UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, really, the meeting is being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, seriously.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will someone be able to do a call out to Phil? Thanks.

Well, it looks like we'll have a small, efficient group today. I mean that, maybe a couple of more minutes then we should get rocking and rolling.

Hello?

PHIL BUCKINGHAM: Hi. It's Phil Buckingham here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey Phil.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Hi. It's Michael Graham. I'm calling in to say I can't call in.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Can you monitor or you can't be on at all?

MICHAEL GRAHAM:	I won't be able to be on. I did want to give a quick just update where we were, talking with INTA. I've got an off-site meeting that's going on today, and attendance is rather mandatory.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Understood. Well, I mean enjoy the MP3. I know a lot of people burn them onto CDs, or you know, put them on their iPods for while they're working out, and stuff like that.

MICHAEL GRAHAM:	Well, I tend to listen to it on the bus going in. Is Eleeza on?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Yeah, I'm on. Hi Michael.

MICHAEL GRAHAM:	Oh hi, how are you? Yeah, we're having an offsite at Expedia today, so and since it's my first, I've got to be there. But, if I could real quickly, I'm in communication, unfortunately Susan Pane [inaudible], who is heading up the new gTLD subcommittee of the INTA Internet Committee, she and then John [inaudible] both agreed that they talked with whoever they needed to talk with and said that INTA would be interested in putting together the survey and conducting it.

And I've reached out to her. I have not heard back yet, on setting up a call with her and John and starting to work that through, to actually structure it and get it off the ground. Probably not something that would happen before December, only in so far as the big meeting for INTA will be coming up in mid-November, and that's when I expect most of the, you know, initial drafting will get done by then.

And I will work with them putting that together.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Could you include me in that call with them?   I'd be interested to hear how they would want to approach and make sure that is in line with our goals as well.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Okay, yeah. Once I set up a call with them, I will go ahead and reach out to you. I've got your number, I think, on your email. So I'll set that up and get you on that as well.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, great. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Michael, this is Jonathan. I would probably be interested in this as well, if that's all right.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Okay, yeah, that would be fine. That would be fine. I think that would be a good conversation. You know, they've had it in their real house, at least since London, but you know, since this work comes first unfortunately. And I've just made the transition out here to Seattle, but I'm now here on the ground.

But I'm optimistic about getting that done. Obviously the question will be participation. What sort of information we're able to get from that source.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Well that sounds good, like it's pretty good progress. So thank you for working on that.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Yeah. There are obviously highly encouraged, and so you know, the catalyst that I've put out there is the fact that since it has been an issue that's been raised by that trademark constituency, for so long, that it's in the best interest of the constituency to actually put together the metrics of that, to either prove or disprove their fears.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Yeah, I agree. I think it would be interesting. We just have to be a bit careful about, you know, going to an advocacy group for this type of data. But I think in the conversation with them, we can probably lay out a lot of those concerns.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Correct. Perhaps, would you be available, Eleeza , Friday of this week to talk?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, in the morning. Afternoon I'm out, but in the morning would be fine.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Okay. Where are you located? LA?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm in LA, yeah.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Oh, okay. Great. Well I'm in your time zone now.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Excellent.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: I'll take a look at my schedule and I'll send you an email and we'll set that up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. That sounds great.

MICHAEL GRAHAM:	Okay. Bye, I have got to go now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	All right, why don't we get the call started? Do we need to do some kind of a roll call here?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I think we can go with the attendees pod, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. Great. Perfect.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Would you like me to get started?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah, let's dive in.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I don't anticipate this being very long, since there is such a small group of us. Maybe we can have a quick discussion here today. But I just wanted to go through a couple of things. I'm going to tell you where we are in the consumer survey. We're very close to selecting a final vendor. I sent around yesterday an updated draft of the metrics report that we are aiming to get to the Board, ahead of the October meeting here in Los Angeles.

So I wanted to talk about some of the changes I made there. And then finally, tell you a bit more about the economic study, which – our fee for which was released yesterday, which hopefully you all saw. So on the consumer survey, as I think I told you on the last call, we received 12 proposals in all from a range of different surveys and prices.

We narrowed it down to five finalists and the ICANN team here spoke to each of those five finalists over the course of the last about week and a half, and now we're down to the last two who we are kind of vacillating in between and we anticipate making a selection and beginning contract negotiations, hopefully by the end of this week, and having someone under contract and started by the 24th of September, which is the date on our calendar. Possibly even sooner than that, as we get the answers we're hoping for.

So I can, I'll provide you with more details of that. I'm sorry to be a bit cryptic, but because we're still talking to these firms, we have to maintain some confidentiality going forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I mean, that was my question is, what is the confidentiality requirement there? I mean [CROSSTALK]…

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, is it just the nature of their bids on the project? Or is it about, I mean… I'm wondering what other details you can share in terms of criteria of elimination, like who the last two are, things like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, the… We've signed nondisclosure agreements with them. So I think until we have a contract in place, we can't really divulge too many details of their proposals. Such as not really comfortable saying who the last two finalists are, particularly the public call, and then that would give perhaps a leg up to the other finalists.

