
RECORDING: This meeting is now being recorded.

UNIDENTIFIED: Hello everyone.

[Various people say hello]

DAVID STUCKMAN: Okay. I'm here.

UNIDENTIFIED: Who is I'm?

DAVID STUCKMAN: Oh I'm sorry. This is David.

JOHN: This is John.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan.

MIKE NELSON: This is Mike Nelson of Microsoft in Washington.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey Mike.

MIKE NELSON: I don't expect we're going to have a huge attendance today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Why? Is today not a good day Mike?

MIKE NELSON: It's the Easter weekend for a lot of people.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was trying to make a pun.

MIKE NELSON: Oh, oh. I'm sorry. [Laughs] I spent three days this week on a college tour, so I'm half brain dead from driving for 20 hours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did your kid make a choice?

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.

MIKE NELSON: Oh no. This is just the start of the process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I find those decisions end up being totally arbitrary in the end.

MIKE NELSON: It seem to be very dependent upon the tour guide we had [laughs].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Um-hum. I met some psychology professors at Hopkins as a result of researching a debate topic, you know, between my junior and senior years in high school. And corresponding with them and things, and they took me under their wing, even though I didn't go on to study psychology, I think that's probably a big part of why I choose Hopkins.

MIKE NELSON: Yeah. It's that personal contact. The smart schools are the ones that have large and successful high school programs. Hopkins also has, they have a summer program for talented kids here in Washington. They suck in really a lot of smart kids that way.

JONATHAN ZUCK: They didn't have that back in the dark ages where I went...

RECORDING: The host has left the meeting. To speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know. Sounds cryptic. Did you have a favorite Mike?

MIKE NELSON: I was very impressed with William and Mary.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh yeah, I've never been on that campus. I've been impressed with the grads.

MIKE NELSON: Yup. We also went to Virginia Tech, which is huge.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yup.

MIKE NELSON: And Davidson, on the end of the spectrum, small liberal arts college, really seems to have their act together too.

MIKE NELSON: So my daughter picked some good places to visit. We really did have some successful visits.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good.

Hey Matt, are you on? Or are you the one who left to speak to the...? Raise your hand if you're not on the call.

MIKE NELSON: Yeah. Matt is still listed as being on the call.

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm on here. I was just doing some technical stuff.

JOHNATHAN ZUCK: We heard that the host left to talk to the administrators, or something like that, but we don't know what to make of that.

MATT ASHTIANI: So that was me. I'm trying to dial out to [Ephren] right now, and it's not working. So I need to speak to one of them to have them try to do it myself.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I see.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, Cheryl here. I know I hear twice, but is at least one audible?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, at least one of you is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh good. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is a great way to, you know, make up for missing a meeting to sign on twice for the next one, I think.

MIKE NELSON: You can volunteer to do twice as much work that way.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You mean I don't? [Laughter]

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, Mike means twice as much as you normally do. [Laughter]

MIKE NELSON: Are we waiting for someone or something? Just waiting for Matt?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess so, yeah.

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm ready to go if you are.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, we probably have enough of a quorum here. We should get started.

DAVID STUCKMAN: I'm just on my phone, I'm not on video. This is David.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Yeah. I mean, given the widely varying hours that people are having to be up to take these, I think we're all glad they're not video conferences.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm astonished you think some of us don't look our best. [Laughter]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can only speak for myself. I'm happy it's not a video conference at any time during the day. [Laughter]

Okay, shall we get started Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure, let's start.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who tells them to start recording the meeting and things like that?

MATT ASHTIANI: The meeting is already being recorded. We're ready.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh okay. All right. Oh, there is a little sign that says it is being recorded. Excellent. Welcome everyone. We've got some exciting news out of Singapore, in that the Board voted yes on both of our interim recommendations for the two studies. And so I think we should cover that, and figure out how we want to divide up into teams to help stack, drop the RFPs for those two studies.

Then staff have also created a deck of some of the questions they have with respect to individual metrics, and things that might be duplicated and things that might have limits and return on investment, for us to discuss. Before we get started, is there anything we need to do to record the participants, or do you guys have that recorded?

Is David the only one on the phone but not on the Adobe? Is anyone else...? Go ahead.

MATT ASHTIANI: As far as I can tell, yes. I'm just asking the operator.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And is everybody up to date with their statements of interest? Or we still pursuing any SOIs? That's on the mailing list?

