
JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay everybody. Welcome to the Implementation Advisory Group call for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice. As we discussed on the last call, we have a February 28th deadline to come up with a set of interim recommendations for the Board to consider at the meeting in Singapore.

And so, what we have been focused on thus far, and I know I've been a little bit of a hammer about it, is sources of information for which we would need to establish a baseline, because that data would either be corrupted, bias, or otherwise unavailable at the time of which the review team actually forms. And so, what I want to do is actually focus on those – the three things we've kind of boiled it down to and then I welcome other input of people who have thought of something that we haven't.

But so basically, the three areas of potential interim Board recommendation at this juncture, is a recommendation surrounding the survey, which I believe we reached a rough consensus with some dissenters, not to – Christopher, who I think voted no and Mike Nelson who probably would have voted no in abstention, but it seemed otherwise we had a majority of people in favor of recommending a survey take place, but we can talk about that for another 10 minutes or so.

And the second has to do with pricing data, which I think will be worthy of some discussion and there are some metrics associated with pricing data that would be difficult to retrieve after the fact. And then finally, a third, there are three metrics that came out of the ALAC process, that

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.

have to do with alternatives to domain names for gaining access to content, so QR codes, search engines, and hosted pages: Facebook, Google Plus, etc.

Unfortunately, Evan is unable to join the call today. So I don't know if there is somebody on the call that feels like they would be a good champion for those particular metrics. If you are that person, please raise your hand, and we'll make sure and give you the opportunity to champion those metrics when we get to the point of the discussion. Is everybody comfortable with the agenda and what we're trying to accomplish for the day, and are there any questions?

DAVID STUCKMAN: I'm fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So the first issue is related to the survey, and I will tell you that, he's not on here, Mike Nelson. I had a communication with Mike Nelson, he was unable to make the last call, it was only on for part of the part of the call, and he fielded this notion of a kind of lead survey. It's a survey that people refer to it, but Mike was talking about rather than surveying consumers, instead survey the people that surveyed them, their DNS needs if you will, ISPs and others that have to field complaints about things not working, and doing a comparison of those report complaints.

And I forwarded that recommendation to Jeremy, who joined the call last time, and said that it was a legitimate thing to do and that he had

mentioned kind of a lead oriented surveys but say that there was an issues associated with introduced bias and things like that, that would be less likely with a consumer survey. So, I don't know whether to spend a lot of time talking about this alternative, or to treat it as a potential list survey later on. [?] of people's complaints databases at the time of the review, because in theory they would in fact have those complaints available, that they had sealed it in whatever their complaint management system was.

So I want to just open that up because Michael had raised it. I got the feedback from Jeremy that it could be do, it wasn't an issue exclusive, but that it could probably be criticized for introducing some bias and not being as specifically relevant because you couldn't get a broad enough field population to poll from. But does anybody want to talk about that? Ron, I see your hand up, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you Chair. I think what you just said in your explanation of this, kind of nails it for me. If it introduces any bias whatsoever, then it is a tainted study, and for the amount of effort we have to go through creating this baseline, the amount of information that we're actually looking for, the pure information if I can put it in those terms, I don't see why we would want to do this at this stage.

It doesn't seem to me to satisfy the needs that we're looking for at the baseline in the marketplace. So I just wanted to suggest anything that would be biased, is not something we should be looking at, at this stage. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Christopher, go ahead. Is your audio working? I see your comment. It looks like we don't have audio for you. Now your microphone is enabled, can you speak? Okay. I see your comment about it making more sense, and that was in Mike Nelson's position as well, and I see the value in it.

DAVID STUCKMAN: Jon, can you read it? Because I'm not on audio, I'm just [?] on the road.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'll read it. Christopher says, "The survey of ISPs and registrars makes more sense to me." So that is what he has written so far in the comments. So he's lodged a kind of a vote there, but I don't know – I don't have the fix from him of why. I will happily forward around, I just got it this morning, I'll forward around the response from Jeremy on that.

I think that my inclination, unless a bunch of people are swayed, is to move forward with our survey recommendation, and keep this in our hip pocket as part of the discussion on how to construct a survey or potentially as a data gathering exercise at the time of the review that we might recommend. Are there any other questions or comments on that?

