
SUE SCHULER: Great. Thanks. Okay, Kristine.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Hi, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the weekly Registries Stakeholder Group DAAR Working Group call. This is actually the working group meeting. It's just the Registries today. So, our goal is to try to get some substantive work done. We've done a lot of noodling over the past few weeks.

By the way, I'm Kristine. I'm one of your co-chairs. And Jim, the other co-chair, is also on. So, we've got a full slate of leadership today. We have been noodling for several weeks—really, probably over a month—about how we might think about grouping TLDs in some sort of meaningful fashion that might give us some interesting results in DAAR and that might continue that community dialog about DAAR.

We've all expressed our reservations about it, but I think we've all agreed, more or less, to give it a shot and see what comes of it. John and Samaneh have promised that they can give it a shot. And if it doesn't work out—if it's a failure—we're not going to be held to it. So, we're going to trust that and we're going to try to make a stab at how to group these TLDs.

I've done a couple of things in advance of this call that I hope will help move things along. First of all, in the agenda, I sent a description. Jim and I went through in our prep call and started pre-thinking about how these last call ... We started identifying them as type one and type two

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.

domains. This isn't really ... We're trying to refrain from any sort of characterizations of them in any positive or negative way.

So, the categories that we came up with were one set, the type one domains, are TLDs that do something pre-registration to review the registrant, or their services, or their organization, or that they are who they say they are, etc. We've taken a stab at what TLDs we think—what sort of criteria might qualify a TLD for that group or category of type one domains.

Our first order of business today is to go through that and see if we more or less agree or if we want to make any tweaks. Remember, the purpose of this is so that we all have a great common understanding of what's going to go in which bucket.

The other type are the ones—kind of how we view the traditional domains—post-registration. Anybody can have a domain. We're going to do the typical WHOIS verification or accuracy that everyone's required to do. But more than that, we're just going to let everyone have a domain, and then we're going to do some things later to try to mitigate abuse. And those things could be proactive, or they could be reactive, or they could be both. But either way, if you let everybody in the door, more or less, at the beginning, that would qualify as a type two domain.

Again, we feel like if you can look down a little bit on the list—and maybe, Sue, you could ... Yeah. Perfect. One of the things we wanted to start thinking about—not that we're going to do this now—is as we're filling this chart out, what sorts of subcategories might just make

themselves readily apparent, and then what concerns might we have with those.

We are trying to also capture that work as we go. In case we do decide to make another cut of the data later, we don't have to re-go through the chart again. Chances are, we will have to re-go through the chart again, but at least we will have a starting point, and we will have given some thought to some further subcategories. So, while subcategories are not a critical component of the work we're doing today, it is something that Jim and I were thinking would be great to have on the back of our minds, so that we don't have to reinvent the wheel again in month or two when we're ready to take another cut of the data.

So, that being said, let's run through type one and type two. Let me really quickly ... And I want to ... Sue, just toggle over to the ... I'm going to put the spreadsheet in the chat. Don't start editing it yet. If you would toggle over to the spreadsheet, Sue, just so people can see and get some context for what it is—the work product that we're imagining.

We're imagining that every one of us could go away over the next week and update this Google sheet with whether or not you think a TLD is type one or type two. And we would ask that the participants—because while this call might not be fully-packed, we know that there are people on this group that have their fingers in a lot of different TLDs ... We've got backend registry service providers. We've got consultants. We've got big portfolio TLD operators.

So, we can go in and fill out, we think, probably 50% of these. The registry service providers, we're going to be really sensitive to you and

whether or not you feel like you want to guess on behalf of the people you support. But let's talk about that as well. The idea would be to just literally go through and type in "type one" or "two."

I'm going to scroll down a little, Sue, if you would go to scroll down just a bit, to where you see the Amazon Registry Services domains. I've sorted them by TLD manager. I would just put type one next to .bot, because Amazon validates .bot domains. So, theoretically, if you're looking at it real time, you should see the fact that I just updated the .bot line. Or maybe not. Okay. That's super weird. But the Google sheet does show that I did type in "type one" in that column D. And then, in column E, you could write in the subcategory for that TLD, if you know it or if you feel comfortable sharing it.

So, that is what we're thinking about doing. Sue, if you'd toggle back to the original, that would be wonderful—just the agenda page, I think, is what I'm thinking of. I'm going to put another link in the chat. That second link is basically to the same thing that Sue has on her screen, but in case anybody wants to get into that doc make some comments on the fly while we're chatting ... I know a lot of you are really great about adding commentary as we go, so I wanted to make that available to people as well, so it doesn't just have to be me talking and taking notes.

