

---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

RON ANDRUFF: So we'll just wait a couple of minutes to let others join or catchup vis a vis the dial in. Thanks.

I wonder if someone could find out where that whistle is coming from. It seems to have abated. Good afternoon everyone, this is Ron Andruff speaking. In Jonathon's absence, I'll be chairing the call today. And we've waited a couple of minutes for any late comers, and I suggest we get started and perhaps take the roll call please.

So we have someone from staff to take the roll call please?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani. I'll be happy to take the roll call, but certain participants have not entered their names, so if I miss anyone, please let me know after I finish. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Christa Taylor, Evan Leibovitch, Mason Cole, Ron Andruff, Steve DelBianco.

And from staff, we have Karen Lentz, Charla Shambley, Eleeza Agopian, and myself, Matt Ashtiani. I also see that Phil Buckingham just joined the room, and if I missed anyone could you please state your name for the record.

---

*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.*

---

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you Matt. All right then, this is Ron Andruff speaking for the record. We have an agenda in front of us that has been provided by staff, and so I welcome all members of the committee who have joined today, and I'm particularly recognizing we're all in the August time period and many people are on vacation, so thank you for making the time today.

The first item that we have today to talk about is the metrics report that has just been published, and I'll turn it over to staff to perhaps walk us through that. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi everyone. This is Eleeza Agopian. We're going to put up a PowerPoint here shortly. But basically I wanted to go through there to see metrics report that I sent out to you about a week ago. After that, I'll give you an update on the consumer survey and on the economic study and where things stand with that.

Let me scroll down here. So I thought I would break this down a little bit based on the email from Christopher yesterday. He raised a couple of important points that a number of you chimed in on. So that would give us a chance to discuss those issues. But first I wanted to start off with a reminder that part of this group's mandate was to discuss the metrics recommendations with their communities before we take our report forward to the Board.

So I'm not sure if any of those consultations have started to happen, or if you've gotten any feedback, but we would certainly welcome that feedback to incorporate into the draft that we have now. I just thought

---

I would open that up now if anyone has any comments on that, or if you have heard anything from the GNSO or from other ALAC members.

RON ANDRUFF: Eleeza, this is Ron speaking. I'm wondering, are you suggesting then that we should be sending out the report to our constituencies for them to review and give us feedback on before we send it on further? Is that what you're suggesting?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, basically... I mean, whichever way you think would be most helpful, but it is open for chairing with your colleagues in those two groups. So whatever would work best in terms of soliciting their feedback on the recommendations you've come up with.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. All right. Thank you very much. Any comments from members in this regard? Eleeza, please go forward.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey Ron, it's Steve. I'm sorry I didn't get my hand up fast enough.

---

RON ANDRUFF: I beg your pardon. Steve, please go ahead. I was a little quick with the gun there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Nope, my bad. Eleeza, have you sent it to council, anyone on the GNSO council at this point in time?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have not, no.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. The council doesn't meet again until September the 4<sup>th</sup>, so as Ron indicated, we can get it into the business constituency. Jonathan Zuck can get it into the IPC. I don't know whether we have ISPs, we need registrars and registries to all circulate it. If what you're looking for is a quick turn around on comments. What's the timing that you have in mind.

KAREN LUNTZ: So Steve, this is Karen Luntz speaking. I think we're aiming to provide this report to the Board for their meeting in Los Angeles. And as far as the consultation and listening to feedback, as Eleeza said, it's really open to the numbers as to the best way to do that, but the kind of expectation from the Board resolution was that since the metrics came from the GNSO and ALAC, that there would be some, I don't know, iteration from the IAG, just sort of reporting back to this is, what the end result is, what the metrics that we started off with.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Karen, it's Steve. I actually agree with the way that you're positioning it. It's a reporting back to our group as opposed to asking them to approve or give input. When you report back on something that started with the group, the assumption is they may have something to say, but it's not an official invitation for an approval or comment, since we were simply executing on a report they had approved.