MIKE NELSON: I faxed mine and emailed mine twice.

DAVID STUCKMAN: This is David. I hopefully got it, I mean...

JONATHAN ZUCK: You faxed and emailed it, so this is [CROSSTALK]... online form.

DAVID STUCKMAN: Yeah, she's having trouble getting it. But I mean, I'm not – I'm pretty sure she didn't give me a derogatory letter or anything.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Staff is there anybody else? Are we pretty much up to date on that?

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt for the record. I know [Charlotte?] maintained a list. I can double check and get back to you by email.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. I'm always, you know Ron is not here to make me check all of these administrative boxes at the top of the meeting, so please let me know if there is anything that I'm ignoring as I try to dive into the substance here. Okay.

So what I want to do first is talk about these two surveys. Do we have the resolutions handy? I know one of the things that came out of that was sort of like blanked out dollar figures and things like that, but for the most part, I think that they were adopted pretty much as we proposed them. Does that sound right? Does anybody on staff have anything that they want to point out about those resolutions that we need to be aware of?

DAVID STUCKMAN: Who is that question directed to?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Staff, or anyone else who noticed something that I may not have when I went back and looked at the resolutions that were passed.

KAREN LENTZ: So Jonathan, this is Karen. [CROSSTALK] ...Margie will...

MARGIE MILAM: Go ahead Karen.

KAREN LENTZ: I was trying to pull it out. There were a couple of language changes that I don't think are especially significant. One of them, in terms of the substance, one of them was sort of clarified that the Board would review the RFP material at some point during the process before we

fully move forward. So that's what was specified in there. And then also I think there were a few things added just to clarify that when we say global for the surveys, that's intended to cover all of the ICANN regions.

And then I think there was a clarification about when you're looking at the marketplace, that that would account for looking at the ccTLD space as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, those were reasonable changes, and I don't think there too different from what it is that we were proposing. I mean, obviously one of the things that would be interesting is trying to choose a subset of countries, and in the case of the consumer survey that are meant to be representative to the [?] the survey in every country and in every one of the ICANN country regions.

So, as far as the survey, who is interested in volunteering to be a part of the drafting team for that RFP?

NATHALIE COUPET: I am. It's Nathalie Coupet. I would like to do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That's excellent. Anyone else?

MIKE NELSON: This is Mike Nelson. I can review the draft and...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. I guess we don't have Tony Onorato on, right? I'm going to go ahead and volunteer him and give the chance, you know, as we do in the United States, opt out rather than opt in, because he does have some survey related background, as we try to put that together. So if you would add him to the list as well.

And if somebody in staff, in particular, going to own that RFP?

KAREN LENTZ: This is Karen. Our team will be owning both the survey and the economic study.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just as a team.

KAREN LENTZ: Yup.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Excellent. Obviously, you can put my name down on that as well. What's the best work process for us to do that? Is it valuable for us to have a brainstorming session about that? Should we do, or what's our best approach for constructing that RFP? Does staff start the process or did we...?

MIKE NELSON: It would be very useful to see an ICANN RFP for something that is even remotely similar to what we're doing here. Just so we know what lengths we have to fill in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I mean to that end, that's why I'm wondering whether or not staff actually start with an outline or something like that. Christopher, go ahead. Christopher? We can't hear you. Are you on mute?

Okay. We read the chat. I thought we did that last time. I'm not sure I know what you mean by that, but so I might need you to write more in the chat. Matt, go ahead.

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt. I just didn't get the full list of volunteers. I was wondering if everyone could please repeat themselves. So far I have Mike and I have you, Jonathan. That's it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nathalie as well. Nathalie, you volunteered. And then I volunteered Tony Onorato as well. And Christopher Wilkinson has just volunteered as well, and recommends that we start from a staff draft. Is that a reasonable way to proceed, staff? I don't want to... We want to help in whatever way we need to, so let us know what that process should look like.

KAREN LENTZ: Understood. Thank you Jonathan. This is Karen. I think we're open in terms of how the group wants to provide feedback, but it was kind of our thinking that it was easier to start with an initial product. The discussions that the group has had already have been helpful in terms of helping a scope, to survey our [?], what its goals are.

So we have that guidance. And then as we're in the process of scoping and creating something, certainly if the group has more guidance or other suggestions they want to pass on, absolutely. Please do that. But then in terms of the small group of people who volunteer, I think we can have a focus session once we have an initial cut of the RFP.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That makes sense. Does anybody else have any questions about that before we move on from the consumer...