So, let's dive into the type one. I'd love to get the show of hands and see what people think about these categories. I'm going to run through them really quickly while you're thinking. So, the first sub-type option, which I was thinking about ... Jim and I were in agreement that these all belong, but we wanted to check in with you on some other sub-issues.

So, we've got this idea of validation, which in my mind is something like the registrant account or credentials are confirmed—something more than minimal WHOIS accuracy checks. And then, there was verification, which is a registrant or credentials affirmatively checked in a way that's doing some sort of follow-up or making sure that they're a member of some other form of account. Maybe you've logged someone through their PayPal account, or some other way to make sure they are who they say they are.

One question for the group that I would love to ask is do people think there's really a substantive difference between validation and verification? Amazon, in our own minds, we do treat those as separate things. But other people might not, and we might start splitting hairs if we separate those out. Then, the next category is a membership situation, which would be your verified membership, such as .bank, maybe, or a .pharmacy situation.

And then, there are use restrictions. This is one where Jim and I really chatted over the time about. We wanted to make sure that this group had some chance to mull over this idea of use restrictions. So, Jim and I came down to the ... I'm going to speak for Jim too, and you can correct me if I'm wrong. We came down to the idea that as long as the use is some sort of affirmative tick box—"I agree to these special use scenarios," and not just a wishful thinking on behalf of the registry operator—we think that that should qualify for a type one. And then, if it turns out that that data's too muddy, we can always separate it out later or ask Samaneh to move it.

And then, it as really important to us to include “other” because we don’t know, necessarily, what everyone’s business model is. If you are doing something, or your client is doing something, that you think is actually another validation or verification thing, we’d like to include that there. One example—and maybe it’s its own subtype—would be .brands. Should that be “other?” Should that be its own drop-down that you’re already limited by either .brand or code of conduct exemption? So, hopefully that’s given people something to think about. It looks like Rick is ready and willing to jump into the fray, so go ahead, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks Kristine. Rick Wilhelm, Verisign. Just to start off, I’m not sure if I’m quite parsing the difference between validation and verification. Maybe you or somebody else could work to help illuminate the difference between those two. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Yeah. This is my distinction, so I’ll explain to you from Amazon’s perspective. It really is specific to .bot, which is why I’m really asking does it matter? So, for .bot, we’re going to validate that the customer is actually an Amazon customer and has an account with us. This is not a secret. You go and try to register .bot domain, you find all this out. So, there’s a validation component that checks who the registrant is and does that.

And then, from there, if you want to register a .bot name, we essentially say ... We’re in an LRP right now because we’re doing a bunch of beta testing, and we basically say, “You have to have a chatbot in order to

get a .bot domain.” And in order to even get the domain, you click through and you go through this verification step, where we verify that you have a chatbot. There’s some different technical means and then some manual means by which we check and make sure you have a chatbot before you get to register or keep the domain name.

For us, validation and verification, therefore, are two separate steps. That may be information people don’t want to share. It may also be just to fine of a nuance. So, that’s why I’m throwing it out there, to see if other people think it’s meaningful or not. Rick, does that answer your question? And if so, do you have any other questions as well?

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Kristine. Let me just pressure test my understanding there. It sounds like validation is very much oriented around the registrant account. And then, the verification goes beyond the account and into other capabilities that the registrant might be bringing or providing, or maybe it has something to do with their hosting. But it sounds like it goes beyond just the account credentials. Is that what it means?

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Yes. That’s what the proposal means. Yes. Again, I’m not wedded to it. I’ll throw another use case out there, for example. This is one that came up under the use restrictions category. I see a little bit of chat about that, and we’ll get to that in a moment. For instance, I’m thinking of Google’s .new. I know Google usually joins this call, and maybe they’re willing to share or not. Oh, I see Google on. Yay. I’m thinking of Google’s

.new. They have absolutely use restrictions on their .new TLD. We've all received them. We've seen them in the marketing, etc. It's not a secret.

They may choose to say that that's a use restriction. They may choose to categorize that as a verification or a validation, kind of depending on how their use case works. If they actually affirmatively go and talk to the customer and say, "Make sure that you've got this. We're going to check. We've got some processes in place to make sure that when you register this name, you're pointing it to this service that .new requires." If you're doing that, then Google may decide that that's a verification.

