
SUE SCHULER: Terrific, thanks. Okay, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, welcome everyone. This is the meeting of the Registry Stakeholder Group DAAR Working Group on the 14th of July.

I apologize for getting started a little bit late here. We were wrestling through what happened to the agenda that I sent around. And I sent it around from the wrong email address, and so naturally it just gets dropped on the floor. But even so, Sue and I had chatted and she's got it up here in the room. I did actually do my part, although last minute, I suppose by most reckoning, make changes to the document. I think Sue will put the link here in the room for us in a moment.

And I did make a few changes to this document to match comments that we've had thus far. In addition, I left one open question. So, I figured I would just take a few minutes to go through this, if people can open up the document when we get to that. So, I'm sorry, I'm just realizing that I'm jumping ahead here. I'm getting all excited.

We should stick to the agenda. The first thing that we really should talk about here is to review our discussion with Samaneh last week. There is one open question that I have from the discussion last week. So, I'll just lead off with that. I thought her presentations were really quite nice. But the ending question about how to work

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.

with ICANN and what our expectations are, I'm interested really in some comments from folks about [there].

We have some text, which is included at the bottom of our document that we'll get back to here in a moment, that we had drafted before. And we'd shared some of that early on, way back in the early part of this year, with John and Samaneh. I'm not sure how far we want to go with sharing some of that again.

The way I'd like to approach this is to get a sense of what our recommendations are, what our requirements are, for meeting with OCTO and/or Comms Team for our messaging? We know that they don't necessarily control everything that gets on to the website, but we want to be able to have an appropriate conversation with the proper set of people.

And a particular question that I had for us here is, do we want to just focus on talking to John and Samaneh and then letting them take those suggestions to the team and work them in? Or would we prefer to get John and Samaneh to bring their Comms Team in to talk with us, so that we can all have a nice roundtable discussion? Especially when it comes to talking about the infographic, which we have offered in our recommendations.

I mean, I'm thinking that's a better way to approach this. I don't know. But I'm interested in what our thoughts are about the follow up on the messaging side with John and Samaneh. Do folks have a preference for how they want to do this? I've offered two options, certainly others are possible.

I don't know what John and Samaneh are really going to suggest. As I understand it, my expectation is they took as a question to go talk to their Comms Team to see if they could get some advice on how they wanted to go forward. But I'd really like to have that question here in front of our group, as well as any other comments about the presentation that Samaneh gave last week. Any concerns or questions? Or do we just let Samaneh keep going forward with what she's doing? She's done a good thing so far.

No one's jumping to the mic. Kurt, thank you. Please go ahead.

KURT PRITZ:

Well, I think where we are is a good inflection point. We've created a set of findings and a set of recommendations and we've briefly talked them over with ICANN who have found them to be not objectionable. It's not clear yet whether they can do them.

So, I think this is a good point for publishing the report. And I think that the sense I got from John and Samaneh last week was that they felt the same way. I think there's a risk that if we go into a set of roundtable discussions to further discuss the contents of the report, not only might the contents be modified in a way that makes it less effective, but it would extend the time for publishing it too and the time for us kind of saying, "Here's what we found" [this] now.

So, if the question you're asking is what should we do at this point? I think we should act to publish it now. And I think that act is something less than what's in the current conclusion. I think the RySG just needs to recognize that not everybody needs to fully

understand [and that] we need to have a consensus opinion that this is the right wording in the report, but just this sense that nothing is objectionable in the report, that the RySG recognizes that this is the competent work of this DAAR working group and it's time to make it public so the conversation could continue. And then the conclusion would say exactly that. This is an inflection point and this where we are, so this is a good time to publish it. And we're going to continue to work with OCTO in those sorts of roundtable discussions you're talking about to take on the next steps.

But I think it's important for us to publish something to demonstrate the work and I think this is a good time to do it because the progress sort of plateaued and we're waiting for the next ramp up.

JIM GALVIN:

So, thanks for that, Kurt. My essential takeaway from what you just said is the [gate] here in us working with OCTO and others on the messaging is getting our final report public and making it visible. And I take your point. So, thank you for that. Rick, go ahead, please.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks Jim. I think that, one, I would agree with Kurt, and thanks for that very good [statement], Kurt.

Further, I think that it would be good to get this thing out there because the longer we deliberate and let the months go by, the more opportunity that DAAR just continues to be out there without

the stakeholder group comments. And further, I still don't think that there's a lot of changes that have been made to the report or its process.

