
JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks everyone for being a part of this Implementation Advisory Committee call. There was a little bit of question Christopher had about this group. I'll ask Christopher up front if you understand what we are now, a little better, after the email exchange, or do you need more clarification – or does anyone else – as far as what the distinction is between this Group and the ultimate Review Team that will be formed in the fall? Christopher?

RON ANDRUFF: I think Christopher's having trouble getting in because of that dial-in, so we may have to wait a moment for him.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. The other thing I want to do is make room for discussion of the additional metrics that Christopher raised. Obviously we want to take in all suggestions, but we need a set amount of [unclear 00:01:39] and also just keep things as objective as possible. Our job is to come up with metrics that are measurable and effect-based as opposed to cause-based. We need to make sure we only draw connections that can be dealt with objectively.

I guess I'll ask staff to look at the metrics that were very recently circulated. I guess they were part of comments before, but we didn't have a process where we went and picked those metrics up.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

If we could incorporate them into the outstanding questions portion of this spreadsheet then we can integrate them into the conversation.

Otherwise, I think we should hand this over to Eleeza to walk us through this spreadsheet, or we can start with an RFP update if people would like as well. I'll hand that over to Karen and Eleeza to do right now.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Karen actually couldn't join us. I'll be covering all the sections. On the RFP the big update is that we have signed an agreement with NORC, the National Opinion Research Center, which is in Chicago, to do a scope analysis for us of the survey. This is an organization we worked with most recently on the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting RFP, and Margie worked with them in the past. She can tell you a little more about what they do.

What they're going to be doing for us is helping us identify the terms that need better definition, and giving us some tools for defining those to include them in the final RFP, and then also helping us outline survey methodology and the more technical aspects, to include an RFP, so that we get the most qualified firms applying for the bid. That's where things stand now.

We're anticipating getting an outline from them by this coming Friday, that will hopefully get us started on the discussion on

definitions. We gave that to them as the priority. By the London meeting we will have a draft of their report, which should be in near-final form. We'll share that with you and discuss it there in London, so that we can get some more detailed feedback from you by then. I'm happy to answer any questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the consumer trust survey, correct?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. On the economic study, we're beginning to put the RFP together on that. As we've discussed before, there are some sensitivities around pricing data, so we need to spend a little more time with our legal department to discuss how best we're going to move forward with that to correct that language and gather that data. We're not quite as far along in that process, but we've started it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: As far as the Sub-Committee on the Economic Survey, do we have a summary of questions, the very layman's non-formal version of a list of questions that we want this economic analysis to answer, that captures the face-to-face meeting we had where we discussed this? It'll be circulated for feedback to folks so we make sure all the different pricing variations that Ron and Christa

brought up are included in that layman's list of things? That's where I think the group, from the outset, will be most helpful.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You mean to send those questions to NORC?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, back to our group, to make sure we've captured everything so that later on we're not saying, "Why didn't we ask about this?" Reading a formal RFP is going to be multiple pages of legalese and boilerplate, and then there's going to be two pages that's, "These are the questions and scenarios that we want to analyze," and it's that I want to circulate sooner rather than later, for feedback from our Sub-Committee.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I absolutely agree. I think [echo 00:06:35] week ahead of the London meeting. If not a week, perhaps three or four days.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, just whatever list you captured from the transcript of the face-to-face, so people can add things. I know this is a very important topic for folks in this group. I want to make sure they've had an opportunity to have substantive input, that's in

addition to what the process issues are, getting the data, and the legal issues associated with the RFP. Are there other questions?

I guess the groups are going to be looking for that, in order to have something to provide feedback to. That's why folks signed up. The sooner then better on that please.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. I can circulate a list we have so far, perhaps in the next couple of days.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That would be great. Thank you very much.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi, I'm in a dial-in now because neither the sound nor dial-out connected correctly. Two things. First of all, regarding Jonathan's first question, yes, I understand there's going to be a review process following this exercise. I wasn't party to the three-stage rocket that we've got here. It seems like overkill to me, but okay. We have to be patient and proceed with the whole procedure.

Regarding the additional metrics, yes, I think we still need to have some baseline metrics collected by ICANN on a regular basis, addressing the conditions of competition. I like the metrics in the spreadsheet before us, but from a point of view, at least in the past of a practicing economist, I think some of those metrics are the cherry on the icing of a cake, which is not yet baked.

We see from some of the reports as to how the registries and registrars are behaving in the new environment. Some basic concepts of competition policy and the domain name market, which is the responsibility of ICANN and no one else, of these pre-conditions are not yet being met. I agree we have to do this in two more stages; through the review and the [unclear 00:09:59] end of this year.

Meanwhile, I really think that we need to start collecting basic facts about whether or not the registrars are discriminating in favor of their own registries, which from my point of view would be a fundamental abuse.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. I'm happy to have the metrics that you have proposed... We're going to need to turn them into objective measures and also make them outcome based. In other words, is there ultimately going to be an impact on pricing or availability overall? I will say that ICANN has made it pretty clear they're not

interested in becoming a competition regulator, and so they presume that governments will take that role. Hang on a second.

More importantly, we've just been tasked with coming up with, at this juncture, some data points that we'd like people to be tracking, and potential projections of what we think would be good deltas of these numbers – that this went up by this amount, this went down by that amount, etcetera – so that they're available as a tool for the Review Team. Anything we've proposed needs to be proposed in that way, an actual number of something, and what we'd like to see happen with that number.

Everything that's subjective in nature, I'm sure the Review Team will have the opportunity to discuss. They will discuss many things that are not part of our effort, but our remit is to come up with a list of data sets and what we imagine we'd like to see happen to those figures. We have to make sure we objectify the things that we proposed.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. In relation to your earlier remark, let's be quite clear. In 1998 the negotiation to create ICANN was quite clearly done on the basis of ICANN maintaining and creating competition within the domain name market. If ICANN now negates on that principle, and I don't take your hearsay as conclusive, but if that principle becomes clouded, in some quarters this will undermine the

multistakeholder private sector self-regulation of the DNS. That is not going to fly.