And so, that's another layer of how we might track that. But I'd be interested to find out if it's more than just a couple of TLDs that might be impacted by this discrepancy. And furthermore ... I'm really sorry. My kids are also home with the snow day, and despite the closed door, I'm sure you're hearing them. There may be too fine of hairs. We may wish to just parse that as far as a use restriction. I'm not sure. Go ahead, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Kristine. That distinction makes sense to me then. I understand what it says. We might want to change the parenthetical after "verification" to help show that it's other capabilities beyond that are which associated with the account or credentials, because your explanation was actually a fair bit richer. Also, I would just offer that if you'd like to send your kids to school, I will take one of those snow days off your hands, and I will go home. So, that offer is out there. Just let me know. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: I appreciate that offer. I desperately want my kids to not be here. We're on day two, and my dryer ran for 10 hours yesterday. So, it's definitely been a hassle. I don't know. I'm seeing two additional people in the Google Doc with me, which is that second Google Doc linked just above Kurt's comment. So, I want to capture—I think your wording was better than mine, Rick—other capabilities beyond ... Do you mind refilling in what you just said?

JIM GALVIN: I'm seeing only view availability of the document, Kristine. I don't know about others.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Okay. I'm going to fix it so everybody gets editing. Oh, it says just "link." I thought I changed that. I'm so sorry. Okay. I'm fixing it now. Okay. I see more people in the doc. Let me know if everybody can now edit. Editing works for Sam. Great. Jim, go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry. That was a hand to fix the editing problem.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Got it. Okay. Thanks. So, does anyone else have any questions or concerns about verification versus validation? I'm a little concerned that it's going to be a nuance, but I think it could be really useful information if we have it. I certainly think that people should just do the best they

can with guessing at which category or criteria is the one that applies.

Jim. New hand. Go ahead.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. Thanks, Kristine. Jim Galvin from Afiliis. I just wanted to add a little bit to your whole discussion about the pre-registration stuff, and maybe some extra words about other ... When Kristine and I were talking about this yesterday, I think that one of the things that we've struggled with ... We've had quite a number of conversations about the different way to make these groupings come out. One of the things that's interesting is it's hard to know what groupings are useful and which ones are not. In some sense, we're just making a guess here.

But two things occurred to me in this process of trying to come up with groupings. One is I'm pretty sure we don't want too many. We just have to figure out what is the small number that actually makes sense. Maybe being more generous and broad with a particular grouping is better than trying to make this little nuanced distinction. In a way, this is kind of test to see, "Well, let's just see what we can get from the group." Validation, verification ... Okay. It's a useful distinction. Let's find out what kind of statistics we get from it, and let's see if people want to work with it. And then, you have the broader categories of anything membership-based, anything use-based.

"Other" was just a way of ... This is just four things to start with, and we're very worried about getting all tongue-tied, if you will, or wrapped up, or ratholing, so to speak, in a discussion about what the groupings

ought to be. So, since we've had so many before, we've never really come to a consensus position.

One way to think about the "other" is if you don't like these, and you really do want something else, actually putting something in there and telling us that would be a helpful thing, because Kristine and I will look at that, we will actually collect all of those others. If you want to say "other," please just offer something else. And don't feel obliged to have to map into these things if they don't seem to make sense to you. We'll try to bring those together and make sense of them.

And try to keep it to a small number of these things. I think that's key. So, maybe that's a point worth discussing. If people think that there's real value in a lot of groupings, we should probably have that discussion. But the most important thing is start with something, and then let Samaneh do a slice across the data, and then see what we get. And then, we can make a final decision about how we want to propose to really do this and have them do it. So, I hope that that's helpful. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, Jim. 100% agree, and I really want to highlight what you said last, which is it's literally about making that first cut and trying to collect a little additional information while we go, in order to get Samaneh going on a new way to cut the data.

I'm going to offer a friendly amendment to the last thing you said, Jim, which is, "And then, we'll make a final decision." I don't think we actually will. I think it's going to take a couple of iterations. And so, I

know our goal is to get to a final iteration, and one that's reproduceable, and one that ICANN can rely on, but that's pretty far down the road. So, I definitely want to support everything Jim just said about really trying to just get the first cut of data and see what we can find out from there. Rick, you're next. Go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Thank you, Kristine. Jumping, and following in Jim's comment there, I'm wondering if the membership is sufficiently different from validation. Maybe I could offer that for discussion about that, because I'm wondering if that's too fine-grained of a distinction—so, something maybe for the group to discuss.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

All right. I'm very open to that. Kurt, did you want to respond to that or were you jumping in the queue per my invitation?

KURT PRITZ:

First of all, I want to apologize for my voice. Second, I was jumping into the queue for your invitation, but to say two things. One is with regard to verification and validation, there's a third category, too, and that's certification. I think that we could leave it up to the registry operator, because they might characterize their registry as one of those things. They might have a reason for choosing one of those words. We could make one column that says, "Validation, verification, or certification," and instead of putting a checkmark, we could put a VA, a VE, or a CE, or something like that and let the registry choose.