Because barring anything in addition, you know, additional... I'm going to move on because we did have a pretty extensive discussion about it on the last call, including a little floor vote, that granted had a couple of

people that disagreed the, but people agreed to move forward with the survey. Anything else from people? Christopher, have you managed to get connected in?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: You tell me. I think...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, now we hear you. Go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I've successfully dialed in, so let's...

JONATHAN ZUCK: You have, yes.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well first of all, this option takes me a little bit by surprise because – I can't say that I've given it a lot of thought. But the, I also trust Mike Nelson's judgment, which I have shared on other occasions. In short, the survey of the general public, it could have involved serious biases and [?] and considerable cost to produce quite limited value results, in terms of statistical significance.

If you go to ISPs and registrars, first of all, they are supposed to know their customers. Secondly, you know who they are, and when you want to renew the survey, you can be sure to go back to the same people,

give or take the odd bankruptcy. And because there are fewer of them, a statistically valid survey would involve, I don't necessarily say a smaller sample, but you could probably survey them all and at far less cost than the original proposal.

But I'm talking off the top of my head because this idea has just come up right now, which is a bit late in the day for the debates. But my gut feeling is that that is a better avenue to follow, both in terms of the cost, the practical feasibility, and you will be surveying companies, organizations who jolly well better take their responsibilities and tell the truth. And if they don't, this maybe subsequently revealed. Whereas, as I said in the last call, I'm not convinced about sort of public opinion survey methodologies that have been – that we were discussing last week.

That's enough from me, because as I said, that's just a gut reaction to the new proposal, but I think it may be on the right lines.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you Christopher. Is there anyone else that wants to speak to that? Or that has changed their feeling from the last call as a result of that? Okay. So, I'm going to propose that we stick with our resolution, if for no other reason, then what we're trying to do is wake the Board up for a need for a survey, and if they approve a survey, and they understand its cost, there will be more conversations about creating RFPs to put out a survey, etc.

And defining the population, defining how [?], etc. This could come up again in that context if the cost is determined to be prohibitive, etc. but

let's move forward with the survey exercise and the recommendation of the Board on the survey, so that we can get that ball rolling. That's my inclination based on what seemed to be the consensus on the call last week, and how this segue ways in. As I say, even as a last ditch, it could be a data gathering exercise later that dissects the complaint systems of these folks after the fact.

It may not be a decaying data in the same way. All right, so the next question then related to that is that the staff have expressed an interest in having some help in the construction of the various elements of the Board recommendation related to the survey. So I don't know if somebody from the staff, maybe Margie, would like to speak to your needs for volunteers from the group on that component of drafting up the Board recommendation.

MARGIE MILAM:

Sure. This is Margie Milam from staff. Given the short amount of time we have in order to get a recommendation to the Board, typically there is a report that gets issued for the Board to read. It's fairly short, but it's usually based on a community report, and since we don't have time to write a community report right now, it would be really great if we could get some perhaps volunteers to work with staff to at least be able to describe the request to the Board position detail for that date.

The questions are answered when they meet in Singapore. And just leaving... The deadline for the paper is next week, so this is something that would need to be done fairly quickly, if we could get two volunteers to help us identify the reason for the request, the rationale,

that sort of thing that typically we would pull from a community report, or a working group report that we don't have that in this case.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, do folks want to speak up in their willingness to participate in this process? There are hands that are flying up to be helpful on this [laughs]. Christopher? Are you volunteering or have something else to say?

DAVID STUCKMAN: Jon, I'm not on video, but I'll volunteer. I don't know if you're saying you don't have any, I would definitely volunteer.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Who is this?

DAVID STUCKMAN: David Stuckman.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. I see that both Ron and Rudi are both in the process. Margie, what would you require from the volunteers specifically?