So I'm kind of hamstrung a bit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm just surprised that the NDAs would cover who the proposals were and things like that. I mean, is it possible to say in, well I don't know. I don't want to get you into trouble either. I'm just, the process suddenly became very opaque, that's all.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not a lawyer, so I'm hesitant to say too much more than that. But, I think that we confirm with Heidi with some more clarity after we've made our selection. But I think going back to the RP itself, it's pretty clear that we've used the criteria that was laid out in there very clearly, to make our selection.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Were there any other questions? I see that Christopher is typing. He says that as an ex-functionary, I understand the constraint. Thank you Christopher.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I guess when we get to talking about the economic terms, maybe we can form some sort of subcommittee within the community that could be a part of the proposal evaluation process on the economic study, because I'm just… You know, that in turn also signed the NDA or something like that. So let's have that conversation separately perhaps.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. I can move forward, if there aren't any other comments. So I wanted to talk a bit about the metrics report, which I realized I sent it to you late yesterday, but we've been sort of focused on RFPs. I haven't really had a lot of time to work on it. But hopefully you've had a chance to take a bit of a look at what I've added to the report.

So the first thing I wanted to bring up is I shared a draft with the group on the community wiki space, and I hope that you can share it with your communities and get any feedback. I haven't heard anything from anyone, so I just wondered if you'd been able to share that, or if it made the rounds. If you had gotten any feedback, I'd be interested in hearing that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I've kept the IPC abreast of these things, as has Michael Graham, so I think we're pretty comfortable with the report.

RON ANDRUFF: Ron Andruff. I've shared it, he's a member with this group and of the business constituency, and shared it and discussed it on a call. But I don't have any illusions that it was a deep dive into this, into the content of the report. But no discomfort expressed at all.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Well that's good to know. So I can go through some of the changes that were made to the report, and I'll refer to the page numbers, hopefully you all can have them pulled up in front of you. One of the biggest changes was a section on previous new gTLD evaluations, which were done…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes?

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve. Right before that new section in red, the final paragraph on page four before the new section. It's really giving me heartache,

and I'm not sure why I didn't catch it last time. It says, "The Board may now take steps toward forming a review team to collecting the recommended data points, accepting or denying those recommendations made by the IAG CCT." Accepting or denying, so when the Board creates the new team, we hope they will, the Board and staff, will make sure that the new team gets the metrics report.

But I don't know that the Board will charge the new team to go through the report, item by item, and either accept or deny. That sounds like a rather stark choice of options. We would want them to consider and could potentially amend, put it more friendly. But that's going to be up to the Board, I guess.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I mean, I think it is also up to the review team… I think it's also ultimately up to the review team which of these metrics they're going to use and how they're going to use them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It is. But accept and the deny might not be the two choices they'll actually make. I do think they would consider accept and amend. Right? We want this to be… In the best of all worlds, we take these and accept them all, but it's their discretion, to potentially add their own, or maybe drop some of the ones that we propose. We knew that going into this project, that the review could not [inaudible] by what we did.

And I just feel like early in this report, the last thing I want to do is send some signal that we have an expectation that the Board will charge the

review team with either: A) accept or B) deny. So it would be better to use different wording there. That's really my point. And then, what do folks think?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Evan had a question, what is the wording to deny their relevance? Actually Evan, I just sent the sentence to the chat. I think what we're referring to is that IAG's recommendation on the metrics, not the statistics themselves.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So we're expecting the Board to a line by line review of what statistics are good and what aren't? Is that really the point of this? We're counting on the Board [CROSSTALK]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: …I think it's about the Board charging the review team to do that.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, read that sentence Evan. The review team. I think the sentence is accurate in terms of the sequence, but in terms of the stark choices the review team has in front of it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, I mean, why is the choice either to accept or deny? Just to consider the recommendations made, or to implement them, or something. I mean, why force a choice of accept or deny? The review

team is going to be working with what it's given. Obviously it may be making value judgments, that some statistics are more valuable or important than others, but the idea that individual statistics are to be accepted or denied, I totally agree with the problem with that wording. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It seems like an easy change to make, to consider the recommendation made by the IAG CCT. I think that is all it really needs to say. Or to incorporate…

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can make that change [CROSSTALK]…

STEVE DELBIANCO: What do folks think of the text I just pasted into the chat?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Steve, why do you even need to put the word amend? I mean, the review team…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well they might come up with new ones, Evan. I think that's the idea there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Evan, we knew all along they may decide to tweak one here or there, drop one or add one, that's all.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So why not just [CROSSTALK]… consider, and then we'll deal with it when it does?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I mean, consider covers it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Christopher, I do want you to understand that the affirmation does not anticipate these preparatory teams like we've been, so that… I really don't believe there is any calling for the Board to mandate that the new review team somehow limit itself only to what we came up with. I don't even think that's on the table, Christopher.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. I think, the whole way along, what we've been doing is be responsible to try and develop some tools for the review team to use so that they're empowered to make some quantitative analysis in addition to the subjective discussions that will inevitably take place. And I think that we've done, gone a long way to empower to make some kind of quantitative and metric base analysis a part of that review.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You're right. So the rest of this is just over engineering it. So here…

[CROSSTALK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: I wanted to comment on the opening section. This is Steve. All of this was in the preface to the very first team that came up with the original metrics. And in the preface, we noted that the rationale behind Bruce Tonkin's [inaudible] resolution, the one that created our group, the rationale behind much of that was that we wanted to define metrics very early, so that the community and ICANN staff could begin, not only to collect, but to manage towards generating good results in the metrics.

The idea was, if you know how you were going to be measured, you'll actually perform better by trying to hit those metrics. And that was all part of this resolution to change the way ICANN manages, from looking in the rear view mirrors, to having a little bit of a road map in front of them. None of that sentiment is captured in the opening executive summary.

