EN

SUE SCHULER:	Okay, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: All right. Thank you, Sue, and thank you, everyone. Happy New Year to our first of the year crowd here. Appreciate everyone who has time and is able to come out and be with us today as we kick off a new year. I hope everyone had a good holiday, whatever your holiday might be.

So, today is Tuesday, January 7th. I'm James Galvin from Aflilias, one of your co-chairs. I see Kristine is also with us, the other co-chair, and a number of other folks.

So, Kristine and I were chatting yesterday about trying to plan on where to go this year and what we think needs to happen and what to do. Now, today's meeting is just with us. Next week we're also going to have Samaneh and John Crain.

I have not actually checked. Here's an interesting question to ask. We were expecting them to have some changes to the DAAR reporting this year. Just out of curiosity, I don't suppose anyone has actually looked to see if that's actually happened in the spirit of recapping from last year. I'm not even sure if that information is available or not. I'm not seeing any hands, so I'm guessing no one else has actually looked either, so that might be something interesting to ask about next week when talking to Samaneh just in case. And certainly if it all comes together we should thank them for those changes, but we'll see where that goes.

As I said in my email message when I sent it out much too short a time ago I know, and my apologies for that, I think that we have had a couple of really good conversations about a couple of specific actions. We have a larger objective here of trying to make DAAR really present some valid and useful information, not necessarily knowledge per se. That's for people who look at it to figure out and identify. But ICANN is clearly going to have DAAR there, and so we're trying to figure what we can do to make it informative and not misleading.

I think that there are two areas that we are getting to in terms of how to look at the data and what we want to see, so these are the two topics that we wanted to get to. I apologize. I'm going to back off here. I see Kristine is responding in the chat room to my question earlier about the DAAR reports. The new reports will be at the end of the relevant month. And you're right that we're going to start doing that in January, and so you won't see January's report until February. So that makes sense, Kristine. Thank you for that. So we won't expect to see any real changes until the January report comes out at the end of the month. That's good. Thank you for that and bringing that up.

But I think we're in a space where there are really two specific things that we're after here. As I said in my email note, we don't believe that we necessarily have consensus, but we do seem to be moving on a path towards two things.

So I think that part of this conversation for today is to recap what those two things are with an eye towards asserting and asking the question, "Is this consensus?" "Where is it that we do agree?" And one of the questions that we're still trying to answer and explore for ourselves so

that we can try in or own way here to move towards conclusion. We're trying to still figure out what the end game is in the specific. We know generally what we're trying to achieve, but I think it's important to just review and really try to focus in and highlight the good place of where we are and what's left to be done so that we can really show some progress and feel good about all of that as we go along.

So the two things as Sue had put up here was a discussion of [categorings]. It's supposed to be categories or groupings of TLDs. I don't know if that's my typo or yours, Sue. If it's mine, I apologize. If it's yours, I'm sorry for calling you out for it. And then the second one was mitigation tracking. Let's talk a little bit about what those are, and anyone can feel free to jump in here as I try to go into this and fill this out or if I try to misrepresent something really egregiously badly.

In the categories or groupings, the most immediate thing that stood out was this split between GTLDs and legacy TLDs, new GTLDs and legacy TLDS. And they've arbitrarily chosen this split and started to slice up some data that way. I think that we all agree this is a point in which we do have consensus, which is that the current split for the TLDs is really misleading. At a minimum in the best case, it's misleading. I think our position is that it really is wrong. It's not at all fair, and it's not at all representative of what we believe it's trying to show and what really should be there.

So along the way we've talked about a number of different things. We've been trying to come up with different ways to think about TLDs and different ways to group them so that we might actually show something which is informative and useful to the community.

I think in the last few weeks of last year, a proposal had been put out for discussion that we haven't really closed on, but thinking about things in terms of mitigation strategies feels like a good way to approach this. And what that accomplishes for us is several things.

One of the things in the very late stages of last year that was suggested is let's not distinguish between GTLDs and CCTLDs. That distinction is not really what's relevant and helpful. We don't think that that adds anything to the discussion to call out specifically that kind of difference. Instead, it's clear that domain abuse does exist in TLDs. But there are many of us who actually proactively do things that do mitigate abuse. And those mitigation things that we do, in some cases those are pre-mitigation strategies, and in some case they're post-mitigation strategies.