So the kind of feedback we're looking for is not approval or endorsement, it's sort of unsolicited feedback based on us reporting back.

KAREN LUNTZ: Yes, I think that's right.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Steve. Matt, I saw your hand up, it was up for a while. I was waiting to come to you. Please let me know if you would like to speak.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi Ron, this is Matt for the record. No. Karen basically hit on what I wanted to say.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much. And I see Cheryl has put a checkmark in the list as well, so she's in agreement. So Eleeza, back to you.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. So just moving down through my presentation here. There is also another section in the IAG CCT mandate that, a suggestion including evaluating other inputs including historical data regarding other valuations from the previous rounds. So I've gone through a report from 2004 from summit strategies and have come up with sort of these broad categories of metrics they included in that report.

It was done in a slightly different format, a little less quantitative and formal than what we're looking at now. But I saw some overlap there. So I'm going to be including a short section on that in the next iteration of the draft that I'll send around to you. I just want to give you a heads up on that.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. Thank you very much.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So moving forward on the report itself. I wanted to, before I get into some of the metrics that I wanted to go over with you again, wanted to go over some of the issues that Christopher raised in his email, and I noticed a little bit of back and forth on the list, but I wanted to open it up for discussion a little bit.

One of the biggest points seems to be whether or not we're recommended too many metrics. So I just wanted to open that up for discussion. I think that, you know, we've come to a point, just from my perspective, of recommending a certain number of metrics, and even

---

within that 66 that are included in the recommendations, that we've put in some caveats or some concerns we have about some metrics, and I think that the review team will see those and certainly make their decisions as they see fit based on those recommendations.

But I'd be interested to hear what everyone has to say or if you want to take another cut at calling some more, or whatever the group sees fit.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Eleeza. So, the question is to the committee, and I see Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you Ron. Christopher, when this sentiment was raised early on, months ago, we did take a hard look at whether we could consolidate, I don't think cull is the word, but consolidate and rationalize the metrics that we had. And a lot of credit goes to Evan for trying to help appreciate which would be impossible to obtain, and that's why some of them disappear.

But at this point, we cannot go back and go in without just doing a do-over without a clear indication on a mandate to reduce it. We didn't have a mandate to reduce the mandate to consolidate and rationalize. I think we did that. So I think we're done with that. There are other comments that Christopher had which we discuss, but another shot at culling the list is not on the table.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Steve. Evan, please go ahead.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. And I guess, thanks for the good word Steve. I didn't know that much of me. I mean, I wanted to echo the sentiment that we're at the final report. This is not the time to start revising this. As the report notices, there are five metrics that were in the regional recommendations that were taking out. Most of them were the ALAC ones, and I'm reasonably satisfied, at least from my point of view, that the ones that were taken out were taken out mainly because of the difficulty to collect.

It's not for this group to determine relevance. I would prefer that we give as much as possible to the review team, let the review team understand, you know, get as much as they can. And let them make the determination of which are relevant and which are not. So, I just want to echo what Steve said. I prefer to err on the side of too many metrics as opposed to not enough, and tying the hands of the review team.

So, you know, as Steve said, there are other issues of what Chris said that might be debatable. Frankly I'm okay with what he said, mostly. But in the case of this, if you notice, we've actually added one metric that wasn't in the original recommendations. So we've beaten that horse. We're at the level of the final report, so revisiting it at this point is just not in the cards. Thanks.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Evan. I also note for the record, for the transcript, that Cheryl Langdon-Orr is also in agreement with this, and by her note in the chat. If no one else has any comment, I would like to just mention that just



---

from my part as an individual member of the team, I was very pleased with the work that was done, in so much as it was done in a collegiate manner. We worked long and hard.