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. So what I think we would do is we would take the first stab at drafting something, so it would be mostly providing input to a drafter pen, report so that it captures the essence of the working group opinion

on this. So really, it's just responding to a draft in a fairly short amount of time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That sounds pretty reasonable, we ought to get a lot of volunteers for that.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah. We'll take the first stab at drafting it so you'll have the shell and the background, and what we think – you know, based on today's phone call, what the survey requested, or the various requests are, to be covered in the Board resolution.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'll definitely be happy to be a part of that as well. Christopher, are you volunteering or do you want to speak up? It looks like you may have lost your phone connection again, I don't know. Can you speak? Are we able to hear you? Oh.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: No. I basically volunteered on the same basis as your other colleagues. I'll be glad to review a draft from the staff and perhaps add a few lines here and there if I think it is useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. So we've definitely got Ron, me, and Christopher, and David that have volunteered to... I mean, my guess is that you'll send the draft

around to the entire group, but these are the people that have promised you that they will get back to you in a timely fashion.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. I mean, obviously we don't want to surprise the working group with something they have not seen before, but I just want to make sure, I've got a couple of people that are paying attention to definitely respond.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so that sounds good. I think we have that then. Perfect. And Rudi has also volunteered, excellent. All right, so then the next item on the agenda has to do with pricing data. And I'm wondering if we can bring up the pricing related metrics that Karen had put together. Do we have that document handy to load up? Or did I catch everybody off guard?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, I think we can put it up in just a minute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, perfect. I'm going to turn away from this interface for just a second and forward you the email from Jeremy with respect to the survey.

MARGIE MILAM: Karen, are you emailing that to me?

KAREN LENTZ: Yup, you should have it.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, I just got it, so give me a minute to get it up in the room.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not a problem. Folks, if you're near your inboxes, I just mailed out Jeremy's response, and he can see what he had to say in more detail about Mike's recommendation. Oh, here we go.

KAREN LENTZ: It will be page three, the pricing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that just everyone knows, what I asked Karen to do was to boil this staff research list down to the items that, for which were identified, in some measure I think, by the early efforts by Steve and Evan, as data that would be difficult to retrieve a year from now, in other words, data that would be lost and would require a baseline. And then her [?] on that is, that would also require Board approval to collect.

So since our crunch right now is to make an interim Board recommendation, that's is sort of the cross section that we're after, which is why we have this limited agenda. And I think on the very next call, we'll look at things that we want to ask the staff to start collecting

that don't require a Board recommendation, but these are the things that require a Board recommendation.

So is everybody navigating themselves to page three? So it's 3-9, 3-10, and 3-11, are three of the metrics that fall into those two categories, the data we would need to start collecting early, and a study for which we would need Board approval. Karen, did you want to talk through these things and why that's the case? And then we'll have a little discussion about whether these metrics are important enough to us to make them part of the recommendation.

KAREN LENTZ:

Sure, thanks Jonathan. So, we looked at these, you know, from the perspective of whether data would still be available at a later point. In this case, this is identified as one of the areas where we – the group really wanted a baseline. And in our analysis of it, it seemed that it would be much harder to try to go back historically and trace what the prices were for various TLDs, from various registrars that at a point in time, at a past point of time.

So one of the, some of the notes on these two items from the group had indicated that this could potentially be collected by a third party vendor, who would work with the data and do the analysis and aggregation of it, hopefully in a way that would be mindful of the legal note that we had on concerns about particularly non-public price information, but any sort of compilation of pricing data for the market.

And so, if that is the case, and if the group feels that these are critical metrics that we want to have to inform the review of competition, that

engaging a vendor to do that study and to do that analysis would be something that would be the subject of a Board resolution to authorize staff to start certifying that study as well, because there is a concern about the data not being available retroactively.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Is there anyone besides Christopher that is having difficulty reading this? Because I'm not having that trouble. You know you can blow it up a little bit by hitting that plus sign at the bottom, and make it bigger. That may make it more legible Christopher. You see down there where it is a plus and minus sign?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I guess my, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: This is Christopher here. Well, first of all, I'm very glad that the staff are reviewing the possibility of collecting price data. Not being first hand, hands on in the business, I had rather assumed that either ICANN had price data, or had the right to ask registries and registrars retrospectively for the price data. But naturally given that I initiated this branch of discussion, I'm in favor pursuing it, of the font – well, let me have another look at that.

I'll look... Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

These are measures dating back to the previous working group, and so I mean, it's – pricing has always been a part of the original set of recommendations. So the question is, for the group, if there is not a disagreement about what we're stating as fact, which is that it would require an outside vendor, and would therefore require a cost, and therefore Board approval to do it, I think we're putting those out there as an actual background for these metrics.