MIKE NELSON: Even before the staff drafts something, it would be great if they could pass around...

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Mike, try to introduce yourself and speak up a bit.

MIKE NELSON: Okay. This is Mike Nelson. As I said, I think it would be very useful if the staff could circulate a RFP that they have used in the past, even before

they draft what they are working on, because then maybe we can provide some feedback even before they put something down.

MARGIE MILAM: Jonathan, this is Margie. If I could [?]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

MARGIE MILAM: As I've been involved in RFP's, recent ones that we're about ready to launch, we've changed our format, our template, and so I don't know that an older version is really going to help, and I don't know that we've published on with the new template recently. I'm doing one, for example, for the WHOIS accuracy system that we're going to post later in the month, and I'm now drafting it.

So, anyway, my point is that an older one may not be our new format. We sort of changed our procedures recently. And then the other thing that I wanted to point out with respect to resolution is that it needs to go back to the resolution for a moment, that there is... Part of the resolution wanted, as part of the consideration for the RFP, is to take a look at what some ccTLDs have done.

I think .au and perhaps another one, have done a similar consumer survey, and so the recommendation was to take a look at what ccTLDs have done so that you kind of get an idea as to how to frame some of these consumer surveys.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Margie, what's the best way for us to do that? Is that something we should circulate on the list? The ones that the work they've done and comment on it, so that you can incorporate those comments into your draft?

MARGIE MILAM: I think so. I mean, I think staff, Karen, probably should get those examples out there so that everyone can take a look at it. And it looks like Cheryl has her hand up, maybe she's got some information on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Margie, Cheryl for the record. Thank you. Margie, it's very timely that this is happening now, because .au has just started its second round of survey. So they've actually had one round and modified the questions for a second level with additional learning, I guess is the best way to say it, from the first effort.

Maggie is the person we need to contact in those registries, she seems to be running that, but also George recently said, earlier this week at our Board meeting, the AU space, was there any additional questions that we might want to ask. And it strikes me that we could in fact get them to modify some of the analysis, if not their actual questions, to suit our own purposes.

So the [all things dot who], assuming we reach that person, which of those registry people would be set on that. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, excellent. So if you guys circulate this around and we'll get a sense of what's happened before, to help inform comments, hopefully from Mike's perspective as well, about what we might do, the same or different, in the next one. Matt, I see you put your hand down.

Any other questions or comments on the consumer trust survey? Okay. So the next thing in the agenda is the RFP team for the economic survey. Do you want to bring that resolution up? That part? And Karen, do you know of anything in particular that you want to point us to in terms of that resolution?

KAREN LENTZ: No I don't think so, other than what's been raised already. In terms of the process for the economic study, I think it would also be an open RFP process, where we did expect to draft something. So I think a parallel process there is what we would anticipate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Excellent. So who is interested in being a part of the RFP team for the economic survey? I remember Christopher speaking up initially, and Chris [?] speaking up initially. Who else is interested in that study?

NATHALIE COUPET: Can we be in both groups? Or should we choose only one?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think you can be in both groups [CROSSTALK].

NATHALIE COUPET: Okay. So I'll also volunteer for the economic survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. You can go ahead and add me too, Matt, on both of them.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Hi, it's Christa. I would certainly volunteer for that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's already done.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Oh, perfect. [Laughter]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who else was bringing up...? We had an interesting brain session about this in Singapore, about the things we want to make sure we include. I'm sure staff captured that, or it's in the transcript, but I'm trying to think who else spoke up at that meeting about some of the things we wanted to make sure and include.

And some of that was said by people that we might want to include as well. I guess, can I assign a task back to staff to look through the transcript of the Singapore sort of brainstorming meeting to see both

what was brought up substantively...? And then, I think at that time, people expressed an interest in participating that may not be on the call today, as Mike points out, because of Good Friday.

So we probably want with both of these to put something out to the list as well, I guess, and not just draw from the people that are on the call today. Any other topics of discussion related to that study? I wonder if that one is worthy of having one of our meetings devoted to it. I don't know if enough has been discussed. What is the thought of staff, of [?], of the staff group, our staff champions on that study?

In terms of the kind of entity that might want to do it, etc., is that something that we should brainstorm about? Or leave to the RFP? And do other people have ideas on how we should approach that?