I think Jonathan was a little too hard on himself. On the list, I think, he takes responsibility for not having culled this list as much as he would have like to. But the fact is, as Evan just stated, better to give the review team more to work with than less, and they will then, ultimately, make the determination as to what they would like to work with or not. I think the work of this group has been exceptional in that regard.

And I just want to say for the record that Jonathan should not feel, by any stretch of the imagination, that he failed on that mark. So, any more questions or comments with regard to main metrics?

Seeing none, I pass it back to you Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thanks. Moving forward, Chris had also raised a point about the final appendix which had the list of group members with their statements of interest. He has recommended maybe putting in an attendance list or something like that. Our suggestion is to include a link to our community wiki page with the previous recordings, which will have a list of who is in attendance. The trouble with that is we haven't taken roll call on a regular basis, and within the Adobe Connect room, as you can see here, we have, in several instances in the past as well, just phone numbers without names associated with them.

---

So it would be kind of difficult to get an accurate picture. But I think having the record of the past meetings available and linked in the report should hopefully get to that issue.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Eleeza. Anyone have any thoughts or comments on that? While we're waiting, for my part, I understand where Christopher is coming from. What often happens in these working groups is, a lot of people will sign up and put their names down, but when it comes to showing up and actually doing the work, it's a much less, much smaller group.

And I think what he was alluding to, is he wanted to show who actually did the heavy lifting here as opposed to who put their names down and then never showed. So, I'm a little torn by that, but I think you just clarified the point. We did not take roll call on a regular basis, so we really can't actually go back and say definitively who was present at each meeting and who was not.

For that, I think because we have, we don't have the data as it were at our hands, I think we have to let that one go as well, and I think the connection back to the wiki page is the appropriate way in this case. Does anyone have any thoughts on my comments or anything they would like to add to that topic?

Seeing none, back to you Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Great. Thank you. Next I wanted to talk about the definition of cybersquatting, something that we've also been talking about that

---

Christopher raised. I know there is still some disagreement about how we should define the term. One thing I wanted to point out is the definition we have now, the one that was, I believe, discussed in the London meeting, is a working definition.

That's one we included in the consumer survey RFP, which, as you all know, the deadline for the RFP response is actually today. But we included very specifically in the RFP some directive that this is a working definition, that we anticipate working with the vendor to assign it, and to make it a more accessible one for survey respondents. But certainly, if you would like to work on refining it for more, we can include a refined definition in the file report.

RON ANDRUFF: So comments, thoughts, questions? Steve, please take the floor.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. In London, I remember looking up cybersquatting on Wikipedia, and I submitted a slightly shortened version of that to Eleeza, right after the London meeting when you asked. And Eleeza, is the one I submitted the one that made it into the draft of the working definition?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'd have to go back and compare the one that you sent in. I think we adapted the one you had suggested, and that's one that made it into the RFP, but I can't tell you offhand right now.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Right. Well thank you, it's about bad faith registration. It's not speculation, which is something Christopher had wanted it to expand to. But it's about bad faith registration of a domain name. And the only reason the definition has any relevance, is that the survey vendor has to explain, when they run the survey, so that the people they survey know how to respond.

So it's up to that survey vendor to fashion a definition that is comprehensible to their target audience. It has no relevance to the work that the report itself we created, and it may not even make its way into the metrics at that point. It is simply an opportunity to explain to people whether they perceive an increase or decrease in cybersquatting and explain what that means. So I don't believe we need to do a thing other than the working definition we've given to the vendor. Thank you.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Steve. Cheryl seems to agree with you on that. I wasn't unfortunately, as was Cheryl, we were absent at the London meeting because of our NomCom duties. But when I read the, just the chat, the chatter on the list in the last few days, responding to Christopher, and I think Mason made some comments on cybersquatting, the thought did occur to me as I read through that, that cybersquatting is one thing, and I think we've got a definition we all understand.