In particular, a pre-mitigation strategy would be something like any kind of restriction, any kind of parameter that enforced prior to registration. The high-end canonical example is dot bank, which goes to great lengths to validate and verify all of its registrants before they get a registration and before it's delegated and made visible. And then at the other end of the spectrum, you have open TLDs where essentially there are no requirements. As long as you pay your registration fee, you can have a domain name. Perhaps contactability is an ICANN requirement that there be some way to reach them, be that an email address or telephone number. It's just worth mentioning that.

But those are the two ends of the spectrum we're dealing with, and when you have open TLD you don't have any pre-mitigation strategies. You're doing post-mitigation in that case. You're reacting to reports or

you're reacting to behavior that you see in your TLD if you're a registry operator or perhaps even as a registrar. You know if you've got a registrant who's doing a lot of registration suddenly, and you might want to react to that.

So the suggestion, as we're getting towards the end of last year, is this idea of trying to group TLDs based on mitigation strategies. And for starters there appears to be at least two groupings that we can create, those with mitigation strategies and those without. Create those two groupings and just let that be the way that they present the data and they move in that direction. The idea being that all of the open TLDs should be compared against each other. They shouldn't be compared against those that have registration requirements and such because we don't think that that's really the right thing for the industry. It certainly doesn't match many of the business models that many of us have, and we want to be careful not to set ourselves up to force us in that direction. So it's acknowledged that they exist, let them exist and get data in that respect.

Then on the mitigation side, we can think about the question and perhaps we can ourselves, here in our discussion, make two groupings out of that, one which is pre-mitigation strategies and one which is post and then just look at those three groups of TLDs. Pre-mitigation, anything which is post-mitigation, or if there is anything like that in there, and then the open TLDs group. And just start looking at that data and then see what groupings come from that.

We've certainly had many discussions about some of the other details and the different mitigation strategies that are done and that we

choose, but why don't we wait and see what the data starts to show and then think about what the future of things to ask is of Samaneh so we can see where we're headed. I don't think we need dozens of groupings of TLDs, but there's probably a few and we just have to figure out what that few is as we look at some of the data.

So that's this first item here about categories or groupings. Think about them in terms of mitigation strategies, and let's redirect DAAR in that direction. I'd like to test the idea of people thinking that that's a path to head down that gets rid of CCs versus Gs distinction. It also eliminates the new versus legacy distinction, and it does seem to be a distinction that fits with abuse reporting and abuse in general. And that's the motivation for going down that path.

So I'd like to get some reactions about that. Does that make people jump up and say, "Hell, no, that's just a bad idea," or at least supportive of trying to head in that direction and then we can use next week to talk to Samaneh about making that distinction. Kristine is saying in the chat room, "Anyone besides me? I've weighed in." And, yes, to the extent that Kristine and I have been talking and planning in the background, I guess we're more or less aligned here. Rick, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Jim. Rick Wilhelm for the record and happy new year everybody.

I thought that was a great recap, Jim, and the one comment that I would offer there is that I think that before we agree that there will be a set of

groupings that makes sense that it would be a good idea for us to at least find one that we can all agree makes sense. Because when I have been mulling over the question of these groupings from time to time, not many categories of groupings or types of groupings last more than an hour of deep and careful thought. In other words, they're not proving very durable in that of finding some clause with them. So I think it would be good for us before we agree certainly with ICANN that there will be groupings that matter, that we at least find some or one that makes sense to this group here. So I'm not necessarily opposed to the concept of the groupings in general if we can find some that have value, but I think before we certainly go back to ICANN and say firmly that there are going to be groupings that we should at least find some that make sense. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks for that, Rick. Before I go to GG, let me just ask a clarifying question here. I actually agree with you because we have had a lot of discussions about different kinds of groupings, and you're right, durable, I like that word. They haven't proven to be really durable. At least we haven't really come to a consensus about them. But that's why the starting point here at the moment is really about whether you do any pre-mitigation or not and deal with that. And then start to see what the data shows and see where it looks like there's some abuse that seems to show up, and then see what we can say about that. Maybe that will help us to identify those groupings.