Of course, I agree with Rick. In a way, they're sort of the same thing. But also, some people are very passionate about discerning between the two or three different types. So, maybe we could save them all but just make it one column and let the registry self-identify what they are, because I think we want to get the registries to agree to our identification for them. I think I'll leave it at that point. Thanks very much.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks a lot, [Kurt]. I think that's a really good point. Let's talk about both of those things really briefly, with Jim's caveat to not get too far in the weeds. What I'm hoping is that it's not a tick box but it's self-fill-in, so you can decide what you are. And I would love to explore a little bit more about Rick's idea for how we might merge a description for membership and validation. I'd love to see, maybe, a wording example of that, Rick, if you have that in mind.

And then, [Kurt], could you give us an example? I don't want to put any TLDs on the hot seat, but I'm having a hard time imagining how that's different from a membership. And so, I would love to know if anybody has an example of how a certification might be different.

Okay. Rick is suggesting, on the membership to validation merge, which I think is great. [Kurt], if you think of an example on what a certification might look like, I'm not opposed to adding it. I just would like to provide a parenthetical like we've done so that the people filling in the table know what we're referring to when we talk about a certification, unless, [Kurt]—and I'm going to put some words in your mouth, since you have

a sore throat and maybe don't want to talk too much. Are you talking about certification as another merge of membership that doesn't intersect with validation?

Rick is imagining an intersection between validation and membership. Are you imagining a different intersection between membership and certification?

KURT PRITZ:

No, I'm not. I'm just talking about how the registries self-identify themselves. Somewhere in the recesses of my mind there's a TLD called a certified TLD or something like that. So, I don't think we should ... I think we should make it as flexible as possible, how the TLDs categorize themselves, and then we'll find out that, like Rick said, they kind of merge. The effects of them kind of merge.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Yeah. Okay, Jim. Go ahead. Once this is exhausted, we'll get to the chat, I think, and talk about use for a minute. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. Thanks. I want to touch on something that [Kurt] is saying. I think it's behind what's going on here, too. You used the phrase, [Kurt], a couple times about TLDs self-identifying—registries self-identifying. I want to just put out there for discussion a bit of caution about that concept and that idea, because I think about what we're doing here and what the long-term effects are going to be.

Whatever we decide are our groupings here, these groupings need to be something that are an administrative opportunity to manage. So, ideally there's as little subjectivity as possible in whatever we decide these groupings are. We're struggling at the moment with this bit of a nuance. We're going to have that discussion, and hopefully we'll be able to, as we come out of that discussion, clearly articulate in black and white an objective definition where there's just no question whether a TLD belongs in one group or another.

Down the road, what I'm imagining is that we need to be thinking about the fact that these groupings is going to be something that ICANN is going to have to manage and record, in the same way that they keep records about TLDs today—what kind of thing that you are—that's just another blank in the form, the template that they maintain. As TLDs change business models or change registration models, it's just something else ICANN will maintain and they'll tick the right box and it'll be there, because you want for DAAR to be able to be automatically generated by these particular categories in a database.

Ideally, the most ideal place for us to get to, I hope, is objective definitions so that all of this is automatic and we don't actually need a process for deciding what category or grouping you're in—so that it's just a given and we all agree. Otherwise, you've got to build processes around appealing, and discussions, and review.

That's part of what's in my mind also, when I think about a small number of categories. You have too many categories, then you're drawing too many fine lines, and then it gets interesting to group them. And then, of course, there's just the issue about what the data shows or

doesn't show. That's the next step. We've got to start looking at data to see what comes out of that.

But that's a little bit of a caution that I have in my mind about this idea about self-selection. I'd prefer that we think of this more in terms of administrative tasks and it's obvious where you belong. That's the way, at least speaking personally, I'd like to see these groupings get towards if possible. Thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks, Jim. I think your point actually kind of deals with what's been going on in the chat a bit, which I'm going to circle to now. I added a little bit of ... Under type one, pre-registration review, I wrote RO-affirmative conduct, just as a placeholder.

We can definitely look at what we might want to say there to get to that idea of it's not just a matter of somebody says, "Gosh, we really hope that you're a lawyer when you get a whatever TLD." It's that somebody's checked something, or looked up something, or done something, or at least affirmatively ticked a box that says, "I promise that I'm a lawyer," not just, "I generally agree to the terms." I think that's where you were getting, and I think I agree with you. Of course, on this cut, we're never going to know that for sure. It's really just our best guess, and we'll see how it shakes out at the end.

