

20140129_IAG_CCT_ID850235

Jonathan Zuck: Welcome, everybody, to the implementation advisory group for the competition consumer-- choice and trust advisory group.

As you all know, the mandate of this group is to take the combined recommendations of the GNSO and ALAC, which amounted to 71 recommendations for a potential metrics that could be used to measure increases in competition, trust, and choice and then narrow the down and make them practical in terms of staff resources and financial commitments necessary for their track and use by the review team that will be reviewing the new gTLD program now or less than a year from now.

So that's our objective. And that's the call you should be on. So, if you are trying to get to another city, then you need to leave the plane immediately and board another flight. That's what we're doing here.

Why don't we begin by having everybody introduce themselves, and let's go ahead and do it in the order of the Adobe chat room to start so that people aren't wondering when to speak up. And let's go through and identify yourself for the record.

(technical difficulties)

Jonathan Zuck: And we're happy to have you. And we're going to work our way through this agenda. And, if anyone has things that they want to raise that are not on the agenda, let's save it for the other business portion of the call at the end

But let's begin, if we can with people introducing themselves in the order of the Adobe chat room. So, if you're not in the Adobe chat room, we'll come to you afterward. So, Cheryl, perhaps starting with you. Please, identify yourself for the record.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm (inaudible) at-large advisory. I'm also a member of the non-commercial stakeholders group in the GNSO and the ccNSO and, of course, apparently, the chair at the nominating committee for ICANN 2014. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Christa? Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi. This is Christopher Wilkinson. I'm at-large, representing an ALS in Europe in the (Unintelligible) part of Belgium. I also negotiated the original registry/registrar arrangement with (Unintelligible) in 1996. And I'm particularly interested, as I've indicated in the submissions I've made to the list, to maintain appropriate competition between registries and registrars.

Jonathan Zuck: Excellent. Cintra? Okay. David?

David Stuckman: This is David Stuckman. I'm from Manhattan, Kansas. I represent small businessmen new to the community, I guess.

I'm also on the phone. I have a bad echo. So I'm on buzz.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh, yeah. Well, being on both might worsen the echo, unfortunately, if you have your PC speakers on.

David Stuckman: Yeah. I muted one.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. I'm Jonathan Zuck from The Association for Competitive Technology and the chair of this advisory committee.

Judy?

Judy Song Marshall: Hi. I'm Judy Song Marshall. And I'm from Newstar (ph), and I'm in Washington, D.C.

Jonathan Zuck: Karen?

Karen Lentz: Yep. Excuse me. This is Karen Lentz from ICANN staff.

Larisa Gurnick: And Larisa Gurnick from ICANN staff as well.

Jonathan Zuck: Excellent. Michael? Michael Flynn? Okay.

Mike? Okay. Natalie? Are you folks on the call?

I'm not sure why my microphone is set incorrectly (ph). Please, give me-- Okay.

Olga? Phil? Is Phil on the call? Ron?

Ron Andruff: Good afternoon, Jonathan. Ron Andruff here. Member of the business constituency; also on the NomComm, representative from the BC this year representing small business and chair of the (inaudible) committee on implementation for the GNSO council and happen to be a part of this group; also the vice-chair with Jonathan in this IAG CTT. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Ron.

Rudy? Santiago? All right. And Steve?

Steve Delbianco: Hi. It's Steve Delbianco. I'm with the business constituency at ICANN, and I was also part of the earlier working group that devised the metrics that this group inherited for analysis.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Great, everyone. Thank you. And thanks for being on the call and living through what is always a difficult thing, trying to find the right time for everyone to be on the phone.

As you know, this is a group that will be meeting for some time to really whittle down these proposed metrics to something more manageable. And so we will have a lot of time to discuss a lot of different issues as we go through.

And what we're trying to do here very early on is figure out what, if anything, needs to be dealt with earlier in the process rather than later so that we can make, if you will, interim recommendations to the board for certain things to be accomplished early because the data will be either more expensive or more difficult to obtain by the review group a year from now.

And to, to that end, Steve Delbianco and Evan Liebovitch started a document whose purpose was to take a first pass at identifying data collections that would potentially pose challenges down the road and that we should consider, at least, discussing early on as potential data to begin collecting now rather than waiting until the group had finished its work.

And then Karen is going to present-- After Steve, Karen is going to-- and Evan-- Karen is going to present a kind of first-pass feedback from the staff and reaction to some of the work that Steve and Evan have done.

And then the final thing we're going to talk about is the one thing we know that, if we're going to do it, we need to do it sooner rather than later, which is the survey. And then we'll have a conversation about the feasibility/viability costs and value, if you will, of a survey and have that conversation.

So that's our agenda for the call. And let's do our best to stick to it and move through it expeditiously.

So, without further ado, what I'd like to do is hand the talking stick over to Steve and Evan to talk about their work and the recommendations that they came across on their first pass through the 70 metrics. Steve and Evan?

Steve Delbianco:

This is Steve. Evan indicated he might be a little bit late for the call.

And so, very quickly, folks, Evan and I volunteered, and the first thing we did was to combine the ALAC and GNSO advice - I with the GNSO; Evan with the ALAC. We thought it would be effective and helpful to everyone to combine the two advice documents into one.

And then we added a column indicating what considerations might be for when to start the measurements.

And we circulated that document last week, I believe.

And the benefit of having it a single doc is that anybody wanting to get up to speed on all the work that's been done now need look only one place, where everything is contained. All the notes, the difference between ALAC and GNSO, which I try to retain by keeping the ALAC notes in red.

And then Evan and I visited the 70 rows. And approximately half of them have some sort of a consideration or note in the far, right-hand column. Mine were in black, and then Evan added his. We kept them in blue, just to keep a distinction between the GNSO and ALAC.

There are 40 of the in their where I either noted something like - Hey, let's confirm that you can get this data after the fact. Confirm that the data source has date-stamped, historical records. And that was in there for a great number of the rows that I noted. And,

if staff can assist us with confirming that we can get the history later, then there's no more that need be said about it now.

There are other items where we have questions for discussion that, if Jonathan and the group wants to, we could cover them on this call.

And, of course, the survey covers at least three of the 70 metrics, perhaps even more. And there's an opportunity to combine a lot of that discussion on the survey part of today's call.

I'll stop there to see if anybody has any questions or needs us to resend that document to participants.

Jeffrey Thomas: This is Jeffrey Thomas. Could you resend that doc (inaudible)? I don't recall receiving it.

Jonathan Zuck: Charla, do you have Jeffrey's e-mail?