I mean, I would probably rather have a meeting with their Comms people to make sure that they understand us, rather than having it be a game of telephone. But it probably only needs to be one meeting just so they hear and fully understand what we're saying and so nothing is lost in translation, as the saying goes. But I don't think it needs to be very big or elaborate. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

So, thanks for that, Rick. My two big takeaways here are that the urgent action for us is to get our report out the door and get it public. And then it would probably be good to have at least one, and perhaps only one, sit down at some appropriate time.

We think that we are all on the same page with John and Samaneh. So, perhaps an opportunity to support them in talking with their Comms Team about what we're looking for in the messaging would be helpful all around, rather than going through iterations of them just doing something, and then us having to comment on it. That kind of thing.

So, we'll see. So, I take that as the advice of the group here as a way to approach this going forward. I will, along the way here, remind Samaneh and John that this is an open question of working together. But I'll resist doing that until after we've actually made sure that our report is going to go forward here.

As we did say last week, we do want to give a little bit of an advanced heads up when the publication of the report is imminent to John and Samaneh just to make sure that they have seen it and they know so they can also see the changes that we're proposing to make here in response to some of the comments that we've had. So, we'll do that too along the way. We'll decide exactly when that should take place.

Okay, anything else to say about the meeting last week? We are otherwise just waiting for Samaneh to say when she's got another set of findings to show us. And so, beyond our discussion about our report, we'll be waiting for that meeting. And that'll be driven by her, we'll just keep this time blocked out. And we'll decide from week to week if she's ready to meet or not, and go from there.

Okay, so let's jump into looking at the report. You'll see here I cleared away all the other comments and highlights that were in here before, and I made a few changes based on the actions that were noted in the comments. Really there's not too much here. I'll jump to the substantial things, but folks can easily comment on anything they want.

I put a Footnote 2 here, at the bottom of page two is where it comes up. So, I defined weighted scale. I decided that definition and expanding on that and explaining it was better just stuck in the footnote than trying to have it clutter up our text up at the top. That was just an editorial choice on my part, which we can easily change. But nonetheless, I call that out to folks. I'll give you a moment to take a look at that footnote at the bottom.

Happy to take any comments, any edits on it. If people are in the document, you can feel free to edit it directly. You don't really just have to talk about it here and ask my permission. Can we change the share so that it's all ... ? Everyone only gets to ... Let me see if I can do that. I think I can do that. So, what does restricted mean, Sue? Can we change it so that people can only do suggest mode?

SUE SCHULER: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: This looks different than normal Google to me.

SUE SCHULER: Yeah. Let me go in and do that real quick.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you.

Everyone can be suggest, but if you could leave me as editor, although I've got myself in suggest mode at the moment. I'll try to be extra careful about that. So, thanks for that, Kurt.

So, that was one substantive thing is that footnote. I'll let folks catch up with that while we scroll on down here.

The next substantive thing that I did was in Finding 4, I added a little bit of an extra paragraph about this new gTLD versus legacy

TLD in Finding 4. So, there's a paragraph there, which is of some substance that folks might want to take a look at the words there.

And I did this because if you scroll on down, you'll see between Recommendations 3 and 4, it seems to me [inaudible]. I added another recommendation. I didn't renumber things at the moment, I stuck this recommendation in. It was kind of casually suggested, but we have not actually had a real discussion about it here. It was just kind of casually suggested, so I stuck it in here. I didn't renumber things, but this is where I would put it and I would do it.

And this is really a consensus call here in this group. Do we actually want to say, in so many words, that they should eliminate this distinction between legacy and new gTLDs? Sorry, excuse me for a moment here.

Okay. I put that in there because that actually was their suggestion for us to do that. It was just casually mentioned and I took that to heart and I added that extra text. It's just some additional explanation in Finding 4. Folks can certainly disagree that's necessary, happy to take it out. And then there's this recommendation.

So, those are the substantive changes that I have made to what's here, and then I have one remaining question down at the bottom in the conclusions. But let me just pause here on the substantive additions and since now folks have had a chance to look at that a bit, see if any comments come out.

I definitely want to take this to the mailing list because not everyone is here who's on the list, and just get a last call

opportunity for anyone else on the list to comment on these particular changes before we get to my question at the bottom. And, Rick, thank you. You have your hand up, go ahead please.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Jim. And I'm sorry, I might have missed a meeting where this was, I guess you said, casually suggested.