But in the chat, where there's a little bit ... I'm going to scroll back up where [Kurt] started talking about the use restrictions and whether not it's pre-registration review or post-registration mitigation. And then, Jim

and [Kurt] have been going back and forth a little bit about that. I think it's the same concept, right?

As with use restrictions, just as with registrant entity restrictions, you can say, "I'm going to not only check who you are, but I'm going to check what you're doing with the TLD, and I'm going to make you click through and say this is the way you're going to use the TLD." So, I think that Jim is really leading us towards a bifurcation that's based predominantly on registry operator actions versus registrant self-declarations and such.

Does that help? [Kurt], I'm not trying to gang up on you, and I hope that you'll continue to disagree if you really think that that distinction is irrelevant here. Go ahead, [Kurt]. [Kurt], you might be muted or have completely lost your voice.

[KURT PRITZ:]

Yeah, or both. I'm happy to leave it either way and go through the exercise and see how it shakes out. The point I was making is that with a validation or something like that, you ensure that the registrant is complying before they register the name. And with a use restriction, you make sure the registration is complying after they register the name. So, that's where I thought it might go into the other pile. But I'm fine with building the thing and then seeing how it goes.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Yeah. Thanks, [Kurt]. I think it's funny. That's exactly where Jim and I landed yesterday. Let's build it and put use restrictions in under type

one, just for fun, and maybe we have separate it out. We also are aware that ... The reason I added “only” after “type two—” “post-registration mitigation only—” is that that would separate out the use situations where they might be doing both.

I think one thing that we’re going to eventually have to get to is if you have a use restriction, do you only do the pre-mitigation—like, “I affirmatively check. I agree. You’ve verified my credentials.” I would guess that in most cases, registry operators don’t just leave it there. If you’ve gone to the point of saying, “You have to click through. You have to be a member of this org. You have to do whatever these steps are,” that they’re going to check on it, and they’re going to follow up.

So, my guess is that for the use, it’s going to be a hybrid because they’re going to fall into type one and type two. And so, I think we’re going to have to solve that problem as we go, but it seemed to me that we might get more meaningful data if we put the use restriction people into type one for now and then pull them back out if we need to. It sounds like [Kurt]’s kind of okay with that. Jim, you go ahead next.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. Thanks, Kristine. Hopefully this is not too much of a repeat. But it occurs to me, just to play this out, what’s going on in the chat, just for the archive and the record, because there are people who listen to the voice and may not see all of the chat stuff in there ... [Kurt] is bringing up an excellent question, and it’s great that he latched onto that and started pressing on it. As Kristine just said, she and I had some discussion about this yesterday, and how to draw this line.

So, I just want to call out carefully at least what's in my mind about drawing this line between type one and type two. I'm looking at this ... I'm thinking about this from the point of view of the registrant, is the way that I'm drawing the line. We can certainly draw the line between type one and type two on the enforcement mechanisms that might be in play or the post-registration activities that are there.

And in that way—just exactly the question that [Kurt] asked—you could take the use restrictions and say, “Well, gee. That's really just something that's going to go on after the fact. I'm not checking up front whether or not you're going to do that because I can't. I have to see if you do it or not.” And so, that becomes a post-mitigation activity.

But the way that I'm thinking about the question is about the registrant. Is the registrant in any way making a commitment about what they're doing? It doesn't matter whether that's a commitment about who they are in terms of their identity, who they are in terms of the organization—so, if you're a .bank or a .pharmacy, and you've got to be licensed and membershiped in some way, who they are from the point of view of a brand, or who they are from the point of view of a person who's going to behave a certain way, as in a use restriction. The registrant is making that distinction about the purpose of what's going on.

Now, the registry may or may not do any checking upfront in that pre-registration cycle, like they do in a .bank and probably do in a .pharmacy and other brands—that kind of thing. Or even a geo might have some restrictions, where you've got to be giving them a minimum address

that fits in that area. They might be doing some enforcement mechanisms there or they might not. I think that that's okay.

The distinction between type one and type two is whether or not the registrant is making an attestation. And then, in type two, it's really just about checking the behavior of the domain name and whatever sampling or full-on mitigation activities that you might enact in order to confirm that your TLD is what you wanted it to be and the reason why you have it.

But again, it's about the registrant. You can always draw the line differently, and that's the point of the discussion. You can go either way on it. That's where I'm resting at the moment, but we can see what the data shows. Or if people want to take a stronger position on the opposite side, I'm okay with that, too. So, thanks.

