JIM GALVIN:	All right. Thanks, everyone. Today is December 10th. It's our Registry Stakeholder Group DAAR Working Group and we are progressing our relationship with Samaneh and John Crain in an attempt to have DAAR be a useful thing for the industry, as well as ourselves more generally.
	So, this week is just us meeting, just the members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. We're alternating weeks at the moment with John and Samaneh, so Samaneh will join us next week on the 17th and we'll meet again at the same time here.
	We had a meeting with Samaneh last week. I thought we had really quite an excellent discussion about how things were going and what she was thinking about with respect to looking at data. We came away in my notes with three, essentially, action items. This is the way that I had put them together. And you see them at the top of the screen there that Sue is sharing.
	An action to categorize TLDs and everything that goes with that, what we're trying to achieve by categorizing the TLDs [to get at a] question that was asked on the mailing list, as well as what kinds of categories are interesting and useful and why. And you'll see that I also, at one point, distributed and made a proposal for four of them. Certainly open to broad discussion. It's just my way of putting something in black and white that gives us a starting point to talk about. So certainly not trying to assert any kind of consensus there on those four things.
	We also have an action to talk about collecting and publishing mitigation information. That's just motivated by the idea that if abuse is

sort of a given and will always be present, then we'd like to find a way to get some credit for the fact that we are actually active and doing something useful.

Then the last thing was for Samaneh to talk to us more about their plan for including ccTLDs. We won't get anymore information about that until next week.

Oh, I should take a step back. I apologize. I don't think I actually said my name. James Galvin, co-chair of this working group. And certainly, my co-chair, Kristine Dorrain, is here with us today, too. Should have made that right in front on this thing and sorry about that.

I think that's it. That's where we are. We did have a couple of people who responded on the mailing list—thank you very much for that—with respect to this categorizing TLDs. Let me look at the attendee list. Let's see. Matthias is not really here with us yet. He had made some comments on the mailing list about a meeting that he went to and I had offered him the opportunity to chat with us here. There's a phone number on the list, though. Do we know who that is, Sue?

SUE SCHULER: I do not. Could you tell us if you're on the phone, ending in 184?

KURT PRITZ: Yeah. This is Kurt. I had to dial in. I'm trying to get in through Zoom but I'll do that later. Thanks.

SUE SCHULER:	Thanks, Kurt.
JIM GALVIN:	Okay. Thank you, Kurt, and welcome. So, I think with that let's just … So, we don't have Matthias to talk more about what he was talking about on the list. Why don't we jump right into talking about the categorizing of TLDs? Unless someone wants to just jump into the middle here based on the mailing list and my notes here, I'll take a few minutes to put a little context around why this was the division that I created, just as a starting point, unless somebody wants to jump in here. I'm not seeing any hands at the moment.
	I think in our discussions to date, I really got to thinking about it. I forget who it was on the mailing list the question: why are we trying to categorize these things? That is an interesting question.
	I think there's a two-part answer to that in my mind anyway and only been thinking about that since the question was asked on the list by Richard I guess it was who asked. I think that—and this is certainly open for discussion here—one of the reasons is because we're trying to find a way to characterize where abuse occurs as much as possible.
	I mean, that has a good side and a bad side. On the up side, we can find a way to split apart the TLDs so that we can focus in on where, in which TLDs, and in which registrars when we get to having registrars on board in this system, then maybe that provides for better targeted mitigation. So that could be a feature and we might appreciate that.

Of course, there's also a downside to all of that. One of the things we have said once before on this call—and I do think about this a lot myself, so I'll mention it here in particular—one of the things that I worry about as we go down this path of looking at where abuse is and adding ccTLDs in particular, is the ccTLDs that are most likely to want to join our little group here and having their stats published are really all about … They do registrant verification and that's not something we really do in the gTLD space and I worry that that will become something that will then get greater influence and attention. So that was one thing. I do see a couple of hands.

Let me just speak to this issue here. The second reason, just for categorizing them this way and the why we do it, is we have actually been talked about the registration rules and been thinking about that as a vector for categorization. It's certainly not the only vector but it is the one we've mentioned a few times on our list here, which is the origin of these four, at least in my mind. But that's certainly a fair question to ask ourselves. Maybe we do want to do this differently or do it both ways. And I open that question for the group to think about.

