

20140107_IAG_CCT_ID844169

Operator: I should say good morning, good afternoon, good evening. I know everybody is calling in from different time zones. Thank you for joining the IAG CCT call. We will start the recording now and I would like to thank Jonathan for agreeing to chair the meeting in interim, until he we facilitate the elections and the group selects a chair, co-chair, or vice chair. And Jonathan I will sit to you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Hello, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: I'm going to hang up the direct line and use the other (inaudible). We'll have to go back onto the direct line. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Hello, everyone. Can everyone hear me okay?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, great. So I think we have a number of orders of business (inaudible). The first is probably from staff on the results of the (inaudible) poll. I guess I'm hearing an echo, so mute your phone if you're not. We're hearing a lot of background noise. Everybody hit mute please. Okay. The first thing I think we need to do is hear from the staff about the results of the poll with respect to how they would like to organize.

Yamoah Kwaku: Hello. My name is Yamoah Kwaku from Ghana. Is (inaudible).

Jonathan Zuck: Welcome.

Yamoah Kwaku: Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, the conference call situation has changed a little bit. You don't -- there's not a human operator that intervenes on your way in and so you don't need to give and spell your name when you come in. You'll just be automatically entered into a call. So can we get a, I guess, a summary from the staff as to the structural survey that went down.

Larissa: Sure, Jonathan. This is Larissa: Um, in the agenda we actually embedded the results of the doodle poll, which was conducted in order to get feedback regarding the preferred structure. And what you see there is there were seven participants with one participant voting for both options. So there were five individuals that were in favor of option A, which is chair and vice-chair, two individuals that were in favor of co-chairs and one individual that selected other, noting both the chair and vice-chairs are independent of the commercial interests, which are regulated by ICANN's competition policy. It is not sufficient that they represent different points of view.

- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. So this looks like from the poll that the decisions seems to be the sort of typical chair and vice-chair for our structure. Who all have expressed interest to be the chair of the group. If our first order of business is to identify a chair and vice-chair, who do we have that's expressed interest?
- Unidentified Participant: John, I think everybody kind of agreed that you'd do the chair. I thought you accepted that at the last meeting.
- Jonathan Zuck: Yes, that was just a sub-meeting and so I mean that wasn't a full meeting, I guess. And so I was nominated and then the -- we were going to go out to the broader group of people that have signed on to be a part of the group. And then other people -- we were looking for other expressions of interest I guess to be the chair. So I guess (inaudible) identify if that's happened.
- Larissa: I'm sorry, this is Larissa again. I just wanted to let you know that on December 20, we circulated information to the full team and at that point, we indicated that yourself, Rudy, and Ron Andruff (ph) indicated their interest of serving in the capacity of chair, co-chair, or vice-chair. We asked for any additional, excuse me, expressions of interest regarding serving from the group by January 6 and as of yet there has been no additional expressions of interest.
- Unidentified Participant: And so we have two (inaudible) and three people. That's Cheryl.
- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. I'm sorry to be stuttering through this initial part of this. So we need to actually make official selections though as our first order of business on this call. Is that right, Larissa?
- Larissa: Yes, I would think so. That would be correct. So unless someone else at this point would like to express interest than serving, then it's the three individuals and the group can decide whether to hold a vote at this point on the phone or whether you'd like some other means of doing the voting.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan, Cheryl (inaudible).
- Jonathan Zuck: So Evan seems to be suggesting we should do a roll call. Do you think that's necessary in addition to the list of names that we've already got listed in the Adobe chat room? Because there might be people that aren't on Adobe. Is that your rationale?
- Evan Leibovitch: Where did you see roll call on the Adobe?
- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. So, okay. Let's go ahead and do a roll call of everybody that's on, I guess. I mean we've normally done that because people identify themselves on the way in. Do you have an active list of participants, Larissa, or do we need to do that manually?
- Larissa: We typically do not do that. We're certainly able to do that. You can see -- and anybody that's in the Adobe room can see the participants listed in the box on the side. So those are all the individuals that are dialed into the Adobe room. It is possible that people are not in the Adobe room and they're just dialed in. And Charla, are you able to report out who is dialed in on the phone and not in the Adobe room?
- Charla: Everyone in the -- yes, this is Charla. Everyone in the Adobe room is also on Adigo. So there are no additional participants only on Adigo.
- David Stuckman: Cheryl, this is David Stuckman. You have David Stuckman and David Stuckman two. I've been trying to get in, but my microphone is giving such bad feedback, I'm actually on my phone and I'm muted on the Adobe if that matters. You see what I'm talking about,