And if the group was okay, I could potentially go back to our original report and see whether there were a few sentences to that effect could be brought forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Steve, this is Jonathan. I'm not sure that I agree that that was one of our charges or the purpose of this resolution. I mean, that's a trap that we, you know, I think to try to side step quite a bit along the way of

suggesting that these are meant to be hints as to how people might behave. I mean, that's the source of a lot of the conversations, the heated conversations we've had about individual players, and things like that.

I mean, I think that this is just an evaluation after the fact that will help to shape the nature of the program going forward, and provide something to manage. The review team will hopefully provide guidance for the sort of management implications of that evaluation going forward. But I think the idea that our process was designed to drop hints to the community as to how they might manage themselves in the near term, I think is a dangerous implication that I'm not sure is part of our remit.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jonathan, this is Evan. I fully agree with you. The idea behind the metrics is to measure what's out there. We're not there to set the targets. That was made very clear from the beginning, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I mean, we were, you know, asked to provide three year targets, in fairness, of how these metrics might be used…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: How they might be used…

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think it's a very fine line. We were asked to do targets, Evan, very specifically. But I'm not sure that… I'm not sure that the idea is that we now, our work is somehow to be used to go and tell somebody they should have done something differently. Because the program is what it is at this point, and there is a guidebook that went through [inaudible] process, and I think that phase of, this is now the new regime under which you live will hopefully come out of the review team's work, and not be into it.

I think that's the only distinction I'm trying to draw. Nobody should be slapped on the wrists for having generated bad metrics, when in fact, these were not the rules of the road when they entered the program in the first place.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right. And I'm simply noting that a number of the At Large metrics didn't have very, they weren't amenable to having very specific metrics to the, or very specific targets to them. So, I guess I'm just saying from the point of view of the stuff that I was looking out for, setting targets as opposed to, well things should improve or things should go in a certain direction, without saying there should be certain numbers.

Because some of the metrics we asked for, simply didn't allow that kind of thing to be done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. And that's true of the GNSO recommended, some of the GNSO recommended metrics as well, that it was about trends, up or down.

Again, I continue to believe that the review team will have some difficulty incorporating metrics that can't even specify whether they should go up or down, but that will be an interesting exercise. But again, I guess all I'm saying, Steve, I don't think that we should make the implication that our work was somehow meant to be a shout over the bough at the participants in the programs.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The paragraph that I'm speaking of is the fourth, fifth paragraph in our October 2012 advice letter. I'm unable to paste it into the chat for some reason. I don't know why. But it says, "The community discussions during the affirmation of commitments review on accountability and transparency, included calls for metrics, objective measures that could be used to assess ICANN's performance on key aspects on accountability and transparency.

Moreover it was argued that such metrics would help ICANN to focus its efforts in ways that would measurably improve performance. And finally in that vein, several community members encouraged ICANN's Board to establish metrics for other AOC reviews, including consumer trust, competition, and consumer choice."

That's the paragraph I was speaking of.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I don't think that's in conflict. I just think it's a timeline issue. I think that that job of ultimately, you know, naming the metrics and setting the targets is a go forward exercise that would be done by the

review team. I don't think we were empowered with setting policy essentially for the program that's already underway.

I mean [CROSSTALK]…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. The working group understands that the purpose of the advice is to provide the Board with definitions, measures, and targets that can be useful to the affirmation review team, that will convene one year after the new gTLDs have launched. However, the working group understands that the advice cannot predetermine, or otherwise limit the scope, of the future affirmation review team.

In addition the advice does not intend to recommend policy changes or policy development needs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I mean, it's my hope and expectation that the review team will in fact take up that, rather onerous task of looking at, well this work just didn't work, let's make this change, etc. But I think we were more about helping to identify tools to make that evaluation, and we can't retroactively break policy.

Are you in agreement with this point Steve? Or is it still bothering you?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Nothing I was suggesting implied we were creating policy. So I'm confused, but if it rubs people the wrong way, we leave it out.

Remember the IAG CCT came on the heels of the work of the first group. So to the extent that we have dropped from the rhetoric, dropped from the report, discussions about how we came up with the original 70 metrics. What our expectations and aspirations were.

That doesn't make it to the report, and I believe that is a loss that will undermine maybe even undermine the creditability of the report when it gets handed to the review team. It's possible, however, to suggest that the review team take a look not only at the IAG CCT report, but the underlying metric support that we started with. That's a lot to read though. So you can see my dilemma. I hate to lose the cogent discussion of what we thought our mission was, and how we consider and decided upon what we did, but the 2012 route.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, maybe I'm just being dense here. I mean, I… And maybe I'm misunderstanding what you're recommending. I guess I'm saying…

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm recommending that a big chunk of page one and two, of the October 2012 report, be block quoted, at the bottom of page four that Eleeza has prepared. The report…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was fine with the language [CROSSTALK]…

STEVE DELBIANCO: …report, it simply says that they came up with recommendations. You know, in the discussion on, in our report, we have a discussion of, we consider the similarities between choice and competition, remember that? We considered and carefully came up with a definition of what consumer was for the purposes of consumer trust and consumer choice. A lot of that stuff is not going to be read by the review team, since it is sort of superseded by this report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So your primary concern is that just the review team will end up duplicating a lot of work because they won't understand their rationales for what we did.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, duplicated would be the least of my worries. What's more likely that it would misunderstand, misinterpret, discard, disrespect, and start over and come to a completely different place. We haven't put our best foot forward in a report that leaves out how we came up with the original metrics. All you need to do is to read the first three or four pages of this report, and then read the first three to four pages of the original report, and you'll see what I mean.