I think our friends on the call who are in the registry and registrar business really have to take that on board, because otherwise we're in deep trouble. Anyway...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes. I guess I really want to emphasize my primary point, which is the remit of this group, which is to provide a set of tools for the Review Team. We could spend an hour and a half discussing ICANN's role as a regulator. In theory, the Review Team is going to make an assessment as to whether or not the New gTLD Program, as it was run, had a favorable impact on consumer choice, competition and consumer trust.

Based on that, ICANN might make changes to the Program going forward, based on that review. The Review Team will be making that assessment as to whether or not those outcomes were accomplished. Our job is to put tools in front of them that if we didn't start the process now wouldn't be available to them. That's where we need to focus – on objectified figures.

I think that can be done, with some of the things you're suggesting. I'm just saying that's the process we need to go through, so we need to [stick to our knitting 00:14:13] as much as

possible, so that we actually get some stuff done and data begun to be collected, before the Review Team is actually formalized.

Any other comments from anyone else, or questions, about process? I said all that, just to say that when we get to the point of looking at some of these additional metrics, we need to make sure that they can be collected as data sets and that we have the capacity. One of our filters on all these messages has got to be, “Can we say what we’d like to see happen with those numbers?”
Steve DelBianco?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks Jonathan. I agree with the explanation you gave to Christopher, but a process question would be, what are our expectations when we’d be able to provide our next piece of output or advice to ICANN’s Board, especially as it deals with the London meeting?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That’s a good question. What we tried to push forward in the beginning were things that were high-overhead in nature. If there are some things that fall out of this process that would be expensive for staff to start collecting, then that might result under the Board recommendation. If they’re not difficult, then I think we’re submitting something for review and getting some data collected, then the ultimate decision on which data sets to use,

which results are relative to them, that would be the choice of the Review Team.

I hope that we don't need to inspire another Board resolution, unless we really feel strongly about some data set being collected, that will have a high cost associated with it, either in terms of man hours by the staff or calls for an outside survey.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Good explanation. I'll see if I understand this correctly. If in fact we withhold from adding any metrics and simply try to rationalize and fully describe like we're doing, do you think that our output simply gets handed into the Review Team and doesn't need to run through Board or staff approval for anything?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Staff might have to answer that more definitively, but I think we're looking here through staff participation for an understanding of things that they feel comfortable beginning to collect, either because it's low cost or low effort, of we've made the assessment that that data is available after the fact. If those things are all through, then I suspect that we don't need anything formal in terms of a resolution afterward.

It's only if there's pushback that this is either going to be expensive or a lot of time commitment that we'll need another formal step prior to the Review Team. Is that your sense, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Can you repeat that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Don't bother. I think that makes sense Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza, do you want to pick up and take us through your spreadsheet?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That would be fine. I sent a spreadsheet to all of you and in the AC we have the tab that's on the metrics that I think still require some discussion. You all have copies of this. I wanted to start off with the first one, just to talk a little about what my approach was here, on the first worksheet in the workbook, which was the breakdown of the metric. I'm trying to look ahead to what this final product will be, which I guess is what you were just speaking about Jonathan.

What I was operating on was that the group will be making a recommendation to the Board on their evaluation of the metrics – which ones they don't recommend, obviously if there any you want to add that would be in addition as well. I thought in the interest of making it of the most use to the Review Team, we could start thinking about how this might be organized.

Given that this is a review that's covering trust, choice and competition, I wanted to break them down in that way, and then group the metrics so that you can see a story in each category, rather than looking at these as individual metrics. I think these, grouped together, tell very specific stories about an evaluation of what's happened in the program to-date.

JEFFREY THOMAS: I have a question. We don't know how many metrics we will have, as far as the number?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: There were 70 that were recommended, and so far there are five that this group has decided to not utilize. The outline that I have takes the five out of consideration and uses the remaining 65. That's where we're at right now. Any other questions before I move into the sheet in front of you in the AC? Okay. I don't see any hands raised. What you have before you is a group of a dozen metrics in all.

Some of these we've talked about in the past, and there are still some lingering questions. I've send the materials out to the group to look through them. Some of them I think are just ones where I feel like there are lingering issues we can discuss in terms of contextualization of the data. I think they'd be helpful in terms of your recommendation to the Board.

The first one I was going to start off with is 1.11, but you may have noticed at the bottom that Michael Graham and I have been exchanging emails about this one. He had a suggestion about how to conduct this one. Michael, I don't know if you want to talk about what your idea was?

MICHAEL GRAHAM:

My thought on that was whether or not it would be possible to poll, using one or another of organizations out there, [unclear 00:21:55] either the IPP, Intellectual Property Practitioners, to put together information obviously looking at both [oral 00:22:04] information, and then information that can go along. As a result, the other metrics would be confidentiality concerns and others.

If they could be put together in a way that we could update trustworthy information and data, that would be one approach I was thinking of. That was something that's been very crucially but initially discussed in a context of the International Trademark

Association, as to whether or not that would be something that its Internet Committee would be able to put something together.

SPEAKER: You're fading away. I can't hear you.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: The point that I had was whether or not we'd be able to utilize members of the Intellectual Property Constituency or community, and specifically in the area of the International Trademark Association, which has an Internet Committee and has had some initial conversations of putting together information – whether or not we could use that to develop the sort of metrics and information that would be useful in regard to 1.11.

Obviously it would face some challenges in terms of confidentiality, but to the extent that it could be phrased generally and we could somehow ensure the information that we were receiving was accurate, that was one direction I thought that we might turn in order to obtain that information.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. I also included in that box an article I'm sure most of you have seen from [Domain Insight 00:24:21] on another approach that was taken to calculating a number, using Sunrise registration data and then average Sunrise registration [crises

00:24:29], which I thought was an interesting formula. I wanted to post that to the group as well and see what you thought of using something like that?