David Stuckman and David Stuckman two. I don't know what to do. I mean it's muted. Yes, I'm talking on my land line.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) also on the phone only.

David Stuckman: Should do what?

Judy Harris: Judy Harris is also on via telephone only.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Welcome, Judy.

Anjali Hansen: Same with Anjali. Anjali Hansen. I'm getting the feedback as well. So and I'm trying to connect to the Adobe, but I dialed in through the phone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. So we will add Judy Harris and Anjali to the list of participants in the discussion notes. So then it effectively between the participants and these two individuals we have a full roll call.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, it's Evan. I just joined. Sorry for being late.

Jonathan Zuck: Going to be a presence in any case. So the first order of business I guess is to discuss this issue of chair and vice-chair. Someone just nominated me as the -- Rudy just nominated me as the chair. Do we want to, I guess the question is do we want to decide this now, here, on the phone and make this decision, or do we want to do this another way, like a poll later via email? Do we feel like we have critical mass?

Unidentified Participant: Can I suggest we do a roll call vote. Just say we want, who we want for the chair and who we want for the vice-chair so we can get things moving. Because as indicated, we need a lot to get done in this first meeting, right. And then we can do a roll of votes.

Jonathan Zuck: Right, and (inaudible) planned. Trying to not step on the process that's all.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. All right.

Jonathan Zuck: So we can certainly do that. Can -- I guess we (inaudible) order of the participants order here on the Adobe chat list and have people specify who they'd like to see as chair and vice-chair. Does that make sense? And then staff, if you can (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan, Cheryl here.

Jonathan Zuck: All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, thanks. I did have my hand waving at you, but that's all right.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's okay, mate. What we still have, okay, we have a nomination for you as chair. That's fantastic. And we have been two, at least because we need to understand it, then we still have two nominees for the role of vice-chair. Is that correct?

Jonathan Zuck: I believe that's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Because I'd like to suggest before we go down and I don't see either of the other candidates, because there was three candidates to the position and you being selected by one of those other candidates and nominated for chair. One assumes that Rudy is

supporting you as chair. But that then leaves the two still looking at vice-chair. Noting the vice-chair in the poll was singular. Is there any reason, Jonathan, that if you were concerned as chair that you could not have two vice-chairs? Because if that decision was made before we go polling, it may strongly influence how people put forward the confirmation for you and in particular when you go to trying to choose between two people and one vice chair. So I wanted to propose that what we do is decide on, we have three (inaudible). We have two (inaudible). Let's change it to two a chair and two vice-chairs and then should you be concerned as chair, and I trust that you will be, that's the end of (inaudible) other vice-chairs. Thank you.