[CROSSTALK]

…our metrics into sections as well.

EVEN LEIBOVITCH: Steve, is it possible just to put in this report a note to the reader saying that, that people evaluating this would be well advised to see the earlier report that informed what this group did, and may go deeper into the motivations behind them? I mean, rather than trying to rewrite this or put something special into this, essentially adding in a note to the reader, a note to the people that are going to be working on this, saying, you know, that there is valuable information in the work that led up to this, that need not be ignored simply because we had a job to do following up on it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah Evan, I think at the very least we do that. It's [inaudible] to do so, and the challenge would be, make that recommendation in the strongest, possible term, since if one starts… If a brand new review team convened tomorrow, and they started by reading the report in front of you, I don't know how they would have a clue, what we set out to do and the rationale we had in deciding what we did.

What it is, is that it is a group that took a second look, so it contains lots of detailed, back and forth considerations of the second group, looked at feasibility and difficulty, etc. And you scratched their head saying, "What? Where did this even come from?" So, Evan at the very least, we should do what you recommended, somewhere at the bottom of page four Eleeza. But ideally, even earlier.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm good with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm good with doing more. I now take your overall point, Steve, and I guess I was jumping on something very specific you were talking about, that concerned me every time it came up. I think that bringing back up the context of the original effort is probably worth the effort in this report so that this report has a better chance of standing alone. I think that objective is a good one.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. Context…

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I'm with you there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I apologize. The very specific example you brought up about managing to those metrics was the thing that I was reacting to. But as far as providing context for how we reached, how we performed the evaluations, how we did, etc. I guess I'm in favor of taking the time, because we have it, for this report, there is nothing, there is not a sense of urgency around the report. I'm inclined to improve this report rather than just adding a reference back to the old one.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And that improvement, at the least, is to look at the first seven pages of the 2012 advice, and it might even be able to copy and paste it, so it looks as if it's going to carry over. But when we get to the actual tables of metrics, we made a point of breaking the metrics into small subgroups even within trust, choice, and competition, into our headings, that would lead the reader to understand, okay, the following four were setup to understand defensive registration.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So Steve, you're talking about going back to the original work that both the GNSO and the ALAC did, and referring to both of them explicitly in some of the broader, this is why we did this kind of stuff.

[CROSSTALK]

STEVE DELBIANCO: …mainly the first seven pages of our October 2012, and the only other thing I'm suggesting Evan, is in the tables where we delineate the metrics that we restore the little subheads, to break the metrics into different groups.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree with that too.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Because in many respects, the IAG CCT did work meta work about metrics, whereas the original group did the actual metrics. And now we're going to hand it to the review team who really only cares about the metrics that survive, they may not give a damn about how some metrics fell away, and other metrics were modified or combined.

That really isn't the story. Their story is, here are the 65 metrics that two different work groups, working in series, are recommending to you. They read only the IAG CCT report, much of it is about how we decided to keep or combine, or drop. Not really relevant to a review team. It's a great report, Eleeza, you wrote what you had to write because you had to summarize what it is we as a team considered and concluded, while acknowledging there were differences views on certain items.

And all of that is very admirably done. That's for one audience. That's for the audience that wants to know that the IAG CCT do its job. Checkmark. Done. Okay, but is this really the right document in hand to be deer in the headlights, dozen people will convene a team in the next two months, to do arguably the most difficult review that we will have done yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's a good point.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So this is Eleeza. I just want to make sure that I'm on the same page with you guys. So the report I think you're referring to, the one I have a copy of, is from December 2012, it says advice requested by the ICANN

Board regarding definition, measures, and targets for competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. Is this what you're referring to Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. The original advice letter from the GNSO and ALAC.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. May I make a suggestion? I mean, I think this should be perhaps this might address some of your concerns, at the very least we can include this as a sort of appendix to the report itself, and I agree with you that in the original metrics, we can add the original subheadings that were included in that report.

And certainly summarize some of the key points that were made in this report in the executive summary. Is that kind of what you're getting at?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Only part way there. Not only the subheads, but the table that you've used to reproduce the metrics doesn't even have the same column where we would identify the source of the data, the relative difficulty of getting the data, and an indication of targets, which the Board asked us for.

See the Board resolution, the Bruce Tonkin's resolution, asked for three year targets. This particular IAG CCT, we didn't pay any attention to that, and it maybe that the review team won't. The beauty of those targets is the rationale that we had, this is when we came up with a

given metric, we would say where the data would come from, how hard it might be to get, and then we said that the expectation is that the new gTLDs would score better than the legacy gTLDs, or they would have fewer of this metric than the legacy.

So what we did was put thought into what we would expect to happen if this metric was indicative of an increase in consumer trust. And the way your table is, it conveys none of that. Because your table was designed to help this group do its job, not the review team. What might be the best thing for the review team to have, is for them not even to read our report, for the IAG CCT, but instead, to read the original advice annotated. Okay? The original advice, and if there was an item that we recommended dropping, it would come out, or get grayed out.

If there was an item that this group has already begun collecting or doing surveys on, that would be annotated in there. So the most useful document is an annotation of the original advice, and the appendix then would be to read the IAG CCT so they understand why did something get dropped, why did something get combined.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. I agree completely with that approach, and that's probably the approach the review team should take. And so maybe the question is not about making dramatic changes to this report, but instead also making what amount to fairly minor changes to the original report, as you say, to annotate the fact that the data has begun to be collected, surveys have been done, and to eliminate the metrics that were eliminated by this group.