I thought that ICANN was pretty firm in saying this wasn't going to come out. As a matter of fact, I remembered Conrad saying that it wasn't going to come out. And so, do we know what made it change? Because I think you said this is a suggestion made by Org. And so, did I hear that right, Jim?

JIM GALVIN:

Yes, that's correct. You're right both on your prior account that David Conrad had suggested that he wanted it. And I did go back and I found some old notes that I had taken before, just for additional context, right? David Conrad had said that it's there because that's how service providers use the data. They like that distinction and they make it in their own filtering.

And then the last meeting that we had last week, it was just John Crain and Samaneh. And they had actually put on the table and suggested that if we don't want that distinction, yes, it's a finding, but if we don't want that, we should make that recommendation. And that was their suggestion.

I'll be a little more deliberate here than just saying it was casually suggested. I got the sense, as you're saying, they're not likely to

be able to make that change. So, if we want to make that visible and make that a point of discussion so that there's a reason for it to change, then we have to make that recommendation. That was the sense that I got last week, and why I added it. But, please, go ahead, Rick. I didn't mean to interrupt you if you had more to say.

RICK WILHELM:

Well, I guess I'm immediately wary when we have Conrad having a pretty firm position on one and it was stated in no uncertain terms that this wasn't going to get changed. And all of a sudden, a literal about face.

It makes me look at it very oddly, is sort of my concern. Like I'm being sold [vest slaves] or something like that.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, thank you for that, Rick. And yeah, Sue, we can hear you, or at least I think that's Sue.

RICK WILHELM:

Pardon my cynicism.

JIM GALVIN:

No, you're right. Fair enough. Certainly worth considering.

Something that I didn't put in the explanatory text, but I thought about, and maybe I'll mention it here now just to see if it resonates with anyone, because I had made this note to myself in my own notes when David Conrad was talking about this is how people

really do blocking—or filtering is what he said. The word that he used with filtering, [I ought to stick to that, not] blocking.

When they do filtering, they actually do make a distinction between legacy and new gTLDs. And he was commenting that there are service providers, ISPs in particular, who will routinely filter just on this distinction of legacy versus new.

And some things that have occurred to me and all of that, is, well, I think that's okay, but we don't have to facilitate that, right? I mean, part of our whole point up here at one point is, I mean, a TLD is a TLD.

We talk about reputation list providers and the fact that they do different work. They create their lists based on different datasets, different sources, and different quality of evaluation of the evidence that they're getting that they use to create their list. That's fine. We don't have to facilitate that or cause that to be a greater point for anybody to notice.

And I think that our position, really from a registry stakeholder group, really needs to sit on the idea a TLD is a TLD. They have different business models and different processes and that's fine. There's no reason for DAAR to try to collect and categorize TLDs. And that was a little bit of why I added the extra text about you're making new versus legacy now, but what happens when you add ccTLDs? Are they new or legacy? Or neither? What happens when more gTLDs get added? And now, what's the definition of new? Is it the new this round? Or is it the new for all of them?

I mean, I still stand on the idea that, no, they should take this away, because it's an arbitrary distinction that, so far, serves no published purpose.

Maybe we should push on them to try to assert a reason why they do it. I don't really want to say that though, I feel like that's a wrong thing. We don't need them providing any justification for it, we should stand on the fact of it shouldn't be there.

And, Crystal, you have your hand up. Please save me.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

No, I liked your like your rant. I think the reason they do it is because they're trying to show whether or not the contracts have any impact on abuse. And the argument is, given the level of high abuse in new Gs, that the contract language we have in our agreement is not sufficient. So, I think that's the reason they're doing it. So, we should be careful in how we approach them on saying how to discontinue the separation. I don't think they'll agree to it, for what it's worth.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you for that. Any other comments from anyone? Kurt, go ahead please.

KURT PRITZ:

I agree with Crystal and I think that our findings should focus on that the operating models of new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs are sort of a continuum. If you lay out the business models on some

scale of existing or legacy gTLDs, then the new TLDs have more restrictive models, models that are about the same restrictive, and less restrictive models.

And so, if we're trying to figure out the factors that indicate abuse, or are the operating factors that are more amenable to abuse, then the new versus legacy is not the distinction. It's doing better study about the operating models. So, put more briefly, there's no sense in this distinction because the operating models are all interspersed on this on this continuum.