I think you're saying two things, and I want to distinguish them and I'm looking for a little clarity. One is we don't want to commit anything with

ICANN, and I agree with that absolutely. I'm not in a place where I think we're ready to tell ICANN this is what we want or don't want. But I do want to separate that from, "Are you supportive of mitigation versus non-mitigation?" Does that seem like a sensible place to start, and then see what the data begins to show us. Thanks. Go ahead, Rick, if you want to respond to that directly, please.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Jim. Yes, I would agree that I don't really want to commit on the concept of groupings until we find some … the notion of pre-mitigation, which is an interesting concept, because mitigation almost by definition implies something ex post facto, but pre-registration actions versus post-registration actions. I think that's been probably the most interesting one that we've been talking about. I haven't fully figured out how that would work operationally. In other words, is it well known? Is there a place where we can all go or someone could go and find the list of TLDs that have such kind of actions? And what would be the amount of "pre-mitigation" that would qualify as pre-mitigation here because you could say that there's a lot of different varieties up to and including a personal interview for the person that is the registrant and that's a joke, certainly not advocating for something like that, would be the deepest level in pre-registration intervention.

So the notion of pre-mitigation versus post-mitigation sounds interesting. The question, about that one in particular, is what would that look like in practice? But we don't need to go down that path right yet, but that's just my comment about that one in particular. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Rick, very helpful. GGI you had your hand up, but you've taken it down. Did you want to jump in and speak? Please, go ahead.

GG LEVINE: Sure, yeah, this is GG Levine for the record. I think we're past this point, which is why I took my hand down, but I just wanted to chime in that I thought it made sense rather than separating out GOs and CCTLDs as their own categories, I think it makes sense to have those that do have mitigation strategies in place versus those that don't. I think that makes more sense as a distinction among those types of TLDs, if that makes sense.

JIM GALVIN: It does. Thank you. Let me try to tie these things together here, and I want to jump off of one point that Rick made which I thought was real important. It's true. We unfortunately we have started using these terms of pre-mitigation versus post-mitigation. Rick highlighted the fact that that's probably not the best terminology. At least in my mind what I always meant by that when I said it, just got leveraged on the word mitigation, was pre-registration versus post-registration actions. So there's mitigation that one might do pre-registration, and that amounts to the various qualities of what you might do to validate or verify a registrant before you actually offer anything to them before you give them a domain name.

Then there are mitigation strategies that you always apply after the fact. So there are no restrictions on who can have a domain name and any kind of verification or validation of that person or identity or anything like that. And you're only looking for domain names' behavior after the fact and what goes on with it, and that's how you decide.

So I do want to clarify terminology here. Let's try and create those two groupings. Beyond that, I think we're all right here. We're not really 100 percent sold on the kinds of groupings that are going to make sense. We have tried a few and tried a few discussions about them, and I think for the moment maybe we should find a way at some point here to recap them and summarize them so we at least have them in front of us.

If we can get Samaneh to make a cut across TLDs based on those that do preregistration strategies of any sort and those that don't and create that cut of TLDS and get those two sets of data to look at. And while they're doing that, we can try to recover all of the various kinds of preregistration mitigation strategies we've at least talked about and at least make the list so that we have it in front of us. And then we can have that list and look at that as we look at whatever data that Samaneh can bring to us. Maybe that will help us in trying to think about what other kinds of groupings might make sense or not make sense. So I think that would be my specific suggestion at the moment in tying together our pieces here. Any reaction from anyone on those points? I see Rick with a hand up. Rick, go ahead, please.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Jim. Rick Wilhelm for the record. I think that's a good idea, but I'll bring back my point about the operational concerns. The question that Samaneh will quickly ask is, "Okay, what's the TLDs in both groups? How do I partition the list of all TLDs into a Type 1 and Type 2 of ones with preregistration qualifications and ones without?" Where does she get that data is going to be the next question coming right back.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks so much for that question, Rick. You're playing a great straight main there. I love it. I do actually have an answer for that, but Kristine's got her hand up. Let's have some other voices besides mine. Go ahead, Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi, this is Kristine. Thanks. I'm happy to let you answer or I will, either way. One of the suggestions that I had, and I'm hoping to get some feedback on this is, I think you're absolutely right, Rick, for starters. I have been saying this all along. We're going to have to just sit down and literally get a list of TLDs in front of us, get two buckets, and put the TLDs in buckets. And then if people want to object, they can object. But remember Samaneh offered to cut the data. It doesn't have to be public yet. We can just see what it looks like, right?