But the original report is a better starting place for the review team, even though this is a very good report of our work.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's exactly what I'm saying.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not quite sure I'm getting this, because I guess what I'm wondering is, you know, this group was charged with making certain recommendations, and your discussion delved pretty deeply into the metrics that came out of that October 2012 report, or December 2012 based on the date I have. So I think just to annotate that report, and not take note of the deeper discussions that have taken place over the last five months or so, would kind of be leaving a lot out. I don't know. That's sort of my…

STEVE DELBIANCO: …leave that out. That becomes the explanatory document. Every word you wrote survives, but it survives as an explanation for changes that were made to the original advice, as opposed to handing somebody just the changes, just the deltas, without any of the underlying organization or explanation. We're really just flipping this around. Instead of your report being the main report, and we hope they read the original, we want to hand them the original as amended by this group.

That ought to be easy to do. They're relatively minor changes. And then they refer to your report, the one that you just drafted for us, to explain why the changes were made.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not sure that they're relatively minor changes though. Based on pretty substantial changes to wording, to organization, you know, which I think are covered in the report that is before you now.

STEVE DELBIANCO: There is five or six items that were dropped. There is no more than six where we changed the wording. And the organization that staff gave us for this group, was to help us understand relative difficulty. It's not the organization that is relevant to the review team. The review team keeps them in order by consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition, broken into the subheads as we did originally. That's the order they would look at them in.

A lot of the order and coding that you help, you did to make our job easier, would make their job harder.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does anyone else have…? I mean, because we can take this offline to refashion this. I think it's just a question of looking at it in order to get it. I mean, the point is that what we need to do is to present the review team with the set of tools we come up with in the most useful way. And so, while including the rationale behind things as a reference, what we want to do is practically provide tools in the most organized and useful way for the review team to actually use them, and the context that they would use them.

I think that is Steve's point. And I think it makes sense that the report… So this could be our report back to the Board of our work. I think what's separate is what we want to hand the review team when it's formed, in order to do its work. I think that's the distinction.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So Eleeza, is it becoming a little bit clearer now?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think so. I'm just, I guess… So, let me just kind of talk this out and make sure I'm understanding it, and stop me if I'm getting something wrong. What you're suggesting then is to amend the original report by either, you know, red lining, for example, the ones that the group decided to drop, changing the ones that the group decided to change, and adding the ones the group decided to add.

And then add in as an explainer note, include the IAG report. Is that correct?

STEVE DELBIANCO: You've got it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	And to make things even easier, at the beginning of this project, I hope Evan is still on the line, because the first thing anybody did on this team, was Evan and I spent a week combining the ALAC and GNSO advice into a single document, it's called combined GNSO and ALAC advice. And we first circulated it at the very, I guess it was the second call of this group.

And it's landscape mode because we wanted to leave room in there to indicate IAG CCT considerations for when to start. And the beauty of that table is to preserve all of the original advice, both from the ALAC and the GNSO, in a single document. And I arranged the metrics so that any of ALAC's metrics would be in the right place, you know, with regards to consumer trust. And that document would even be far easier to amend, so we have to delete only five rows and add one, to have that be the roadmap for the review team.

I don't know, is that document in the wiki? And maybe to make life easier, I could just reply all to Eleeza's last note that was the copy of that. Maybe I'll do that right away so you all will have it. |
| ELEEZA AGOPIAN: | I wonder if that's the document I'm looking at now, since I started in January. It's dated from January 19th, but it says it's a December 2012 report. It's the combined tables from… |
| JONATHAN ZUCK: | Oh, right, that is that document. |

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Is that what you're referring to?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes ma'am.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Well I can use that as a starting point, if that's what the group would like.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And don't dispose of a single character that you typed in your report. We need the report, that you've circulated and attached today, to explain the amendments you're making.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So then, what I can do is red line this report, as you suggested, and I'll send that around to the group. Would that work?

STEVE DELBIANCO: It certainly works for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Definitely. I mean, again, I think one way to think about this is, a report of our work back to the Board is one thing, but the tool set, the [inaudible] tool set that, here review team, here is our best foot forward on how we were able to help you, is something else. I think that's the distinction we are drawing.

And that the focus is on the changes we made to the original document, kind of hides the 80% that didn't change, and how it was organized, and the thoughts that went into it, that's in the first report. So we need to make sure that we're capturing that. And the best way to do that is to start from that report.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It feels jarring, but as your mind wraps around it, I think you'll see it really fits like a glove with the work that you've been doing.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, I'm just in the midst of taking notes here. That's fine. I can certainly work on that and circulate it to the group. You know, I just want to point out that, just to ensure that we get all of this together in time to present something to the Board, I would like to set a deadline for this group for September 26th.

So I think what I can do is get something sent around to the group this week, and perhaps we can try for another call next week, and hopefully work toward a final document in the next couple of weeks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, and I don't know if we need a call to do it. The edits should be self-explanatory. We ought to be able to review it by email, but of course I'll leave it up to the Chair to decide if that would be sufficient.