JIM GALVIN:

So, thanks for that, Kurt. I know that you know this, but I want to add for context for the recording here in particular. We want to be careful suggesting greater study in restrictions, and things like that, and actually even suggesting that ICANN go forward and do that because, of course we [inaudible] ourselves here before that if we're not careful, what's going to happen here is there's kind of a movement towards all gTLDs having to do all kinds of verification and validation prior to registration, like some of the ccTLDs are doing, as opposed to any notion of an open TLD where the way to mitigate abuse is mitigation after the fact. We don't need to facilitate that and make that happen any sooner than it's lucky to come around anyway. So, we just want to be careful in our messaging and what we actually document here in terms of what we want them to do.

So, Crystal, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks. I was just wondering along the lines of, yes, each TLD has a different operating kind of business model. How do people feel about asking them to actually just expose which TLDs they're talking about? I mean, we keep saying we want them to go after the bad actors, why not identify them publicly?

JIM GALVIN: So, are you suggesting an open discussion on having a list of TLDs ranked in some way by the presence of reported abuse?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I am suggesting that. I think they're turning to registrars next. So, it would flow that they would do it for registrars as well.

JIM GALVIN: So, I know that you're a recent addition to our working group discussions here, Crystal, so I think I'll just tell you that we've had a lot of discussions in this group in the early days about the presence or absence of a list and whether we want TLDs listed, ranked in any way, by the amount of abuse. And our consensus, and even the consensus from the stakeholder group when we exposed this idea to them, was that no lists. [She says she was there repping Donuts.] So, you must have heard some of these discussions? I'm sorry.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Totally. I just think that we're slightly in a different position than we were a year ago or a year and a half ago when all this started.

Right? We're now talking about all the conversations of ICANN 68 being the contracts are fine, ICANN has enough to go off of, they don't need anything else. So, I mean looking towards what does that mean? And what does that look like?

If we're looking to identify who the "bad actors" are, if that's what DAAR is being molded into being used for, we should think about that.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. So, let me take a different approach as Chair and just say you're asking to reopen that discussion a bit for us here. And that's fine. That's a question to the group. If anyone wants to comment on that. I'm okay with that.

And Rick has his hand up. Rick, go ahead, please.

RICK WILHELM:

Sure. Thanks, Jim. I think that when we went over this, this came up and was discussed pretty broadly and Donna made comments about it being a broader stakeholder group position that we weren't going to get into, individually identifying members of our own constituency group and having that suggestion come from within the stakeholder group.

I think that was sort of where this got settled as being more like a broader stakeholder group situation, as opposed to something particular to the DAAR report, that's sort of basically as a matter of "principle," that the registered stakeholder group wouldn't be in there suggesting that its members be called out individually. I

won't use the terms naming and shaming, but that was a lot of the colloquialism used at the time. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

I agree. Rick, I do understand that even we talked about it here. It was exposed in the stakeholder group, didn't seem to be any sense of wanting to change that. I have to admit, I don't know, I have a slight bias in favor of at least having the discussion about rankings and listings. But I do get the argument against it too.

So, I'm just trying to stay right in the middle here and see where the herd ends up wanting to go. So, okay. Kurt, go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ:

Yeah, you might recall I was for sort of a middling position where we talked about publishing a Pareto analysis, and I was a fairly big proponent of that. But, as you as you mentioned, Jim, we talked about this for a long time.

And so, to me this is another instance where I think it's a good idea to give birth to this report because, while I want to have the discussion, Crystal, and figure out how to improve reporting and decrease DNS abuse, this report's at a point where it's time to let it go and then go on and have those discussions.

So, I'd rather not go back even though I was in this middle ground in my position.

JIM GALVIN:

So, thanks for that, Kurt. And actually, I think I kind of like that, too. You're right. If we get this report published, then there'll be a lot more discussion. And I have to believe that the listing of TLDs is going to come up once we start talking about DNS abuse and measurements of DNS abuse, that has to be part of a follow on discussion. So, we don't have to promote it at the moment, but I have to believe the community's going to bring it to us.

And, Crystal, I saw your hand, but you took it down. So, I'll give you a moment if you want to talk. Otherwise, I'm going to move on. Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Oh, yeah, sorry. I was just putting in chat. I totally agree that this should go out. I like the discontinuing the distinction add and move on, but we should consider how the contracted parties are going to be part of the discussion with the community. If Göran said enforcing the contract is something we have to help them do, okay, how do we help them do that?