MICHAEL GRAHAM: I think in the earlier group of putting together the original draft metrics, that was one of the things that was discussed – the fact that any of these measures would be somewhat limited, and what information they actually provided, whether or not it was an accurate reflection of those costs would come into question, because there are so many alternative rationales for either participating in, or not participating in, sunrise periods.

That would certainly be a useful snapshot, but I think it would have to be take in regard to other information that we could develop.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I would agree with that. I think in a number of these cases a lot of this data has to be contextualized in that way.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Going back to my earlier answer, I think what I was proposing from Eleeza was reaching out to see if some of these IP organizations, if their members would be willing and interested in participating. Obviously it's in their interest to have their

information out there, but at the same time we'd want to have assurances that the information we're getting is accurate.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

One other consideration would be the National Arbitration Forum. They send out a newsletter once a week on different cases, on domain disputes, which is actually quite interesting. There's only two or three arbitration forums out there, so it might be worth trying to ping them to see if we can't get some information from them.

MICHAEL GRAHAM:

Again, both NAF, WIPO, and then there's another one – I forget where it's located – there are at least three of them. There may be four now. I do know that both WIPO and NAF do publish statistics in terms of numbers of cases filed, resolutions of those cases and such, that would be useful to have. They'd enable us to have a historical photograph of going back in the past to see what the trends have been.

Once the new gTLDs are online, also what numerical effect that would have. That is something we could trace and track, and is readily available.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions on that one? I'll move onto the next one, which is 1.13, which we've discussed before. This is quantity of compliance concerns regarding applicable [unclear 00:28:17], including [unclear] data security breaches. There was a concern in the past that our Compliance Department doesn't...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Mute your phones everyone. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It doesn't track national law concerns, per se. We don't have any complaint code that would really track closely to this. Obviously we do track data security breaches and compliant concerns related to that, so my suggestion to the group would be to rephrase this metric. I think we discussed this before but never came to a conclusion on it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have a recommendation for rephrasing it, or should we ask for recommendations?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: My recommendation would be to draft applicable national laws. I feel like there are other metrics that... We're going to be tracking

crime complaints and things like that, so I'm not quite sure how we'd be able to track this. At least from a compliance standpoint that wouldn't be possible.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If this information isn't tracked then the conversation we need to have is whether or not we try to get Maggie to somehow start tracking it, or do we let this go? We need a slice and dice at this point. Does anybody have a comment, a recommendation that they want to raise?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm going to ask that if people agree with the recommendation could indicate with the green tick?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Definitely. If we don't have any comments for it, can you do a checkmark to agree we let 1.13 go?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I would recommend don't [unclear 00:30:31] tracking the reported [unclear] rephrasing the metric, because we do track that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a different thing. This becomes a security breach tracking then?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Does everyone agree with this recommendation? Please show you agree with the checkbox. Done. Go ahead and make the change.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Moving on. 1.19 – quantity and relative incidence of types to be found dealing in or distributing identities and account information used in identity fraud. Again, this is one we've discussed in the past. Our feedback from our law enforcement colleagues has been that this would be extremely difficult to track in terms of time to TLD.

Mike Nelson has discussed possibly exploring some academic research opportunities. I don't know that he ever... I never heard back from him on that. Mike, did you ever get anywhere on that?

MIKE NELSON: I'm sorry. These phone calls did not get what I needed, so I'll go a little further on this.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to follow up on that one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Mike, reach me offline if you want an update or reminder of what the ask was, all right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Moving onto 2.6 – the percentage of IDNs compared to the total number of gTLDs in H-script or language, should be compared to the percentage of people who use each particular language or script. This one is... I wanted to bring this up as one that we can track in a number of ways, but it's going to be difficult to come up with a definitive answer.

Just one consideration I note here is that not all speakers of a particular language may be comfortable navigating the web in that language. For example, be it that there are a greater number of IDNs in Chinese, if it's not representative of the total population of Chinese speakers, is that really an indication of not meeting our goals, or whatever the case may be.

I'm not sure if we want to put in your recommendation any language about that, but I thought this was something that was worth discussing a little bit longer.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I was going to say my first reaction is that because we're just looking at deltas and increases in choice, we don't need to make a lot of those value judgments about what the absolute numbers should be, but instead be tracking the numbers so we can at least make the assessment of whether or not the numbers of IDNs relative to the populations has increased or not.

That would be interesting, because if those IDNs have come to pass and therefore created new choice, that's all we're really being asked to try and measure. Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

When the original team came up with metric 2.6, because Bruce Tonkin asked us to, we put a three-year target in there. I can see that the target is what's giving pause to the work that Louisa and Margie are doing. The target in there was that the percentage of IDNs should trend closer to the percentage of global population that uses that script. We put that in there because we were asked to do three-year targets.

You're right. It might be difficult to say who uses a script versus having it be their preferred script. As Jonathan said though, if we focus on the metric and the metric is able to be measured, the percentage deltas will indicate whether we have increased choice, by having a greater percentage of IDN gTLDs than we had before, and a greater percentage of scripts and languages covered than before.

Those deltas should be sufficient to help assess whether we've increased choice, and we don't have to focus on that three-year target, which gives the uncomfortable point of trying to compare to the number of people that speak and prefer to speak and use the script. I think we can modify to de-emphasize the three-year target, but retain all of the original language as to what the metric would measure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, thanks. I think that's helpful. [Marni 00:36:00].

[MARNI]: I have a question about the... When you talk about the metric being a percentage of IDNs as compared to the total number of gTLDs in each script or language, are you looking at the actual TLDs available on that percentage, or the number of registrations that are within a particular TLD, and using the number of registrations as a metric?