Most TLDs are represented on this list I think. Maybe not on this specific call, but between either your backend provider through NEWSTAR, Afilias, Verisign, etc., is on this. Uniregistry is on these calls typically. Donuts is a member of the mailing list even if they're not necessarily on these calls. I think [Ellen] has a conflict. Amazon has 52 TLDS. I think by

the time you add up all the TLDs we collectively control or have access to, there are contracts and information about them, I think we get most of them. Then I know that [Martin] is on the list and he can maybe help us with brands.

So I think the point is is that we can get a pretty good cut of self-identifying, and we can say which of our TLDs have pre-mitigation steps involved and which don't. The real question is going to be do we feel like that's a trade secret that we wouldn't disclose. However, I don't think that's a very genuine concern because we all have to publish our terms, and there's registration agreements and terms and acceptable use policies. So I think that it should not be a big secret who does what. It's just a matter of collecting it.

And then from there the people that aren't participating, we're going to have to go through that list and put them in piles. I think most of them are probably not doing proactive stuff, but there's a couple of strategies we could use our best guess. We could ask somebody to go and do some research, and maybe that's something that Samaneh could have some resources that ICANN to do for the last bit of cleanup.

But then once we get two buckets going, we could run the data and just see what falls out. It may be that the data's not very helpful, and so cleaning it up and making sure it's perfect is perhaps going to be a waste of time. That would be my suggestion, and I'd love to get some takes on how that works or what you think of it. It's going to not be perfect, and we're going to have to be okay with the first cut not being perfect.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Kristine. Let me summarize this into two specific actions that I think we need to undertake here. As Rick said and Kristine elaborated on quite nicely, one of the things that we are going to have to do is create that initial list of Type 1 versus Type 2. One of the things that has occurred to me in that process, as Kristine said, I think that's all fairly obvious, and I think we'll be able to do that. Most of them are going to be represented by those of us on the call here, and we can probably just make a choice about the others that aren't here and we'll sort it out as we go. None of this is going to be demonstrated on the website yet anyway, so we'll have plenty of time for accuracy in the data and making sure that all the distinctions were made. Probably have to do some outreach to get it all set the first time. If end up going down this path, we're going to have to go for accuracy, and we'll deal with that and we'll get that set up the first time around. I think we do have the action ourselves of making that list. I think it all will fall out fairly easily for those of us who are in this and know and understand what's going on.

The second action that is going to be important down the road once we go down this path if it turns out to pan out and we like it, is we will ultimately need a process that ICANN will have to employ and execute in order to maintain this particular element about a TLD. And I don't think that's particularly challenging conceptually. They certainly maintain a lot of information about TLDs anyway, so this is just another little box in the list of things that they keep in. As TLDS change and evolve over time, this is just a box that they keep up-to-date like they do other things, contact information and things like that. So I think that

that's a relatively straightforward thing. I'll make one last overarching comment and go to Richard here. He's got his hand up.

One of the things that's interesting to me in this is in this grouping's discussion, and we've touched on it here again now, there was always this question of, "What exactly do people do and what qualifies as a mitigation strategy and what doesn't, and is that visible or not? Do people know about it?" And I think that in the preregistration case, that's going to help drive and influence what kind of groupings we can create. We're going to have to discuss amongst ourselves here, what do we expect is going to be visible as part of a TLD application or a part of a TLD's business practices? Because we can't make groupings and ask for groupings to be created for data that's not ordinarily available and not ordinarily known.

This is why I was beginning to lean towards the idea, at least in my own mind, that there's a very limited set of groupings if they exist at all that are going to be possible. GO made sense to me. Brands made sense to me. Anything else is challenging because it's not clear what data is available to help you make that split. If anybody does anything about registrant contact information, maybe that's really the only line that needs to be drawn, and at least that very broad-sweeping data point is visible. The details behind it might not be, and that might be okay and maybe that's enough of the distinction or not. Maybe there's nothing past preregistration versus open, and we're just going to have to see where the data takes us is where I am with that. So I certainly don't want to suggest that we expose anymore data than we already do. Thank you for that. And, Richard, you have your hand up. Go ahead please.