But then there is the domain investor that is buying up names and parking those names, and what type of names they're buying and parking. We're seeing now, I mean this new round of TLDs that are

---

coming out in some cases, some of the registries are actually taking names that are legitimate trademark of others and putting them on a premium names list, for example.

Those kinds of activities mean in one way could be saying, "Well, we're parking that name, and we're holding that until someone wants to pay us a price that we're satisfied with." So there is some merit to this issue of parked names, but I think the difficult part here is that, for the work of this particular IAG CCT, the train has left the station.

I don't think we can get something back in there at this point. But if there is something I'm missing or misstated, based upon the London meeting, I would be grateful to hear from some of you. So I'll take Evan and then Eleeza.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi there. Thanks. I guess my point here would perhaps be to put in some notes to carry forward to the review team. Just to indicate the concerns that we have about this, to indicate that perhaps the issue is just broader than just the legal definition, and to indicate to the review team going forward, this committee had perhaps maybe a divergence of opinion, but certainly had some opinions within the group, that there is an issue of domain abuse that goes broader than the legal definition of cybersquatting.

It's probably way too late in what we're doing to start to play with that, but I think it might be worth putting in some notes ahead to the review team, that this was an issue that was of concern to the committee. Thanks.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Evan. That will certainly be, and satisfy my concern that I just raised. Eleeza, please go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. So just further to Evan's point, what I would suggest, just as Evan had said, we can include some notes in there on divergence within the committee. But I do think it's important that if, Ron you had mentioned premium groups of names, and whether some of the registrations that you would like to include under cybersquatting are included in there, that's something that we will be including in the economic study. That was actually my next point here, on the idea of so-called premium pricing. That's something that we're going to ask the economic study under to explore more in-depth on how certain domain names get grouped in that way, how they're marketed, how they're displayed and so forth.

So I think this is going to be captured in a couple of different ways. That's all.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Eleeza. And I realize I used a very poor example for what I was trying to get out, considering we're talking about premium prices next, but thank you for bringing that forward. I see Evan, I'm not sure if that's an old hand, Evan or a new hand. Okay. Thank you. Steve, please, go ahead.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Eleeza said it best. The economic study would potentially capture pricing issues, with respect to reserved or auctioned names that you brought up Ron. The user survey, consumer survey could not. The consumer would not know if a potential trademarked name was being held on reserve or part. It's very rare that they would have any feeling for that, other than if they visited Apple dot TLD, and discovered that it wasn't Apple computer at all, it was just somebody redirecting them on a parked site.

So there is a small perception that would show up on a parked page that people found their way to, but otherwise, consumers aren't going to know what prices were charged, what practices were used, prior to a name being resolved. So let's not try to, in view into the consumer survey, questions that consumers could have no way of answering. Do that in the economic study instead. Thanks.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Steve. And I really appreciate that clarification. I apologize again for conflating the two issues, and I didn't mean to, I just used it as a core example. I'm grateful for both responses if in fact, the notes will make it clear on the cybersquatting issue than that is really what we're discussing at this point. So I'll ask if there is any more discussion we would like to have on cybersquatting before we move into the premium prices that we're already kind of discussing.

Is there anything left to be said about cybersquatting and the definition? Seeing no hands pop up immediately, I will then look to Eleeza to talk about premium prices.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. I basically just covered it. I just wanted to comment on the issue that Christopher raised in his email. The idea of premium pricing will be included in the study, and we should be careful to note that, you know, what type of value we assessed to that now without have any data available to us, but that it is included, or will be included in the RFP, and that's certainly something we're going to ask the vendor to explore.

RON ANDRUFF: Great. Thanks very much. Any other thoughts or comments from the committee with regards to premium prices? And seeing none, I will turn it back to Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thank you. So, moving forward here. There is still a couple of metrics that we haven't really reached any sort of conclusions on that I wanted to raise again with the group, and hopefully we can get a little bit closer to determining our recommendation. The first one I want to I wanted to talk about was one that, again, came from Christopher's email, but we also still haven't gotten an answer from, I don't know if the go by INTA [en-ta] or I-N-T-A, but this is 1.1, the cost of domain name policing.