It might be that one TLD, for example in China, becomes the one that everybody uses, and then maybe there are millions and millions of registrations there. The number of gTLDs at the top-level may not be indicative of that kind of success you're looking for.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

We're only looking for the availability of creating choice, and for that one only need look at gTLDs that people can use to register and resolve. You don't need to count the number of registrations that actually happened. We were not looking at registrations but rather the choice among gTLDs, using the scripts and/or languages that the world uses.

We're not assessing the end result as to whether choice actually happened. This is one of those metrics that looked at the new gTLD expansion and said, "Did it create more choices for people?" Those choices are evident in gTLDs, in IDNs and on English languages, regardless of the [unclear 00:37:37].

[MARNI]:

Okay, I understand where you're going with that. I understand.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Great. Any other questions or comment?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess my question back to staff is, does this give you enough comfort about this; that we can track the data and leave it to the Review Team to decide the importance of it, or the cultural context in which the data is collected?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think it does. I just wanted to present it to the group as something to consider. Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I just want to clarify that you don't have it on this list, but 2.5 is the metric write-up of it, and 2.5 is the simple doing the math. It said the quantity of registrars offering IDN scripts or languages other than English. In 2.5 it's the registrars that offer them. 2.4 was the quantity of TLDs using IDNs or scripts other than English at the top level. 2.4 is about the core availability.

2.5 is about the distribution by registrars whose websites are in the right scripts and languages. 2.[unclear 00:38:56] was a metric that attempted... It would have required [unclear] assess the percentage of the globe's population that uses, say, Traditional Chinese. I get that that's troubling. It's possible that if you consider 2.6, 2.5 and 2.4, the 2.4 and 2.5 are enough to get at the

notion of whether we've increased choice, and that we could omit 2.6 in favor of 2.5 and 2.4

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Are you suggesting we omit it then?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I am. I want to be sure everybody understands, and that it's in the context that we're gathering all the raw data in 2.4 and 2.5. We're not proposing getting rid of those, we're simply saying that trying to also ask staff to size up the globe's population on scripts that people use is not necessary to measure what we want to measure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Actually doing the research to which those raw numbers are compared would still need to be done, right?

STEVE DELBIANCO: It would not. 2.4 and 2.5 do not compare to global script and language use. 2.4 and 2.5 simply feed into the percentages; in other words, how did we relatively increase the choices available, at the gTLD and the registrar level. We don't need to compare it to some assessment of the globe's use of scripts and languages. I believe that's optional. In the context of 2.4 and 2.5, gathering all

the data, 2.6 could be discarded, if staff is reporting to us that they have trouble coming up with those global statistics.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Christopher? Do you want to write a question in the chat? Evan has said it's useful to know if registrants who were previously... Hold on Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I just wanted to comment on the previous statement. I'm not quite sure who it was who was speaking, but everybody in this call is Anglophone. I think a lot of people in the world, and certainly the Internet communities in a number of language areas, feels first of all that the introduction of IDN domains has been artificially delayed for several years, as a result of this New gTLD Program.

I think it's relevant to relate the availability and usage of IDN names to the actual and potential demographic base of Internet users who are out there. I would support maintaining the staff proposal of 2.6.

SPEAKER: It's not the staff proposal. The staff proposal is to rephrase or omit 2.6.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, it's there in front of me as part of the staff spreadsheet, so I'd keep it there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You're misunderstanding. Staff is saying that 2.6, as phrased by us on the original team, is presenting some challenges. [overtalk 00:43:50]

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: ...Is either the total population, which is either an exaggeration, or the numbers are being estimated but widely quoted numbers of Internet users in each geographical area. I think this can be done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess, Steve, you were making a recommendation that we don't need 2.6, since we're gathering the raw data for the numerator data. We're collecting it in 2.4 and 2.5 and staff are expressing difficulty with gathering the denominator. Is that right?

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's exactly how I read staff's statement of sensitivity, since the denominator would cause sensitivities at figuring out what the percentage of the globe's population says that Traditional Chinese is their preferred script, and preferred language. Given that, I'm trying to be responsive to staff's hard work on this. If they feel

they can't get that denominator, the good news is we have the numerator, and the numerator is a measure of choice, roughly one year after the new gTLDs are out there.

That's why measuring registrations is a different kettle of fish. Our group did measure registrations, starting in 2.11, where we asked staff to measure to the zone file the geographic diversity of registrants. It's possible we could look at measuring the linguistic diversity of registrants. Again, it's a numerator type exercise, where you look at the quantity of registrations. Let's keep in mind that one year in we will not have a significant number of IDN registrations.

The IDNs were placed first priority in this launch, but very few of them were able to take advantage of that. They weren't ready. Moreover, the browser-side tools and email software is having more and more success over time at being able to handle IDNs.

Currently, if any of us were to try to use an Arabic script in Outlook we're going to have some challenges. If we were to use it in Safari Browser, the right to left direction, there are challenges on the user-side tools in that one year in, accounts of registrations may not really reflect anything about the use of those scripts and languages around the world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: They're good points. I guess this exercise is meant to hopefully survive past that initial Review Team, since there will be more. Maybe I need clarity on this. Staff are saying there are concerns that this data might not be entirely accurate, because of cultural sensitivities, but it feels to me that if there's any kind of a number, we can still track what the delta is in that percentage. Maybe that's not different than tracking the delta in the numerator, but...

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's what I thought you were saying. It's all of the raw data necessary – as you call them, the numerators – and you don't need 2.6 to ascertain what percentage we've increased the number of TLDs in IDN scripts and languages.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: If I may make two final small comments on this. First, we are not alone in this field. A lot of research has been done, and I believe UNESCO would be a good source as to what the extent of usage of different languages is, and what the extent of Internet penetration is in different language groups.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's right. The Review Team [overtalk 00:48:06]...

