant traits or business models [across] these registries?" Maybe

they don't even have to be identified publicly. Maybe that can be done in the background and see if an analysis and work can be done to knock that off. So the Pareto analysis might even be a way to get around the naming names problem. I got a lot more to say about it but I'll stop just to see if people think this is a better way to go than a top ten, or maybe neither. I'll just point out that the existing report has a type of Pareto analysis in it. That's all.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks a lot, Kurt. In the absence of additional hands, I actually… Oh, I see some hands now. I do… I'm liking it. I have no… I have never heard of this Pareto report before so it seems like a good idea to me, but what do I know? Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Kristine. Just as a question, what would the Pareto be? So Pareto, of course, is your stack ranking these things. What would the Pareto… What are the axes of the Pareto analysis? Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Kurt, go ahead.

KURT PRITZ: Yes. I'm thinking out loud here. What it's not is it's not the number… Let's see. So the first registrar listed, so the horizontal axis is the number of registrars, so registrar one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight in amount of abuse. But what it's not, and then the percent of

EN

abuse would be the vertical axis, the cumulative amount of abuse would be the vertical axis. But what I'm trying to get around is that it's not that, for example, Verisign is in the number one position because they have a couple orders of magnitude more registrations than the next biggest registry. They, I would think, be naturally at the top of the list but that's not a helpful guide for how to attack abuse.

So the Pareto analysis I would suggest would be about abuse density. So if one registry had 20% of its names were under the abuse category, it would be ranked first and then the next registry might have 13% abuse names. It might be ranked second. The third would be 8% and it would go down pretty fast after that, I think. But it would be about the percentage so that we can focus on… and then we can focus on those registries with the highest percentage of abuse which I think is the most helpful in reducing abuse because we can… Those registries with high levels of abuse will have some similarities across their operation that could be identified and then we can have a discussion about whether some regulation of that would be helpful or hurtful or something like that. That's the next step that has to be taken.

So now that I've talked for five minutes and wasted your time, the horizontal axis are the list of registries ranked from those with the highest percent of abuse to the lowest and the vertical axis is the percent of abuse names in each registry. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Kurt. I'll just read Matthias Pfeifer's comment in the chat. He says, "Instead of top ten, we could ask for a group of TLDs which made

90% of the overall hits in a report." So there's another slight way to look at that information. Think about that while I turn to Martin's hand. Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Yeah, thanks. I like the idea of the abuse density perspective and relaying it this way in some form or another. I probably just have a question then to tease out and make sure we don't miss it somewhere which is that there was also the point of trying to demonstrate that there is abuse, but how quickly does it get treated and dispersed. So I just want to make sure we don't lose sight of that as well, as we go through this, because I thought that was a key part of the Section 5 that we were exploring as well. But otherwise, yeah, I do like this sort of position of trying to do the abuse density and focus in on the top ten or 20%. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks a lot, Martin. And I just want to clarify. We're actually looking at Recommendations 2 and 4 and Kurt's comment's relation to that right now, not actually Recommendation 5. We haven't gotten yet to Recommendation 5, but I think we're not going to have to spend a lot of time there because the communication in the e-mail indicates that we're just going to kind of trim down the math in that recommendation. So if you have anything additional to add to Recommendation 5, Martin, today would be a great day to bring it up. Turning to Jim now. Go ahead, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN:	Thanks, Kristine. What I'm taking away from this discussion at the moment here and just this is a test for the group here just to make sure that I'm capturing what I'm hearing in a sensible way so that when we go to really revise this document into another view for us to review. I'm actually very supportive. I like the idea of that Pareto analysis which, well actually, we just don't realize it. Everybody talks about the 80/20 rule. The Pareto analysis is really just what the 80/20 rule is all about and what gets you there, just for reference. You probably just didn't know what you were naming it and what it really was.

I view this discussion is to get [inaudible] data. Pareto analysis is a way to avoid having names. It's really a way of trying to find where the bulk of the issue is without actually naming in particular who is there. And I like that concept. I think that that's a good thing and it speaks to an important question that we have. So that's my major takeaway from all of this discussion and I think that we want to bring that concept to all of the various presentations and graphs and pie charts that are there, is to try to pull them away from listing names, at least in the default case, which brings me to the other point that I wanted to make that I want to put out here to see if we've got anymore discussion about this.