UNIDENTIFIED: I don't.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Staff, do you feel like you have enough to carry it? Do you have enough information from the previous discussions to get going on an outline or something for that RFP?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, I do. In terms of the substance of what we will cover, I think we'll have enough to make an initial version of it, which of course, could be amplified. In terms of... One of the things you mentioned, Jonathan, was brainstorming as to who could be qualified, I think in both cases that, the survey and the economic study, I think it would be helpful to...

We'll publish the RFP, but the group has suggestions of places we can send it, or make sure that we would be reaching the types of firms or

entities that would be qualified to do these types of things. Suggestions on that would be helpful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. I think the people on this call have ideas on both, on both of those topics, so I think you'll get plenty of feedback there, I think, on who wants to take a look at these RFPs.

Okay. Anyone else that is interested in the economic survey group RFP? And again, even if you don't volunteer here, it will still be circulated to the list and things like that, you'll get a chance. But if you want to be a part of it from the ground floor, then speak up now. And we will also send something out for volunteers on the list. Okay.

So, that's great news. I know there is a lot of interest in the economic impact of the new gTLD program, and pricing, and after market pricing, what those recommendations should be, and so on. I think that will be an interesting study. I'm excited about it.

Okay. Should we then move to the slide deck and go through some of the metrics that were duplicative and see if we can all get behind the staff recommendations for combinations and look through those efficiently? And we'll look at some of the ROI courses, the data set. Are there people from the ALAC on the call? Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, I am. [CROSSTALK]... I'm hardly one of the primary proponents of ALAC world these days, but anyway.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right. That's right. I was grasping at straws here a little bit. I thought if I sent up a signal, you'd throw me a line. So, I guess we'll go through some of those. I'm concerned if anything that we talk about is not

adequately represented on the call, we may need to table it for the next call. But let's at least look at it, and begin to get through that process. Did that make sense to everyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. So, who is leading...? Is it Karen? Are you leading this or Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I can start, this is Eleeza, and I think Karen can jump in as necessary.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hello. So just to start off with the...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You're fairly new. So do you want to tell the group about yourself a little bit?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Oh, sure. Hi, I'm Eleeza. I started in late January. My position is lead researcher, and working with Karen on a number of things that I actually think the metrics are going to be the biggest piece of my plate for the time being. And my background, I used to be a journalist, and before that, or actually more recently, worked in international development in Washington, D.C. managing media access information projects, mostly on USA, the Department of State funded programs.

And before that, I was a graduate student at Georgetown University where Mike Nelson was my thesis advisor. So I have a couple of ties into this world, but this is my first time working with ICANN, and on this topic, so I'm actually pretty excited to be here.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You've agreed to work with him again?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have. [Laughter]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh my goodness.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: He's not that bad of a guy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You are the perfect ICANN staff employee clearly, because you have just the right level of masochism for this job. [Laughter]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well I did used to be a reporter, so I feel like I've subjected myself to that type of a world before. But I'm really excited to be working on this, and I'm pretty enthusiastic about this particular project. There are some really interesting metrics in here that I think are going to produce data that's useful, not only for evaluating the program, but it will be useful for the community At Large.

So it will be quite interesting, although it's going to be a large beast to maintain. So I guess we can start off with the overlapping metrics that, or the ones that I kind of saw as being overlapping. And the first two, I believe both came from the GNSO, or the first two sets of overlapping metrics. So the first one here you'll see on the slide, 2.3 and 2.13, I mean just based on the first sentence, they're pretty well asking the same question.

And the suggestion I have listed there, depending on what this group decides to do in terms of their recommendations on all of the metrics, is to in a way combine all of the end user consumer survey metrics into one that kind of gets at a number of large questions that we want to answer. And I think those large questions, of course, will be then

divided up by a survey firm, the firm is more qualified than I am, in determining the questions to ask, to get to what is consumer choice?

What is consumer's understanding of the DNS? How TLDs are managed? What gTLDs are? And so forth. So I won't repeat everything I said on the slide there, but that's the first one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Does anybody want to comment on Eleeza's analysis here?

UNIDENTIFIED: This looks easy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does. I agree. I know I did a lot of steamrolling as we tried to get through our interim recommendations, so I'm trying to be a good chair. But I think this makes perfect sense, Eleeza. Unless there is some objection, I'm going to say let's go for it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. All right. Then let's move on. The next set are 2.9 and 2.10. I think there is a couple of ways of interpreting these. The phrasing is fairly similar, and again, yeah, these both also came from the GNSO. In 2.10, it suggests either an automated analysis or a survey. And in the notes on this one, it mentioned a consumer survey.