With that, Kristine, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi, thanks. Yeah. I think that the other thing I wanted to add into the mix is a little bit of a recap from last week where we started talking about why we would and wouldn't categorize. I had put forward the hypothetical and I think the hypothetical still exists. I think Jim and I talked about it a little bit yesterday where the hypothetical that I put

was we believe that probably the restricted both brand or other TLDs, whether they're geo-restricted or whether they're restricted in some other way by other eligibility criteria. We believe that probably what we'll find out is all of those TLDs are very low levels of abuse and not really the focus of abuse efforts or should no be the focus of abuse efforts.

I think part of the thing is that people have a tendency to want to categorize. We have to try to figure out how the DAAR reports can be useful. So one thing I'll put out there for the community to discuss, or this working group to discuss is, is eliminating certain categories a useful metric?

I mean, I'm putting this out there as a hypothesis, but if we can say brands, highly restricted, whatever TLDs just don't see a lot of abuse, is that a way to say, well, we don't have to think about those because we know that they've done something else to mitigate abuse. So really the problem is in open TLDs or whatever. I feel like we probably already know that answer but is there any benefit to making that metric be out there?

And then I think maybe this goes to Richard's point—or maybe it was Rick's point. I'm forgetting … I'm not following the emails in the chat very well. But whoever's point it was about it might not be the end. At that point, we may have to say, okay, of the open TLDs, how can we figure out what the factors are that lead to abuse? Because there's going to be a variety of different factors, and for every factor that may tend to lead to abuse, there might be a mitigating factor. So we've got to really be able to think about. But is weeding out some of the other

TLDs useful? And I'll just stop there and see what other people think about that.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks very much, Kristine. Sam, go ahead, please.

SAM DEMETRIOU: Thanks, Jim and Kristine. Kristine, can I build off what you were just saying there? This is something I've also been kind of thinking a little bit about, just this question about why categorize in the first place and what end does that serve. I think we all discussed this a while back, that the reason ICANN split out—or the suspected reason ICANN split out—new gTLDs from legacy TLDs in the initial reporting was to assess whether spec 11 "works", whether those additional obligations that don't exist in the legacy contracts make for lower amounts of abuse in those TLD's name spaces.

So, I guess the question that pops into my mind when we're breaking it out further is does breaking it out help us or help the readers understand whether certain things work and is that something that we should be striving for?

So, if we break out on the lines of different registration restrictions and the data shows that more restricted TLDs tend to have lower levels of abuse—and Kristine, this gets to the point you were kind of concluding with—what does that mean for the open ones? Does it mean that open TLDs should not be open? I mean, I think we would all argue—especially

EN

I would argue—against that. Open TLDs obviously have a place in the marketplace the same way restricted ones do.

And this kind of gets at the other question, I think, about other mitigating factors such as verification. If we talk about verification, is the conclusion that all TLDs should then do verification? I don't know that that's a realistic thing for us to be thinking about.

I guess, as I've thought about this over the past couple of weeks, especially since Montreal, I am kind of wondering if breaking out the categories along this way really does serve a purpose?

But Kristine, I think your point about should we just take the spec 13, Dot Brands, where's literally only one registrant or you have to be an affiliated entity or trademark licensee to get a domain in that, can we maybe safely eliminate that and kind of cut out some of the noise and make these reports a little bit more targeted? I think that's a really interesting idea for us to think about. I think it would be really interesting to see some of the data cuts with that done. So, sorry. Just a little extra food for thought there.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Sam. I do want to capture that point about it would be good to look at some of these category splits and even the registration split just to see the data for ourselves once. Maybe that would inform our … In fact, any category vector that we decide to use, we should certainly get Samaneh to show us what that data looks like and we can use that to inform our decision—or suggestion—about which way to go. So, thank you. Richard, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

RICHARD ROBERTO: Yeah. Can you guys hear me okay?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, just fine, thanks.

RICHARD ROBERTO: Oh, good, good. Yeah. I just wanted to clarify my question and thank you for raising it and having a discussion. It's really helpful. The question I was kind of trying to get to is in categorizing who is going to benefit from this? Who is the audience and what actions happen as a result of whatever we learn? And if it's just for our own information, then I think we can, as you suggest, ask Samaneh to run different types of categorization vectors and let us see visualizations and find out what's interesting if that's all it is.