At least for myself, I'm still of the mind that it's going to be hard to escape. Somewhere along the way, there's going to have to be a list of something. There's going to be a top X or a bottom X depending on what number you're actually showing and what it represents. That has to be available in some way. I think that we're just going to have to be prepared to deal with the fact that even if we can get ICANN to agree to not listing them be default on the website, I'm willing to bet there's going to be pressure from the community that access to that list is going

to be relevant. And we just need to be prepared about that too. Either recognize the fact that there might be a way to get at that list if you're looking at the DAAR stuff. It's just not immediately available. You might have to click through a couple of things to get there. Or we're going to have to come up with some messaging which really sets all of that aside. And I just want to put that comment out there and if anyone has anything to say about that, I'd be really interested. So did I capture in the summary? Anyone object to my summary and then my follow-up question. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Jim. I think the summary seems right. I'll let Kurt opine, but first I'll take the Chair's prerogative and answer your question. So I think that while ICANN's going to do what ICANN's going to do, they could have named and shamed us today. There's nothing preventing them from doing that. So whatever is stopping them now is the only thing that's going to be stopping them going forward. So just the fact that we changed the graphs or we changed the way we present the aggregate data isn't going to, I don't think, make it more or less likely to change their decision to name and shame. Eventually, they will decide to do that and we will continue to fight that battle and we will lose and it will be water under the bridge. That's my viewpoint. But I don't know that we have to address it other than to say that we continue to oppose it and let them sort of decide what they're going to do with that information. I don't think we're going to get a commitment from them not to name and shame. I don't think they've committed yet. Correct me if I'm wrong though. Kurt, go ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Yeah, I was going to say the same thing. I think the summary was fine. There's already a Pareto analysis of sorts in the existing DAAR and they haven't pressed for that. Yeah, that's a risk, but I think if we're… I don't know. We need to be in the lead here, right? So we're recommending changes and so we'll take the lead and recommend how those changes should be employed. But like I said, there's already a Pareto in the report where they haven't forced to name names. But what Jim says is a risk of course.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

I like Maxim's suggestion in the chat to have some muppets in our next presentation. It'll distract them and get them interested. Okay. Thanks a lot, everybody. So I think that was the primary question. There's a little bit of a discussion, but I would like to hold and maybe continue that via e-mail if we have to because I'd like to turn and spend a little bit of time on the messaging. As I said at the beginning of the call, so if you have anything burning that you need to get into the doc, I encourage you to take them in and add a suggestion or a comment in the doc itself or add a note to the e-mail string that's going back and forth so we make sure we capture it. So this week, Jim and I plan to take a rerun through this document, incorporate the changes. It's not going to be 100% perfect but we want it to be really close. We want to review it next week and at that point, we're going to discuss how we're going to present it to the Registry Stakeholder Group and what sort of discrete items we want to get Registry Stakeholder Group input on because there are some pieces on here that we don't think people are going to really care too much

about, other things we think people are going to care deeply about and we want to be careful to present them in a way that displays all the viewpoints of this working group and that demonstrates the consensus where we have it and that there's no consensus where we don't' have it. So next week will be all about that so I do hope that all of you who are on can join again as we get ready to present to the Registry Stakeholder Group. So if we haven't gotten to your point, please do make a comment in the document itself so we can make sure we add it.

I'd like to scroll briefly, and again, I don't think this is going to take a ton of time but I'd like to scroll briefly, Sue, to the bottom part where we say "change the way we discuss the tool" right there. Oops. Yep, there you go.

So we have… You will remember that one of the first work products we did back in the spring… And now on top of the tree, I have screaming in the background again. I apologize. So the… We had written… We had taken ICANN's DAAR report. We had pulled that preface in those first, that introductory material out and we had added it to be more clear and to sort of say what DAAR is and what DAAR doesn't. And we had sent that out. We kind of circulated that around, sent that off to Samaneh and said, "Hey, are you guys willing to talk about this?" She pushed back a little and said, "Well hey, we're changing the DAAR report so some of the stuff, and the things you're saying about the report aren't actually true anymore." So there was that.

Secondly, they are… Any sort of formal messaging that goes into a report like the DAAR report goes through multiple layers of review. So it's not just her and John Crain. It's OCTO. It's Legal. It's lots of people

that go through and make sure that the wording is the way they want it to be. So he didn't think. So she didn't think that that was going to go very quickly. But now that they're at the point of issuing a report and they have to revise that language anyway, they are looking for some input.