So I feel like with 2.10, a consumer survey would get to the question of how much pressure, or you know, the reasons behind registrants would want to duplicate across different TLDs. Based on our discussions with our technical people, we feel like there is some pretty good ways of automating this analysis. So we would actually get a sense of how many duplicate registrations there are.

But if this is a survey question as well about consumer attitudes and choice, then we may want to either refine that 2.10, or add it in with the

survey metrics. Obviously it's up to you. But I feel a lot of overlapping of what these two are asking for.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Enough overlap that I find it confusing, actually that we will produce something with that much overlap. So, I reached out to [?] who is on vacation, who held the pen on this. I'm just hesitant about this because obviously the number of duplicates is equal to... One way to look at defensive registrations and non-utility registrations, and I don't see that as a consumer issue at all. And so now I'm having trouble recalling why we had mention of consumer survey in there.

But so, I mean, my... I would guess I just want to table that for clarity, and take that conversation, or finish that conversation on the list. But I open it to comments if other people have them. So certainly from the way it's presented here, it's again seems like a no-brainer. That concerns me, I guess. In this case, what the consumer angle was meant to be. So I'm just forgetting, I'm not remembering it.

Does anybody else...? Cheryl, do you remember what we had in mind?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm struggling to separate, looking at them now... It's Cheryl for the record, by the way. Excepting where, if we look at the latest detail, because we did want to very much draw that out as a separate item, there is – yeah. The usage of duplicate is in the [?]... So we probably need to go back to our original work on 2.9 and 2.10, but yes you're right.

Steve would probably just have that on the top of his head.

UNIDENTIFIED

I have 2.9...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, 2.9 and 2.10.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Christopher has written in the chat here that the new [?] themselves out of the names. [CROSSTALK] ...different issue. That's an interesting topic for discussion. I don't know, they've all been given permission to reserve 100 in each TLD. But I guess this is about looking at registrant behavior and seeing if these duplications might be one possible indication of [defensive] registration, as opposed to a registration born of some innovative purpose. [CROSSTALK]

I like it... Yes, exactly, marketing is a tougher one obviously.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, Cheryl here. For example, .au is about to do a one dollar [?] promo exercise, the sort of thing that different places do do, and so if you're getting ABC dot something .au, you're more likely to end up with a fleet of ABC dot something .au as a result of that type of behavior. Now, that's arguably a different thing than a named defensive registration.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I would argue, and this is always an interesting can of worms. I mean, I would argue that even in the context of when somebody offers something for a dollar, my rationale for taking it is largely the sense of, okay, you've made it affordable enough that I may have to lock it up so that other people won't register it.

Yeah, there's something subtly differently about these two. I'm sorry, I'm drawing a blank on what it is, because there is something about making a comparison to the legacy TLDs, and then the notion of...

-
- CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Registrant's behavior.
- JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, that's right. So I'm going to ask that we table this one, and I'll try to get that conversation going on the list on Monday.
- ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza again. If I could just jump in. I think as with some of the other metrics, we've asked questions about defining terms, and I think maybe in that conversation on the list, we can make sure that duplicate really means the same as those registrations already having the same domain and legacy TLDs. For example, Coke dot com versus Coke dot soda, etc.
- I mean, that's how I'm taking it to mean, but there wasn't really clear action on that.
- JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm worried that there is a typo here or something. Like this should be relative share of new gTLD registrants that already have the same domain and legacy TLDs. In other words, are you just capturing the same people going back and getting their old second level in the first level, or something like that. So that's why I think we need to go back and look at that again.
- I'm sorry, I should have looked this up and figured it out before this call, but I didn't. I just want to table that, but let's keep the conversation going.
- ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Great.
- JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's move on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So the last set of metrics, 9.1 and 9.2, these are not overlapping in the sense that I think they are asking the same questions, but rather one is derivative, that 9.2 is derivative of 9.1. And I think both are asking a really important question, which is ensuring that all end user software can resolve the new gTLDs, and then if not, which browsers or other applications require plug-ins.