Charla Shambley: Hold on. Let me check my folder here. If you have it up, if you want to send it to me quickly, I can get it in the room.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh, you don't have it, Charla? Okay. I'll send it to you.

Ron Andruff: Jonathan, this is Ron Andruff. I just posted a note in the chat. Just wondering if staff could put that document up on our Adobe Connect. It would be much easier for us all to look at rather than toggling between screens.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely, Ron. Cheryl here. I support that. I've just had a little bit of a long meeting about an admin matter in the chat as well. Jonathan, this room is set up inappropriately for the call (ph).

Steve Delbianco: Folks, I have resent the original e-mail that went to all of you. And I've resent it. It says Combine GNSO and ALAC Metrics. I'll give you all a moment to retrieve that and for Charla to put it in the room.

Jonathan Zuck: So, I guess what I'm hoping to do is not to walk through this document on this call. That would be a pretty inefficient use of all of our time.

And so the question I guess I have for Steve is whether or not there were particular items that he wanted to raise above the den (ph) as topics of discussion because there seemed to be consensus between him and Evan that some work would need to happen now rather than down the road in order to track those particular data elements. So that's the question that I would pass back to Steve is-- we have this document, and we appreciate it. And, presumably, most of the people on this call have gone through it. But are there things that you want to raise other than the ones covered by the survey in this document to people's attention for purposes of discussion?

Steve Delbianco: Thanks, Jon. And this is Steve.

There were several items where I simply wanted to confirm that historical data would be date-stamped. And I'm speaking of the kind of historical data that's maintained on registries and registrars and zone files. And I would think it's a relatively easy matter for staff to simply verify that they keep snapshots or have the availability of snapshots of zone files. And, of course, it doesn't need to be every day. I suggest that, when you want

to go back to the early 2014 period, that you just have at least weekly and, if not that, even monthly - snapshots of zone files.

Anyone on staff able to react to that?

Karen Lentz: Yeah. Steve, this is Karen Lentz.

I believe that, as part of our review of this that that was not an issue.

Steve Delbianco: Thank you. That's really helpful.

And, then, before we dive into the survey, I did want to ask, Karen-- I was trying to think about using the document you attached to your e-mail. And I'm a little confused because roughly 40 of the 70 metrics where we had some indication of consideration but only a small number, a dozen or so, were attached in the Excel sheet that you did-- sorry-- in the attachment that you sent around just the day. So help me understand, Karen, the difference in scope, the document Evan and I did and what you sent around.

Karen Lentz: Sure. Sorry. Can you repeat the question?

Steve Delbianco: The document that you sent around only captured about a dozen of the considerations that Evan and I had, the stuff where you put in green with the notes column.

Karen Lentz: Yes.

Steve Delbianco: Is it just a matter that you didn't get to the rest, or those ones you want us to focus on immediately? Give me some background about how that fits in with this discussion.

Karen Lentz: Sure. Yeah. I'll do that. And, again, I'm relatively new to the project. You all probably know more about it than I do.

And perhaps it was just slightly differing. Understanding. But my understanding of the first task in terms of the staff input was to identify the "low-hanging fruit;" so, the things that are-- of the 70, the things that are either, you know, data that we already have, data that is easy to collect to sort of categorize or identify those so that they can be taken off the table and focus on the rest. So those are the ones that, based on the staff exercises-- those have notes in green.

There are-- So, you're correct. There are a number where there are notes in blue about when to start or when-- that these are key in terms of getting baseline data. Some of them have surveys, et cetera.

So, if they're not responded to, that only means that we didn't have an instant-- this is feasible; this is useful. And, if there are open items where you need more staff action or more staff input specifically on that column of the considerations that need to be addressed more directly, then we're happy to do that.

Steve Delbianco: All right. Thanks, Karen. It sounds like yours was a work in process and won't be responsive to all the questions that Evan and I had.

So, Jonathan, I might recommend quickly-- if I were to do three examples, it would help us to understand where this call could go.

Folks, you all have the document on screen in Adobe, or you may have received it as a second time as an attachment to the e-mail. If you open it and go to page 12, you'll see where this table actually begins. And, on table 12, item 1.4 is the survey. Jonathan suggested earlier we can handle all the survey discussions later in the agenda. So we can skip past that.

And the first one that Evan and I raised a concern about was 1.8. That's on page 13. Each of you can control the scroll on your Adobe, whether you have it open in Word or PDF, whatever you want to do.

This was one of Evan's-- one of the relative incidents of registrar complaints that come into ICANN's internet (inaudible). And we simply made a quick question to say that the internet system kept by ICANN have the ability to reach back the stamp of the complaints. I have to believe the answer to that is yes. Karen, anyone?

Karen Lentz: Yes, Steve. So, on 1.8, we did check on the internet. I think my note says that, in terms of compliance and collecting that data, some of the internet data has unfolded into the present compliance statistic. That includes back to January 2012. We do have the older data, but it will take some more manual work to pull that forward and review it for the types of complaints that are (inaudible). Does that make sense?

Steve Delbianco: Thanks, Karen. We don't need anything but a yes/no answer, because, if you say yes, we can get the old data, we don't actually need you to go get it yet.

Karen Lentz: Okay.

Steve Delbianco: You just indicated that your notes were responsive to 1.8. And here's where I'm really confused. The attachment that you sent around a few days ago doesn't have 1.8 on it at all.

Karen Lentz: Well, it should. The one I'm looking at does. So I can take a look at whether that was missed.

Steve Delbianco: All right. I'm continuing. Why don't we move on to the next one? Scroll to page 14. This is a note from Evan, and it might be better for me to let Evan speak to it. But--

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I'm here, but I just walked in.

Steve Delbianco: Hey. We're on item 1.11 and the suggestion that we reach out to MarkMonitor and other organizations, ask them the simple question. Do you have ideas for sources of this information? And, if they do, we would ask them whether historical or archived is available. And, if the answers are yes, this is a done deal.

Anyone on staff who could reach out to MarkMonitor? Is that kind of information available on IP claims? We're talking about page 14 at 1.11.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. Thanks, Steve. This is Evan. ICANN has a number of consultancies right now that are working on trying to protect the IP interest of clients. And it would just strike me as totally reasonable that at least a few of these would have some archival tracking of what they've had to do, at very least, on behalf of their own clients to get some kind of a benchmark for us to work against. Yeah, it might not be complete, but it's better than not having anything. And I suspect that some of the larger ones, and I mentioned MarkMonitor by name-- there may be others-- will certainly have more comprehensive listings across a fairly, reasonably, diverse set of clients. Thanks.

Steve Delbianco: Thank you.