The question then becomes, given that we don't have the time to evaluate these relative to all of the other metrics that we're trying to [?], do we have -- some discussions we had on the relative merits, or importance of these metrics, for future use. I'm feeling confident in Christopher's view on them because he has been bringing this issue up. Are there other people that want to speak up about the value of collecting this baseline pricing data now? Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you chair. I think this is also, I support the idea of getting this data. I've been a little bit on the sidelines in terms of the new gTLD program and some of the offerings, but in some side discussions I've had with colleagues, I understand that there is one model out there that is going to start at a price that's literally in the tens of thousands of dollars, and every week that price will go down until it gets down to a point where it may be down to the \$15 range or something like.

That's an interesting model. But I don't know the merits of it, I don't know if it's successful or not, but I think having these kinds of different models that are going to be so diverse from what we've seen in the past, that it will behoove us to actually go out and try to get a baseline on this kind of information as we go forward. I would imagine that Chris [?] and perhaps Phil Buckingham might have something that they could add to that pricing discussion, if they are aware of anything that's going on in the marketplace, and might quote what I just said, or just tell them what I just said. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Ron. Anyone else want to speak on this issue? Hands dropping everywhere. Let's see, Phil wrote something, "Yes Ron, EAP, my company is tracking this data." Phil can you fill us in more on what you mean by that? Does that mean that your tracking it across the board or...? Christa, go ahead while Phil is typing.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I think pricing will change depending on the business and how they're doing over time as well. I think right now everyone has a business plan and a business model based on a certain pricing, but I think as more

new gTLDs are released, and the volume increases, and they see the results from their business, and the volume, and the implications are going to change over time.

And the other thing that we might want to consider an introductory price versus something that will happen in your two or your three doing price changes, but they'll actually have to go through ICANN for something that we should consider now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Sure. I mean, again, I think the idea here is that we've been asked, or the review team will be asked, to assess whether or not there has been an increase in competition as a result of the new gTLD program. So this will be fairly aggregate data about kind of what it costs to get a domain name now, both at the wholesale and retail level, and then a comparison will be made to kind of what it costs to get one later.

So I'm sure there will be outliers in both the baseline and in a year from now, or a year and a half from now, when the review team convenes. But remember, our job is to deal with this in the aggregate and it's not about telling anybody they needed some things cheaper, but just to see whether or not the new program led to a rise, or a fall, or no effect on the overall prices of the TLDs, I think.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

Yeah, I agree. It's Christa.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So, let's make sure that if we made this recommendation, and put out an RFP, or whatever form it would take, to get this baseline study done if we decide to do it, it includes making that distinction between introductory pricing versus non-introductory pricing.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Yeah. It's Christa again. Along with any application fees that they might have done initially.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, right. I just went out and got a couple of new ones myself, and the application fee is where the money is [laughs]. It feels like shipping and handling to me at this point. [Laughter] But you want what you want. Any other people that would like to speak to this issue and the merit of collecting, making recommendations to the Board of collecting this baseline data? Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF: Thanks Chair. You, first of all, just talked about paying, what we can call, shipping and handling, can you expand on that a little bit? Maybe explain a little but further how many [?] how broad this practice is? Because I'm hearing it for the first time right now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess given that are other people... And Ray is typing, I'll say that, it's a very anecdotal experience for me. But I went in to reserve a few names in, let's see, dot holdings, dot photographer, and dot gallery, because of

my interest in photography and [?], etc. And in both cases, there was a kind of an application fee, you know, kind of like when you pay the initiation fee at the gym, that's like a large, up-front, sum that you pay but then your actual annual rate for the TLD itself is much lower.

And that was my experience that those numbers were up around 250, \$275, the so-called application fees, whereas the actual number for the domain name itself, the second level domain, was in the 59 to \$75 range. That's just my own personal experience thus far, I haven't done it through the practices across the board. I don't know if Christa, if you have anything to add to that.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

It's Christa. No, I think you're bang on, and the other thing that we might want to consider is the state of premium names new gTLDs are introducing, and the pricing that goes along with that because everyone has the premium list and that could skew the results of the data.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

And just something to consider, I would actually have to give it more thought, but we might want to – it might be a nice thing to have that [sub private] between here is the average price of the normal, say, on premium domains, and here is a price on premium ones, and somehow tie that into the – back to the purpose of it, to promote competition. And potentially the implications of that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Ray, go ahead.