RICHARD ROBERTO: Richard Roberto for the record. Can you guys hear me okay?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, just fine.

RICHARD ROBERTO: Oh, good. First of all, thank you for what you just said because I think that was along the lines of what I was thinking. My question for this group is when you talked about trying to [inaudible] which of the available groupings will have ICANN try out the data analysis and see if we like it, do we have any consensus among this group of what that will mean? What do we mean by like it? Do we have a sense of what will make us happy as a group of constituents? I don't know that I understand what that would be, but I agree with all the statements you just made about have them be sure if there is a grouping that it's going to make sense, and there is very limited metadata. I don't want to start adding metadata arbitrarily just for this purpose. Thank you for that. I'm curious as to what other people think about what we want to see as a result from monthly analysis.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Richard. Let me speak directly to your question of consensus. I personally don't want to invent any special definition of consensus speaking for myself. I just see consensus is do those of us on the mailing list as much as those of us on the call once we start writing things down and documenting it, are we generally in favor of it? Is

there any strong objection? And then I want to understand that objection, and then we'll just have to deal with that, and we'll see where that takes us. Ultimately, a formality of all of this is that it's going to have to go back to the Registry Stakeholder Group, and all of those processes will come to bear on us in terms of what actually represents a commitment that we want to present to ICANN to act on. So we're just a working group at the moment that is developing something, and for those of us here can we find something that we can all agree to, or at least we can respond in some sensible way to any objections that come with whatever we propose. Then whatever happens in the Registry Stakeholder Group, it'll work there. I hope that responds to that comment. Kristine, you might want to jump in here and say something. Go ahead, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks. This is Kristine. I just wanted to say something, not really so much about consensus, but this is something I've been challenging myself with, and so it might help the rest of us in the group as we think about our next steps. We've been going around and around on this idea versus categories or groupings for a while now. I think about a month of calls. Now, granted we had the holidays in there, etc. And I realize that we're really reluctant. I'm very reluctant, and I've said this multiple times that we have to be careful how we box ourselves in. I also don't like the idea of collecting random metadata that can be used against us in some way. This makes me very, very nervous.

On the other hand, as I think this was one of the points Jim was alluding to was we created this working group not just to complain about DAAR

because we can do that at any point. DAAR is here to stay. That was our original premise. But we created this working group to try to make suggestions about to make it better. I think one of the things we have to do in making these suggestions is get comfortable with being uncomfortable and stick out our neck a little and trust that we're going to be able to try some things and they're not going to work and that's going to be okay and they're not going to be held against us. I don't know what else to say about that. I know that I'm really uncomfortable with some of these things, and I'm trying really hard not to be because I'm in this group to try to make a change. And if we can't collectively come up with some changes to try, there's no point in continuing these calls because we've already complained to ICANN about what we don't like. We've already got a few changes.

So I'm going to challenge everybody to think a little bit long and hard about that because if the fact is is that we just don't ever think we're going to be able to agree on black and white suggestions and ideas to help ICANN do better, then we don't need to keep meeting. And I don't mean that in a snotty way. This is really a soul-searching I've been doing myself. I'm trying to get comfortable with the idea of trying to come up with some ways to parse the data in ways that won't throw any of us under the bus while at the same time really just being sensitive to accidentally opening doors. So we're going to throw that out there because I think we're all really uncomfortable, and I wanted to just lay it out there and just be really open about it because maybe we can have that conversation, and I think it's important to throw that out there. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Kristine. I agree with you completely. You and I have had this discussion ourselves about how to go forward with this and certainly supportive of that. I do want to call out something that Richard had said in the chat room just for the voice record. So, for now, lack of objection is sufficient to keep moving forward, and I think so to the extent this is a working group. We're working. We just have to move forward a little bit, and it's not always going to be comfortable as Kristine was saying, but let's at least try.