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: ...A little bit of enquiry along those lines would be fruitful. Secondly, as I think I've already pointed out in respect of other categories of data, what this group is doing is by definition extremely sensitive across the whole frontage. Please don't shy away from a difficult question of language use when there are other issues behind this data, which is frankly extremely sensitive. For good reason. There is a major problem. The fairness of the introduction of all these new domains.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Again, this is just choice. Just to take us back to being more objective about this, if we can, is if we don't really think there'll be a substantial change in that denominator, then it may not be something that we need to request anybody begin capturing now, for purposes of delivering delta statistics later on.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Exactly right. If UNESCO has the data, they can give us the data if the Review Team wishes to divide it in the denominator on the numerator. There's no need for staff to do anything about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It probably won't change. It won't change, certainly not in a year, or even three; the number of people speaking these different languages or primarily using these individual scripts. I've come

around to support DelBianco's recommendation to drop 2.6 from our effort, because we are collecting the data that's going to be subject to a most dramatic change. Is there anybody that's opposed to dropping 2.6?

JEFFREY THOMAS: I'm not opposed to it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Put an 'X' if you are. I'll give you another five seconds to wake up here. Otherwise I think we'll go ahead and get rid of 2.6, because 2.4 and 2.5 are already collected in the data the Review Team would need the delta on.

Evan's opposed without a replacement, but Evan, again, the issue is that we don't need to ask staff to collect this information as a time series, because the particular denominator is not subject to change, and we are collecting the data that would be used as the numerator and making sure we have the delta in that. Does that make sense, Evan?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [Bloody hell].

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jonathan, I've been corresponding with Evan on the chat, and Evan is heading down a different direction, which is not the counting of TLDs but the counting of registrations that are made.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's have that conversation separately.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That would be a new metric. We did not have a metric that counted the registrations in each of the IDN scripts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Okay. All right. Thanks. I think we're on the same page. We're collecting the data we need to collect so that it won't be lost, and the Review Team can make an assessment about whether or not to go out and get that denominator from UNESCO and other sources that Christopher mentioned, and do the math [unclear 00:51:48] important statistic. We will have armed them to make that calculation.

If you guys can somehow archive your conversation in the chat for respect of a new metric, let's append that to the bottom so that we can keep going in order here in the spreadsheet, and hang onto that conversation if you would.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. I was going to mention to staff to just take 2.11 and come up with a way of rephrasing 2.11 to be linguistic in script diversity instead of geographic, and put a bookmark there where we can bring it back later.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Thank you. Eleeza, we're dropping 2.6 and we're...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Got it. I noted the suggestion from Steve. Thanks. I think there's a way to rephrase that to capture linguistic diversity. Thanks. The next two are 2.9 and 2.2. We discussed this back in April, and I think it was a call on which Steve was not with us. Jonathan, you wanted to discuss this with him. This is a question of duplicate registrations. 2.9 is relative share of new gTLD registrations already having the same domain and legacy TLDs prior to expansion.

2.10 is automated analysis or online survey to determine the number of duplicate registrations in new gTLDs. I see these as being duplicative in a way that on the one hand we can track duplicate registrations at the second level. We could do that in an automated way.

In our survey we'll also be polling registrants about their attitudes towards registering in the new gTLDs and if they feel compelled to

register a domain, they may for example hold it in a legacy TLD and a gTLD. I'm wondering if there's...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Steve, we were at the precipice of going ahead and completing these two. As the scribe of our last effort, I put a pause on that until you were able to weigh into that particular argument on 2.9 and 2.10.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I can respond to that. The reason these are different and distinct, we tried to capture that in the way they're described in the actual document. I know this is [unclear 00:54:22] entire statistic here. 2.9 – something that could be done in an automated fashion. 2.9 says the very same domain name.

I am netchoice.org, and if in fact I have netchoice.org, or some other new gTLD where I'm representing the exact same registration, another gTLD, and I redirect it to my old registration, then therefore I have duplicated the domain name, to the left of the dot, in a new gTLD. That would say that it's not a flavor of a brand new registration.

It isn't necessarily an indication that we've had innovation and choice – because we're all under the choice realm. In that case, I chose to light up a new domain name. I chose to buy another

label, but it simply points to a website I already had in a legacy gTLD. We mean to imply that that measure of choice is relatively, not nearly as important as someone who used the new gTLDs to light up their very first domain.

Redirected registrations, what we had said was that we were hoping this wouldn't be a huge share of the new registrations. We put a number in like 15%. That can be done in an automated way. 2.10 is different. 2.10 would say that I opened up netchoice.org but didn't call it netchoice. I called it something else, and I redirected it to my old site.

We were implying that it would be very difficult for an automated function to know that I, as a registrant, purchased a new domain name and simply redirected it if the new domain name doesn't even match my old one. The idea of the survey was to genuinely have a chance for the registrant to say, "Yes, I just pointed it to my old one. I don't believe this was a really important measure of choice for me."

That duplicate registration [unclear 00:56:31]. That's why I put quotes around the word "duplicate" – to indicate it's not an exact duplicate of the actual domain characters. It's a duplicate in the eyes of the registry. Subtle difference. I can well understand why it would have created some confusion.

If the costs of a survey to discover this are prohibitive or large, and we would suffice to say get quite a bit of information from 2.9, then not do 2.10. We shouldn't mistake 2.10 as being the same thing as 2.9. I hope that helps.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

That's helpful. I see the distinction in it. In terms of a survey, what I was suggesting was that this is something that can be included in the consumer survey; that we have questions about registrant behavior and choice, and the choices that they make. In that sense, that piece is going to be captured in the consumer survey. Then there's also the automated analysis.

I'm not sure if perhaps we leave 2.10 as is and treat that more of a survey metric, and group that with our survey RFP questions, if that gets to what you were thinking?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I'll say that I think when we really delve into that RFP for that consumer survey, the [controlling 00:58:05] for making sure that we have a statistically significant sample of registrants may make that effort prohibitive, because the primary purpose of the survey is surrounding consumer trust, and not choice. I hesitate to defer to that. I think we need to make a definitive decision about whether this is worthwhile.