RAY FASSETT: Thanks Jonathan. Christa, I think you're making a very good point there with regards to premium names and pricing. Like for example, in the dot com world, basically the premium names exist in an aftermarket environment, where the registry in the dot com world can't come up with their own premium names and then put retail pricing or wholesale pricing to those names.

Instead it is all done in an aftermarket that has evolved all on its own, which is a wild competition, of course, with different providers from Ceedo to Go Daddy to many others. And I'm just wondering how that ties in when we talk about comparison. Are we only comparing the new TLDs amongst themselves? Are we comparing to the current market environment as it exists today? And if it is the latter, then how do we take into consideration the aftermarket prices that goes on in dot com?

For example, the aftermarket prices in dot com fall, then there is a reasonable conclusion that the new gTLDs cause that to happen. That's just an example of course, a hypothetical. I was just wandering if you were thinking about the aftermarket aspect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know, I think it was a really good point too Ray. So, what I feel like I'm hearing, and I'm – oh, Christa, do you want to go ahead?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Yeah, just another quick comment on that. We might also want to track the number of premium domains that each, or every new gTLD is providing, because that will have a direct impact on competition. Some one gTLD might have 10,000 names, and another one might have 100 premium names, and there will be implications on that as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. It does. What I feel like I'm hearing is actually a growing consensus that a price survey should be carved of our interim recommendation to the Board in order to gain a baseline, and that we have a number of interesting things that we should build into what we would like to see tracked as a part of that baseline so that we can compare that to the fact.

So, that's what I'm hearing on the call. Is there anybody that disagrees with that? Because if that is what we're saying, then we can move to the second phase of this which is to try and define that study. Is there anybody that thinks that this data is not important enough or... I don't want to bias it like that, I'm asking the question. But, is there anybody that believes that we don't need to ask the Board to approve a baseline survey of current prices in the TLD market?

Is there anyone who doesn't think we should do this? So speak up now. I won't do a vote because I feel like people are agreeing that – if there is anybody that disagrees, I would love for you to speak up now. Okay. So, I'm going to take that as consensus that we will – that our second recommendation to the Board, in the central recommendation, is to get

an outside firm to do a survey of current pricing, that's done in such a way that the second study can be done at the time of convening of the review team and make the comparison.

And we might have identified a couple of variants to look at in particular, which is first versus aftermarket pricing in trying to normalize that, as Ray points out. The implication of application fees as a kind of boost in the price at the onset. The frequency – premium names and how they're handled. I think that those were the big issues. And so, if everyone agrees with that recommendation, then I'm also going to volunteer Christa and Ray to be the designated, though not sole, but designated volunteers to review the draft that comes out from the staff with respect to this recommendation.

Is that all right with the two of you?

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

It's Christa. I'm perfect with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. And Ray, you're down with that? Excellent. All right, so we're going to consider that done. Does staff have any other discussion that you would like to see happen on this call before you would feel like you're in a position to do a rough draft of a recommendation to the Board?

MARGIE MILAM: This is Margie. I think we're fine. If we have questions, we'll send them to the list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Okay. Excellent. So then the third category of things that are on Karen's list, are three of the recommended metrics that came from the ALAC list, and we also believe would probably require some kind of outside study, and therefore Board approval. So we need to have a similar discussion about, I guess, A) if that's the case and B) whether or not we believe these metrics are important enough to make it a part of our recommendation to the Board.

So, Karen, can you tell us where we need to navigate to in the document to find those three? Like, five, seven, eight, or nine, or something, right?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah. Number 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4, there at the very end of the document.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead.

DAVID STUCKMAN: Could she say the numbers again?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, it's at the bottom of the document, those five two, three, and four.

DAVID STUCKMAN: Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: This is Karen. If I may, I'll give a little background on these. So when we looked at data sources for the whole set of 70 metrics, but when we looked at these in particular, it was really challenging to find an existing source or even potential ones. There was, you know, pieces of data here and there that a group had done a study, or some data was published for 2010, and there was some out there but in terms of having anything comprehensive, it seemed particularly difficult.