Christopher raised the issue of whether or not they were a reliable source to provide meaningful data on evaluating this particular metric. I think he raises a valid question. I think one other concern that we



---

would have is how comprehensive this data would be and how meaningful of a portrait it would paint. So I'm not sure if Michael Graham is on this call, but he was, he had taken the lead in coordinating with INTA on that.

But I'd be interested in hearing the group's reaction to those concerns.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Eleeza. I don't see Michael on the call at this point. So unfortunately he is not here to respond, but would anyone else like to speak?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Ron, this is Steve. When we did this original set of metrics, it was Michael Graham who came up with 1.11, and he was representing intellectual property constituency interests on that, as a member of the working group who came from the IPC. So he's intimate with the purpose behind 1.11, and I think it's fantastic that we can lean heavily on him to come up with objective and reliable sources for the data that he claims could have been gathered.

Ideally, Michael would have done that much earlier, but he was in the middle of a job change, and I realize that's why he only now recently reengaged. He's not with Expedia, and getting reengaged with the ICANN process. So we're asking the right person. He was the one who originated it, he was the best position to give us an answer. So let's lean on him and see if we can get that answer before the report is finalized. Thanks.

---

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Steve. I think your recommendation is a good one. So can we look to then staff to reach out to Michael and ask if he can then respond on this with a response to this particular question and to find out in fact [inaudible] can provide meaningful data for this evaluation.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I can do that.

RON ANDRUFF: Okay. So the ball is back in your court Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. 1.19, this is also another one that, in the past, Michael Nelson had suggested that we look into some academic sources for tracking numbers of domains that deal in identify fraud. I know that he's also in a career change, and Jonathan has offered to take this up but it seems like his plate is full right now as well.

So I'm not sure how we want to move forward with this, if this is something another group member would like to champion. But it still seems to be something too complex for us to do internally here, and I welcome your input on that.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Eleeza. Steve, please.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. I think we handle this one like we did two other items on this call, which is we should note in the report that we had interest in taking this a step further, but didn't have resources available within the timeframe, and we would invite the review team to consult with any member of this working group if they want to learn more about considerations that we had.

In other words, not everything has to be in writing. All of us will still be around when the review team convenes later this year. Perhaps as early as January, as late as January, and we're all go to be here to help, if in fact, they want to learn more about things that we considered, that didn't complete.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Steve. And in fact, we may find many of these [inaudible] also joining that body. So Eleeza, perhaps you can send a mail to both Jonathan and Michael, on the same day as the other Michael, just to inquire as to where there are, if anything has been done to get a sense of that before we start moving to that footnote.

But I think Steve's recommendation is a good one. Then with that, if there is any other comments with regards to 1.19. Seeing none, back to you Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. I'll follow up with both of them. Okay. Just a couple of more to get through here. The, on 1.21, we've been working with our technical

---

services staff on this one, and I wanted to pose this one back to the group. And I think I sent back to the group an email about this a couple of weeks ago, and if not, I can send this out again.

But 1.21 had to do with errors and gTLD zones. And I think we still need a little bit of a tighter definition of what this means. The notes that I had from the original recommendations, was that there might be syntactic tests to determine if there are errors in the zone, and basically what I was told was if it can't be algorithmically detected, then it would be really hard to tell whether there are errors, and what types of errors there are, and how in fact there are influencing the zone files.

So I am definitely not a tech person, but I would, I can send some comments from our tech team back, and I'm not sure if anyone else, if anyone in the meeting now had worked on this metric in the past and had any comments on that. But that's something that we're still working to refine.