So, that's just a separate discussion from the DAAR report.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay, thank you. All right. Let me assert the following just to see if there's consensus. Like I said, I added that paragraph defining weighted scale. Just looking if there's any objection to that, or folks are welcome to edit it. I added an additional paragraph about the new gTLD versus legacy discussion. Again, looking for objections, or, of course, any editorial exercise anyone wants to apply and consensus on whether to include this recommendation.

I'm suggesting inserting it right there mostly because I want to separate it from the technical recommendations and the messaging ones. And I sort of put it in the middle there because I felt like it was really part of the technical recommendations, just put it at the end.

So, looking for objections to the recommendation, and I'll renumber things and get it in there for sending to the mailing list. And I'm certainly okay, they show up as anonymous here on my printout, which I see they're also displayed as anonymous.

The editorial changes to recommendation currently ZZ, I'm certainly okay with those changes, and I'll just accept them unless anybody else wants to object or do something different to them? So, Kurt's owning up to being anonymous in the in the chat room. That's fine, Kurt. Thanks very much for that. Okay.

I have one other question that I wanted to bring out here. So, there was a comment that was left in the conclusion. So, you need to scroll down to the conclusion. I didn't do anything with this comment. We've certainly talked amongst ourselves here many times about ...

And I would say that we have consensus, that we don't want DAAR to be actionable. That is not a position to the registry stakeholder group, so DAAR should not turn into something that ultimately ICANN or compliance or anyone else can us to force us to have to do things. We're fine with this display of information that people can interpret and make use of, however it works for them, but we're not looking for ICANN to seek to create the evidence behind these things and distribute it.

So, my question here is we certainly have had that discussion. There's no reason in this report that we have to make this statement, but I made this note from our last conversation on June 9th. A question for ourselves here.

I had thought about this. I couldn't come up in my own mind, at least, with a good sentence to add that sort of goes down this path that, at least in my mind, seemed to follow from anything else we said above.

So, I was nervous about trying to add any comment about DAAR not being actionable, and our desire for it not to be, because I felt like I stick something in the conclusion, I've got to find some text add further up somewhere to justify being in the conclusion. And I couldn't put all those pieces together.

So, I leave it open here for the group to think. I mean, do we want to say anything? And if we do, what do we need to do to make that happen? Or maybe we just pass on this and the conclusion is fine as is. So, I'm looking for some reactions from folks. And, Kurt, you're unmuted, so go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ:

I didn't press the raise hand button yet, I was still thinking. So, one, is it seems to me that if we were to make a comment that DAAR is not actionable, it really belongs at the top of the report and not the bottom, because it's sort of a non sequitur at the bottom. And if we have consensus that this is not an issue for us to be raised, then we should probably just leave it on the cutting room floor.

JIM GALVIN:

Thanks for that, Kurt. I'm inclined to leave it on the cutting room floor, which I guess is evidenced by the fact that I didn't try to make any changes to respond to the comment. But I did want to confirm that with the team here, especially if anyone had any specific suggestions for how to get it in there if they wanted to.

So, I don't see any hands. No one's jumping up to want to add it. Sam, go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Jim. So, I'm sort of similarly on the fence about how blatantly we want to say this. I mean, I think everyone in the registry side understands that DAAR is not actionable, or the data that's in there is not actionable by registry operators.

So, I think if this is something that's important to us, it, what it comes down to is the way the DAAR report is messaged to the rest of the community, right? Because I think what we've all observed is that we have conversations with other community members, and when we make that point, they're surprised to learn that that's the case.

I know we're not really in a spot where we're reopening recommendations right now because this work is largely done, but if it's going to go anywhere in the above part, I think possibly it goes into Recommendation #4 where there's already romanette three. And three, neither the feeds nor DAAR are capable of showing whether their domains were registered, blah, blah, blah.

There could be another romanette to add there that like, registries do not get information directly from the DAAR report about specific domain names. And that'd be something that goes into the overall messaging that ICANN presents about the DAAR report, so that other community members understand that it really is just statistics and aggregation. It's not something that funnels back to the registry operators that they can then take action on. That's just if we do want to preserve that point in some way.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you for that. For me, that's very helpful and it causes me to want to, at least for myself, assert the following position. I'm actually inclined to let this comment be on the cutting room floor, to borrow a phrase.

I think that it is absolutely something we should keep in mind for ourselves. And as we get engaged in the messaging, we should be very careful to make sure that the messaging never heads down this path.