- Jonathan Zuck: So does anyone have any objection to there being two vice-chairs? And who, CW has their hands.
- Steve DelBianco: Right, and Jonathan, this is Steve. I was going to mention that in Adobe, people can indicate agree or disagree as opposed to getting in queue to voice things like objection and --
- Jonathan Zuck: Oh, no, I agree. That's why I was just asking for objections, but does -- do you want to all just vote and agree or disagree with Cheryl's suggestion about having a chair and two vice chairs? Let's all just do that.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For those of you, Cheryl here, who aren't used to the Adobe system, it's just above the marker phone and you've got an agree or a disagree. And obviously, Jonathan, you've got it listed here for on the (inaudible) I believe. They may have to indicate --
- Jonathan Zuck: Right, they'll have to give their -- let's go ahead and do the poll here on the -- on Adobe and then we'll grab the last two answers via phone. So if you would go up to the top of your screen and specify agree or disagree.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chris just (inaudible) I think is CW. He's abstaining and he wants to speak to the floor.
- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Oh, sorry, would you like to go ahead and speak? Chris?
- David Stuckman: He may have the same problem I had. He may have to call in. Cannot hear me. No, we can't hear him. I mean I can't.
- Jonathan Zuck: Yes, no, I cannot either.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not hearing anything.
- Jonathan Zuck: Mike Nelson, are you on? Can we have hear from Mike now?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Christopher wants you and the other chair to present some (inaudible). This is becoming very formal and I would suggest very cumbersome, but perhaps you could have a 60 seconds each.
- Jonathan Zuck: Oh, I might have my (inaudible).
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He's saying he's never met you, Jonathan, which is why he needs a presentation apparently. By the poll at the moment, Christopher (inaudible) ascertained whether we are going to have a chair an two vice chairs. So that's the order of business to (inaudible).
- Unidentified Participant: Has CW been muted? Is this on Dashboard?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know. Cheryl here. And I also think it's very awkward for Jonathan as interim chair to be running this probably election of himself. So if you don't all mind, I might just jump in here and (inaudible) as returning officer. That's Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. What we had currently polled for is the question of a chair himself. Now, he did

indicate I think he was abstaining and I trust that was from the poll to have a chair and two vice chairs. But the majority does seem to have spoken to have accepted that. So I think democracy being what it is, we are now (inaudible) a chair and two vice chairs. But it does seem reasonable before everyone indicates their acceptance abstain or otherwise for Jonathan to take the role of chair that we do two things. We call for any other person who wishes to put themselves forward as chair, which has one nomination that has been put forward and accepted.

So let's give a few seconds for anyone else to put themselves or someone else forward as chair. Please indicate if you have -- Eric, I'll be as succinct as I can be. Thank you. I'm also trying to make sure that people have (inaudible) reasonable time to do what is considered to be important, which is organize our leadership. Thank you. So if anyone would like to put themselves or someone else forward as chair, speak now or forever hold your peace. In which case, Jonathan if you'd be so kind, I'm not seeing that coming through. That if you'd be so kind as to give a succinct, to keep Eric happy, introduction to yourself for those such as Christopher who have not met you to be able to feel that they have enough information to either vote or abstain.

Over to you, Jonathan. Maybe 90 seconds, whatever you want.

Jonathan Zuck:

Okay. My name is Jonathan Zuck and I'm the President of the Association for Competitive Technology, which is an international trade association of small and medium sized application developers based in (inaudible). We have about 5,000 small and medium sized businesses that are members and our -- the primary interest of my members is not in the specific outcome of very many of the debates that take place inside ICANN, but more about the process and preserving a process in which ICANN appears to be well run, better in the context of the UN and other forces that have come up. So the primary emails I get from my members are make sure that ICANN keeps its current role.

And so as such, one of the things that I've been a constant advocate of within the ICANN community is the establishment of metrics for management inside the organization. Because today's management, metrics of ICANN have included things like higher three new people or spend X number of new dollars, which I never considered to be legitimate metrics. And so at one point, given the results of the ETRT recommendations and the affirmation of commitment letter, Bruce picked up on this issue and decided to form a working group that would look at metrics specific to the issues of new GTLDs and whether or not they increased consumer choice, and competition, and consumer trust in the internet. And I was very excited by that. It wasn't an organization wide call for metrics, but it was certainly a call for metrics in a critical area of the organization. And I was part of the establishment of the metrics that we're now trying to call down (inaudible).

As far as my (inaudible) establishment of metrics that they're used down the road by the review team more so than any particular interest (inaudible) outcome of any of the individual metrics.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank, thank you, Jonathan. Cheryl again for the record. I think that gives you all sufficient context, even if some of you have not had the pleasure and privilege, which I have, of working with Jonathan on this issue and on other matters in the past. I just note that we've got Anjali Hansen too, you're second at the phone, Anjali, and Carlton (ph) still with, at least on my screen, showing if they can remove those before we poll, that would be useful. If not, I'm going to have to (inaudible) an audible vote because we only have the one now, thank you very much. Anjali, you can use either of your personas. We will only count one of them, however.