And a lot of the sources we found were companies, or organizations that were offering these products like QR codes. And so, our sense was that if, even if there were recommendations to invest money in trying to obtain some of this data, it would still be challenging. And so, we wanted to have a discussion about the relative importance in that it fits in consumer trust.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, I guess we'll treat this the other way around. If people... Let's have a conversation about whether we want these – the metrics [?] enough that we should focus on solving the problems associated with collecting them. So, I would like to open the floor to questions or comments about these three metrics and their value in determining consumer

trust. I don't know if Rudi, if you are – feel like in a position to, you may not even on the line.

Are you in a position to talk through the ALAC's thinking around these metrics? Or is there anyone else that was a part of that process that could speak up? Oh, and QR codes are those little things that look a little bit like bar codes that you see at the bottom of posters, and coffee mugs, and things like that, that you take a picture of with your mobile phone and it was embedded in it an URL, or other types of information that take you to places on the net, so that you don't have to type in the URL to get there.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, yes. I've actually seen those things on airline tickets.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Christopher here. Although I have an At Large hat on, generally speaking, I did not participate in developing these metrics proposals, I really can't say very much about them. No. On the one hand, they seem to be sensible things to look at given the way the Internet is going, but on the other hand, does this really infringe directly on consumer trust in ICANN and the domain name system?

I would really need to think about that and to listen to people's opinions who have more experience at actually using, developing, these kinds of

new services. So, in spite of my At Large hat, I really have to abstain from this part of the discussion. I'll learn. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Rudi? Were you a part of coming up with these?

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you. It's Rudi Vasnick for the transcript. No, I was not part of the whole process. But what I would like to propose, in order to make things moving, that we address Olivier and Evan by email, asking them of the priorities of these requests of metrics, so that we can quickly align them in our decision and our recommendation to the Board. Is that something that could work?

I can send out an email in half an hour and get the response from Olivier, probably within a short time. Olivier's very often [?].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I think that's worth doing, and we have the group list where we can de-sway, but since we are on this call to try and make this determination, we'll leave it as open question for Evan and Olivier to speak up on those three, but I do want to make sure and use this opportunity to get people's feedback on these as a measure of trust.

I guess it's bad form for me to give my opinion about it, so unless I hand the chair ship over to Rudi or Ron to do it, I don't know how that works. But are there other people that have a feeling about... So Rudi answers yes, so if I can please do that. The justification is also in the ALAC

recommendations document, which I read. I mean, I can take a shot at doing that, if that's helpful to people, but I'm also interested in what other people's reaction is to what Christopher said, which is whether or not you believe these things are [?] of consumer trust, or likely created by other factors?

So I really open the floor to debate these things to the degree that we can, because things get lost once we're just back on the list, if we haven't narrowed the question down as much as we can. Is there anybody else that would like to speak to these metrics, and whether or not you think they are [?] of consumer trust? Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you Chair. Two things. One, you can feel free to take Chair's prerogative and voice your personal opinion. There is no problem with that. Two, with regard to these metrics, I can appreciate where they're coming from, but I think we are getting a little bit too far from the core activity here, and that really is consumer trust in ICANN and top level domains. Growth in the use of QR codes is interesting data, but I don't think, I don't understand how that is going to serve the needs of this very specific mandate that we've been given, and that is to try to prepare the way for a working group to do a full review in a year, after the domain names have come out.

Whether the QR codes have grown or not, I don't see the relevance of it. In the same way, I don't see whether or not hosted pages have grown cases have grown in Facebook or Google. Those are stats that are relevant to Facebook or Google, but they don't see to be relevant in

ICANN in my view. So, my vote falls on not including these because two reasons: I don't see the relevance, and I don't understand how the staff or someone is going to gather this data, because if Facebook doesn't want to give you this amount of information, you're just not going to get it.

Of course, in QR codes, that's going off and looking in a place that I don't where we would find it. So, we've got a difficult hill to climb with these three, and the connection to what we're trying to do is just not there for me. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Ron. So plus one. Is there anyone else that would like to speak on this? Christa.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I'm on the same page as Ron. I don't see how QR codes would actually show any kind of increase or decrease in consumer trust in competition. It could just be a new technology, or some other new method out there that more people are going to use, and I don't see this tracking to be any kind of reflection of what we're set out to do here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you Christa. Anyone else that would like to be heard? I guess I'll take Chair's prerogative and... I've had quite a debate with Evan about this. And I'm not convinced that we can very adequately use these as a measure of trust. In other words, an increase use of search engines as opposed to typing out a domain name, is a [?] an area of trust. It just

may be that with 1,500 second level domains, it is becoming more difficult to remember them, and that would lead to a greater use of search engines.