And, in fact, we should keep in our mind and influence any messaging in a direction away from the idea that DAAR is actionable, or in any way presents evidence, if you will, to the community. It simply provides a bit of information that can be applied in different contexts and interpreted in different contexts.

So, to say that differently, I'm suggesting that we not call this out as something because calling something out always has a way of making it a point of discussion, but we should absolutely keep it in

mind as we go forward to work on messaging. That would be my personal position in all of this.

So, I'll just add that to the discussion here. Anyone else want to comment on whether or not ... ? I haven't heard anyone jump up in support putting the comments in here. Sam offered an opportunity for how we might put this comment in if we get some consensus to put it in. And I'm not seeing anyone jumping up and down and wanting to give some traction to making sure we cover this.

So, absent anyone jumping up and wanting to give support for it, I'm inclined to just let it drop. And I think that, from a working group perspective, I'd prefer that we just keep it in mind and use our position with respect to this in the future, but not call it out to the community at-large in this public document. And Sam is saying in the chat room that she thinks that's a sensible approach.

Okay, with that, we can draw a line under this. My action here going forward would be to clear out these comments that are here. Now, at this point, I'll take on board all of the suggested changes that have been proposed here and trying to keep up with them and they all look fine to me. So, hopefully others will agree with that. And then send a note to the mailing list and give people an opportunity to comment. Maybe just a couple of days, maybe the end of the week, because that way, if we give people to the end of the week, if there's any substantive comments about it on our mailing list, then we'll meet next week.

Otherwise, what I would suggest is we won't actually meet until Samaneh is ready to meet with us. And we'll make that decision

on Monday of every week. So, we'll try to get that in the day before. I'll try to make sure to touch base with Samaneh on Monday mornings. Maybe I'll appeal to Sue to help me to make sure that I get that done so that people will at least know the day before if we're actually going to have a meeting on Tuesday.

And, as long as there's nothing substantive from this report in our group here, then we will turn it over to Donna and bring it to the RYSG stakeholder group and we'll figure out what mechanisms she wants to apply to getting stakeholder group consensus and then a publication, basically a delivery of these recommendations to OCTO. I think we've talked before about just making it an email message to OCTO or something and maybe it's published as an open letter, but we'll let the process figure that out. We don't have to decide that here.

So, Kurt has a comment about the conclusion. Let me let you jump in and do that because, otherwise, I was going to say we're done here. Any other business. And so, go ahead, Kurt. What did you want to say about the conclusion?

KURT PRITZ:

I think that the messaging and the conclusion is a little bit too much. This is the end, we're done. And I think it needs to be a little more about this is the end of the beginning. And maybe not this working group, maybe we're concluded, but the RYSG is going to continue to engage with OCTO on improving the report and learning more to create a tool that's useful for everybody.

So, I'd rather end on a note that the RYSG has been really active in forming this DAAR group and, as the RYSG, we're going to continue to be active.

So, I think we should change the tone of the conclusion a little bit. If you if you all agree, I'm willing to do that over the next day or so.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah, thanks for that, Kurt. You're absolutely right. I had not thought about that at all, but you're right. This conclusion is written as if it's this working group providing a conclusion to the registry stakeholder group. And that this is a report which we're going to deliver and publish, it really should reflect the stakeholder group reporting to the community and/or OCTO.

So, you're absolutely right. This does need some tweaking. And, yes, the messaging here needs to be adjusted a bit. And I will absolutely take your offer to make some adjustments here. So, please do take some time to do that, and when you're done with that, just ping me directly if I haven't noticed it, because then I'll fold all that together. And I'll clear it out for distributing to the mailing list. I'll wait until you've had a chance to do that before distributing this document to the mailing list because then everyone will have a chance to comment on all of it at that point. I don't think we have to meet again or get into reviewing your edits in particular. I trust that you'll keep the messaging and just frame it in the right direction. And that's a good thing.

Okay. I think that's it. We'll do our part here to get this out to the mailing list and then get Donna to take it into the stakeholder group and do that. So, that's the next steps discussion.

Anything else from anyone else? Any other business? I'm not seeing any hands or hearing any voices. So, with that, thank you very much everyone. I appreciate you joining. We'll just wait to continue to work with OCTO and we'll let them drive the schedule for the most part. So, we're adjourned.

SUE SCHULER: Thanks, Jim. Michelle, please end the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]