So this is kind of a minor point, but I just wanted to point it out that it's not necessarily two separate figures, but rather one is dependent on the other. And I wasn't sure how you wanted to treat that, but I thought at least bring it to the group's attention.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I can see how this could happen. You can answer 9.1 yes, but all applications are capable, and then 9.2 finds, but some of them require plugins, or user installed enhancements. And I think this is an attempt to get at two different, since we're trying to make this data driven, this isn't attempt to get at numbers, right?

So I mean, I think my first reaction is that these remain separate questions. Does anybody else have any comments on this? I don't know that if we gain anything by combining them, that's my point.

UNIDENTIFIED: I think it makes sense to combine them. They're related, make sure there is not some unnecessary words.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I feel like 9.2 is a caveat to 9.1, and the 9.1 is still an interesting question in of itself. I could have some that weren't capable even with an user, end user application or plugin subject to some of the new DNS, new gTLDs. I mean, there are approximate to each other. So I don't see these as confusing in the same way as the others were.

Anybody else have an opinion on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. It's not a criticism or a suggestion to call, I mean it's simply an observation that one is rather derivative of the other. So, I don't think we need to worry, we're still going to be asking questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. I don't think we're changing the level of work, or anything like that, but what we do to answer this question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. The reason I brought it up was in so far as your mandate was to make a recommendation on the metrics and how they might be presented, combined, condensed, and so forth. I thought it was worth pointing out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Again, I don't know... And that's why I'm in the same position that I am, which is I don't know if we gain anything by combining them. And it may cause some confusion, because it's not sufficiently derivative. I mean, I know if I just had the answers to 9.2, I wouldn't necessarily have the answer to 9.1. Margie did you have something you wanted to add?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. It's not so much about the overlapping nature, but I'm trying to understand with these, 9.1 and 9.2, when you get the answer, what does it tell you about the new gTLDs program? I think that's the link that I'm having a hard time understanding.

How does it show that competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice is, you know, are benefitted through the program? I don't see the link with these particular questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think, and others are free to speak up as well, but I think the rationale behind them is that if you had a gTLDs that were inaccessible, that it

would limit the degree in which they added to consumer choice. Right? If you couldn't get to them from all of your various DNS clients and the user systems, or there was a barrier to using them, that would have an impact on choice and competition frankly.

MARGIE MILAM: And you guys think that's a meaningful metric for that...? I get that you can get this data, and another question for Karen and for Eleeza is, have we thought about how we would get this information? Do we have a source, you know, of this information?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. Yeah, we've talked among other staff about how we can measure it. It is a bit difficult, but the general feedback is that it would be a good entertainer of the new [G?] success. I think it would... In terms of browsers, that's a small finite number. In terms of applications, that's where it would become much more challenging and we'd have to talk about sampling, which raises all kinds of questions about how do you sample applications and have them be representative of the whole.

I'm not really sure. But I think there might be ways to do it. I don't think it's one we saw as being totally insurmountable in its challenges.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, good. I just wanted to confirm that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other comments from folks on this, on these? I mean, there may be, to your point Margie, some refinements made in terms of what we're trying to expect from the data collection side of this. And what incarnations this might take, so maybe this is where we need some refinement.

I think we were just looking for things that might go wrong with the program, that – make a dent in its promotion and choice of competition. Any other questions or comments on this?

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

It's Christa. I think there both actually really good metrics, and I think we should keep both of them, and I think they will give us a little bit of an indication on how things are going, but if there isn't, then it obviously isn't, I don't know, or I haven't heard of anyone who is having issues with their browsers not working with them.

And we could easily just do a... Or maybe there is a customer service method, or survey there that they're collecting the data, and we would kind of know or had some insight from that before they go and spend a whole bunch of money on a survey for it. Are we getting 100 complaints? Or do we have none? Where we're at kind of thing. But I think they're useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

In other words, look for an indication that this is a problem worth measuring.

CHRISTA TAYLOR:

Yes, exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl here. I have a little bit more of a problem with that attitude than I do with just making it into an early survey system. What we're talking about here is an early survey system, would then be, I think we would be preempting a little bit too much what the following review team may or may not want to make as their approach.

They may, in fact, choose not to be necessarily complaints driven in the basis of their analysis. And I do think that at this stage, particularly

when we're also trying to make sure that the IDNs are properly aggregated in all of this, and there is a whole lot of future IDN ones to come, you would have end users who don't know what they don't know, and that wouldn't be captured, if you took a complaint based system.