We can ask those questions, but the survey is really about do users, i.e. not specifically registrants, trust the DNS. I don't know if we'll necessarily get a big enough sample of people that self-identify as registrants to answer this question. I wouldn't rely on that, if we really think this is important. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just to recall that I think I mentioned in a mail that on this question of duplicates, it's interesting if the registrant registers the same name in other domains for defensive purposes, but we must be clear in our minds that, except in the case of protected trademarks, duplicates are inevitable and will be there in large numbers, because that's the whole point. People will be able to use the same name in different TLDs, and they can be different people in different countries and in different jurisdictions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If you read 2.9 and 2.10 that isn't what we're measuring. We're saying the same registrant – not a new registrant but the same registrant – of a domain name and new gTLD, and simply pointed it to their old legacy TLD.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: If that's interesting to you, go ahead. I just wanted to put on record that that is not the main purpose of increasing the number

of TLDs. We're increasing TLDs in order to have it easier to have multiple, not only duplicates, but triplicates of the same name in different domains.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other comments on this?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Steve, can you one more time explain to me 2.10? I want to make sure I captured this correctly, what the distinction is. You're thinking more of different registrants registering the same name in a different TLD? Was that right?

STEVE DELBIANCO: If you read the original text in 2.10, that Evan, I, Olivier, Cheryl, Jonathan and Michael worked on, it says, "For purpose of this measure, duplicate registrations are those where the registrant reports having and maintaining the same domain name in a legacy gTLD." It's about asking a registrant, "Do you have the exact same domain in your legacy TLD – the same content, the same domain name?"

That might only be accomplished in a survey, or if you can figure out a way to do it by walking the zone file, you could do it that way. Or we just satisfy ourselves with 2.9, a relatively easy walk-the-zone-file measure.

As Christopher said, if 15-20-30% of the new registrations are simply new labels for existing content, that may indicate an element of choice that was exercised by the registrant. If there's traffic going to those new domains, then it turns out that the users are responding to that choice; that end users are clicking on that link or typing it in, when they access a web resource. It's one of many, many measures.

We'd say that if there's a lot of this duplication, it doesn't indict the element of choice in the new gTLD expansion, but it certainly gives us more information than to assume that all new gTLDs are brand new content and brand new sites. We know that isn't the case, so we want to try to get a handle on what percentage of the new registrations point to old registrations.

For that reason, I believe you could put 2.10 in suspense, pending some other vehicle of surveying registrants in statistically significant numbers. 2.10 goes in suspension. 2.9 is full steam ahead, and we'd note that 2.10 is pending the discovery of another way to do a registrant survey with statistical significance.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay, I think that helps. I think we'll have to keep that in mind, particularly as we look at the survey model and how they're going to be doing the sampling.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Let's make a note of it. I have my suspicions that that effort will blow up quickly if we're trying to come up with lots of different kinds of consumers, beyond ones whose trust we're trying to test. I'm inclined to agree with Steve's recommendation as well, of tabling that discussion, of 2.10, or putting it in good reserve and seeing if it can be fitted into the survey. Otherwise we'll let it go.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Any other comments or questions there before I move on? Thanks. The next one would be 4.5 – number of complaints received by ICANN regarding improper use of domain. A few weeks ago I sent the group a list of compliant complaint types, and noted that we don't have anything that really captures the words, "Improper use of domains."

We have a number of different complaint types that capture this in more specific ways, such as WHOIS-related complaints, PIC complaints, which has a valid metric as well. I wanted to put it to the group, what you'd like to do with this. We can defined "improper" in terms of one of these complaint types, and capture it in that way, or whatever other ideas you may have. I wanted to finish off that discussion, hopefully today.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, taking a look at the complaint types that Compliance uses, is there another of those, or a category of those complaint types that could be identified here? We could change the word “improper” to say “complaint types A through J” or something like that? Evan, I’m not sure if you’re on the audio.

JONATHAN ZUCK: He’s only on chat.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Eleeza, what was the date and subject of the email where you sent back to us the complaint types that Compliance uses?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Let me find that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: May 9th, for those on the call, please bring that up. Evan, this could be a straightforward answer on this. The word “improper” may not be as precise as we...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was May 9th and the subject was “Compliance complaint types”.
Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, I can't open another screen while I have Adobe open. Very briefly, once that email is up, without reading the whole thing, a quick encapsulation would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Maybe I can help. It's hard to read off every single Compliance complaint type, and they're tracked across a number of different places on our website. One thing that might be helpful, and Cheryl maybe you can take a look at this later on, is Compliance's presentations from each of the meetings. In that they show the various complaints they've received in each category.

For example, there's a registrar complaint, there's everything from abuse, contact data, customer service, data escrow, domain deletion, fees, privacy proxy, registrar contact, WHOIS issues, UDRP, transfer... It goes on. There's a long list there. Depending on how you want to define them, they could relate to improper use of domains. It's a little difficult to summarize, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The way Steve was approaching it was that it would be very nice to have an A to J type of classification. In the absence of a nomenclature, which defines those categories that are now being

used as a “proper” versus “improper” as opposed to what could be seen as almost administrative issues or logistical or timing issues, because some of those things will be that – not “improper” use.