I just recirculated the original combined document, and the note that Evan and I sent around when we finished our combination exercise,

which was back on January 19th of 2014. And I think that's the right document, Eleeza, that you have got in front of you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

STEVE DELBIANCO: You note that in that document, all of the ALAC stuff is in red, as I pasted it over into the GNSO, which is in black. And so, that red and black combination was just meant to convey to the AC SOs coming together, it wasn't a red line so to speak, not the red line that you're speaking of.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I see what you're saying. I haven't gotten it yet but I'll keep an eye out for it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Eleeza, when did you join this team?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The end of January.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, got it. So this is just before you came on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct.

Would you like to go through the rest of the changes I made to the IAG report?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, yeah. Yes, definitely because it's still the report of this group. So I don't think that's… So please, keep going.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. So I wanted to start with the bottom of page four, the previous new gTLD evaluations. As I mentioned before, the sort of Board directive to this group included taking into consideration any previous evaluations that were done. I read through those, and tried to just summarize the key highlights, without actually regurgitating fairly sizable reports.

I have, of course, noted them below. I think there were a couple of interesting findings that I've noted in here, particularly from the plan for action regarding the new gTLDs and also from the OECD report. So I've noted those in there. So that was one sort of big section that was added. The remaining changes were all fairly minor, and were in response to some of your suggestions from our previous call.

One I noted here was the definition of cyber-squatting, which is on page 10 at the bottom. Maureen noted that all of these definitions were really starting points, and that there was some divergence of opinion on how narrowly to define cyber-squatting. I think this is something as we move forward with the selected sender, that we can narrow these

definitions, particularly in a more consumer friendly way, to make sure that they translate easily to an obviously nontechnical audience, and of course, translate into languages other than English.

The other point I wanted to make was on page 21, on metrics 5.6, which scroll down there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you want to bring up the text on the…?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. This was on the growth, the metric is, growth [inaudible] define networking as an alternative to the DNS. If you guys will remember, this was a metric that we decided against. Thank you. Against including, but Evan had made a point on the previous call there was another definition of software defined networking that perhaps we weren't considering, and so I just noted that there.

And then finally, I added a link to our community wiki on the appendix four which was all of our community members, just to show… Since we haven't been very diligent about taking attendance, to demonstrate who had actually been participating in calls and so forth. Finally, I also added in, I was finally able to get a little bit more information from our technical services team, which has expanded in size and now we have a team member who is kind of dedicated to helping out with these more technical metrics.

I've included input on these metrics I have listed for you. So just to quickly go through some of his input, and also some of the

conversations with the group members. So for 1.5, which is the percent of time for registrar services, as the metric noted, this is provided that SLAs are established. And the technical team just wanted to note that, you know, it's contingent on making sure that we have the data from those SLAs.

On 1.21, this has created some interesting discussions regarding errors in gTLD zones. I think, you know, part of the trouble we initially had with this metric was how to define errors, and there are a number of different ways to define them and to tempt them. If you go into the report, let's see which page it is.

I believe it is on page 18, scroll up here. You'll note the text that I added on page 18, hopefully now you can see it here on the screen. Essentially, based on some conversations we've had, I think this one came from Olivier, the recommendation from our technical team was to use a test called a lame delegation test, that would query for a sample of domain names, and we could determine how that sample would be taken to demonstrate whether or not they're actually representative of zone files that are actually active.

The suggestion that Olivier had was to test for some tactic errors, but the feedback that we got was that this would be extremely difficult to measure because some tactic errors, such as commas instead of dots and so forth, can actually turn up as valid in the DNS. If it's actually entered into the zone file. So it's sort of difficult to test for it as being valid or invalid. I'm giving you the fifth grader's understanding of what I understood our technical team to be sharing with me.

But that was their reaction to that metric. So I shared this with Olivier, and I think we were kind of reaching the same page on this one. Yeah. I love the expression this lame delegation, but shouldn't it be lame registrations? You may have a point, but I guess that's the way, that's what the test is called.

I also wanted to note on 2.8, which is just below this on page 18, just below 1.21, regarding the shared sunrise registration and domain blocks. This is another case where our technical team pointed out that it's important to define very clearly, in that IDN variance, for example, might be considered a domain block, depending on how you measure them. So it's just another case where the review team will have to be careful about how these definitions are set and what we're actually measuring.

JONATHAN ZUCK: To be clear, I mean, IDN variant is not a domain block. We want to be clear on that, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, exactly. We have to be careful, I guess, in how they're defined in terms of actually taking the metric within the zone. So that was the distinction they wanted to drop.

Moving down toward 2.9 and 2.10, which are the root, sort of similar metrics regarding registrations that have the same domain names, and [inaudible] TLDs, prior to the expansion and… Prior to the expansion, and then of course, in the new gTLDs, and then a similar one on

duplicate registration. Again, the technical team just wanted to point out that this would be a question of statistical sampling, particularly if this was to be some sort of a query that was developed on our end from the technical team that, we don't do, pretty careful with sampling to ensure that it is representative.

The data sets obviously are extremely large and really difficult to measure in their entirety. On 2.14, the next one, which is on DNS traffic. This is another one where we've had a lot of discussions, and I think the sort of final conclusion we reached was that there is a lot of different vendors out there that offer this data, all of which is going to come at a cost. This is not something that necessarily can be done internally.