If it's to provide the world with canned reports to go and look at DAAR data, I don't know that the categorizations are all that helpful. It kind of depends on what you want to get out of it.

I do think, though, that one of the things that I was struck by in Montreal during the presentation was they didn't seem to have a clear idea of why they were categorizing, only that they were categorizing based on some previous list of categories. So I thought it was useful to ask the question.

I agree that those spec 13 TLDs don't seem to have the kind of abuse risk that the rest of them do but I'm not sure we shouldn't still include them in results.

I'm still struggling with the idea that we're trying to figure out how to make DAAR more useful. I think, as being apart of that, it can't be viewed in isolation if that's … I don't want to sound too harsh but does that sound like I'm being overly critical?

JIM GALVIN: Not of DAAR from my point of view, Richard. I think that you asking the question why we are collecting is a good one because I don't think that we've ever actually asked ourselves that question that directly here. We've sort of danced around the topic a few times, so I do think it's good that you brought it up and we're having this discussion here now as we look at this.

From my point of view, I'll just speak for myself for a moment and then we'll go back to the hand list here. I love that we have so many hands. I don't want to take too much time away from that. The problem is that they presented DAAR with a particular split which was gTLDs, legacy versus new, and that clearly was just not the right model. That was broken right from the start.

So we found ourselves having this discussion of how to slice the data that would be more useful, both for us as registries and of course for the community. And I say of course for the community because it's based on the principle that DAAR is here to stay and it's not going away. So our best bet here is not to try to kill it, per se, but let's figure out how

EN

to turn it into something that at least is informative and doesn't hurt us so badly as gTLDs versus—new versus legacy. So that's why we got into this categorization discussion and now we're going to continue that in a bit more formal way here as go forward. So thanks for that. Kurt, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks very much. Much of what I have to say has been made redundant by the comments in the chat. But first, as far as the categorization goes, I think there's a missing one here and that would be community TLDs. So that's a category of TLD created by the guidebook where each of those TLDs that self-identified as categories added restrictions to their agreement. So that may or may not play a role.

But having said that, I agree with a lot of what has been said here, that if we were to do one report or a few reports that are based on this sort of categorization, I'm concerned there would be … And then admitting that this is the first step, now we have to, as Kristine alluded to, dive into the open category and see what's going on there, I'm concerned that others might say that's going to take a long time and TLD abuse or DNS abuse is a very serious topic. Let's just implement some new reactions now on the open TLDs in order to take steps to cure the problem.

So I'm concerned that this interim step of categorization where we can anticipate the outcome would have more detrimental effects than beneficial effects. So that's why I'm for … TLDs are in sort of a

continuum of most restricted to least restricted and then, within that, we see areas of concentration of abuse. So the purpose of the DAAR or the DAAR effort, to me, is to dig into that to uncover what the causal factors between an operating model and abuse are.

As Kristine said and others have said, price is one factor but is it price and geographic location? Is it price and registrars used? Is it price and some other form of communication? Is it price and some tool that the registry or registrar provides to the registrants? We don't know.

I think it's more important to try to get into that right away, rather than taking the step of creating these categories where we think we know what the outcomes are.

Finally, I think it was Sam who said something about the reason for the original configuration in the DAAR report was to see if spec 11 was effective, and I think that would be a really important effort that cannot be determined, even by a modification of DAAR but it really needs to be sort of a [inaudible] for reasons we've discussed here but really needs to be sort of a separate study. What is the effect of spec 11 on abuse?

I'm becoming more and more convinced it's a significant effect, either in the number of abuse cases or the time the abuse cases get to live. So, to recap, I think we should be urging the OCTO to think of TLDs as a continuum and focus on the areas of concentration for TLD abuse and get to the real causal factors of what it is rather than provide this sort of categorization. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks for that, Kurt. I want to offer a brief comment about that. I mean, I agree with everything that you said. I have a concern and my worry is that … I want to tie together a couple of threads that have gone on here in the chat and some words from other folks.

I think that our problem, as registries, our shared problem here is … I think it was Kristine used the phrase "implied solutions". There are going to be implied solutions that come from any categorization vector that we choose. And I think that that's the fear that we all have.