And, Karen? This is Steve. I reopened your original e-mail, and I see in the Excel sheet that you had three tabs. And I had missed that. My bad. I had only looked at one tab. So thank you, Karen. You did put quite a bit of work into this, where you have tried to be responsive on all of the items that Evan and I brought up. I got the impression that a few of them were covered. Thank you for that.

Karen Lentz: I was about to type that clarification in that there are three tabs.

Steve Delbianco: Got it. And, Karen, you didn't have a note on 1.11, which is the one that Evan just explained. Any thoughts on that?

Karen Lentz: Yeah. So, if that's the direction of the group that staff do this outreach, I think that's fine. I think that particular item was fairly broad. And it would be useful to have a little bit more discussion about the pieces and how they're meant to be interpreted. But, in terms of being able to do the outreach, I think the answer is yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. I guess our intention at this point, Karen, is really just to cover our bases as our progressions progress. There's a long set of discussions ahead of us. Will we regret not having reached out or track data now because we couldn't get to it? That's really the issue, not trying to make a decision about whether it's a good metric now. But if it's data that we couldn't get, if we don't start getting it now, then we would move the prioritization of that discussion to the top to either keep or dismiss that metric sooner rather than later so that a decision could be made about making a recommendation to the board.

So it's really just the fact finding about whether or not that data-- if it turns out to be-- to survive this review process, will we be able to go back and get it after the fact? That's really the only question we need an answer to at this juncture.

Steve Delbianco: So the outreach on that could be according to the entities that are listed in the document. We should jump ahead to 1.13. Evan had a note in here to request as soon as we could 1.13. This is (unintelligible) concerns that are reported to law enforcement because they contain violations of applicable national laws. It's not something about which ICANN would have the data. So this one is very tough to gather, considering there are different law enforcement regimes all around the world. I don't even know whether (unintelligible) is a good source of it.

But are there any thoughts as to whether law enforcement data is consolidated and combined by entities such (technical difficulties) where historical data can be requested and provided from them? Again, this is 1.13.

Karen Lentz: So, Steve, this is Karen. In response to that one, we are looking at all of these, and this struck us, too, as one of the more challenging ones. I think--

Evan Leibovitch: Actually, Steve, can I--? Karen, maybe I can explain a little bit of the reasoning behind. I see Christo (ph) has his hand up ahead of me in the queue. So I don't know in Adobe Connect how you want to deal with that. I mean, I'm capable of answering to this right now because-- just to get my thoughts behind writing.

Jonathan Zuck: Chris and Mike, are you guys offering an answer to the question about this item?

Evan, why don't you go ahead? (Inaudible).

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So, essentially, I just wanted to explain my thinking on this in that ICANN meetings have typically had law enforcement representation. Is it amongst every country? Not necessarily.

My issue right here is I think we're in the realm of we don't know what we don't know. I mean, if the question isn't even asked of anyone - Is this information being collected - then we'll never know. I mean, it's totally possible that, if we make some inquiries, we may find that at least some kind of partial collection is being done. So that's why I mean. This is sort of one of those Rumsfeld unknown unknowns thing. Then I'm hoping we can at least get a better idea. Does it mean that this is going to be a metric that's going to be very heavily depended upon? Not necessarily. But, right now, I'm sort of-- this is, to me, the fact finding stage of just figuring out-- even asking some questions and finding out if this exists. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Evan, that's a good point. I guess, can anyone from staff confirm whether you're willing to reach out and just answer that question?

Karen Lentz: Yep. This is Karen.

Jonathan Zuck: (Inaudible) would be difficult. And I guess the question is trying to understand whether or not this data is captured now.

Karen Lentz: Sure. Absolutely.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Steve Delbianco: Steve here. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: No. I saw Mike in the chat saying that this is problematic. I'm not disagreeing. This is not going to be one of our cornerstone metrics. It's the kind of thing, if it exists, it's useful; if it's not going to exist, then this is going to be the one we're probably not going to spend a whole lot of cycles running after. It's in there just to find out if it's even being done.

Steve Delbianco: Great point. And now there's a series of five rows in a row, from 1.14 to 1.19, where we simply wanted to get staff's help to confirm that the data sources would retain date-stamped, historical records.

And I'm 99% sure that the anti-phishing working group would have date-stamped records because Rod and his group published time series charts, which means they have data at least broken down by month. So I'm confident of that.

But the one we're less confident of is law enforcement authorities, or LEA, as it's indicated in here. Evan just brought up the discussion that it's going to be very difficult to get consolidated data from law enforcement agencies. And I think the same thing would apply to metrics 1.16, 1.17, and 1.18 and even 1.19 because it would require government to help.

So, Karen, when you compose the note to either the GAC or to Interpol or whatever entity you think you can reach out to, please, pick up not only 1.11 but all the way through 1.19. All of these, we would be asking whether there are available, consolidated data sources for these kind of statistics. And it doesn't have to be perfect. It just has to identify trend, because I have a question for the whole group. If we discovered that only, let's say, European law enforcement had the data and was willing to provide it. Would that be sufficient for us to measure trends over time in comparing the new gTLDs with

the old if we only looked at a single continent worth of law enforcement? Or do we feel the need to get a geographically diverse, as well as over time comparison data?

Unidentified Participant: I would say no.

Evan Leibovitch: Steve, this is Evan. To me, this is going to be a similar thing to working with the trademark owners in that figuring-- we know ahead of time we're probably not going to get everyone. So it's going to be a matter of doing a preliminary - how much can we find out - and then making a decision based on what's available, whether or not this is worth running after.

Steve Delbianco: Thank you, Evan. And I heard someone else suggest that we would need a geographically diverse set of statistics. It wouldn't be sufficient to pick a single continent. And I would concur.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah. That would be my view as well. This is Jonathan.

Steve Delbianco: Karen, if we could bounce ahead to number 1.20, you have a note in green there about who is (inaudible). What are your thoughts on that?

Karen Lentz: So, I thought-- Well, this one seems fairly straightforward in terms of having some data that exists. I think, when you come to looking at reviewing the new gTLD-- new gTLDs in that space, there's a little bit of maybe interpretation that needs to be applied. So, typically, the WHOIS inaccuracy complaints that are received are issues that are addressed with the registrar within the way it works today.

Steve Delbianco: Karen, if I could-- This statistic doesn't care. This statistic as it's worded doesn't care if the inaccuracy was the fault of anyone. It could have been the registrar, the registry. It doesn't matter at all. It's simply measuring the incidents of complaints for inaccurate, invalid, or suspect WHOIS before and after.

Karen Lentz: Yep.