We may need to come up with a standalone nomenclature down the pathway, which I think Steve was getting at that, and that’s what I was trying to get to. That might be for a later conversation.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Do we have follow up on Cheryl? I opened the slide deck to slide 12 and you're right, it's only registrar complaints. We have a view point that other complaints could be logged at ICANN, and they're complaints about the registrant use of the domain name, not the fact that a registrant transferred it correctly. Thus far, the focus of the staff, the PowerPoint they got from compliance, only looked at registrar complaints.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Actually no. There are registry complaint types in there as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, but I believe [unclear 01:10:25] ALAC metric. I believe what the ALAC was after was proper use by the registrants. I'll look for Evan to provide an answer in the chat on that, or Cheryl, since you

were working with ALAC. Did you mean the registrant, the registry, the registrar, or all the above?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My memory is all the above.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, can we hear from you?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: He just chimed in and said, “The end user does not know the source agreed on all of the above.”

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, so as “improper”, the WHOIS format, the registrar contact wasn’t correct, the privacy proxy wasn’t there. Slide 12 on the May 9th email has probably 12 different categories, and what we need is for the ALAC Members, the three of you on the call, to quickly look at those, along with the registry complaints that come in, to see if all of them constitute improper use.

If they all do, we simply have to get a numerical count of all of them. Relatively easy. If a few of them don’t constitute improper use, then go ahead and let them know which ones, and then the metric can exclude those from its count. I see slide 12 was the

registrar complaints. Are the registry complaints contained in the same PowerPoint?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. They're on slide 30.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. There are wildcards prohibited, abuse contact data, registry operator code of conduct, trademark claims notice, and the continued operations instrument. Those are rather... There are some very strange ones on there, and they may not be improper in the eyes of the ALAC, when they came up with the metrics. That's slide 30. Is there an additional set of complaints that come in about actual registrants?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We track complaints based on contracted party, so registries and registrants...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That wouldn't be captured in that way.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I don't disagree with you, but I did find that to be surprising, if in fact a domain was a source of fraud, it was pretending to be the

American Red Cross, and soliciting donations. Hopefully it wouldn't be up for long. It would get taken down. If I filed a complaint with ICANN over a domain name that was being used to perpetrate fraud, that doesn't get logged anywhere?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It would have to be logged as a complaint against either the registrar or the registry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I see. For intention purposes, where do they stick it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It would depend on what the complaint was.

STEVE DELBIANCO: For the complaint I just gave you; that a website pretending to be the Red Cross, soliciting donations?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't work in Compliance. I can't tell you exactly... I wouldn't be able to give you a definitive answer. If I had to guess...

STEVE DELBIANCO: There is nothing on the registrar list on page 12. Hence I thought it had to get captured some place else.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I honestly couldn't tell you. I could ask our Compliance Department what they would do with a complaint like that. I'm not sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think the to-do item on this is for Cheryl, Evan, at least the two of you, to take a look at those pages – 12 and 13 – from the PowerPoint, and see if all of those would be improper. If not, which ones would fall out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Evan's asking to pay attention to his comment, Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I see that, Evan, in terms of the registrant being the Red Cross, but I'm a donor. If I'm upset about fraud – maybe I'm naïve – but I would have thought that among other things I would call ICANN and lodge a complaint that a domain name, under one of their contracted parties, is being used for fraud. I realize only the Red Cross could lodge a complaint like a UDRP or a URS, but I'm

surprised ICANN doesn't get complaints from regular old Internet users, but I'm happy to be educated on that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not sure that ICANN... I don't know how many we receive, but I know that when we do, we might redirect them to the appropriate registry or registrar, depending on what the complaint is. We also have, I think I mentioned, a complaint code that is "invalid" and that could be any number of things that include issues that ICANN does not track or oversee with any of its contracted parties.

Something like that may end up there, and we might then redirect them to the appropriate registry or registrar, for example.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Also, as Evan's pointing out, there is significant evidence and history on the significant annoyance on how a number of things don't fit into specific categories in the world of Compliance, and just get deleted in terms of the metrics they rejected. We're getting into very thin ice here, guys. We need to be very careful on all of this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is it appropriate for us to ask Compliance?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be perfect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We could ask Compliance to capture a few more granular categories of “other” that we know they don’t have dominion over, but do have the capacity to interpret on the way in, that still for their purposes of Compliance are “other”, but for the purposes of data collecting and understanding the impact of the gTLD Program would be helpful. That might not be [unclear 01:17:33].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, that would be extremely useful, and I believe that would alleviate some of the fear of what is classed as “inappropriate”. There is the real opportunity that the gatekeepers on the data have access to the data set, but because the data set doesn’t fit with their performance requirements and metrics, the data set is put aside. What would be useful is rather than waste access to that data, that data set could be captured in a way useful for our purposes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That’s right. I’m reading Evan’s comment. That’s what I’m talking about – the categorization of complaints. Even when they do fall outside of their scope of enforcement, the flip side of that is that it

could be the work of an intern or somebody like that, later, since all these things are in fact logged, even if they're "invalid" or out of scope. If they exist then someone should go through them and flag them as being relevant.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've never seen you as cruel and unusual up until right now. There you go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm very surprised by that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry guys. It's 4:30 AM. I'm allowed to have a bit of fun with Jonathan.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: What would you recommend that we do then?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go to Compliance.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Ask them to parse all of the invalid complaints?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In terms of parsing...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl and Evan, they should look at which, if not all of, fall into the “improper” use bucket. That’s at a bare minimum. Then they should ask Compliance about whether they’d be able to categorize “all other”. If I could ask staff, let’s just keep a separate list of things we come up where we want to make a proposal to Compliance and do that in one fell swoop.

We’ll see what they’re willing to do that we imagine would be low overheads to them, and also confirm the data available that the Review Team could hire worker bees to do after the fact, if Compliance is unable or unwilling to make those classifications. Does that make sense, Margie and Matt? Thanks guys.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Shall we move on then? I know we’re running short on time here. I have a few more metrics and there are a few more Agenda Items. Jonathan, I’m not sure what you’d like to do next. Should I continue or do you want to discuss the other Agenda Items?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Next steps? I think we need to get through this process. I want to make sure that we've found a way to capture and delve into our timeline, addressing the metrics that people have been proposing on email and elsewhere, with respect to registry/registrar separation. Christopher brought up another set, which came in on top of our email.