So these are three recommendations that have come out of the work that we've been doing as a group this last year that kind of demonstrate to ICANN where our pain points are and what we'd wish they'd change. And one of the things we could possibly do is re-add that letter. And I want to say if I scroll down, I might have added it. No. Yeah. Yes. If you scroll way down in the Google Doc, I actually copied that work in just so we'd have it. We don't have to attach it as an appendix, but excuse me, I did copy it in, in case you want to see that work that we did. And this was really… We went back and forth to kind of tweak that through this group.

So scrolling back up – I'm sorry, Sue – to the recommendations, the first thing we have is sort of highlighting the fact that the communication really is a struggle. We were constantly addressing it within the community. People go to the mic and say that DAAR is capable of and is doing things that it's not doing and is not capable of. So we need to really, I think, highlight that as the premise. I think Jim called those assumptions in the technical section above but the assumption is that the Registry Stakeholder Group is going through and sort of correcting community misperceptions of DAAR pretty frequently.

So then we basically take that assumption and say, "So then we are going to make three follow-up recommendations." The first is we're

going to talk about what does DAAR show and not show. And I see that Rick, this is where he's put his "We need to be more specific here". And I feel like that's maybe where we were talking about that changing of the algorithm and make sure that we understand that it is… that we're kind of working with a moving target here and the data's changing on the fly.

And I will just run through these really quick so people can gather their thoughts and then I'm looking for hands for any input. Also do feel free to just add your comments right in the doc if they're nothing that you think requires group conversation, if you think it just needs to be fleshed out or something.

Recommendation #7 is to conduct community-wide webinars to introduce the community to DAAR and its features. We thought that one of the ideas behind this recommendation is rather than just changing the preamble on the doc itself, which I don't think a lot of the community, #BC, is reading, it might be a way to spread the word about what DAAR is and isn't if we piggyback it on the new report. So it makes sense that ICANN may want to do a couple of webinars, maybe some regional webinars to explain the new format. And it's a really good opportunity to say, "Hey, by the way, we've updated what this report is and isn't and the preamble and let's talk about it a little bit more" in a little bit more of a public awareness campaign than just hoping that people read the preamble in the text.

And the goal, as I mentioned, would be to possibly sort of help the community write its misunderstandings of what DAAR is and isn't, and

so we would sort of take those misunderstandings and work backwards to figure out what the messaging should be.

And then the third bit that we thought could be helpful would be for ICANN to kind of create an infographic that talks a little bit more about the abuse reporting process. There is a lot of work coming out on this and so it would be very easy for ICANN's OCTO at its DAAR page, to set up a small microsite that talked a little bit about how to use the reports, what it is that registries and registrars were obligated to do and what it was that they were doing. So we've got the new registrar, how to report abuse. I know that there's the framework that some of the registry operators signed onto that has a model about how to report abuse. Internet jurisdiction is coming out with, or has already come out with, information on reporting abuse. So there's a lot of different documents going to sort of how, who's responsible for what in the food chain and so putting that information out there next to the information about abuse itself may juxtapose that in a way that's more meaningful to the reader and to the people that are finding this information on ICANN's site.

So that's a little bit of a monologue there. I apologize. Hopefully my monologue is giving you time to think more critically about what's there and see if you have any suggestions. So not only, I welcome wording suggestions or anybody who doesn't like something that's there. But if you think there's a communication piece that we're missing, is there anything else that you think from reading the DAAR reports that would be helpful for the community to understand and for us to communicate to ICANN? And I'm going to pause and let you all think.

Rick, please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Kristine. This is different than the stuff that I was typing while you were talking there. Does the Registry Stakeholder Group want to take the opportunity to… and maybe it depends on how some of these other, maybe this suggestion would depend on how some of these other recommendations turn out, to do its own communication on these or do we want to just do this jointly with OCTO? Is that sort of the path that we want to take here? Are we concerned that if we would do our own communication, that it would come out the wrong way? Is that a concern?