KRISTINE DORRAIN: Thanks, Jim. Appreciate that. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks, Kristine. This is a little bit amplifying a point that Jim made. I'm not so sure that we need to worry too much about the subtypes. I think it's going to be challenging enough to get good solid data across the board just on the types themselves. So, we might be worrying, or burning calories on this subtype thing, when we really ought to be thinking about whether or not, or if, or how we would—and how that process would work—get and maintain reliable data about the types themselves. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Rick, it's like you read my mind. Fantastic transition. I would love to move. I think we have good agreement on this first initial cut of how we're going to categorize these. I love your suggestion. I will read it into the record. So, Rick has edited the definition of validation to say, "Registrant account or credentials confirmed. Something more than minimal WHOIS accuracy checks. May be done directly or via membership in an organization, or a check for particular credential status, e.g. professional certificate, license, etc." So, I think that covers a lot of categories—membership, certifications, etc.

We still have verification, and his update there was "affirming the existence of other capabilities beyond registrant and account data, e.g. technical capabilities." We will delete membership as a separate criteria. We will leave the use restrictions and then we will leave "other," because we definitely want people to be able to ... We want people to have another category, if they just don't think that they apply.

And then, we're adding to type one. If no one else has anything better, we'll say "registry operator affirmative conduct" goes with the definition of type one, because it really refers to that ... The registry is actually taking some steps.

So, to your point, Rick, where I think we should go now in the remaining 15 minutes, trying to honor the Jim Galvin 20/20 rule of trying to end calls five minutes early if possible, to allow some passing time for the next call, I would love to turn to this idea of how we're going to fill the table. So, I'm switching over to the spreadsheet, and I'm going to drop

that link in the chat again so you don't have to scroll up. I'm going to make sure that it's on sharing to edit, and it looks like it is, so everybody should be able to edit that table.

I think it's really important now to talk about how we're going to fill it in. Rick brought up a really good point in how is this going to be sustainable, and how are we going to fill this in going forward? I think that's absolutely a problem, but I think that's future DAAR Working Group's problem, not today's DAAR Working Group problem. So, I think we should work on filling out this table with the information that we have today, and then work on trying to solve the problem of keeping it fresh and keeping it correct.

I originally proposed that those of us on this call who represent or have some sort of relationship with some of these TLDs, that you would be able to go into the spreadsheet and fill in on behalf of these entities that you work with, either as a consultant or as the registry backend, or as the registry operator themselves, and be able to fill this in. I know we don't have Donuts on this call, but Donuts is part of our group, and I think we can get them to fill it in.

So, I'd love to see some hands about if you have discomfort about the ability to do that. And then, from there I think we have a deeper issue about how we're going to fill in the remaining categories. So, we want to ... One thing I did want to mention is that I was going to actually filter this data and get rid of the ccTLDs. The only other question I had with that was to the point of deciding ... We had talked about not actually filtering ccs. Some of the ccs operate more like a gTLD. So, did we want

to include those or not? Some of the people on this call are backends or operate some of those ccTLDs.

So, I'd love to get some feedback about how you think you can get this done, how effective you think we're going to be, and any ideas for filling in the missing information. We might be prepping, really, for next week's call. But thoughts about that? First of all, does anybody have any heartburn about being able to fill in information for the registries you work for or support? Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Kristine. Maybe would could look at this as a two-phase process—so, use this group as representative and see how far we get and then address your second question about how can we do this more broadly? After that, it could be that we could ... If we can settle on what works for a representative group, then maybe that's something we can talk to ICANN about and see if there's a possibility that this could be done through GDD, or OCTO, or somewhere else.

I'm very conscious that the Registries Stakeholder Group ... I think we only have 80 members. That covers a large number of TLDs, but there's still a big chunk that's missing. We might be able to draw on the BRG and Geo TLD group as well to help. But perhaps think of this as a two-phase process. Do this as a representative group for those people that are part of this group, and then see how we can fill in the blanks later.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Rick. Thanks, Donna. I have some reaction, but let's let Rick go next.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Kristine. It may be more complicated to get the information than we think because if a TLD provides this information, they're probably going to want or need to know how it's going to be used. And given how things are kind of blurry between DAAR and Compliance, and an indication here might be related to a particular TLD's registry agreement, regarding whether or not they're type one or type two, and what their pre- and post-registration activities are, registry operators might be ambivalent about providing that indication because they're not sure about what the long-term repercussions of that could be. Thank you.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Donna, is that a new hand? Thanks a lot, Rick. Okay. Thanks, Donna. So, my reaction to Donna's comment is I hear what you're saying, and I think we absolutely could do a cut with the representative people on these calls.