We're trying to be constructive about where to go with DAAR because complaining is something we can easily do, and we could've always done that. I've always thought that our role here really is to explore and find a path forward and make real constructive suggestions for what ICANN can do that would be, as Kristine said, "Wouldn't throw any of us under the bus," per se but would still be helpful, respond to what we believe ICANN is trying to accomplish here and help the community at large.

I want to move off the categories discussion into a little bit about mitigation tracking here. Just to quickly summarize, I'm going to assert here and look for any kind of challenge if folks want to make it, and we'll certainly have next week to talk some more about it. We will look to talk to Samaneh next week about creating a look-at-the-data in terms of two groups, preregistration restrictions versus no restrictions, on who gets a domain name. That gives us an action of trying to create those Type 1 and Type 2s and divide that list up for her so that she can then create that and do that. That's at least a step one. Let's start to look at that data and see what it looks like. I don't immediately have a suggestion for how we're going to create that list of Type 1 versus Type 2. We'll

take that question to the mailing list, I guess, and I'm sure as Rick was pointing out earlier, absolutely Samantha's going to ask for that right up front next week when we're talking. But hopefully we'll have a suggestion on where to go forward with that next week. I'll pause for a moment here. Kristine, your hand popped up. Go ahead, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Jim. I'm going to throw a question out there. So if we don't have a list to give Samaneh, and it's very unlikely she's done any work in the past two weeks, I'm wondering if it would make sense to uninvited them for next week and spend that time starting on the list because otherwise I don't think we have anything else to share. Our action items at the end of our last call with them was for us to come away and try to make a list. So if we haven't done that, and granted we've had the holidays as well and had this call, does anybody feel strongly that we should still have them on next week because I feel like maybe we could just use the next two weeks for ourselves.

JIM GALVIN: I like it, great suggestion. Anyone object to uninviting and us doing our work on creating the list? Any objections to that? I see a plus one in the chat room. Not seeing any objections. Let me scroll down the list here. People can check, "Yes, you like it," or "No, you don't" if you want to, but if you say no you're going to have to speak up and tell us why. Let's go with that, Kristine. Thank you for that. That's certainly going to help move us forward. So we'll plan on doing that for next week, and

I'm assuming Sue is taking note of that and take care of that with John and Samaneh. She says, "Yes," in the chat room. Great.

On the mitigation tracking, mitigation tracking is something which we've talked about conceptually. I think I've been the one who's been pressing on it the most, but the reality is there's no obvious solution yet to what exactly that means. So let me first recap conceptually the point that I'm after here in mitigation tracking.

That that always meant to me in having brought this up is one of the issues I always believed that DAAR is misleading about at best is the fact that they're using that data to suggest that there is a widespread systemic problem. And in reality my position is, and I think many of us here on this call agree, there are registries and registrars who are really quite proactive, and we do good work. There is no systemic problem. The problem is much more localized for some definition of local, which seems to be a point of discussion too, here. And that's because there are quite a few of us who have some systems by which we actually carefully look for or react to abusive reports, and some of us have our own little intelligence systems for identifying potentially abusive scenarios and we deal with those and we respond to those. We deal with abuse in our TLDs and in the case of registrars, in their particular registrant portfolios.

The things which is missing here in DAAR, the other piece of this that matters in this discussion, is that the actual presence of abuse … the problem here is what the data doesn't show is that its not necessarily the same abuse from month to month because we don't control abuse. You don't control what people do with their domain name. You don't

EN

control the fact that domain names can be hijacked and websites can be hijacked and email can be hijacked and lots of things can happen. You could have end number of abusive reports one month. You could have the same end number next month, but they could be entirely different reports. So they're not reflective of the fact that you actually do things, and you are moving forward, and you are addressing abuse. It's just that it comes and goes because that's the natural order of things.

So what this gets me to is this topic of mitigation tracking. The idea here is is it possible for DAAR to somehow represent the fact that registries, and ultimately registrars if they get down their path of showing all of that, that we do actually take action. We are doing things, and we are being responsive to the abuse that's there. There is no obvious solution to that, but it is important that DAAR, in some way, they have to reflect the fact that registries for us here in particular, are not the bad guys. And somehow that has to be captured and presented so that people can see that. We haven't really talked a lot about the specific things we could there. I do have some ideas, but I do think that that's a topic for us to keep in our mind. And as we move past this discussion of groupings of TLDs, we probably need to have more discussion of "What can we do?" "What kinds of data can we capture that represent the fact that mitigation is happening on open TLDs," in particular. And then, "How can we get that represented in DAAR so that we all get credit for what we do," which is very good, if not excellent, and the community can see that there is not a widespread systemic problem. I think that's an important data point to get out of all of this.