Right now, the categorization vector that we're focused on is by registration model and I think that's primarily because it was the easiest thing to latch on to and it's very straightforward to see what that is, and I think as you just said, Kurt, TLDs naturally fall into a most restrictive to less restrictive spectrum of registration model things.

So, the implied solution that comes from that particular categorization is that there is going to be a drive towards a preferred baseline registration model and I think that there are quite a number of us that would not like that. We would not appreciate that the default has to be some kind of verification in order to get past that.

But I think that regardless of what vector we choose for categorizing and breaking out the data, we have to have a replacement I think for new versus legacy and that's really the issue. And if it's not registration model, we have to come up with something else that's at least informative and then we are going to have to have a story for the implied solutions that come from whatever that vector is and I think

that's the way we need to approach this. Okay, over to the call list here. JC, go ahead, please.

JC VIGNES: Can you hear me okay?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, please, go ahead.

JC VIGNES: I'm going to be [harsh] just for a second and say that I don't think it's for us to find a solution. I want to caution this in the sense that categories can be a rabbit hole. We've been working on some categorization since way before the AGB and ICANN didn't want to recognize that. We all know that [inaudible] became a category after application, not before, because it was much easier to treat them as a [inaudible] and to think about what could be before the application.

Now, speaking of [inaudible]—and I'm not picking on anyone here but, yes, I do think that we should try and dispense with the noise if the only reason that we may remember that the article from the mailing side when the DAAR report went out was the title, the headline, was brands are non-compliant, which I think we can all agree is silly and shows that there is a huge problem with DAAR.

The problem is that, as this conversation [shows], categories are extremely difficult. And you know that ccTLDs are a pet peeve of mine because abuse, in some ccTLDs, is ripe. [TK] is a ccTLD but it's the

number one TLD where abuse is common because they give away domains for free. Not cheap, just free. And we know that [TK] will never have to abide by spec 11.

So, if our goal here is to show that we are doing a good job but the Internet as a whole has some abuse, I don't think it's for us to say we're the good guys and we're going to define what is good and what is bad. I would much rather [have ICANN] work on their model because, at the end of the day, ICANN is pushing this on us than for us to find solutions for ICANN, which judging by this conversation and other discussions online, is an extremely difficult exercise. I'm sorry it was longwinded but I don't really have a clear answer, only to say that I don't think we should define categories because I don't think we can.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. Maxim, go ahead, please.

MAXIM ALZOBA: I have a few points. First of all, just not having any kind of data and trying to understand what correlations are is pointless from the data mining perspective. And what we are doing now, we are just guessing how to dissect the data sets.

Second thing. I think that the idea of cheap domains are bad is misleading because bad guys, they are … One second. Because the bad guys, they are going for the simplest and cheapest registration. I mean, if all of us make our domains $100 and one particular TLD makes $50, most bad guys will go there because it's cheaper.

Also, the situation where, as examples of good domains, everybody shows us some, I'd say, very not cheap domains, saying that, yes, they have reactions, yes, I agree if you have to provide [inaudible] license, you will ensure that you don't have abuse but at what cost? It's millions of dollars. It's not $10 or $100.

And the second thing is that, effectively, the situation with DAAR is that ICANN shows us that formally they have good will, good ideas, but in reality, behind DAAR we see cybersecurity companies who are [inaudible] e partially clients—I mean, not clients, they're contractors of some governmental agencies and ultimately they push for the right to choose which bits to [inaudible], effectively.

So, we need to be careful saying that we have to provide the model for ICANN. They [created statistical tool]. They need to find correlations and it should be repeatable—I mean, the data has to be accessible which is not what we see now. So we cannot check if the information they provide us true or not, verifiable. And the process should be transparent because currently we have a situation where ICANN doesn't think they use a funnel of some data flowing from [inaudible]. We have a very dangerous point where ICANN assumes that all data they receive is true and basically we are trying to discuss how to comply with what they inserted there. It's, I'd say, wrong on many levels.

So, we need to accurately point those items and to ensure that we are not hostages of the current not working and effectively I'd say not good for us model where they created something, marketed it as universal solution, and we have to explain that we're good guys. It doesn't seem to work. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:

So, thank you, Maxim. I guess I want to call out one comment that seems kind of consistent. Consistent thread going on here, both from what you said and when I'm looking at the chat and listening to what's going on here.