In that case, and having no other person bring themselves forward or nominate someone else to run against you, Jonathan, you are the only candidate. I would simply now ask for anyone who wishes to object, please note I'm asking for objections. And the reason I'm

asking for objections is if Anjali's green tick stays up there we don't have to worry about the count. So if you object or abstain, we might as well do them both at once, if you object or abstain would you please indicate using your cross or your step away button. So there is a step away button, which would give you the little red slide. If you want to put a pick up that's fine, but most importantly if you object, please indicate or abstain, please indicate on the Adobe Connect. Not seeing any of those, I'm now going to call for anyone who is only on the phone bridge. For anyone on the phone bridge who objects or wishes to abstain. I'm hearing none, in which case I will now hand the chair over to the fully confirmed Jonathan to run the rest of the meeting and take the opportunity to congratulate the two other candidates, Rudy and Ron, as vice chairs. Thank you very much. Over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck:

Thanks, Cheryl. I'm excited to be here and excited to have Rudy and Ron as vice chairs. So thank you. I think that we had the beginnings of a meeting in Buenos Aires where we started to talk about some of issues we'd be facing and one of the things that we wanted to try and identify I think very early on are metrics that might require tracking soon, if not immediately, as this process that we're going through is going to take some time and the (inaudible) will be changing underneath our feet. As we do so, one of the things we resolved to do early on was identify data that should begin to be collected that won't be easy to collect retroactively once we've made these decisions.

So I guess that would amount to our metrics on which we can agree that it's worth collecting the data, recognizing of course it will be up to the review team which metrics, and what numbers, and how to interpret that data. We're not mandating that for them by any means but we're, whatever consensus we can reach on data that we should begin to collect at this point, that would be difficult to collect later is the number one topic on the agenda for today. And so I open the floor for questions and comments. Questions about what I mean by that or if you have comments, or if you want to start making recommendations.

And the first and obvious one that comes to mind is any polling we might want to do as a before and after should probably take place early on. But I open it up for discussion. Evan, I see your hand up.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks. It's Evan Leibovitch speaking, for the record. I guess I'm thinking almost in terms of a negative (inaudible), Jonathan, in wondering, since presumably the GNSO and ALAC were both very deliberative in choosing the metrics that they wanted, are we being selective in saying, well, of those things that were all picked, we're going to go through the things that don't need to be kind of selected. Or are you simply doing a prioritization on those things that need to be looked at right away?

Jonathan Zuck:

At this very instance, I'm not trying to start the culling process, but identify those things that if we were -- I mean maybe this would be done in two steps, but identify those things that if we decided were important would lose their value if we did not begin selecting them right away. So it's prioritization by time sensitivity at this point is what I'm looking for, and then see if we can reach some consensus of the collection of individual data points. And that's separate from what we might suggest as what the metrics associated with those might be, or the recommended outcomes, et cetera, but simply the collection of individual data that should start sooner rather than later. That's what I would love to identify first if we can just because it will change, right. I mean again the most obvious example is a poll about people feel about trustworthiness of the internet, for example, is something that there's already new TLDs entering the root as we speak. And so if we want any kind of a baseline measurement, that would need to happen sooner rather than later. Does that make sense?

Evan Leibovitch:

Absolutely, and actually that's one thing that the specific example you gave, Jonathan, is exactly something I think we -- is worth calling attention to. Thank you.

- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Steve DelBianco?
- Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Jonathan. Evan, to respond to the question, it's not just the survey but there are some statistical measurements that may need to be gathered now in case they are confirmed by this group as part of our metrics. I'll give you one example in the defensive registration area of choice, we ended up saying, keeping track of the number of registrations that were done during Sunrise to trademark clearinghouse access, as opposed to the public registration. It may well be that staff can determine that after the fact, but if we ask staff, do you need to capture the Sunrise registrations now, during Sunrise, as you know we're going to see as many as 20 a week going through delegation. Then we would want to start to gather some statistics now. And that's where we were looking for staff to be helpful on things that could be gotten after the fact from historical data was things that had to be gathered and captured now, in case they would be used.
- Unidentified Participant: Steve, wouldn't something like that, like for instance the Sunrise registrations, wouldn't be that almost trivial to get after the fact in terms of getting dates of registrations? I mean those are exactly the kind of things that are captured in metadata that we could come back quite some time after the fact and find out timing and what was done with.
- Unidentified Participant: Yes, that would certainly be the hope and I would ask staff to verify that just not the date of a registration, but whether the registration was done because the registrant was using the trademark clearinghouse as the means to get into the Sunrise period. So the date alone won't be sufficient to know if it was a Sunrise registration since each TLD operator is allowed to allocate up to 100 other names for their own purposes that aren't part of the Sunrise. So I think that I'll bet staff can solve this, Evan, and tell us a way to get many of these 70 data elements can be gotten after the fact. And I hope it's the case with nearly all of them.
- Jonathan Zuck: Right, and I want to go through the list, but let's bookmark and say that we do want to ask that to look at the metrics, if they exist, to see if any of them other than the poll. It could be the poll is the only example. Are there any things other than the poll that will be difficult to trace our way back to after the fact, and if we ought to begin to collect sooner rather than later? Mike? Mike Nelson?
- Michael Nelson: Hello.
- Jonathan Zuck: Yes? I think I heard you now. Go ahead. Mike Nelson?
- Unidentified Participant: He might be muted.
- Jonathan Zuck: Is he speaking via microphone or on the phone?
- Christopher Wilkinson: Am I muted?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You're all right now.
- Jonathan Zuck: Go ahead.
- Christopher Wilkinson: This is not Mike Nelson. This is Christopher Wilkinson but the chair is happy with me filling the gap if that's okay with me.
- Jonathan Zuck: You are. Go ahead, Christopher. Go ahead.
- Christopher Wilkinson: Just to say that, to draw your attention to the paper which I posted as a contribution to the discussion. My basic position is that at this stage in proceedings, ICANN should just collect as much data as possible, especially private data and registration data from all registered staff. We will discover, and I think ICANN will discover later what analysis will necessarily have to be done with the data collected. But it would be extremely

prejudicial if in six months' time or a year's time of serious competition policy issues were arose and it was discovered ex-post facto, but ICANN didn't have the data. So I think that's a baseline for the whole process.

Specifically regarding registry, registrar competition, I discussed this in the paper that you received and we've put it on the agenda as the next point. Thank you.

- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Christopher, I think that's a good point in theory. I guess in practice I think this group wants to recommend to staff specific data sets that they might be trying to collect that can be found amongst our 70 metrics that were created by the -- that were recommended by the GSO and ALAC so that. So that it's really about identifying data that we can't decide after the fact to go back and research. And so I mean, I agree that just collecting the world of data would be good, but I think helping the staff to define that world is part of our jobs here.
- Christopher Wilkinson: Well, I'm not against that approach as a staff practitioner in the past. The whole idea of collecting 70 different categories of data (inaudible). So but the -- there are a few -- first of all, it's cheaper to collect data and analyze it later than to try and decide (inaudible) you need.
- Jonathan Zuck: And that's all we're deciding is just to collect it, not to analyze it. So it's more about trying to figure out whether the data will be difficult to collect. And so there are, there are, there is some data that might have a cost associated with collecting it. It's better (inaudible).
- Christopher Wilkinson: Yes, I would refer to the staff as far as the cost of collecting data is concerned. But for instance, I noticed that paper from the ICANN legal service is recommending against the collection of (inaudible) data. Now, from a competition policy point of view, that's absurd. Anyway.
- Jonathan Zuck: Right, and so we may need to find solutions to that. So the question really is going to be whether or not that data -- whether or not it should be collected, could be collected after the fact or if we need to start collecting it now before this work group finishes its -- that's really the question here. So Micah, your question about the legality of data collection I think is relevant and will be a way that we'll need to evaluate whatever list we come up with now in addition to whatever list we come up with as a function of our workgroup. But the issue is what data would we like to see collected now and that can't be collected later.
- Ray, do you have input on that?
- Ray Fassett: Hi, this is Ray Fassett. Sort of, Jonathan. I don't know. I guess I'm maybe backing up a couple of steps here. I just heard a couple of times the mention of the polling and the data collection, et cetera, and this is all about consumer trust in the internet. And I just want a little clarification. Excuse me. I think it's about consumer trust in the domain name system. So I just --
- Jonathan Zuck: That's right.
- Ray Fassett: So any data we're collecting has to do with that. Then there's a question here of whether non-public data is useful, collecting that data is useful or not and polling to find out if consumers have increased or lost trust in the domain name system. I'm not sure that's relevant, but I think the discussion is healthy. Thanks.
- Jonathan Zuck: Okay. [Indiscernible] do you have another point to make?
- Unidentified Participant: Yes, Jonathan. It was a response to Christopher Wilkinson with respect to pricing. All ICANN is said is ICANN legal clarified that that the non-public price data, which is the

wholesale prices that registries offer to registrars, that ICANN legal rendered an opinion that they couldn't be the ones to collect that. Someone else could collect it but they claimed that it could not be collected and tagged and identified by ICANN. And I refer you to appendix C of the advice letter to know whether they have a valid concern, whether they have a valid concern or not, I would ask staff whether wholesale data is available at all. And if not, we would have to investigate having somebody collect the wholesale data, maybe even to anonymize it in such a way that particular registrars don't reveal the wholesale prices that they're getting as a competitive advantage over other registrars. Because, as you know, some registrars get different wholesale prices if they offer to do additional levels of marketing or shelf space. So that's the first response to Christopher.

And the second, to Ray, hi Ray. With respect to the survey, it always helps to be specific. So I just pasted into the chat the exact language that the advice letter had indicated about the survey on trust. And to your point, it only looked at trust in DNS and we delineated several things that the survey would try to ascertain before and after the expansion to TLDs. So it's so much better for us to specifically look at those elements. Now, if we're okay that we're probably surveying most of the right elements of trust, then the only outcome on today's call is to task staff to help us understand the RFP that would have to be issued to get a survey run as soon as possible. And then we can all debate the particular questions that are on the survey. But we ought to get started on the process of figuring out if we need survey now, and if so what are the steps to get one contract left. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck:

So I think that we have rough consensus that if we're going to do a survey, it probably needs to happen sooner rather than later. I think we have rough consensus of that. So the question is, are there any other data points that anyone else can see among the 70 that, the data sets that were suggested for metrics that would be difficult to obtain after the fact. The answer may be not, that there aren't any. But I just want to make sure that we're aware of any data that will be tougher to collect six months from now than it is to collect data about what's happening right now, will be tougher to collect six months from now than it is now. So does anybody have any additional input into that, including staff, given the analysis you've done of data that is particular time sensitive? And then we can have a substantive discussion about that data if we think it's time sensitive. If it's not, we don't need to have that conversation right now. Does that make sense?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Judy Harris:

This is Judy Harris on the phone. I'm new to all of this so I'm not all that familiar with the 70 criteria or anything else. So please understand that in light of the comment I'm going to make. I would love to see collection of the aggregate costs kind of per GTLD application and I don't know whether that will be preserved in some fashion, in other words, the application fee, the cost for that any application has to pay for -- to go through the objection process, to go through any of the various steps in the process. Some of those costs will be paid over to ICANN and others of them will be private to the applicant. And I don't know whether they'd be willing to share them or not, but it would be any fees in connection with an auction and monies ultimately bid in order to win a particular GTLD. And I just don't know enough to know whether starting to collect that now would be easier than waiting until the end of the process because I don't know if it's going to be kept in any fashion sort of applicant by applicant. But I do think it would be a good matrix to know when we go to the evaluation.