Steve Delbianco: So, if your WHOIS complaint system has the ability to categorize inaccurate, invalid, or suspect WHOIS and date stamps that and knows which TLD it came from, that's sufficient. We don't really need to know registry or registrar sources.

Karen Lentz: Okay. So that's-- the WHOIS complaints is one of the things that we've been tracking data on for quite a while. So I think that is-- in terms of being able to respond to 1.20 as it's worded, that's a clear can do.

Steve Delbianco: Excellent. Great news.

And, on 1.22, just a quick yes or no. Are you guys keeping the originally submitted applications that came in in June of 2012?

Karen Lentz: Yes.

Steve Delbianco: Thank you.

And now we would jump into a bunch of ALAC metrics on end user confusion. Karen, there weren't any green notes in the far, right column. (technical difficulties). And I don't- - I'm wondering whether you just haven't gotten to them yet. Or did you need Evan to clarify?

Karen Lentz: Sorry. Which number again?

Steve Delbianco: 4.1. We're just proceeding right on through the table. 4.1.

Karen Lentz: 4.1. Okay. So, most of these-- are you looking for a yes or no?

Steve Delbianco: The absence of any text from you in your column. I wanted to know whether that means you just haven't gotten to it yet. Or did you have questions for Evan, who actually composed these items?

Karen Lentz: So, I think they're not things that we data on currently. And they're not-- It wasn't clear that they could be easily established. So that's why there's not a note. So I guess it's closer to we haven't gotten to it yet. I mean, we have looked at it and understood what the intention is, I believe. But, in terms of being able to commit or say, yes, we know how we would do this, we don't have a response on that yet.

Steve Delbianco: All right. And it's possible, in the end of this call and the agenda, we'll cover all these because they almost all involve a survey.

Karen Lentz: Right.

Steve Delbianco: So, Evan, the agenda for this call was for us to quickly get through this and address Karen's notes. And then we would get to the survey design, and that would touch many of these rows. So I think we should skip ahead to section 5.

And, Evan, you've got blue on section 5 - 5.1 through 5.5. And, again, Karen doesn't have anything in here yet. So, Karen, do you have any questions for Evan and the ALAC folks on the call in order to help determine whether this data can be gathered?

Karen Lentz: I don't think so. Not at this time. Thanks.

Larisa Gurnick: This is Larisa. I just wanted to interject that, to the extent that the metrics involved a survey, we also took a look at those as a broad category. And, in my e-mail, I had articulated the kind of information that would be helpful as we continue with the fact-finding vision of what it would entail to do some of these surveys. So we have some broad questions, not necessarily specific questions, I think, because we'd like to approach it from a broad perspective first and answer the-- get some direction from the group as to how many surveys and the scope of them so that we could start drilling down into the specifics later.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, Larisa. This is Jonathan. I saw your e-mail. And survey is a sufficiently big topic that that's our next topic on the agenda. So just wanted to get through these data points and the non-survey data to see if there was anything that we needed to act on quickly.

Larisa Gurnick: Perfect. Those are survey-related data points.

Jonathan Zuck: So the ones that are survey related, we'll talk about in context certainly. And, if there's any others that are in here that are not survey related, such as 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, for example, those aren't survey related. And so I just want to get us through this so that we're not leaving things on the floor. It's an okay answer to say you haven't gotten to them yet because, obviously, it's a lot to think about. But that's the exercise we're trying to do is just try to figure out if there's any data that, a year from now, we're going to regret not having begun collecting.

- Mike Nelson: This is Mike Nelson. I'm really concerned that items like 6.1, which involve talking to dozens of different national regulatory agencies, are just going to take a long time to get going. And so that's not a matter of-- that we need the data today. It's just that we need to start engaging these people, unless ICANN already has contacts at all these different places. And that was my question regarding 6.1. I think 6.1 is incredibly important, and I would hate to be in a position in two years where we're just getting to know the people who have the data that we need.
- Jonathan Zuck: That's a really good point, Mike.
- Mike Nelson: Does the ICANN staff know if we have relations with the Federal Trade Commission in Washington or the equivalent in Germany or Japan?
- Karen Lentz: Mike, this is Karen Lentz:. So, I think we have some. As-- I think it was Evan noted there are some law enforcement groups that do participate to some extent in some of the ICANN activities. I'd have to check on the specific agencies and countries and people that we do have contacts with. But, certainly, I understand the point that it's a large exercise, and I would-- as far as the items in 6.1, I think they can be incorporated with the earlier item that had us reaching out to that same group.
- Mike Nelson: I think it's fair to say we have a lot more relationships with law enforcement agencies than we do with consumer protection agencies. So that was-- because there's a lot of people trying to track down cyber fraud and the rest. They've certainly been very involved in the WHOIS discussions. But I'm just concerned about the people who are there talking to consumers about the service they're getting.
- (Multiple Speakers)
- Jonathan Zuck: Sorry. This is Jonathan. I think that that outreach is something that probably needs to begin happening now. And so what we might want to consider is a recommendation because a lot of these fall into that same outreach to those agencies-- that that outreach begin now, as Mike suggests, rather than at the point at which the review team is trying to do its work less than a year from now. And so that outreach and beginning to build those bridges and understand what data they'll be able to provide is something that I think should happen immediately. And that's a recommendation that we ought to consider-- an interim recommendation that we should consider making.
- Mike Nelson: That relates to my other biggest concern about this whole list, which is that, if we don't get to some of these people who are going to provide us with information early and get some understanding of how these complaints are filed, we could end up in a situation where we're combining apples and oranges.
- And that even applies to ICANN. Number 8.1 is about how many complaints are received by ICANN. Well, we can't just count the complaints. We have to have some sense of how serious the complaint was and what the topic was about. I presume we already have a complaint process. But we don't want to end up in a situation where, over the course of the review period, somehow the complaint process has changed, and we can't really compare one set of complaints to the second set of complaints. It's a cry for standardization so that we can actually make time comparisons.
- Jonathan Zuck: And, Mike, I think that's a fair point. And that's probably got to be part of our ongoing work to understand that better. But, as long as that data is tracked in whatever form it's collected in now and maintained and has date associations with it, then the analysis that needs to be done to normalize that information later is something that we can discuss

over time. So I agree that we'll need to be reaching out to those groups as we go on and several groups to figure out how that data is structure, how it can be used. And that will be part of our (unintelligible), I believe. But this short term here is just to make sure that this data's being maintained, collected, and can be date associated so that some sort of before-and-after analysis or trending analysis can be done down the road.

So those challenges you raise, I think are good ones.

Back on the 7.1, there's a question about whether it's a snapshot or tracked on an ongoing basis. And I think it's really just snapshot data, unless Steve or Evan disagrees with me. But we're just kind of looking for a before-and-after snapshot, you know, sort of now and a year from now when this review is taking place.