But I'm not sure that that is a reflection of a distrust in the operations of the DNS. That what I type in is actually where I'll go and things like that. It could be that today, if I understand that someone's brand is, you know, wedding photos, right? And I make some assumption that that is wedding photos dot com, but then later on I end up typing in wedding dot photos, because of an assumption that I'm making that all photographers would have migrated to that new top level domain, that those assumptions will be unseated.

That that will end up being another business and not the one that I thought I saw at the wedding show or whatever else, right? So there is some potential for confusion if people make an assumption that a particular top level domain is authoritative somehow, right? That the best place to go for photography, photographers is dot photographer.

You know, that assumption that maybe in fact encouraged by marketing efforts around that domain, could potentially lead to some consumer confusion and distrust. Potentially, right? So that's part of where I think this comes from. I feel like the growth in QR codes and URL shortening again has more to do with convenience than it does with trust, because the QR codes relies just as much on the DNS, when all is said and done.

It's not the consumer's explicit use of long form URLs, but it's still the DNS potentially functioning. The QR code is just another gateway into

it. So I guess that I'm personally not convinced that there is enough of a linkage between the increase usage of these three things, as an indicator that there has been a decrease in consumer trust. So that's my opinion.

Would anyone else like to be heard on this? Multiple attendees are typing [laughs]. Christopher, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, this is Christopher again. I did say that I did not want to speak particularly to these proposals, but as someone who has actually proposed two or three additional metrics, and I'm with you all in the need to keep this exercise to some proportionate size, I would rather speak in support in due course perhaps in the next conference call, to the proposals that I've made, rather than to fill the space with proposals which may not reach consensus.

But let's wait until Evan has replied to Rudi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I'm inclined... I reached out to Evan when he said he couldn't be in the call because I really wanted him to be a part of, or to designate someone to be a part of proposing these metrics. But because of the deadline, what I'm going to suggest instead as Chair, is that we take a vote on whether – of the group of people that we have on the phone now, as to whether or not as to include these as part of an interim recommendation to the Board.

And if, as I suspect, if it won't pass us, then it would be up to Olivier or Evan, via the list, and really frankly the next day, or even later today, to change our minds our minds via the listserv. Because we do need to move forward and either include it or not include it. So what I'm interested in having everybody do if you would, is if you believe that we should make them a part of the recommendation to the Board, click on agree.

If you think that we should leave them out of the interim recommendation to the Board, please hit disagree. Let's just get a baseline of people's viewpoints on this. And we'll have a default decision absent convincing by Olivier or Evan. All right? Christopher is abstaining. Cheryl are you abstaining?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: Jonathan, it's Charla. Cheryl is not on the line. The Adobe room has been trying to connect with her, but she's not answering.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Is she on the Adobe Connect?

CHARLA SHAMBLEY: No.

JOHNATHAN ZUCK: Okay. She's just listed there. All right.

MARGIE MILAM: The Adobe room is just trying to reach out to her.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I got it, got it. Okay. So, I'm going to suggest that we failed to get consensus that these three metrics, or a request for a baseline survey surrounding these areas of data, have the muster for an interim Board recommendation. But we will all be vigilant and wait for a discussion from the... If there is any points that Olivier or Evan make to the list, we'll all keep an open mind about changing our views on this.

So I guess on a procedural matter after they send out their justifications for their inclusion in the interim recommendation, because it could also be that Evan believes that this is something that can be done after the facts too, he may disagree that it needed to be a part of the Board recommendation. So if he makes the case that it should be, that I will wait for any of you that voted no here to speak up and say, "Yes, I really want to change my point of view."

And if I don't see emails like that, I won't do another vote. Okay? That's where we are, and then hopefully we can circulate the recording of the call to quickly so that Evan and Olivier can hear the discussion that did take place to contextualize their remarks. Does that sound good to everybody? Does anybody else want to speak on this matter? Okay.