Jonathan Zuck:

Thank you for your comments, and I guess the question is whether or not that data will be difficult to collect after the fact. I want to encourage everybody on this group if I can to go back and read the two advice letters. Because I think we're going to all be making reference to them. We're not starting from scratch on this group. What we're doing is starting from that list of 70 and trying to boil it down to a smaller number that's more affordable, basically. I mean that's essentially our charter. And we'll certainly look for

additional metrics that people have thought of. I don't want to be exclusionary but I think people are going to be referring to those two documents quite a bit in the course of this conversation. So I definitely want to make it a homework assignment for everyone in the group to go back, and go back over and refresh your memory with those two advice letters so that we're all on the same page and talking about the same stuff.

Unidentified Participant: John, I've got some (inaudible).

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Participant: You said there's two. I've got the one December 12 or whatever. There's another one also? I made hard copies. I've been reading them and studying them, but if there's two maybe I better find the other one.

Unidentified Participant: Would those be circulated just so we're --

Unidentified Participant: Yes, I've only got one is what I'm saying.

Steve DelBianco: Jonathan, may I clarify? This is Steve.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, the letter, the GNSO advice letter had metrics and then there was an addition, an addendum that was provided by the at large advisory committee or ALAC that added several new consumer trust metrics on top of that. So they're additive and that's why Jonathan is right to think of it as two advice letters. Staff has already compiled all of this material. It doesn't need to be circulated. It's far better if folks will just click on the wiki for this work group. Larissa just put it up in the chat. So if any of you click on that and look at the reference materials that we're speaking of, everything is there and there's also not just in the reference materials, but in the actual list of metrics, they're in a table form. All 70 of them are in a tabular form. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible) God send.

Unidentified Participant: I have them. I just was misunderstanding. Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, I believe that there's a consensus that one of the things we need to do sooner rather than later is take a consumer poll to get -- establish a baseline in terms of consumer trust and confidence. And so I believe that that is a consensus of the group. I want to know if anyone objects to that belief. And if not, I want to task the staff with looking into how we go about doing a poll, and probably set our agenda for the next meeting to really start to dive into what the questions of what that poll would look like. So are there any objections to that is my question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Steve has put the poll advice language into the chat. This is Cheryl. Jonathan, I know Michael Flynn has his hand up. I don't know whether that's an attempt to vote or he wishes to speak.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't either. So Michael, do you want to speak up? We can't hear you.

Unidentified Participant: Not at all.

Jonathan Zuck: Michael, do you want to type something into the chat?

Unidentified Participant: He is.

Jonathan Zuck: That's Mike Nelson I see typing.