So, Steve and Evan, do you agree with that on 7.1?

Steve Delbianco: This is Steven. And I'd suggest that the before snapshot could be taken now. We only have about 25 gTLD registries right now. It would be very easy to go through the 25 registries and see whether they have the privacy policy. And it might even be helpful to do a snapshot of the HTML files of their privacy policies and stick them in a collective document.

If that's done and then we do another one a year after the new TLDs are in the route, they'll be able to satisfy what ALAC had in mind.

But, Evan, do you want to respond to that?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah. This is Evan. I'm cool with it being a snapshot. I'm agreeing with what you guys are saying.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks. Karen, jumping ahead to 8.1, you've got some notes in here that you have the data.

And then you've asked a clarification of Evan on 8.2. You said: What is the intended link between a registry's compliance and the RAA issues? Evan, are you able to respond to Karen on that?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry.

Jonathan Zuck: 8.2.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I think that the distinction was to try and figure out the nature of the compliance--of the accuracy that's going on; so, in other words, in terms of a breach of an RA having to do with various components, such as grace periods and things like that and so on. So the idea being trying to get a sense as the expansion rolls out of whether or not what is being promoted to consumers is actually what is being delivered.

And so a metric of complaints to complaints about alleged breaches of the RAA, even if they resolved in favor of the contracted party, still can give us a feel that there may be expectations that are being set unrealistically. So you may have a situation where a registrar or registry is totally compliant with the RAA, and, yet, they're still getting complaints about it. That just means that there's probably not sufficient consumer awareness of what those limitations are. I hope that's making sense. Even in a situation where there's a complaint against the contracted party and the contracted party prevails

because they were within the RAA, is there a widespread perception by consumers that what is being offered is something else?

Jonathan Zuck: Hey, Evan, I'm going to cut you off (inaudible) for a little bit.

Evan Leibovitch: I was done.

Jonathan Zuck: This conversation isn't about the whys, because we're going to have those conversations, I'm sure.

Evan Leibovitch: No. I was just asked to explain the rationale behind it.

Jonathan Zuck: No. I understand. But I think the key is that we'll have the data necessary to make the analysis that you suggest in the records that are kept. In other words, we'll be able to see if a registry's mentioned. We'll be able to go back and look at that information in the description of the complaints down the road.

And so, as far as the question of the days, which is whether or not we need something to be collected that isn't, it would seem as though the data necessary to make that analysis, if we decide-- if we agree as a group later that it should be done, will be available for us to do.

Does that make sense, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Steve Delbianco: Then we're done with consumer trust.

And, Karen, if you pop over to consumer choice, these are the metrics with the number 2.

Mike Nelson: Actually, I had a question on 9.1 regarding consumer trust, which is about whether end users software applications implement all of the new gTLDs. It says here audit. Is that an audit by ICANN? Or can I just get a little more detail on that?

Steve Delbianco: You know what? It wouldn't matter for this conversation because it's only going to be done a year after the new TLDs are in the route. There's not a before and an after snapshot on this one. So there isn't any--

Mike Nelson: There wouldn't be? I thought that was the reason this was on here, to see whether the applications--

Steve Delbianco: No. The column for the target is In All Major Browsers and (unintelligible) Resolving the new gTLDs. So the review is done a year after they're in the route, at that point, we can see of the major browsers how many of them can resolve the new gTLDs, particularly the IDN. There's not a before-and-after snapshot necessary, and that's why I didn't think it was necessary to cover it at all in this section.

Evan Leibovitch: But, if I read you-- Sorry. This is Evan. If I read you right, you're asking who's doing the audit.

Mike Nelson: Correct.

Jonathan Zuck: Which is not a question for now though. We'll get to that. Right?

Mike Nelson: Well, again, this is one of those issues where, if you're asking the software companies for information, you can't start that a year from now and expect to get it done in a month.

Jonathan Zuck: Mike--

Mike Nelson: We can talk later.

(Multiple Speakers)

Mike Nelson: There's something I did not understand about it. Well, it's not just browsers though. Right? And the real question is how fast are they adding the new gTLDs. So it's not just a yes/no question.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. I don't think that's the question for this moment though. Let's (inaudible) to the conversation. Thank you because I'm already getting grief on the time budget here. But I feel like this exercise is important so that we don't have regrets down the road. So, sorry, Christopher that we're not making progress faster, but we're trying to get through it as fast as we can.

Steve Delbianco: All right. This is Steve. Competition and consumer choice, which is number 2, has just a handful of notes in here from Karen.

2.4, which is the quantity of TLDs that use IDN. Karen, your question for us is meant to gather the number of TLDs offering IDN registrations or number of registry Websites offering service.

I believe that the first one, 2.4, is only about the number of TLDs that have IDN scripts or languages other than English. And that is a simple count. It would be trivial to count. It really wasn't something that we needed to discuss on this analysis. This is why there were no notes in there from Evan and I.

On the other hand, 2.5, we did need to get a snapshot today. How many registrars today offer IDN scripts, second-level domain? As you know, IDN is supported today. There is IDN.ASCE and things like CommonNet (ph). And there are some IDNs only on the cc side. But, today, we could do a snapshot of how many registrars of the accredited registrars are selling IDN script, second-level domain, or languages other than English today. And that is a request for staff to capture that. It doesn't necessarily mean the registrar Website has service in other languages. That's not what we meant. We meant to say the second-level domain.

Karen Lentz: Okay. So that's helpful. Agreed. That's easy to track.

Steve Delbianco: Great. Thank you.

2.7, the same section, which was the quantity of different national legal regimes where a new registry operator is based. This can be done with manual work. I appreciate your notes That's good. That's great where operations-- I think it's a legal entity question and probably only a legal entity question or, to the extent that who's applicable national laws would apply. That may have to do with legal and/or physical. Not being a lawyer, I don't know the answer to that.

That's it for the consumer choice.

And now we're on to competition. And, Karen, as I look through your notes on competition, there's only a few.

Let me take a moment then. Thanks again for all the work you put into this.

The first competition you've indicated could be tracked, could be tracked.

And then you've asked some definition on terms on 3.3. 3.3, everyone, is the quantity of unique gTLD registry operators before and after expansion. And the point of this, and this is even a footnote, is that we wanted to understand if there was one registry operating multiple TLDs and it's really only a one, unique operator. We even had a footnote in there, Karen, identifying who they are. So what was your question for us on definition?