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Rick, I think that's a really good point. We haven't actually discussed that express question in this group. So I think bringing it up here is perfect, especially as we think about bringing this information to the Registry Stakeholder Group and I think the key question will be if we want to do more, what would that look like and who would support it and who would oppose it? Sam, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Kristine. So I think it's a good idea for the Registry Stakeholder Group to have a pretty concise and consolidated set of talking points, if you will, about the DAAR reports. But I do want to avoid a situation where there's a line coming from OCTO and then there's a line coming from the registries. I just don't want there to be sort of this public point

EN

and then response point if we can avoid it, right? So if OCTO is willing to collaborate with us as I'm seeing Rick has put into the document, which I agree with. If we can get on the same page before they do this sort of reintroducing the DAAR report series of webinars or updated information, I think if we can align as much as possible, that will be a better look. I'm just sort of thinking about the PR of this, if that makes sense. If we can have there be alignment on, you know what, these reports are not necessarily the be-all, end-all. They have some limitations but here's how they can be useful and have the Registry Stakeholder Group almost not necessarily endorse but have it be like, "ICANN has worked with the Registry Stakeholder Group to bring this information to you in a way that everyone thinks makes sense." I think that is, it's better PR, really, to go back to that term, to other parts of the community than if we have sort of our own separate stance on the DAAR reports that may not line up with what ICANN is saying.

Now I won't rule that out if we can't get to that kind of alignment. If we can't get to that kind of alignment, then probably we do want statements about this and maybe that could be something that we leverage the Registry Stakeholder Group website for where we start to gather information about other registries' abuse mitigation activities and things about reporting and things like that. But so just… I just want to have that in mind as we think about this question.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Sam, I think that's really smart and I was starting to kind of head down that same path as you were talking, so I think that was good. The other thing that you made me think of as you were kind of identifying some of

the challenges, is that we also know, and we know even within this group, there's a pretty strong… DAAR is a very polarizing topic and abuse is a polarizing topic. And even as registries, despite the fact that we work really hard to collaborate and get along and make the best of the situations that we've got, the fact is I think it would be really hard for the registries to come up with a blanket, universal Registry Stakeholder Group position on DAAR simply because we just disagree. And so we have to sort of take what we can get. So I'm with you. I think it's better if we can do the best we can, put the best possible input toward whatever OCTO's doing, and then just kind of lean into "Yeah, we worked with them and we think that that's the best we can do." And that's one of the things for this group.

But I think, Rick, it's fair to think about what our talking points might be because OCTO is really sticking their neck out here in working with us, and they've pointed that out. I know John Crain has noted sort of they're nervous about the sort of code of silence we've got going on, the embargo. They want to be more transparent about this work. They want to advertise that we're working and we've told them that they can say that they're working with us. So I think if they come out of the day and say, "Here's everything. It's really transparent. This is what we worked on. But ultimately, this is our work," and then the registries come along behind and say, "Yeah, yeah, they did a pretty good job and they took our views and this is what's there," I think ultimately, it makes OCTO look good and it makes the registries look good. So I think we would love some talking points that would maybe put OCTO in a positive light, assuming as Sam says, it does actually come out our way and assuming they don't actually just throw us under the bus, which is a

big trust factor we're all facing right now. But I think it's definitely worth keeping in the back of our mind, what it is we might say officially for, as a stakeholder group when it comes time.

Thanks, Maxim, for joining. I understand you have to drop. We're going to wrap up shortly anyway. I'm not seeing any disagreement with the comments that are there. I have another two questions then. Is there anything… I think I've already asked, but is there anything that we're missing? Any communication pieces that we should make sure to include? And then the other thing I want you to think about really quickly is, as we present this to the Registry Stakeholder Group, we have to – and [inaudible] talk next week – we'd like to start identifying which issues we think the stakeholder group might be more polarized about. I know that we're going to have a conversation about naming and shaming versus Pareto charts.

But is there anything in the messaging that people feel might be troublesome to some registry operators? Is there a way to make sure that we've sort of thought about all the different angles before we finalize this messaging section? And is there anything else that we'd like to discuss on this bit? Because we don't have to belabor it but I just want to make sure that we've thoroughly though through it all so that we can hopefully put a bit of a finalization on this because I think we're going to spend more time on the one through five recommendations next week because those are getting a bigger rewrite. Thanks for joining, Martin.

Okay, I'm not seeing anything and so I'm not going to belabor it. You have an opportunity. Please enter your thoughts into the doc. We've

got some thoughts on the doc. Jim and I will take another cut at it this week. I think the only last thing that I would like to then ask since we have a couple of minutes is for the people, I think specifically Jim and Kurt, but probably Rick as well, anyone else who has been engaged on this, how much detail should go into Recommendation 5? I'm going to put Jim on the spot. I know one of the things that you mentioned in the e-mail was that you are okay with some cutting. Kurt was concerned that we were doing a little bit of too much work for ICANN. Do we have a really good understanding in Recommendation 5 of what it is we want to cut, Jim? Do you need anymore insight from the group before we start taking our red pen to that section?