I admit that my primary motivation for myself for proposing categories was the belief that because ICANN started with categories, which was legacy versus new, that the best path forward was for us to propose something different to them as a replacement categorization.

But you know, maybe that's not the answer here. Maybe there's no reason for categories. I think that we're sort of coming around to that it feels like, as we question whether registration models are appropriate because we kind of know the answer. More restrictive registration means less abuse. I mean, the data just seems to bear that out and we're only going to end up focusing on open anyway. Maybe we don't have categories.

Another reason is because any other kind of vector seems a little problematic to get at the data to do the categorization. I mean, it would be a little bit challenging to create the categorization based on price, for example, because you don't really have ready access to that in marketing programs and the effect that that has, that kind of thing. And that really is kind of an issue in all of this, too.

So, I just want to put that out there. Maybe categorizing is the wrong thing and we should be driving towards not doing that, and instead just focus on the fact that abuse is there. We know it. It's okay. Let's figure

out how to acknowledge mitigation instead. And maybe that's a good thing.

In that respect, maybe the registrations models is one form of mitigation. So it would be good to have other forms of mitigation to show how the abuse rates in various mitigation methods … Maybe that's a path.

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

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Jim. Rick Wilhelm, Verisign, for the record. So, actually, kind of a good segue into a comment that I had been sort of sitting on here for a while. A couple of points. One, the categories, whatever we come up with, are going to need to be objective and easily definable in that they should be sort of self-evident and traceable back to documents and such. I'm not exactly sure if the ones that we have sketched out here on paper are right now exactly that.

Secondly, to your point there about the categories, I think that categories can add value but really it's in the notion of comparing TLDs—individual TLDs—or how they rate in terms of abuse within their categories, sort of in the same way that let's say you're talking about within an Olympic event like swimming or track and field, in the same way they have different kinds of races or different kinds of age groups in youth swimming, where you swim against people that are in your same age, in your same age group. In the same way that different abuse rates might matter or are comparable within different types of TLDs.

If you've got a brand TLD, it might have certain levels of abuse that might seem great if it was compared against an open TLD, but against a brand TLD, that might actually be very, very high and unnatural levels of abuse.

So, I think that part of what the challenge here is that, right now, we're using categories to compare TLD categories against one another, when in fact what it should be doing is using the categories to compare TLDs to one another within the categories.

So, I think that right now the notion of categories is actually being misplaced because it should be used to classify TLDs and show how the TLDs compare to one another within their category. But I think that right now one of our challenges is that the TLDs aren't being named individual or even anonymously where it's TLDs one, two, and three within, for example, the brand category and showing how their abuse rates differ within those levels.

So, this is right now I think the problem is that the TLD categories are used to being compared between category but actually that's where they are not comparable because they are fundamentally and categorically different. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that, Rick. I think that your last comment there made perfect sense to me and as you were saying it, it was like, well, of course that's the answer.

To me, our concern here with any vector and categorization is the implied solutions that come from it. That's also coming from a base assumption which is that the idea of the categories is to identify mitigation methods that we all need to apply, and the obvious mitigation method in this case is restricted registration. But that's sort of the wrong path here.

I think what you're saying is—and I actually agree with it as I listen to you say it. You're exactly right. The purpose of the categories is to be able to look inside an individual category and see what you can do there to maybe talk about different kinds of mitigation methods. It's not about comparing categories. That's the wrong kind of model.

So, the implied solution needs to be an implied solution inside the category, not between categories. I actually agree that we need to make that distinction. And I hope that wasn't confusing for anyone in that as I tossed all of that out there. JC, is that a new hand? If so, go ahead or take it down.

So, I think we've gotten to a new place in this discussion here, at least I have, so let me kind of assert this here. I'm going to leverage off of what Rick said in particular.

I guess I've always thought that categories are useful but I was worried about trying to pick the right categories. I think that given the idea that the messaging that we need to go with this is not that categories are bad … So even an open category is not a bad category. It's just a category and you need to look inside that category to consider what's going on in it.