Karen Lentz: So, I just wanted to make sure that, in tracking these words that we're careful on terms. Registry operator is a term that we use in the-- Well, in terms of establishing baseline data and a snapshot now, I think there's no real issue. Registry operator is a term that's used now to mean the entity that has entered into the registry agreement, as opposed to 3.4, registry service provider, which is defined differently. It's an entity that may have-- be contracted with the registry operator to provide some or all of the technical functions.

So, in terms of unique, I think that's where maybe a little bit more guidance will be needed at some point. There are some with common ownership, or there are many entities that are unique in terms of being their own privately or individually formed companies, but they do have ties to another one.

Steve Delbianco: I don't think ties alone would combine the entities. I mean, you'd need to look for controlling interests in ownership. And this is in the area of competition, and we want to be able to evaluate whether the new gTLDs have decreased the supplier site competition. And so let's use common sense measures of common ownership and not a mere alliance or affiliation.

And we were very conscious of the distinction that you just raised - the distinction between registry service provider and a registry operator. We knew those distinctions, and that's why we have separate metrics for them.

Karen Lentz: Yep.

Steve Delbianco: But 3.4-- we're cool with that?

Karen Lentz: Yep.

Steve Delbianco: There were no other-- you've already answered the notion on zone files at least every week.

So thanks for everyone's patience. I think that covers everything but the surveys. And we can turn over to Jonathan for the rest of the agenda.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Steve and Evan, for leaving me a minute to discuss surveys. I think this exercise was important because we wanted to make sure that we didn't regret not having this conversation down the road. And I think the results are mostly positive that a lot of our work can proceed at pace, and decisions can be made over the course of the coming year as to whether or not each of these metrics represent valuable metrics or targets and things like that as part of this ongoing process.

So the big issue that we have to discuss, and, as everyone, I'm sure, understands that it's a pretty big issue that we may not get through.

I see Steve wrote a little note about staying on. So, yes.

Sorry, Christopher, we're now on point 3, the feasibility and usefulness of a survey on consumer trust.

So what I guess I would like to do is open up the discussion on the--

Christopher Wilkinson: Hang on. Can we come back to Karen's list?

Jonathan Zuck: I'm sorry?

Christopher Wilkinson: Could we, please, discuss the first task from the staff, the input from Karen?

Jonathan Zuck: That's what we've been discussing now. Your note wasn't correct about us only being on point 1. We were on point 2 for most of this hour.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yep. Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: Do you have something else you want--?

Christopher Wilkinson: I sent the list some comments and proposals for the for-competition policy.

Jonathan Zuck: And I value those inputs, and we're going to definitely get to them. But it's just not on the agenda for this particular call because we were just trying to figure out if there were data elements that we wouldn't be able to (inaudible) later.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, look, let me give you--

Jonathan Zuck: You haven't been forgotten.

Christopher Wilkinson: Let me give you a brief impression of the conversation to date. We're designing a Cadillac. And, from my first document, which you've received, I'm not against collecting as much information as is available because I think that, in the future, there will be techniques and algorithms, which will allow us to analyze data in ways that we haven't foreseen. But this Cadillac that we're designing still does not have a steering wheel or a gearbox.

And the fundamental competition issues from the point of view of consumer protection has not yet been thoroughly addressed even in the varied details. I can pay tribute to the enormous amount of work that has gone into these documents. But we have not yet got to the nub of the question. So I would like to put on the agenda--

Jonathan Zuck: I need to cut you off. I'm very sorry to do that. I'm not disagreeing with you. And I'm not agreeing with you either. But I'm-- all I'm trying to do is table this conversation about the substance of these metrics until we have finished the discussion of things that we need to do now rather than down the road. So additional metrics or different data that we need to collect are going to be open for conversation, although I'm hoping we don't go from 70 to 120 as a result of that effort. But, right now, unless there are data points amongst your suggestion that you think need to be done to be collected now and can't be collected retroactively, that is the only question on the table right now.

Does that make sense? I'm really not trying to defer the work that you've done, which I appreciate. I just think we're not ready to process it yet because, right now, while there are new TLDs being already today entered rapidly into the route, we need baselines to happen beforehand. We need that to happen right away. And we needed to figure out whether or not we needed to make interim recommendations to the board to collect data that wouldn't otherwise be collected or be available retroactively. That's literally the only question on the table today.

Christopher Wilkinson: Well, I reserve judgment, sir, because there's a history going back several years of GNSO dancing around, particularly, the vertical integration question, in ways which are anticompetitive. And I think you're dealing with a certain amount of mistrust in this department. And I do not want--

Jonathan Zuck: Christopher, I mean, the time to raise that would have been on the public comment period for these metrics that was open. So, right now, we have a very specific task on our hands, which is to winnow down the metrics. I'm sure that we'll have to make some time to discuss additional metrics as part of this exercise because (unintelligible) developed further, et cetera. I don't plan to be dismissive of that. But, right now, right at this moment in time, we're just looking at a snap of a four (ph) snapshot if we need to make one in the places where we need to make it.

So the next (inaudible) for that--

Christopher Wilkinson: I can see your point in terms of the schedule vis-à-vis the launching of a few new gTLDs. But what concerns me most is that, as I said, we're building a Cadillac. We're talking about the upholstery and the paintwork.

Jonathan Zuck: I take your point, Christopher. And I'm sorry. I don't mean to be--

(Multiple Speakers)

Christopher Wilkinson: In two months' time you'll find that we have-- you'll find that the staff have exhausted their resources and, particularly, are still relying on the legal services' curious opinion that ICANN should not collect price data. We're putting ICANN into a non-credible situation.

Jonathan Zuck: And I appreciate those remarks. And so I just want to table them right now. I'm not trying to--

Christopher Wilkinson: Just to come back to your previous point about the public consultation several years ago, I did table, and I have re-circulated to the Website the paper I presented at that time, which foresaw some of the difficulties which we are now in.

Jonathan Zuck: So that's why we're gathered together. This is really just a timing thing. Right now, we have a specific path at the beginning of this process, which is to determine what, if any, data we need to start collecting now or that can't be collected downstream. That's literally the only question on the table right now. So I promise you that I will make time for a discussion of additional metrics or additional data that we ought to be looking at to look at the competition issue as we go through this. Our goal will be to come up with a subset of these metrics, and there may be some additional ones. But it will be a hard-fought battle to get them, but there may be some additional ones. But we need to make--

Christopher Wilkinson: Wait a minute.

(Multiple Speakers)

Jonathan Zuck: But that is not for doing on this call, Christopher. That's all the point I'm trying to make. We're already running out of time.

Christopher Wilkinson: The point I make, sir, is that.