JAMES GALVIN: Well, I think what I'm going to do is try to create two versions. I do think that the detail is helpful for other folks when it comes time to give this a broader review. I've got to think about… As we write it, Kristine, I don't want to lose what it actually is supposed to represent and what's there. So maybe I'll move it to an appendix or something. I don't want to just toss out the text if it helps explain what it is. So… But I think for right now, I do get the point of turning it into requirements and so abstracting back into what it is we're trying to achieve and then we'll keep the detail around our own internal discussion for right now is the path that I'm going to take and we'll just take a slice at it, we'll see how it goes. I'm sure folks will be very happy to tell me if they, I can do more and that'll be fine. We'll take comments as we get them. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Okay. Thanks, Jim. And I was just going to mention I do agree that we don't want to lose it. So the purpose wouldn't be to cut it forever. I like the idea of we would create a whole new doc at this point that would be the one that would be massaged to go to ICANN and the other one would stay with us. And then when we meet with Samaneh to go through the recommendations, I absolutely would assume that if it came up and if it were appropriate, that no one would object to us saying, "Hey, we thought of this way to do it as one of potential solutions, but this is the way we thought of." But I see Kurt's hand so I'll let you. I'm not going to put words in your mouth. Go ahead, Kurt.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, and I think Jim has a really good point. So I think in the pros of our report, we want to make… To me, we want to point, we want to make two important points in how they make this calculation. One is that you can't measure the lifetime of domain name until it doesn't exist anymore. So their calculations can only be based on domain names that are abusive names that existed and then have stopped existing, so the average is calculated on that. And then the second point is but some so-called abuse names live forever. So there has to be some cut-off, either 30 or 60 days or something like that, to that. So I think there's a couple important points we want to make in the pros, but I think we should show… I think Jim's right. We should show the extent to which we've gone, the thought that's gone into this, that we're not just popping something on their table. So maybe this could be put into an appendix that said, "Here's an example way to prove it to ourselves we went through and came up with this way of doing this calculation and putting that in the appendix." So I just wanted to avoid kind of being

condescending. When you're somebody's boss, you tell them what to do, you don't tell them how to do it. And so I wanted to avoid that from us. But I think maybe putting it into appendix would show the depth of thought we've put into this and allows us to put it in a way that says "Here's a suggestion" but of course, you do it your own way.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Kurt. I think that's good. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Very briefly, just a little bit echoing.

SUE SCHULER: Sorry. Rick, can I butt in a second? I'm sorry. We have Karla on the line already from GDD. Karla, can you drop for a few more minutes? Sorry, Karla. Hold on.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: [Inaudible] she has audio, just video.

SUE SCHULER: Okay. I'm sorry. Can you drop her real quick?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Nope, not a… One moment.

SUE SCHULER:	Thank you.
MICHELLE DESMYTER:	I don't know if she'll be able to rejoin if I disconnect her. One moment.
SUE SCHULER:	Okay. Sorry guys. We have another meeting right after this and she's just joining early.
KRISTINE DORRAIN:	Thanks for that, Sue. I appreciate it. We'll give Rick the last word and if Karla just stays muted, that would be lovely.
SUE SCHULER:	Okay, sorry. Thank you. Sorry for the interrupt.
RICK WILHELM:	Just very briefly, Kurt was talking about the denominator there as far as names and their lifetimes. I'll talk a little bit about the numerator as it relates to Recommendation 5 and sort of re-bring up a point that I had brought up before about the fact that the numerator is based on things that are on the abuse list and the algorithm on the abuse list is going to be changing – again, just flogging this poor equine a little bit more – that it's going to be changing dynamically and it's a little bit dangerous, I think, to put very, very rigorous math on top of numbers that themselves are very shaky. And that's the way I'll just summarize it since we're short on time.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks a lot, Rick. I really appreciate it. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This has been a really, really great discussion. Look for the document to be turned, as with typical Jim and Kristine fashion. I wouldn't expect it too much before Tuesday. But we'll do our best. And hopefully we'll be able to come to a semi-final version that we're comfortable sharing with the Registry Stakeholder Group. Thanks, everyone, for joining. We'll talk to you next week and sorry for running over a bit into the next call. Thanks a lot, Sue. You can end the call.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Kristine. Michelle, please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]