RON ANDRUFF: Any thoughts or comments from the committee?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Ron, it's Steve. I put it in the chat, but I'll say it in case somebody is not on the chat. Olivier Crépin-Leblond from the ALAC was the one who added that metric, 1.21, and at the time, Olivier did give us a few examples, and those of course are in the document. Malformed addresses, commas, domain, bad IP addresses. So it's possible that

---

Olivier, Evan, or Cheryl would have other examples that the ALAC has discussed from time to time.

But we never got more specific than this at the time.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Steve. I wonder if either Evan or Cheryl would like to comment?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's Evan. I guess I didn't follow up beyond it other than what Olivier put forward. If there is a need from the tech folks on clarification of that, perhaps we can suggest that we take it directly up with him.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That makes sense.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, that would make the best sense to me as well.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Eleeza, you know Olivier and how to reach him, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I can take care of that.

---

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. And you can copy Evan, Cheryl, and I, and others who are all part of that group, and Jonathan, and we can all help in any way.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thank you.

RON ANDRUFF: All right. Eleeza, thank you very much, we'll go to the next item.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Phil Buckingham in the chat just weighed in on this. It's possible that Phil might know more about malformation errors. Phil, are you there?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not sure if he's on a mic, but I can recap to Phil as well, separately. Thank you Phil.

RON ANDRUFF: It looks like Phil is now actually typing something in the chat. Yeah, if you could please go ahead and reach out to him Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you very much. So the last metric I wanted to bring up is another one I've been discussing with the tech team which is on traffic in the new gTLDs. I've kind of left this in their capable hands, and we're still working on refining what this was. I wanted to just raise a point with you on one suggestion they had for actually measuring traffic,

---

which is to recommend sampling, for example, particular domains like the most popular domains in a particular TLD as representative of the sample traffic.

It might be difficult to measure all traffic, in particular TLDs, and compare that in a meaningful way. So I just wanted to put that out there to the group because that's something that's still being discussed in terms of feasibility and what the best approach might be, and so I may have more for you on that, on the next call.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. Unless anyone else has some comment that they would like to add to that? I suggest we move along, thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

RON ANDRUFF: I beg your pardon, Steve raised his hand.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks. Chris, really quickly, that one on traffic, we had the assumption that a data source like Alexa would be a source of traffic, indiscriminately, we'd get all traffic and all TLDs. And I don't know that Alexa uses comprehensive counts or does a sampling of their own, but if staff has discovered that Alexa doesn't make it all available, or is

---

prohibitively expensive, to get data for all TLDs, then pass that along to us and we'll try to act accordingly.

But if Alexa can provide all TLD data, whether sampled or actual, we prefer to get more data than less and put it in hands of the review team.

RON ANDRUFF: Absolutely Steve. I absolutely support more data than less. Go ahead Eleeza, I beg your pardon.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, and I mentioned the Alexa possibility as a reaction is that it may not be a very good measure. I can't remember the exact details of why that may not work out, but this is something that we have a dedicated person on the tech team who is working on the sort of tech related metrics, and I hope to have a little bit more information for you on all of this soon.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And we don't think the registries will be the best source of the data since the majority of queries get fulfilled from cache, somebody outside, downstream of the registry, has to be the one to assess traffic.

Phil Buckingham typed in there that he didn't, he thinks Alexa is not a good measure. But Phil Buckingham, you used the chat, what are some other sources that staff can explore?



---

RON ANDRUFF: All right. So Phil has noted in the chat, what a question, question mark, I'll come back on that. So we'll leave it to Eleeza and Phil to have that conversation. I look forward to hearing more about it. So Eleeza back to you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thank you. Before I move into the survey, I just wanted to give an opportunity to give you, give everybody an opportunity to give any other feedback on any other aspects of the report, or any of the other metrics, if there is anything that I'm missing there. Or if there was any other recommendations that particularly stood out for you.

I know several of you haven't written back yet, but I welcome your feedback on the report as a whole, or any particular session. And I see that Evan has his hand raised.