As long as those are captured and we're not losing them, and they become part of the timeline of discussion, I say we forge ahead on these metrics and keep going through them until we run out of time.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay. The next one is the three that are related to [user hosted 01:22:07] pages, QR codes and URL-shortening services. I know there was some email traffic on this in the last week or so. I just wanted to note on this one that the data out there is available, if not cost-prohibited, to achieve.

I would recommend that this is really more a reflection of choice than trust. It might reflect how people are using the Internet, and is it necessarily a reflection of trust in the DNS itself. I wanted to pose that to the group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We might get Evan to put something in the chat. I'm inclined to agree. I remember speaking to Olivier and he seemed to believe that they had been pitched in the context of choice. It could be that it's a mistake, although I've heard Evan at one point of another suggest that it could be a result of a breach of trust in that, "I'm going to go and use a search engine because representations that individual TLD registries have made have proven to be false." Etcetera.

I'd rather just go back and use the old [freight train 01:23:24] system to look for things. I think it would be a difficult metric to put anticipated or target values on, and that's one of the tests I think we need to do on all our metrics. Are we able to go through the exercise of putting targets on them, to truly make them useful to the Review Team?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Evan raised that it doesn't matter whether it's trust or choice, and that it's arguably both.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a fair point that it doesn't matter how it's categorized, I guess. I think the issue is that I don't know that we're going to be able to determine the sufficiently causal relationship between that, and choice or trust, to make a target value that's meaningful to the user group. That's what I'd put out there. Evan missed a couple of

key calls when he got crossed by outside forces. I want to make sure you have plenty of time on this call to...

STEVE DELBIANCO:

While they're typing, could I quickly comment on this? [unclear 01:25:06] brand new. You might say that I'm choosing to use my Facebook domain instead of a new domain name, or I'm choosing to use QR codes. That's a choice. That isn't the kind of choice that this group is supposed to measure. This group is measuring whether the New gTLD Program created expanded choices for Internet registrants and users.

The choice to use something outside the DNS, outside the new gTLD, doesn't really measure up as a positive indicator... I do think that Evan's primary motivation for these was to say that declining trust in the DNS per se was leading people to choose non-DNS ways of getting to [unclear 01:25:58] headline of this section of the ALAC document.

It says, "ALAC's additional measures [unclear] use of domain-based and non-domain-based alternatives for Internet resource acquisition." I'll stop there. I think Evan's about to put something in.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'll read it for others. Evan pointed out this is not for us to determine the length. That's for the Review Team to do. Making the link as to what this stats mean is for the Review Team. We're just providing staff on what will be useful inputs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evan, I'm trying to follow the Board, to the resolution, more specifically, with [unclear 01:26:57] targets. I think the key is that we want to make sure we're giving a work product to the Review Team that they can make some efficient use of. They can disagree, but part of what we were supposed to do in using these as measure is to come up with the metrics and targets for those metrics.

If we can't think about a link that would help dictate a target, then I think we're just putting too many metrics in front of the Review Team, and they're simply going to have to go through this same argument and discussion over again. I'd rather they were spending their time on the subjective measures that we're not capturing, and also on disagreeing with our targets – that we were too aggressive, or mitigating factors, or something like that.

If we're just throwing data at them without contextualizing it in terms of what we think ought to be the outcome of that data, then I don't think we're doing our job. Yes, we are starting to do

the [IT 01:28:02] work for them, in that we're trying to provide targets. That was part of the Board recommendation.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The Board resolution that asked us to work with staff, did that repeat the original call to come up with a three-year target, or did they leave that out?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't recall. It was part of the original resolution, and I guess I've always believed that the purpose of this was to go back and refine that exercise and examine the utility, which was one of the words used. I find that if we're unable to posit a causal relationship between a data set and one of our value outcomes, then that particular data set is of limited utility – if you want to use the language specific to the most recent Board resolution.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. The word "target" doesn't necessarily mean coming up with, in three years, the [sense of 01:29:10] registration should be no more than 15%. That's one kind of a target, and pursuant to Bruce Tonkin's original resolution, we did some of that. There are times that the target is as simple as saying, "To show that there's choice, the statistics should be higher in the new gTLDs than it is in the legacy gTLDs."

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's fine too. I think that can be a target, but I'm not even sure that we can make that statement about these statistics.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I see what you're saying. Underneath the notion of the use of non-domain name system identifiers, like QR codes, an increase in the use of QR codes, it's not obvious that that's indicative or counter-indicative of the New gTLD Program [unclear 01:29:55] trust and choice. It's not obvious which way that goes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I feel like to do our job for the Review Team we need to be picking metrics where there's some consensus that the numbers should at least go up or down, to be a measure of our value outcomes, in terms of consumer trust and choice.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I just want to point out that we're already running a little over time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I have to get on another call unfortunately. I'm sorry we got to this at the end of the call, because I know Evan feels strongly about this. I just want to do the work now and not kick the can down the road again on this, and send too much data up

without direction as to how it might be used. That's all. Evan, we may need to table this and pick it up again. I really want to give you enough time, and us as a group enough time, to discuss this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think particularly when Evan is limited to chat as well, is another good reason to start off with where we are now as a starting point in the future call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I agree. It's difficult for Evan to participate in the conversation.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Should we send around a Doodle poll to settle the next meeting?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's do that. We'll also have this conversation and get to a way to effectively have this conversation with Evan. I'll try to reach you offline Evan, to talk about this. I'm not really trying to take it off. I want to go through all of them and take everything off, where we don't have a strong consensus about what our expectations are of the data, because I feel like that's our remit – to really provide a solid set of recommendations to the Review Team.

We can disagree on that as a group, but let's have a conversation about that. Okay. Thanks guys. We'll look forward to the Doodle poll for the next one.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]