Perfect. We've just hit 1:00, and so I believe that we've gotten through our agenda, ironically enough, and if there is any other business, if there are issues that people would like to raise on this call, then please raise your hand now. Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Chair. I brought onto the list a week or two ago, about the fact that a number of SOIs are not noted on our list of participants. With your approval, Chair, what I would like to do is ask Charla to go out and approach every one of the members on the list who have signed up for the IAG-CCT, but have not posted their SOIs and asked to do so within one week.

And if they do not, then we should just delete them from the list. As I've noted in my email, this really has to operate according to all processes and procedures, otherwise output is not going to be a valid output. I'd hate to harp on this, but it's not a big deal for us to get our SOIs in, and if those do not, then we should delete them from the membership of this particular working group, because that taints the outcome of it.

So, I leave that to you to make that decision Chair, but I did want to bring that back on the table. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Karen, did you want to speak to this or some other issue?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, it was a different point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then I'll wait. Christopher, did you want to speak to Ron's proposal or another issue?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, I agree with Ron on this. There is literature surrounding the multi-stakeholder model, which actually is rather critical, but we are too few. We are not open enough and don't succeed in incorporating a wider range of opinions and participation. So generally, I think people, first of all, should take their responsibilities, put in their SOIs of course, but also I think in the reporting of the meetings, we should have a list of participants and apologies in the minutes.

Are you going to change the subject Chair? Are you going to open the schedule for the Singapore meeting?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Am I going to vote, how? Sorry.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Dates? Schedule? Planning?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. We'll definitely put that one on the list, for sure.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Because I think, from my point of view, as early as possible that week, if I can get to Singapore, which is not yet confirmed for funding reasons, if

I can get – I will not be there for the whole week. So meeting actually on the weekend, the beginning of the first weekend would be okay, or not on the Monday but on the Tuesday. But don't leave it until the end of the week. Are we going to have another conference call between now and then?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know, actually. How many weeks are there between now and the Singapore meeting? Matt, perhaps you can speak to that.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. I'll leave it to the Chair [CROSSTALK] in ICANN to work on this as a...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So your preference has been heard, I don't know if anyone else has another preference, but I'm perfectly happy to have it early in the week as well, at the ICANN meeting. So Matt, hopefully you're hearing that that is what we'll be trying to do. Yes.

MATT ASHTIANI: So the Singapore meeting space, which would be the 7th of March, so we eventually have four weeks, three and a half.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I think we should have another call before Singapore, in say two weeks. Is there any objection to that? Okay.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: There is a lot of the staff, staff's work which we haven't discussed yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh no, for sure. We have a lot of work ahead of us Christopher. I was really just trying to get to recommendations. So, let's schedule another call out in a couple of weeks, and let's try to have the meeting earlier in the week rather than later in the week, if we can, Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt. May I please make one suggestion?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Of course.

MATT ASHTIANI: In two weeks, most staff will actually be gone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

MATT ASHTIANI: I think a week might be better because just for timing reasons.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, to have another call in a week?

MATT ASHTIANI: Yeah. In two weeks, most staff will be on an airplane.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. For the week? That's a long flight.

MATT ASHTIANI: So today is the 26th, right? So if we go forward two weeks, some staff will be... It's not us, I won't be on an airplane but, if you need something, it will be from another staff member. It would make more sense to have [?] then to like...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm in our Brussels office next week, but I can do a call next week. I already did this one quick, so I don't want to overwhelm people with consumer metrics.

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm very new to the group, so I'm sorry, say sorry knowing [?]. So it doesn't necessarily have to be exactly week. So we can do it, I think, on the 7th or the 14th.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let's go ahead and do a Doodle on a few of those things and get people to compare to their schedules. Let's try to do that. So why don't

you try to identify some dates when there is staff availability, and we'll choose between them via Doodle.

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay. [?] Exactly, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Great. Karen, go ahead.

KAREN LENTZ: Thanks Jonathan. I'll take my hand down. I was going to bring up the Singapore anticipated activities as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, yeah. I think we'll probably be doing a briefing and we should definitely hold a meeting, and I support Christopher's desire to have it earlier in the week rather than later. All right. Any other business anyone wants to raise? I want to thank everybody for staying on point, and getting through this efficiently.

Staff, we'll look forward to a draft recommendation to the Board that includes the survey on consumer trust, and the survey on TLD pricing. And you have some volunteers who have committed to responding expeditiously to that draft, and everyone else is welcome to respond as well.

But otherwise, thanks everyone for a great call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]