RON ANDRUFF: Please go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. Again, this is more a comment that might be worthwhile for a note rather than for changing anything in the metrics right now. One of the five that was left off, was something referring to something called software defined networks. And I guess I was not in on the call where the definition of that was put in. Essentially, that's one of the metrics that was left off, and let's see, where am I going?

---

Oh yeah, 5.6. And based on the definition that was given, you're absolutely right. 5.6 is redundant with the other ones that were listed. When the concept of software defined networks was put in, it wasn't thought of as just another path to hiding URLs. It's going way beyond this call to get into that, but when that was originally put in, there was a whole technology called software define networks that is somewhat growing, it's a bit underground right now, but it could conceivably pose a threat.

I just, after reading the report, see that the definition of software defined networks, essentially rendered it redundant with the other ones in section five. So I don't know if it's worth making a note. So based on the definition that was provided... So for the purpose of this analysis, SDN was defined as blah, blah, blah.

And under that definition, absolutely it's redundant and deserves to come out. When it was originally proposed though, SDN was actually a distinct technology, that isn't redundant with those. I don't really want to revisit it, but it might be worth a small note that, to make note of that particular characteristic.

That the definition that was given made it redundant, but as, when it was originally put in by ALAC 5.6, it was based on something that definitely was not meant to be redundant. Thanks.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thanks Evan. Does anyone else have some thoughts on that they would like to bring? Seeing none, Eleeza, back to you.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thanks Evan. I guess I would ask you to help us out a little bit more with what the definition is. We did have, we did pass this along to our tech team for their initial review. And when they looked into sort of the more technical definition, I guess you could say, of software defined networking, he didn't really see how this was really going to have an impact on the DNS, or on trust, choice, or competition.

So, either we did not have a good definition to begin with, or something. So maybe that's a conversation we need to have again, and if you could point us in the direction of a good source of information on SDN, that would be helpful.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well, just like you're pointing to your tech people, I'll need to go back to the people that I know that sort of pointed this out, that would be able to speak to it better than me. So, at this point in time, like I say, it's not worth changing the report, based on the analysis, based on the definition given.

It was appropriate to take out. I would simply note at this point that, at least from what I recall, the definition was somewhat different. And so, I don't know if it's worth, I mean basically, it might be a matter of putting your tech people in touch with our tech people, or whatever. But just simply did make a note of SDNs as being something different than merely redundant with the one, with the other ones in section five.

---

I'm referring to the paragraph in page 20, where it just explains why it was taken out.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. I see what you're talking about.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So Evan, do you, let me ask you a question. You raised the point of maybe having the two technical, the two parties speak directly, both the ICANN tech person and the person within the ALAC, could we ask you to facilitate that? How do you suggest... There should be changes necessarily in the report, but we may want to put a footnote in if in fact, there is some important element there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That is exactly what I was getting at. I mean, I'm not trying to put 5.6 back, because the way it's written, it does need to come out because it's redundant. So the idea of a footnote in there would probably be the best way to handle that, and I'm certainly happy to facilitate that.

RON ANDRUFF: Great. Thank you very much. So Eleeza, we'll let you follow up with Evan and his crew accordingly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sounds good. Thank you.

---

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. Okay, then we'll move on then to the next element.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So I just wanted to give you all an update on the consumer survey. Today is the deadline for the RFP responses. We've actually received five so far. So checking my email, I don't think I've received any others since then. We had, I think it was, in all, nine firms that have expressed an interest in responding. So we'll see what happens, and see how many responses we actually get.

But just to go over the timeline with you, we're planning on completing our own internal preliminary evaluations by the 20<sup>th</sup> of August, and notifying the finalist shortly thereafter, and having presentations from those finalists for the week of September 2<sup>nd</sup>. And starting to, hopefully again, the negotiations with the [inaudible] by the 10<sup>th</sup> of September, and have a contract in place by the end of the month, by the end of September.