(Multiple Speakers)

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. Okay. So I really need to move on. A number of people have suggested that we keep going, and I would like to keep going for at least a few more minutes, another 10 or 15 minutes if we can, to begin to talk about the survey. And those that need to drop off, I understand. But I feel like what we're doing here is important, and so I want to make sure that we are thorough about doing it.

And so the next thing that we need to discuss is the survey. And I know that there are those on the call that have some opinion about the potential value for a survey on consumer trust, and I'm interested in seeing hands for people that would like to be heard on that topic about the value of a survey on consumer trust and some of the challenges or benefits. So, pros and con, that's the conversation we're having right now. (Inaudible) of a survey on consumer trust.

So I see Mike Nelson in the queue, so go ahead, Mike.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

Mike Nelson: I'm sorry. I was on mute.

I was going to say I don't see that trying to do a survey where we take a random sample of end users is going to provide us with much useful information. I do think that the focus should be on complaints to ICANN, complaints to law and to consumer protection agencies, and, most of all, complaints to the registries and registrars, if there's a way that we could get them to reveal some of the information they're getting and the feedback they're hearing from their customers. But I just don't see how anybody could do a statistically significant, random sample of users to see how they feel. I do think, after the fact, you could ask a random sample of people in a year or two. Okay. Given where we are today, do you feel that the domain name system is serving your needs better? I think a single snapshot would be useful, but I just can't see how doing two surveys and trying to compare a random sample of people today with a random sample of people in a year is going to get you anything that's going to be incredibly expensive. And you'll have all sorts of self-selection problems. I just-- I'm a physicist by training, but I work with a lot of social scientists. And it just seems like an intractable survey problem.

Jonathan Zuck: Mike, thanks for your comment. I guess my training is social science, so this could be an extended conversation.

(Multiple Speakers)

Jonathan Zuck: -- back on this, and then we'll try to read some consensus on how to proceed.

So, Christopher, is your hand up on this topic, or is it still up from before?

Okay. Nathalie?

Christopher Wilkinson: Frankly, to do a survey globally with a large enough sample that's scientifically designed to make it statistically significant so that the results would be taken seriously, I think that's going to be exorbitant. I just don't see how it can be (inaudible).

Personally, as an economist and a physicist, I wouldn't touch this.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Thanks, Christopher.

Nathalie? Are you still on the phone, Nathalie? Not connected. Okay. So I'll come back to you.

Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks. To me, this is like a prime instance of the perfect is the enemy of the good-- that, because we can't do something that is absolutely top-notch and full blown, that we can't and shouldn't do anything at all. Frankly, I think it's an embarrassment to ICANN that, before the TLD expansion came out, there was no widespread survey of people saying what worked for them about the DNS, what didn't work for them about the DNS. We obviously can't do that now.

But the least that we can do and what we're tasked to do here is to try and find out whether or not the TLD expansion was a good thing for consumers. And one of the best ways to do that is to just ask the question. If you go and you limit yourselves to complaints, well, I don't think you have to go very far. And I guess I can come up with the research if I'm pressed to find out that, just because people don't complain, doesn't mean that they like what's going on. Many will just walk away and stop using memorable domain names completely. We won't hear complaints. We'll just see a drop in use. And, if we are to accurately be able to give a picture of whether or not the TLD expansion delivered on its promise, I think one of the things that we really have a legitimate task to do is to ask the targets of what we're doing: Did this work for you?

Mike Nelson: This is Mike Nelson. I don't disagree with taking a survey. I'm just saying you can't take two surveys a year or a year and a half apart and think you can compare those surveys. I think asking in a year and a half: Are you happier today than you were a year ago-- that would be helpful. But I just-- I'm having problems saying that we have to do a sample today and then repeat it a year and a half from now. So I just wanted to be very clear on my complaint.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I'm happy with that. I understand the logistics and the inability to do an apples-to-apples survey if you're not asking the same people. No. I'm fine with that.

Jonathan Zuck: Christa?

Christa Taylor: Can you hear me?

Jonathan Zuck: Yep.

Christa Taylor: Why don't we actually--? Instead of doing a survey, why don't we start gathering the user data today? We have the tools that we can implement today to give a sample around the world to see how people are actually using the internet today and gathering that data to see what kind of changes in behavior occur over, say, the next 12, 24, 36 months and see what happens from that. We'll know how many people are doing typos. Are they doing direct type-ins? Are they doing something else? And, from that kind of user data, we'll be able to see the before and the after snapshots whenever we want.

- Evan Leibovitch: But Christa, is that data going to give the kind of information that says that somebody says - Oh, just forget it; I'm going to use search engines or I'm going to use Facebook or I'm going to use something else? I mean, we can see when people have typed things in, but can we see whether or not that has actually resulted in an increase or decrease in consumer trust or even use of the DNS?
- Jonathan Zuck: So, I guess-- and this is going to be a fairly detailed conversation as we move forward. But I remain unconvinced that people switching to search over typed in DNS is necessarily a reflection of a lack of trust in the DNS.
- I guess we need to discuss the relative viability of doing two surveys versus one survey that looks backward. But, I mean, part (technical difficulties) trying to assign some metric to this notion of trust, because the only way to really understand whether people are having trust issues is to ask them or to look at their complaints. I mean, their behavior in this particular case with respect to using Facebook or Google is going to be very circumstantial as a method of measuring trust in my opinion. So I think that's why the survey is there.
- And so I think what we're trying to get at is the notion about whether or not we can capture enough of this kind of subjective feeling of trust from a survey after the fact as Mike suggests or whether we need some sort of a baseline of how people are feeling about the integrity, if you will, of the internet beforehand.
- Ron?
- Ron Andruff: Thank you, chair. I think that my general sense in this conversation is that we do need to do a survey. And ICANN is certainly sufficiently equipped financially to pay a firm on a global scale to do such a thing. And, with these kind of baselines in place as we start this process and going out two, three, five years from now, we will be able to see answers to these questions. But, if we don't get that baseline, then we've really failed because, looking back and trying to figure out what exactly was it like then is impossible for any of us to look back two years from now and see where you are today on any number of activities. And you wouldn't even have thought it was activity two years ago, but, yet, you may be actively involved in them today.
- So my view is that it's critical that we get this baseline survey, and it's critical we find the right firm and do it. And, if in fact, we can go back and ask the same people a series of questions 24 months out, 36 months out, all the better. But, if we can't, we still have some very valuable research and very valuable baseline information as to what consumers are feeling and thinking today, and that's the critical element. We need to know where people are at today, so we can measure that going forward.
- And this should be understood. This survey may be something that happens every 24 months for the next ten years, the point being, if we have to get these measurement specific, we have to have this understanding so that we can actually see where this process is going right and where it's going wrong and how we can improve it, because everything that we're doing today with regards to the expansion of the internet is going to be out there for a hundred years. I mean, we need to take a longer view on this thing.
- So that's my two cents. Thank you.
- Mike Nelson: What questions are you specifically trying to get answers to? That's-- I'm struggling with that.