Then, to get to something that Donna had said in the chatroom there. ICANN has talked a few times about wanting to bring registrars into this system and we should facilitate that and do what we can to make that happen, too, because part of the problem, part of the concern with open TLDs in particular is that puts a lot of flexibility, if you will, on the part of registrars to also have behavior that's, shall we just say, undesirable and it would be good to be able to call that out. You just want to see that. You want to see where the abusive domains are and which registrar they're in and just make that information available. I think that that's the path about open TLDs, especially open TLDs that have proactive anti-abuse programs. I think that's important.

This is where we get back to this idea that there are other forms of mitigation than just registration model. It doesn't have to be restrictive registration. You just have to be able to deal with abuse as you see it and as it comes up, and being able to get some credit for that I think also counts, and then you just have DAAR message all of that and make it available to the community. Let me pause there and let Kristine jump in. Go ahead, please.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi, thanks, Jim. This is really fascinating and I really appreciate everyone's engagement today. I feel like, in some ways, if we want to talk about categories, this idea of comparing within a category, not across categories, I feel like that comes full circle to what we said at the very, very beginning of this conversation.

EN

Again, going back to the hypothesis, if we look at the types of … If we put the TLDs, if we categorize them, which you would have to do in order to compare within a category, I think we would probably still end up with restricted brands, zero abuse. We don't even consider those. None of them have abuse. Maybe there's one false positive or something. Geos, maybe there's a handful or whatever. Restricted/other, there might be a handful. But between them, it's like a matter of ones and two, not orders of magnitude difference.

So, ultimately, at the end of the day, we're still talking only comparing open TLDs and how you compare within that. That's how we started this conversation.

So, I appreciate the fact that we have maybe come around to this idea of comparing within a TLD but that's kind of where we started. We started with this idea that, by categorizing, you're almost taking everything that we pretty much know to not be a problem out of the equation and leaving the open TLDs, and from there, we'd be categorizing within—we'd be looking at open TLDs and staying within that bucket. And then from there, we don't know more. That's the problem. That's how we started this conversation of within open. And then maybe that's where we get to this conversation of what we're doing to mitigate because you've already weeded out everyone that's doing preventative mitigation is what I'm calling pre-mitigation. That's not a clear term. It's just I'm trying to distinguish between preventative actions and remedial actions.

So, I think that's my concern. I don't know that we've really gotten anyplace different, but maybe I'm being negative and I don't mean to be because maybe I'm just confused. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that, Kristine. I guess I agree with in principle, but I do think that we have better … We have a better understanding of where we are and why. Maybe I'll phrase it that way. So maybe we're not necessarily anywhere different, per se, but I think it's very clear where we are now and why we're there and that's why it feels different to me. So that was just my characterization in that sense.

I actually had another point that I wanted to make based on something you said, but I forget what it is, so let's go to Maxim. He has his hand up.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Another item about being cautious. We're talking about pre-mitigation, or effectively, forbidden registrations following certain patterns of domain names. If we have this as a standard, guess how much time passes until you have letters like [inaudible] or we add to some [inaudible] of malware the list of your premium names and you will not be able to register any.

So, we need to be quite careful because basically currently all those efforts are two items. First, you see [inaudible] registrations with some pattern and you try to understand. If it's not for good, then most probably you try to prevent it.

Second, you have reports of some malware having the domain names as potential list of communication points. So, we don't have powers of real police. We cannot understand if something is going to be used for good or bad before it is used.

So, we might say that, yes, hypothetically it's a good idea if we are able to predict future but I wouldn't say that it's a good item to make it … I'm not sure how we make it a strong point.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Maxim. All good points. Let me just keep going down the hand queue here. Donna, you're up next.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. Can you hear me okay?

JIM GALVIN: Yes, just fine, thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thank you. I'm not sure whether this really fits into the conversation but it seems to me that it's … OCTO has a lot of resources available to them and it's surprising that they haven't done the level of analysis that we're talking about here, the cause-and-effect type thing. So if you've got one type of abuse, what are the actions it can take to mitigate that? It just seems that we're absent some really good

EN

information that ICANN has a lot of resources that it's surprising that they haven't undertaken that analysis in some way.

But what I was wondering, when we did the audit, when compliance did the audit, there are a set of questions that they access in the RFI and there was a subset of those questions that we wouldn't answer. Or, not we. Some did answer, some didn't. But we don't know who did and who didn't and we don't know what the answers were.