So that's where things stand now. I think we are moving forward at a good clip.

RON ANDRUFF: Indeed, that looks like a very nice timeline and immediately doable. Any thoughts from the committee members?

Not seeing any pushback on that, Eleeza thank you very much. Let's go forward.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Lastly, I just want to check about the economic study. We have a draft RFP that we've been circulating internally, and we hope to share that with the sort of ad hoc group from the team, probably in the next two weeks.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. So any comments or thoughts with regard to the economic study from the committee? I note that Phil Buckingham is typing and Christopher Wilkinson is typing. So we'll see what comes forward from that.

A quick question I have while they're typing, or a quick look through the notes, no comment. I shall comment additionally by email if necessary. Thank you Christopher. And one question I would have for you Eleeza is, is there a timeline you have in your mind from staff as to when you would be getting this RFP out? And getting information back and so forth? As per the survey you have shown us? Is there something out in the horizon that you see?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think our timeline is as soon as possible, depending on whether we can get a draft out to the group and get some comments back from you all. You know, hopefully have a RFP published. I would imagine at least before the Los Angeles meeting, if not sooner. It's a little hard to say.

RON ANDRUFF: So that's very helpful. I was just trying to get a ballpark. And Phil Buckingham notes in the chat, thanks do you have any dates on the RFP

---

going out? And so I would assume that the RFP would be going out around middle to the end of September? Is that what you were thinking?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'd say that's a fair [inaudible] good point.

RON ANDRUFF: Very good. Any thoughts or comments from the rest of the committee, in that regard with the economic study? Seeing none, I think we're ready to move back to the agenda.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you. In terms of next steps, I think I'll just follow up with those who I said I would follow up with, and incorporate any changes into the draft we have going on now, and circulate it back out to the group, hopefully in the next week or so. In the meantime, if you have any other comments, I certainly welcome them. And you know, hopefully have a final product ready to present in October at the ICANN meeting.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Eleeza. I see Evan's hand is up. Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, old hand.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Evan, no problem. Thank you very much. Well, I'm very pleased with the work that's been done. As I noted in my email on the list, I think the staff has done a great job on this. Eleeza, you've been sort of leading the charge and I think it's an excellent job. The report is certainly passed the whey test, it's in-depth and it shows that there has been a lot of thought, a lot of consideration given to this.

And I think that the members of the committee should also be pleased with themselves for having generated the work on this to bring us to this point. So at this point in the meeting, I would like to ask if there is any other comment or questions that others would like to raise? And if not, then we'll bring this call to a close. Any thoughts, questions or comments please.

I note that Steve and Phil are typing in the chat, so we'll wait a moment to see what arises.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Hi it's Christa. Just one question. I just wanted to make sure Eleeza was okay with the [online?] definition that I provided and it made sense.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Christa. Yes, it did make sense, and I noted that in the section of the report that talks about new recommended metrics. Hopefully I captured your meaning in there. So if you could take a look and let me know what your thoughts are on that, I'd appreciate that.

---



---

CHRISTA TAYLOR: To me it looks okay. I just wanted to make sure that it made sense to you, and everyone else is okay with it because it kind of came out just between you and I as opposed to the whole committee. Yeah. And feedback on the report is, I thought it was really well laid out, it was really logical, and I think it reflected everyone's analysis and [inaudible], so I think it was a really terrific job.

Thanks to everyone, and yourself, for doing that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Christa. Appreciate those comments. And I'm seeing in the chat, Cheryl Langdon-Orr is saying it's all good, Phil is good with it, Steve as well. So with that then, ladies and gentlemen, I would thank everyone again for taking the time during the summer to get on this call, and most importantly, for doing this great work, and again to staff.

So with those words of commendation, I will bring this call to a close. We can stop the recording, and thank you everyone, enjoy the rest of the summer and we'll talk to you on our next call. And of course, your winter in Australia, as Steve reminds me. Bye for now everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**