My worry is that it's going to be ... We know what our results are. So, to be able to compare it across all TLDs, where the TLDs with the unfortunate reputations may or may not be part of this group, I'm a little bit worried that Samaneh and others are going to view the results as being invalid. We're not really going to understand if we're going to get meaningful information. That would be one of my concerns, if we don't do the best we can to get as much of the data filled in as possible. 100% agree with both of you that I think it's going to be a problem to get it all filled in.

I'm thinking of a couple of options, and neither one of them is fantastic. One could include us just going through and guessing, which may or may not be positive. We might not like being guessed at ourselves, so our colleagues may not appreciate that we guessed at their policies. We could find out if Samaneh or John have any funding for an intern to go through and click through registry policies for the first try. To your point, Rick, we could be transparent and say, "We're trying to do a study to improve DAAR. Are you willing to share this data?" and then just take what we can get and hope that maybe we get some percentage more than we would have gotten otherwise.

I do think that Donna's right. I think we do need to go through and add what we can first, and then we'll see what's missing. So, I think that's going to be key. And then, from there I don't know. Does anybody have any reaction? I don't have any firm thoughts. Those are just random ideas rattling around in my head. Worst case scenario, I guess, we can give Samaneh what we've got. But I'm worried that it's not going to show the full picture of the data that we're trying to capture here.

This may also not be a today problem. It may be a matter of simply stepping through this project the best we can and making decisions with the information we have. So, maybe our job this week is to fill out the table as much as we can. Donna has suggested in the chat putting it out to the RySG membership. I think that seems like a fair option. At least we'll get the 80 or so members to see it, and hopefully add their confirmation, and as Donna points out, a reasonable representative sample. I like that idea.

Okay. I don't know if there's ever a way to email all registry operators that aren't part of the membership to ask and see if anyone would voluntarily provide it, that we could do and not outreach—we could do as an internal Registry project that would be less intimidating than having it come from ICANN. Some ideas to think about. I'm going to pause. People are very smart on this call—smarter than me. You guys all have great ideas.

Thankfully my children have stopped screaming. This is good. Okay. So, I think our steps going forward ... And we don't need to prolong this call any longer than we need to. I think our next steps will be first actions items for us. I'll send out a recap to the entire list, because a lot of TLDs are represented that aren't necessarily on this call today. So, we will ask everybody to please go through and enter this with respect to the TLDs that they can and the ones that they support. If you happen to know of a TLD that has specific restrictions, maybe you want to add that in with a comment or a note that says you're guessing, or this is based on information that you have. I'm not sure.

And then, from there, let's come to the call next week ready to discuss it, ready to take a look at the gaps, ready to propose some solutions for how we will address those gaps, and how we might be able to fill in the table even more. Probably we'll send this out to the full RySG as well over the course of the week, or maybe early next week, so that we can fill in as much as possible.

We technically have a call with John and Samaneh on the 21st. I'm not seeing that we're going to be ready. I think even if we all do our homework—and that's kind of wishful thinking that we'll all do all the

homework within a week here—I don't think we'll be ready, because we won't have looked at the table and we won't have discussed how to get the rest of the data. So, at a minimum I think we'll postpone John and Samaneh one more week, unless anyone disagrees, because I don't want to waste their time when we don't have any data for them. But we could absolutely change our minds on that on the list this week.

Secondly, I would say that'll give us a chance to reach out to the other members of the stakeholder group and beyond to get more of the data filled in if we can and if we need to, as well. And we'll go from there. Any questions or concerns about that path forward? I'm going to update the descriptions in the Google Sheet, so that should be all everyone has to refer to.

J.C. also mentions, "Potentially, give us time to get authorizations from clients." Absolutely. If someone's client's concerned, to be able to share with them a little bit about the work we're doing ... I think that's a really good point, J.C., thinking about how we want to share this. Yes, the idea is that potentially ICANN would use this as a way to slice the data later. But we think it's more meaningful than the way they're doing it now. Ultimately, they're going to keep doing it badly unless we give them something different.

One thing that might help our clients that have a little bit of hesitation to provide information ... One thing that might help them get more comfortable with it is this idea that we're simply trying to do better, and that this is just an experiment at the time. J.C., go ahead.

J.C. VIGNES:

Sorry. We are in a situation that I think is common to many of us, in the sense that we are both registry operator and RSP. Now, as a registry operator, we don't have any notion of validation or verification. As an RSP, some of our clients might be in that boat. The problem is, I have full reign to commit my company and talk about our TLDs. We believe DAAR is important for us as RO.