So that's my recap and my comment there. Again, we haven't really come to any solutions, but this is a problem. This is an issue, and I think

it's an important topic for us to move to. As we move out of the groupings discussion, we need to move to talking about things. This is obviously going to be inventing new stuff, and sadly, it might actually be inventing work on the part of registries. There might actually be additional data that we're going to have to collect and report to ICANN that can be capture and summarized and presented. We just have to acknowledge that that might be the path that we're headed down. But I'm certainly open for any suggestions and doing something different. My main goal here is making sure that we get credit for what we do, which is positive and the good thing and the right thing. If that means we have to do a little more work in order to get that, I think we're going to have to just honor that and sign up for it. But it's certainly a discussion to be had.

That's my story. I'm going to pause here. Any reactions or comments from anyone? Anyone want to characterize this issue differently? Sam, you have your and up. Please, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jim. This is Sam. I'll caveat all this by saying that this is really the first time I'm thinking through any of it, so none of these are fully formed thoughts. I am a little bit wary of voluntarily signing up for more proactive reporting to ICANN because I think we've maintained throughout that there should be some separation between compliance and these reports. Keeping the line between the DAAR reports and what compliance is able to track and take action on I think is something that's been important to many of the registry operators who are involved in this.

That gets me wondering, and this is just my own ignorance of the way these feeds work, but whether or not there's information that can be tracked through the feeds about things like the age of a threat and how long a specific domain has been used for abusive purposes. What I'm wondering is if the feeds have any accuracy in determining how long something is a problem, and if that is a metric that can be tracked and reflected in the DAAR reports on a month-to-month basis. Just an open question and a thought.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that, Sam. I'll comment and respond in the following way. I agree with you. It is appropriate to be wary of signing up for additional reporting for ICANN. And in the spirit of keeping compliance separate from all of this, I should comment that even in my own mind I think that allowing for the possibility that auditing might be the way to show some of this is certainly an option to think about. Maybe the work is something that we have to keep internally and just make it available so that it can be demonstrates that it's happening. I don't know, but this is why this discussion has to be had because I do agree with you. Being wary for signing up for more work is absolutely a concern and deserves a thorough and full vetting by a lot of people because we have a lot of different kinds of interests to keep in mind here. So it's an open question. Thank you for that. [Sean], you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

SEAN BASERI: On the question of data feed, I think that's a big question. From what I've seen, they will remove items from the list for a number of reasons. One of them is they just age out over a period of time. They have a predefined period where a domain name may be listed. I'm not quite sure that they would do the level of verification that registry or registrar, for example, might do if they were going to have some kind of further action. The issue of mitigation is also tied to the reason the abuse happened because if you have, for example, abusive registration that's one thing. The other is a compromised domain. So I guess I don't have a recommendation here but just want to call out there's a lot of complexity here. For example if a domain name is listed on a feed and then some action at the registry or registrar level is taken against the domain name, that may not always apply for cases of compromised domains where the real issue is the underlying systems of a company have been compromised and now they're serving malware or acting as a [inaudible] command and control server. There's a level of complexity that goes into identifying what we consider mitigation and whether it's effective and then things like timing because that's something that's always come up, as well.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Sean. You're absolutely right. There is an important distinction to be made that I want to highlight in what you just said, which is that the mitigation is tied to the type of abusive activity. We are suggesting at the moment this preregistration versus post-registration mitigation activities. Registration abuse is just one type of abuse, and that will probably be captured or evaluated on the preregistration side.

On this post-registration side, there's still the question of whether it's a registration fraud or if it's just some other abusive activity, and you're right about the quality of the feeds. Since DAAR is based on the quality of the feeds that it gets, there is this question of how we balance what the feeds are saying, and this is where we get into this whole question of how do we take not of any mitigation that we do and then capture that data in a way that it can be presented inside of the DAAR system. I don't know what the answer to that is. Can we improve the quality of the feeds, or are we somehow just going to make some kind of data visible that DAAR can incorporate and use? And then this gets to the question Sam raised about, "Are we reporting something to ICANN, or is there some other mechanism in place?" I don't know, but it is a somewhat complex set of circumstances, and we do need to thoroughly vet and walk through all of it. So, thank you.