Unidentified Participant: That's beyond this call.

Unidentified Participant: I'm not sure who's speaking.

Unidentified Participant: Please, we should identify ourselves.

Mike Nelson: This is Mike Nelson. Who was speaking just now?

Ron Andruff: This is Ron.

Unidentified Participant: And, Mike, if I may just respond here, that's exactly what a survey firm has to do with. They're experts. As Cloe (ph) point out in the chat, this is a science, and there are people who understand that science. And we need to work with them to find that answer. Thank you.

Mike Nelson: But we're going to be instructing them on what information we need. And I'm struggling to see what information we can gather at this point that would actually give us something meaningful to work from because I want results that are actionable and can actually guide policy in the future. And I'm just struggling to see how we can get that information today.

(Multiple Speakers)

Jonathan Zuck: Mike, I guess that's part of the problem is that an increase in trust-- remember the affirmation of commitments called for an increase in consumer trust in the DNS. And we made an effort in the previous part of this exercise to identify objectives; so, the data-driven, indirect indicators, if you will, of people's trust in the DNS. But the large hole is actually using the words and gaining people's understanding of how they feel about it. I mean, you know, it could be that the things we think matter-- for example, that a bunch of people made promises to have restrictions on entry into their TLD, and then they broke them all. We have that in there as a metric that's aligned with trust. But, if everybody was so cynical as to not believe them in the first place, then it could very well be that all those broken promises had no effect whatsoever on consumer trust. There are sort of guesses of things that we think might upset trust but not actually measures of trust. And so the attempt here is just to-- our remit is to try to come up with some kind of metric associated with trust itself. And the only way to really ask that question head on is to ask that question. And that's why the group that spent many months on this beforehand settled on the idea of a survey.

What I think I'm going to do is-- I'm good friends with Anna Greenberg, which is a pretty big survey firm. And I'm going to just ask some of the questions that have been raised and try to gain an understanding of-- I wasn't talking to them about hiring them or anything like that. But it's just somebody that I feel like I can get some answers to these types of questions that are being asked and pass them back to the group. And then we'll just make an assessment about whether or not we'll try to do a before survey or, just as Mike suggests, ask people to test their memories, you know, in the American political jargon of you feel better off than you did a year ago. So that may very well be all that we can accomplish. And she may agree that it's impractical to try and do this as a statistical exercise. And I honestly don't know the answer, despite having been an econometric CA.

So I think I'm going to take this-- table this for the time being. Everybody that wanted to be heard, I believe, has been heard. And I'm going to ask some questions of an ex-survey expert and pass those answers on. And then we will simply vote on how we wish to proceed and what we'd like to recommend to the board.

That make sense to everyone?

Mike Nelson: The most important question to ask her is what models she could point to where they've tried to do a global sample set on this kind of question, not--

(Multiple Speakers)

Mike Nelson: The only one I know is just what the (unintelligible) foundation does, where they go around the world and ask: What's your impression of the United States? And it's a massive, multi-country, millions of dollars kind of thing.

Thank you very much for doing the research. That will be very helpful.

Jonathan Zuck: So I'm going to ask her those questions. If anybody has any other questions they think that I should ask her, then, please, pass them to me via e-mail.

(Multiple Speakers)

Jonathan Zuck: Does anybody else want to be heard on this topic?

Mike Nelson: Just one more thing from Mike. The other thing is to ask her if she's ever heard of surveys that try to do this kind of thing in a very dramatically technology environment, because I do think that, no matter, a lot of these metrics are going to be influenced by behavior changes and new gizmos and new apps. Some of the other ones are more stable. But this kind of survey question, I think, is going to be really impacted by whether Bing or Google comes up with some cool new way of doing things. And suddenly people change their behavior because of that, and it has nothing to do with ICANN policy.

Jonathan Zuck: That will be in the wording, and some of it will have to be in how the survey results are weighted amongst the other statistics. But we have been asked.

Mike Nelson: I understand.

Jonathan Zuck: (Inaudible) that we failed. But we have been asked to try to come up with a way to measure increases in consumer trust. That's all. And we will have many discussions on this. I'm not comfortable with suggesting that greater use of search engines and less use of specific domain names is an indicator of trust. That will be a conversation that we have.

Mike Nelson: Yeah. I totally agree with you on that one as well.

Jonathan Zuck: The best thing is to ask. And so it may be, as you say, that all we can do is ask after the fact and take everything with a grain of salt. But it will be a data point that the review team will have available to them.

But the question we need to answer right away is whether or not we're trying to get a baseline, as Ron suggested. And so that's what I'm going to try to establish with this expert. Okay?

David Stuckman: Jon, I have a question. This is David Stuckman.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Sure. Go ahead.

David Stuckman: Timeframe. How much timeframe are you talking on the survey? A week? A month? Two months? What?

Jonathan Zuck: You mean for the time for the survey to take-- to be taken?

David Stuckman: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't know the answer to that. That will be one of the questions I ask.

David Stuckman: Okay. That's what I meant.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. If anybody has any other thoughts on this, please, please, please, e-mail me on them, and I will put them in front of Anna Greenberg and get the answers back to you guys. And we'll use that as an additional data point in addition to everyone's opinion on this, and we'll make a decision. I think, in the end, we need to decide whether to recommend to the board that a survey happen now. That's really the issue. It's a go or no-go on that question.

I want to thank everybody for being on the call.

The first thing on the agenda next week will be the discussion of these results, which I will try to circulate.

And the other thing that we need to reach a conclusion on is whether or not a formal recommendation-- and this is a question for staff-- Does that outreach to consumer protection agencies around the world now require an interim recommendation to the board, or can staff informally begin that outreach?

Larisa Gurnick: Jonathan, this is Larisa. We'll get back to you on that.

Jonathan Zuck: Great. So that may or may not be early in the agenda for our next call as well. So, if it looks like something that you have a clear picture of what that needs to be and can start doing it, you may just start doing it. Otherwise, you'll come back to us and say that you need something formal from us to request it. Okay?

Thanks, everyone. Thanks for staying up later, as Bob Costas used to say. And we'll schedule the next call.

And we'll get these resolved, and then we'll dig into the meat of this, which is what's in and what's out going forward.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Good call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jonathan.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.