I know that Alexa was one that was measured, and the consistent feedback that we got was that Alexa isn't a good measure of DNS traffic and that it could be very easily manipulated. So I think this is something that we're going to have to move forward on, at a best effort and continue to explore our possibilities of different vendors, and that's something our technical team is starting to do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: There is somebody out there is providing traffic data, it may be flawed or imperfect, but Internet traffic is very frequently used measurement. We're not [inaudible] cant' get this.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly, I'm not saying that we can't. I think it's a matter of identifying the most reliable source.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, this is Jonathan. I guess I still have a question about the previous thinking. I don't think that a data set of new registrations is that enormous yet. So I'm not sure I completely agree with the technical team that we need to do sampling to look at new registrations, and comparing them to old ones.

We're not having to query through the entire old registry database. Sorry, I should have spoken up sooner. I'm just absorbing the significance of these things. Well, because we're looking at the notion of defensive registrations, which I think is going to be a complicated process to begin with. Not the lame registration issue, there is one lower down where you were discussing having to go back to a sampling for duplicates. And I don't, I'm not sure that the number of new registrations is so great to represent an unwieldy amount of data. In 2.10.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I mean, that's the feedback I received…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. It's okay to include that feedback, and I guess the review team will have to make that assessment but, I mean. I… That's, you know… That feels like a manageable query because the number you're starting from is the new registrations, not the old ones.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I thought that Christopher had his hand raised.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Just to remind you that I was on the call. But I agree with Jonathan and the previous speaker. So far the numbers of new registrations don't seem to me to justify heavy sampling. Offline, I'd be interested to know how Alexa or other sources of data could be manipulated, but I don't want to take the time on the call just now. Thank you Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. So I don't… I mean, given that it's just reflecting the feedback of the technical team, I'm not sure it needs to be removed, I'm just not prepared to forgo doing an actual data analysis administration at this point, that's all.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. I even note that, and I can certainly go back to the team and inquire further…

JONATHAN ZUCK: And let me know if I can helpful with that as well Eleeza. I'm happy to sit on a call or something like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure thing. Moving forward, on 4.4, this was what I hadn't gotten very good feedback on, but we've made a little more progress. So I added some feedback on here. This was regarding the frequency of dead end domains, those may not… On Adobe Connect, we're on page 19, on 4.4. In short, the recommendation was to better define dead end domains. Again, this raises the question of domains that are registered but may not resolve, like the IDN variance we mentioned earlier.

Parts domains are also difficult in that some of those domains may be registered for email, or for other purposes, or websites that redirect. You know, the example I was given was if you type in ESPN.com, it automatically redirects you to ESPN.GO.com, and other Disney owned websites, as one example of that.

So this is a little bit difficult to set the parameters for in terms of what we actually mean by dead end, and what doesn't actually resolve for what purposes it doesn't resolve. So that was where we are on this one.

I can continue moving, if there aren't any comments on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, sure. I think we're aware of those challenges, and we're going to have just to sort of do our best and there are going to be those, I mean, that's come up quite a bit in our conversations. You know, how to really define what a dead end domain is. [CROSSTALK]…comments, I don't know what the implication of the comments are, and I think that it is something we need to grapple with. Steve? Sorry, go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The dilemma and the grappling that you're speaking of, if in fact this was the review team call, the review team would consider the difficulties you just raised in the greater context of well, how many metrics do we have folks for consumer trust? We've got about 30, and this particular one is troubling with respect to the interpretation and the obtaining of the data.

There is no great loss for them to say for a few of these that are troubling, that we have enough to go on to measure consumer trust. We don't need to have this. I mean, I have a feeling the review team will be merciless at discarding metrics that present dilemmas like this. And we [CROSSTALK] with lots of metrics in each category, maybe anticipating just…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right and legitimate, and I hope that they are merciless, right? And the question, I guess, is going to become on a case by case basis whether or not a particular question is sufficiently addressed by the alternative metrics. I mean the other way that the review team might look at this is as a function of a delta. In other words, whatever those exception cases are, they're going to exist both in the baseline and in the new data.

And so they are controlled for in that way, unless the argument is made that the new program is somehow expands the exception cases, right? So I mean, it's possible that just studying the baseline in the delta is going to lead to interesting results, even if diving into either data sets

directly that have several exception cases. But yes, and they just drop it if there is another way to get the answer to the same question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:　　So those were the most substantial changes I made to the report. At the beginning of the call, Michael Graham was on for those of you who came on late, he had to leave, but he quickly gave us an update on INT's interest in polling its members on metric 1.1 which has to do with the cost of policing intellectual property cases.

So we're going to pursue that further and see exactly what they're thinking, and how that might fit in with our metrics and ensure that the data that they collect can actually be useful to us. So that was sort of the update there. And then I also, again, just wanted to mention that I'd like to get this report squared away by the 25th of September. So hopefully I can make some changes and circulate to the group the next week, and if necessary, schedule another call, perhaps, later next week or early the following week, and then we can finalize this report.