We are at 10 of the hour. I have a New Year's resolution for myself. I really want to make all meetings end five minutes before the next hour at a minimum. So to me that means we've got three minutes till this meeting is over. I'm going to be quiet now and try to run down the list of people with their hand up and see if we can get through that, and we'll see if we can help me achieve my New Year's resolution. Kristine, go ahead, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: This is Kristine. I wanted to throw a proposal out there and get people's reactions to this. I was having a separate conversation on a different matter with Jeff Bedser from iTHREAT, who I think all of us know basically built DAAR for ICANN and runs it. And he has his own concerns

about it and isn't necessarily a fan of how it's been implemented. Actually, he almost feels like he could be part of our group.

That's actually a good segue because we were talking a little bit about this mitigation problem or tracking problem. He has a really deep insight into not just how the feeds work, but how the various technologies available for tracking this sort of thing. And I was wondering if it could be useful to the group to have him join on one or two of our calls that re coming up to talk through some of these suggestions or problems and to see if there are things that he's been thinking of because if there are things that he's been thinking of that could potentially do this that ICANN's pooh-poohing, perhaps we could get on his side and help promote those things. So there could be a little bit of information to be gained. Worse case scenario, we waste a call, but I thought I would throw that out there and see if people think that inviting him to one of our calls could be useful. In order to keep things on track and allow other people time to comment, I will ask for people to put in the comment whether or not they think that would be useful to have him and engage with him on one or two calls in the next couple of weeks. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Kristine. GG, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

GG LEVINE: Thanks, this is GG. I guess I want to make sure that we are clear as a group on what it is that we're trying to accomplish. On the one hand, yes, we definitely want to get credit for the mitigation or restrictions

that we are putting in place to prevent or reduce abuse. But it seems to me on the flip side of that is that we want DAAR to narrow in on where the abuse is taking place and not being mitigated. So it seems to me that that would be a goal that would be in our interests as far as what DAAR could do. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks for that, GG. I agree with you completely. To me, this all just speaks to the issue of whether there is a systemic abuse problem in the world or not. The important thing is, from my point of view, the systemic problem is not the registries. It is still localized and specific. One of the perhaps unintended, so let's make it a recognized and acknowledged consequence of DAAR is it will ultimately highlight where a lot of the abuse does take place. There will always be abuse in many TLDs because we don't control the abuse. But knowing that we're responsive, I think, is the key part, and being responsive will balance the assertion that there's a systemic problem, and then it will also ultimately highlight where abuse really does exist in a systemic way, or at least in a very, very focused and regional way. GG I'm going to assume that's an [inaudible]. Kristine's question about inviting Jeff is a really good one. I actually support that idea. I think it's useful. It would probably be useful for us at a minimum as a community of registries to get some insight from someone who's an expert in this space and does this for a living, both looks for abuse and addresses abuse. I'm sure that he would have insight that we might find helpful to our discussions even if we don't latch on to a specific recommendation, which we could also get from Jeff. He's a good guy in that respect. I did see a couple of plus ones about inviting Jeff. Richard had said that above, and then you said

it again down there below Richard. I see that. Unless someone wants to object, maybe what we'll do is we should put that question on the mailing list, Kristine, and we'll have a discussion. We'll make a decision next time, and then we'll see about inviting Jeff to one of our future meetings. So we won't invite Jeff for next week, and that means we probably won't invite him for two weeks either because we'll have Samaneh and John on the call then. But we should be respectful of Jeff's time, too, and give him some lead time, so I think all of that will work out. We can have some follow-up next week.

I think with that, we're three minutes over time. That's my new philosophy here in all of this. We have some actions. We're going to meet next week with just ourselves without John and Samaneh. Any other business from anyone? Any last comments from anyone? I'm not seeing any hands going up. No one jumping in. So, thanks everyone. Have a good week. Welcome to 2020, and we'll talk next week.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]