I think the questions that we were concerned about answering were those that were outside the spec 11(b). So that is the question about what action do you take to respond to abuse? And we haven't answered those questions. And I wonder whether it's worthwhile within the stakeholder group to have a look at that and see if we should revisit that and do that ourselves, so we have a better understanding of when somebody gets abuse in their TLD, what's the action that they take and how does that mitigate that? I wonder if we can do that analysis or research within the stakeholder group and whether there would be any value in doing that because maybe it might be helpful in what we're trying to get to the bottom of here.

If I understand it correctly, we're trying to understand whether solutions that are being proposed are going to actually fix the abuse problem. But what we're seeing from the rest of the community is they just want these blanket solutions without understanding whether that's actually going to solve the problem or not. So maybe that's something we could undertake as stakeholder group. So I'll just leave that out there.

But also we're going into a call with Goran in about 13 minutes. One of the first questions we have for him is "what's his takeaway about the discussions on DNS abuse". And to the extent that anybody on this call wants to raise part of the discussion that we're having here about we are concerned about blanket solutions for problems that we really don't understand, aren't clearly defined yet, I think it would be worthwhile for Goran to hear that. Sorry, Jim, if I'm off track but I think potentially we could do something within the stakeholder group by way of a survey to try to get to what action are we taking when we have abuse in our TLD and maybe that would help this conversation. Thanks, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Thanks, Donna. I think you make an important point. I want to frame that back in a way that I understand it and give you a chance to respond to respond directly before we move on in the queue here. Sam made a comment in the chatroom which sort of applies here.

In my view about this, I've always been concerned about—and I've sued this question before—what problem are we trying to solve? The reality is abuse happens and there's nothing we can do about it and what I see in DAAR is that we're being held accountable for the fact that there is the presence of abuse. To me, that's the storyline that has to change and that's why I have always focused on being able to show that mitigation is active.

Registration models are certainly one mitigation method and it's useful to recognize that and maybe we need to call it out for that, for what it is, but that should turn into an obligation on open TLDs.

And the problem with open TLDs is you just don't know which domain names have been discovered to be active from one day to the next. So, as Sam was kind of saying in the chatroom there, the question is can you get DAAR in any way, can you display the fact that although you might have 10% abuse two days in a row, that might be two different ten percents is the problem. And there's no reflection of that. And that's actually the good news. The fact that it's different twice over is good news. The problem is something other than registrations and there's no way to reflect that and show that.

To me, that's why we look for mitigation and try to demonstrate that we are being reactive and that would be a good discussion for us to get to. I'm sorry for jumping in and adding all of that. Let me give you a chance, Donna, if you want to add to that or say more and then we'll go back to the queue.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Jim. I think, just in response, I'm aware that the Business Constituency is about to send another letter to ICANN calling for lots of blanket solutions to the DNS abuse problem. Maybe we need to take the opportunity to have a call with the Business Constituency and just have this open conversation so that maybe they can educate them a little bit more about what abuse is and the challenges that you do have. So, along the lines of what you just explained, Jim.

I think we have really good discussions amongst ourselves and maybe we need to find ways to have that conversation more readily with other parts of the community. I think we can do that. We shouldn't just rely

on three times a year when we have ICANN meetings. Maybe we can be a little bit more proactive in engaging with other parts of the community in a kind of education discussion mode. Thanks, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. We'll have to take to our list here the suggestion to meet with the Business Constituency. Me, personally, I like that plan but see what can do about that going forward here. Kurt, you've been waiting patiently. Go ahead, please.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks very much. I've been thinking about Rick's suggestion about analysis within each category and how that can be helpful. I'm viewing this as more of a management problem than a calculation or arithmetic or statistical problem. And that is how do we manage the discussion of DAAR and abuse statistics in a way that will lead to constructive solutions and avoid hasty ineffective and costly and detrimental solutions.

Rick's idea to do the analysis within each group sort lays out the next steps for people, so that if we just did an analysis by these categories, as everybody on the call I think agrees, that it would point to open TLDs as a source of abuse. And what we want to do is not just jump at that whole category but then do some further analysis.

So, Rick's idea naturally provides the next step in that analysis and would steer the community, the whole set of people looking at the

DAAR reports, to expect a next step in the analysis rather than jumping to solutions right away.