- Unidentified Participant: Oh, I'm sorry.
- Unidentified Participant: Michael Flynn has his end up.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Eric, I think a not at all was a comment by someone else about the being able to hear Michael. That's why we need to clarify. Christopher, do you still have your hand up? I don't see your hand up.
- Christopher Wilkinson: Well, yes briefly. Regarding the poll, my main question would be the scale of the poll in order to get it -- get anything that was significant because a poll of a small number to be globally representative would be extremely difficult. And the poll of the large number that would be significant might be expensive. I don't have any objection to the poll, but I have reservations about its feasibility, which I'm sure that the staff will advise us about in due course. But I do want to insist that fair competition between registries and registrars is primarily in the consumer's interest. I disagree with Evan when he said that these are internal prices which are of no interest to consumer confidence.
- We can go into this in greater deal or in writing, but the first C in the CCT is competition and the purpose of ICANN in the competition area was to regulate -- is to regulate the conditions of competition between registries and registrars. And there's evidence that particularly as a result of the reverse backwards integration decision that the market power of registrars has been considerably enhanced, whether this was deliberate or by accident, I will pass on. But consequently from my point of view, the conditions of competition between registries and registrars is one of the most important issues for this group.
- Jonathan Zuck: And I would agree, Christopher. Pricing is one of the things that's in the 70 now. So it's definitely on the agenda to be discussed. There's no question.
- Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. Fine. Thank you.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a matter of prioritizing in terms -- Cheryl here, in terms of whether we need to get started with something. And one of the proposals of getting started of something sooner rather than later is the survey (inaudible). Because as we all agree, it is an art form and needs to be properly designed and properly done, and none of that happens either fast or (inaudible).
- Christopher Wilkinson: The (inaudible) prevails. One of the main demonstrations to the registrars to discourage them from discriminatory practices is quite clearly and early notice from ICANN, and indeed, from the likes of us that discriminatory practices by registrars will be monitored from the point of view of fair competition. (Inaudible) notice, brother.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine. No one is disagreeing with you, Christopher. You've still got Margie's hand, Jonathan.
- Jonathan Zuck: Yes, Margie, is your hand up?
- Margie: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to remind the group that the mandate of the group is to make recommendations to the board and then the board looks at them and proceeds with it. So any suggestion that there would be a poll written now and done now I think is really not the process that was envisioned when the group was created. And I also wanted to agree with I think it was Christopher's comments about the care and cost associated with doing this kind of survey. In my view, it's not the same as some of the surveys we do when we're trying to get information from registrars or within a small ICANN sphere on a particular policy issue. But this is a much more global outreach where you're going to probably want a third party provider, perhaps a university or a commercial entity that specializes in (inaudible). So it's not something that's going to happen very quickly and it's going to be costly. So if you're talking about something that you want done sooner

rather than later, my advice to the group would be to identify those issues now, send that up to the board right away so we can get the buy in and the approval to go forward on that, and the budget associated with that, and then focus on the longer term ones later in a second phase, in order to satisfy everyone's need to get this information sooner rather than later.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's right. Who else is speaking? So Margie, I think that's exactly right. I think we will probably need to short circuit the intentions of the board in this case if we identify things that need to happen right away and go up with an interim set of recommendations for things that we think are time sensitive. I think that's definitely the case. So the requests of staff at this point is just to begin to look at what the cost and logistics would be associated with constructing a poll. And then I think we should devote a significant part of our next call to making a decision about whether to do a poll or whether to recommend doing a poll, I guess, is the proper way of phrasing it, and what the contents of that should be. So I think it is something that exists that if we are going to do it and if polling is going to be a part of the data that's available to the review team down the road, it's something that needs to happen sooner rather than later.

I think there seems to be a rough consensus that that is in fact the truth. So whether or not we do a poll and what the contents of that poll should be, should be probably the top of our agenda for our next meeting. But if you could take away as an assignment to kind of look at what the logistics and cost of that would be, that can help us to evaluate whether or not it's just insurmountable as a couple of folks have suggested. Does that sound reasonable?

Margie: I think we should talk about it at the next call because the question is what is the poll -- I'm not sure yet what the poll is intended to address, which metric are we talking about.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, I mean there's definitely a poll -- there's a description of a possible poll in the document.

Unidentified Participant: 1.4.

Margie: Okay. You're talking about 1.4. I'll take a look at that.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. So I'm going to call this meeting to a close. I know some people have to get off the call. Steve and Even have the assignment of trying to do the -- a quick assessment for questions that need to be asked of staff about time sensitive data and we're going to make the poll issue number one on our next call. I want to thank everybody for participating. We've got tough roads ahead, but I'm still really excited about the work that we're doing and thank you so much for participating.

Unidentified Participant: John, have you got a targeted date for the next meeting?

Jonathan Zuck: I don't. So we'll handle that via email, I guess.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I just make one please that as staff is suggesting dates for the next call, they look for dates and times that are as clear as possible of class commitments. There is the shared calendar now in the My ICANN space and I'm trying to encourage everyone to put their meetings in there because it does help minimize doing two or three meetings at once. Thanks and thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Thanks, Cheryl that was a good suggestion. Thanks everyone.