I do not know, at this point, whether our RSP clients would feel that same—not because they don't want to be outed or anything of the sort, but simply because for some of them, what we do here is, if French guy can make a [terrible pun], too much inside baseball for what they're doing. So, I don't really know where that leave us, but I wanted to put it out there because I'm not even sure an extra week of delay would be enough for me to make critical case and to obtain the authorization I would need—so, some food for thought, I think.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks a lot, J.C. That's excellent information. I think we'll just work with the information we have, and this will evolve over time. The reason I put out this idea of finding somebody who could have the funding for an intern is that at least in theory, this information is all public. We're not asking anybody to disclose something that's not already out there.

Everyone can go in. I could go in and try to register a .whatever domain name, find the registrar, and I could see. What are your terms? What do I have to affirmatively agree to? What do I have to comply with? Presumably, you're going to check on me, right? So, I can literally register a domain name in every TLD and try it out and see. I could read

the terms of service, and figure out who says what. So, I could literally go through it.

What we're really looking at is a faster, self-disclosed way, rather than literally going through and doing the work. Fair point. Clients might say, "Yeah. You're right. It's public, but you do the work." That's their prerogative, and we're going to have to work around that. I'm hoping the fact that we're only looking for what's publicly-available is going to help. It's a matter of making our work easier at this point.

But to the greater point—and I know Rick and Jim have both made it—is that even if we can get this data one time, and everyone's willing to say, "Yeah. This is what we do. We verify or validate, or we do whatever," there's no way at this point to continually maintain that and to require registries or whoever to repeatedly self-certify and let us know if their terms have updated or the way they operate their TLD has changed in such a way as to maybe relax their regulations.

I agree, J.C. Yeah. People are not going to necessarily agree, and that's fine. But I'm hoping that that's one—that that's a sell that will work for some teams—certainly not everyone. Rick, go ahead.

RICK WILHELM:

Thanks, Kristine. I just wanted to offer a plus one to J.C.'s comments and echo that. I hadn't really thought too deeply about the stuff he was saying, but I think that his point about speaking on behalf of other registry operators, if one is the registry service provider ... It tied into the comment that I made about not knowing what the repercussions of

this information are. I think that J.C.'s comment ties in directly there, and I just wanted to echo it—thank him for the insight.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

Thanks very much, both of you. That is exactly the call I was looking for when I asked, “Does anyone have any heartburn?” So, good. Good call. We all know that this is going to be a problem. We’re going to do the best we can. Sam, go ahead.

SAM DEMETRIOU:

Thanks, Kristine. Just as an alternative to the backend registry provider, we could think about reaching out to some of the bigger consulting firms that we know of who do have a little bit more—authority’s maybe not the best word—but permission to make assertions on behalf of the clients they work with, or at the very least have a closer relationship, to be able to touch base with them.

I’m just thinking about when I used to be at FairWinds. We kept information about this kind of stuff on behalf of the few dozen TLDs for the clients that we worked with. So, I’m thinking FairWinds could be a good resource, maybe Valideus, maybe CSC—any of the firms that do ongoing gTLD consulting on behalf of clients. They might be a good resource to be able to help fill this in.

KRISTINE DORRAIN:

I think that’s fantastic, Sam. I think we’ll definitely do that. Besides reaching out to the Registries Stakeholder Group generally, I think

you're right. I think you will get a broader sweep if we can get some of the consultants. I think that's a fantastic idea.

Good. We have some strategies. We're going to do the best we can. Please block time right now. Get off the call. You're going to have four minutes left. Make some time on your calendar to spend an hour updating this. If you sort by TLD manager, and you can sort by your own registry, you can literally fill it in. If you're all type one or all type two, it'll take you 30 seconds to do the dropdown.

The last question ... And I will take this to the list, because I don't want to take a lot of time with it. Should we say "N/A" or should we find any way to differentiate TLDs that have fewer than some number of domains under management—fewer than 100, fewer than 1,000? Do we feel like the data might be skewed if we take super-small TLDs that only have a NIC page or only have one additional page up?

I will take that to the list, because I don't want to take up a bunch of time now, but would love to think about that as well. Feel free to throw in the type one or type two for all the ones you have. But the reason I ask is because if a TLD has only got a NIC page up, it might not have any registration policies posted yet that would make this information meaningful at all. So, something to think about there. And apologize for springing that on you at the end. I had that at the bottom of my notes, and I totally forgot to bring it up before now.

This was a great call. We've got a lot done, everybody, today. Thank you very much. Have a wonderful rest of the day, and we'll talk to you next week.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]