So, I think Rick's idea of analysis within each category would be a useful management tool for us in how to manage the steps going forward. And just to draw that to its logical conclusion, maybe the paper we need to write is to lay out a battle plan for mitigating abuse or reducing abuse by a multi-step process where we do this analysis, then we take it to the next steps, then we test mitigation measures, see if they're helpful or not or it's just a game of whack-a-mole, to lay it out with the argument that this is really the fastest way to go about it, too, rather than to jump at solutions. Those two things. Thanks very much.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks for that, Kurt. I guess that's still … For me, if I understand correctly, suggesting it kind of reframes where we are at the moment anyway. We're sort of exploring this question of categories and how to split apart and understand the TLDs and where the abuse is occurring. In theory, I think that's supposed to lead us to what kinds of mitigation would be most appropriate or what kinds of things we might change, do differently, in order to reduce abuse. I guess that's kind of the discussion we're trying to have here is what is that battle plan? What are the next steps for ourselves in this open category? Maxim, you had your hand up but it went away. Okay. Oh, your hand is up again. Go ahead, Maxim, you get the last word here for the moment and then I think we'll try to wrap up here.

MAXIM ALZOBA: Speaking about the ways registries react, we had these conversations. We talked about these in details and it's in security framework because trying to find the way which is universally acceptable for all TLDs is extremely hard because we have different jurisdictions and we cannot all be measured by what happens in United States, for example. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you, Maxim. All right. Let's see. Where are we? Next week, we're meeting with Samaneh. I had believed that we need to be making suggestions to Samaneh, and ideally I'd like for us to bring to the table next week when we talk to Samaneh a proposal for other ways to slice and dice the data, so that we can begin to look at what falls out and do two things, which Richard was talking about in the chat at one point. We do have a desire to see what falls out in terms of which slice and dicing of the data makes the abuse information look interesting and useful to the community.

So that naturally feeds into what do we want the stock report to be looking like at all times? So, we're trying to find a way to slice and dice this so that it's informative to the community.

I don't know that we've come to any conclusion here at the moment yet, so I'd like to suggest that we try to continue this discussion on the list. We do need to come up with specific suggestions for Samaneh and I'd like to give them to her next week, so that she can take that with her and develop all of that for the next time that we meet with her. Let's get some other slices across the data. Let's see what it looks like. And we

need some suggestions for that so that we can begin to inform ourselves and what we want to go going forward. So, that's one thing.

I think the other thing I want to come back to is leverage a little bit off of one of the things that Maxim and Kurt had just said, too, what I worry about in this discussion about abuse is this expectation, especially from the Business Constituency Group, that abuse should be zero. I just don't think that that's a goal but I think that that's an unstated expectation of the community at large and that's the origin of why I always like to ask the question what problem are we trying to solve? If you don't start from the premise that abuse should be zero, you accept the fact that it's going to be present, then you look at this whole dynamic somewhat differently. And I think that's really kind of where we are and I think that's an important part of our messaging here. Somehow, we have to do better at making it clear that that's the problem space here. Abuse is never going to be zero. So you need to look at the problem differently if you want to find solutions and report on it effectively. I guess that's kind of where I'm coming from in this.

So, we [need] on the mailing list. I'll try to … I'm not sure we've changed the categories in any way but we'll wait for the transcript to come together so that other folks can see that and then I'll try to capture some thoughts. I'd welcome anyone else capturing some thoughts, too. Let's see if we can't make some explicit proposals for Samaneh to go look at data and slice it up for us and bring it to us, so that we can look at it and then begin to think about what the next steps are.

This is the battle plan idea that we've heard talked about a few times where we're going to have an open category. What's the next step in

that open category? Let's look at what's in there. What other things can we do with this data so that we can begin to see in more detail what's inside all of that?

So, I think, with that, any other last words from anyone, especially Kristine, my co-chair, but anyone really want to jump in and suggest something different, add?

Yes. Thank you, Sam, in the chatroom. "So many factors, so little time." Exactly right. I guess that's why we struggle. And I think it was JC who said the first time around we've been working on categories of TLDs since for as long as we can remember right now. It's a hard problem.

And with that, I have the top of the hour, so thanks, everyone. We'll see you next week with Samaneh. We're adjourned.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]