JONATHAN ZUCK:　　That sounds good. And if you want to do, if it's helpful to do a smaller call, Steve or whatever to talk about the distinction between the report of this group's work, and what a product…. I mean, the best way to think of it is the product out of both teams' work, might best be to hand to the review team, which is different than the report being handed to the Board. Potentially… We're happy to have a separate side call on that Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay, thanks. If we could put the PowerPoint back up? Thank you. So, lastly, I just wanted to talk about the economic study. As I mentioned to all of you, the RFP was published yesterday, with a deadline to send us questions and indicate an intent to apply by Monday the 15th. Proposals are also due on the 29th of September, so in three weeks, or just about three weeks.
	In the last couple of weeks, we've reached out to about 23 different firms that do this type of work. Seven expressed an interest in applying [inaudible] actually will. And our target date for contracting is the 10th of November. Obviously that middle week in October of the ICANN meeting in LA, that kind of holds us up a bit, otherwise we could have gotten it done sooner.
	But I think we're moving along in, at a good clip and all of your input was really helpful in the RFP. I hope you all had a chance to take a look at the final product that was published online.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Definitely. I think it looks excellent. This is Jonathan again for the transcript. I think it would be a really good idea if there was a way to find a very small subset of this group to be a part of looking at the proposals, and that do have insight into whose coming on and who is chosen. So how do we go about discussing that possibility?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You know, I'm not sure, as I haven't done this before. Margie, is that something perhaps you can speak to? If you're still on Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: I'm sorry. What was the question?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jonathan was asking about having some of the IAG members, a small group or a couple of people, participate in the RFP process for the economic study.

MARGIE MILAM: Oh, okay. Yeah, I don't have any background on our processes for that. The only thing I can say is that we'll check internally and get back to you. I don't know if that's something that we can do. And we have a new director of procurement that has been working with us, and so I think Eleeza, you and I can perhaps talk to him and get back to the group.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yup, I can do that. And I'll send a note around and let you all know what I find out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. And again, let me know if me getting in on the phone is useful to fleshing out that conversation a little bit. I just, we're in a, you know, a high stress time in ICANN's history with respect to transparency and accountability, and all of the conversations that are going on. And I

think it would be a good idea if the community was able, in some small way, to take part in this process of evaluating the vendors.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. I will look into it and let you know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Next is really all I had.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you feel like you had enough people to reach out to for doing this? Can you share the list of people that you sent this out to? And we could potentially provide additional firms or something, if we see somebody that is missing from your list.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Let me find out if I can share that list, I honestly don't know. I don't want to overstep my bounds here. But I mean, in terms of, you know, [CROSSTALK]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: …anyone that we want to. I mean…

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Of course, and I have been asking the group for any suggestions on firms. We're more than happy to take names, because obviously this is a niche business, and we're looking for good candidates. And if there are other names out there, I'm more than happy to take them, but certainly you can also forward the RFP on it at your will.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Find out if you can share the list that you contacted, and in the meanwhile we'll all try to think if there are other firms. You may have already thought of them, that's all.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. I will let you know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And that was all I had for today, so if there is anything else.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, Eleeza, it's Steve. Thank you. I thought that an one minute exercise would help to define expectations and to make it easier to do that modification of the combined doc, which is going to be another one of our work products. Is it possible for you to load that into the Adobe Chat and jump to page 12?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I can do that. Just a moment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Folks, this is the combined doc that Evan and I had done for the group back in January, which combines the ALAC and the GNSO advice that retains all of the original groups. Context, scope, rationale, and organization.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. I'm just trying to, I'm not too well versed with Adobe Connect.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Oh, you're well ahead of me.

[CROSSTALK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, let me just send it real quick Charla, thank you.

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Okay, thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And Charla, if it's on an email, I just circulated to the entire group if you're still receiving those.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I haven't gotten that email from you yet Steve. I wonder if…

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: I haven't either.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's not good. It went out a while ago.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Have others received it?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, it says it went out at 1:50 PM, about 30 minutes ago. Jonathon, anyone get it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm looking. I don't see it either.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It has to be routed by IAG dash CCT at ICANN dot org.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I don't think it came through.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All the more reason to load it, if you can Charla.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I just sent it to her. You said page 12 Steve?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Please. It's where the actual tables begin.

Technology is working about as slow as Apple's is today. The Apple demo crashed when they were showing off the [laughter].

Thank you Charla. Folks, this is the table that I was speaking of, and you'll see right here on page 12, that what Evan and I did was add a fifth table in this column. And we did it in January of this year, because the group wanted us to help everybody focus on, hey, which of these do we need to start capturing now? So that fifth column, Eleeza, is the place where you can transfer anything that our group concluded, about these metrics.

So for example, what was the first one that we recommended changing or deleting? I'm checking your original draft here. The first thing that we recommended, yeah I guess it was a little while before we made any recommendations to change or delete.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was 2.13.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, right. Thank you. 1.13, did we recommend on 1.13? I'm saying that that fifth column doesn't have to be about, or when to start. That fifth column should just be labelled IAG CCT recommendations. And in that fifth column, anything that IAG CCT recommended about that metric, which is all captured in your report, to be noted there. And of course, if they need more details…

How come IAG CCT recommended deleting this one? Boom. They go right over to your report, and they'll understand the long discussion and considerations that got rid of it. So this would put everything in one place. That that fifth column is ready made to do it in. That makes it easier than you trying to redline something. You just get to fill in that fifth column. How does that sound?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, we might actually red line as well, to show, to make it really obvious that it was something that was dropped. [CROSSTALK] …or blue if it was amended or added, or something like that. But yeah, beyond that, I think you're right. And maybe change the heading a little bit, because it was very focused on when it was start…

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right, make it IAG… [CROSSTALK] …recommendations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That's all I wanted to do was to get some consensus on how to use that fifth column, and hopefully to make it more reasonable task. Because I sense the hesitancy in your voice.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't find the task difficult, I just wondered how you wanted to present the data, that's all.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Do you think it makes sense now?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm fine with changing it the way you suggested it, yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you, that's all I had.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other business for anyone else? Okay. Well, Eleeza, perhaps you and I will be in touch offline on a couple of those other things, but let me know how you could be helpful.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thank you all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]