I don't really want to get into the debate here, I'm just bragging that I'm a little discomforted with that thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's a good point Cheryl. I guess, if I understand Christa's point, that we'll either see that someone has brought it up, that it exists as a problem and that it should be scaled, as opposed to using a consumer survey or a complaint system to scale the problem, it might be sufficient to figure out whether or not there appears to be a problem.

I mean, it may not, right? But I think that was probably Christa's notion there. I'm inclined to keep them separate myself, and to keep them in place, and then let's add to them to the discussion of the other ones that we're tabling for the list this week, to maybe do some refinement about the situations in which these might occur, and what's worth trying to track.

All right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Shall I continue?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, let's go on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay. So, the remaining slides are metrics that we've identified as either still having a cost associated with them, some kind of cost impact, or that we still see as being difficult to gather in terms of gathering

either a representative sample, or in some instances, we get back to the question of definitions. And on some of those, I've sent emails to the ALAC and GNSO representatives to get a little more clarification.

I haven't heard back from them yet in terms of definitions. I kind of put those aside for now, and have the remaining eight or nine metrics left. So this first one, 1.14, quantity and relative incidents of domain take downs, this one we would have to rely on voluntary self-reporting, either from registrars or governments and law enforcement.

To the extent that we can get data, there it will be, but it won't necessarily be a very representative sample, and it may just in result in kind of sparse data. The other point I bring up is why those domains are being taken down, whether those broad numbers will provide context. I think what I'm getting at here is, are these domains that were taken down because of, for example, trademark infringements? Or were they political take downs, for example?

Just wondering about how we can provide context for raw numbers. Is it because there are more take downs or less take downs, we want to be able to analyze these numbers to represent some kind of a trend, or at least provide some kind of an analysis. So I just wanted to be sensitive to that and raise that question.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's a good question. Who wants to speak up? I think the notion was that, just looking at the relative incidents of domain take downs is a possible indicator of trust in the DNS, regardless of the reason, if it was a trademark violation, or a violation of local law, etc. I mean, I think the idea was just looking as an aggregate number to a degree possible,

based on what the incident seems to be now versus what it is under the new gTLD program.

So I think you're right. We'll have difficulties in sort of contextualizing. It could be that there is some other trend that is completely separate from the expansion of TLDs that's led to this road of incidents going up or not, but it feels as though that number in the aggregate would still be useful to know if the number of take downs, in a relative sense, was increasing dramatically.

Does anybody else have any ideas about this? I mean, it feels like a good metric to me, even though it is problematic in the ways that you've outlined. I think your points are both good about it, I'm just – I don't know that we need to know why they were taking down, as much to know that, wow, a lot more of these are being taken down than used to be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. Yeah, that's my memory of part of [?]. I'm sorry, I just got bumped again out of the Adobe room, I was going to put my hand up on, instead I'll just type it in. And it is very much, that's what is the relative intent.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza, what is your sense of how we might be able to approach getting at the data sort of now? I think some – versus in the future. Is this data sort of available through this reporting? Or is it voluntary self-reporting or is it a big effort? Is it going out and doing a survey kind of effort? I guess I don't know the answer to that question, so that might help inform whether it's worthwhile.

[?] it seems worthwhile to me, I guess is what I'm saying.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. And I do appreciate why the number itself is important, and it's certainly one I would like to see. I guess the concern is the data isn't really out there. It isn't data that we have, or that we've asked for, we being ICANN. We may be able to get some data from registries, so in that sense, we may be able to, at least from the legacy registries, be able to get some baseline data.

The concern is, moving forward, it would be a pretty substantial product. So we're not quite sure how substantial yet. This is kind of a difficult one to answer at this point, because we're so early into the new gTLD space. And then going past that, from governments and law enforcement, that's almost on a one by one case by case basis. And they may or may not collect them, have them in one place.

They may not be one spot to ask that from, depending on a government or the law enforcement agency. So it's just kind of different data sources, which is where I raise the concern about sampling and how to valid data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean it's a fair point. Go ahead...

NATHALIE COUPET: This is Nathalie Coupet. There shouldn't be any difference, I guess, before and after extension of the gTLDs, unless there is more scrutiny. If there is an increase of domain takedowns, I guess that would be because there is small scrutiny. [?] change in their behavior, logically would not have changed just because there is more gTLDs out there.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Hi, it's Christa. One of the issues would be user policies that aren't being met for the new gTLDs. They have to meet some certain criteria in order to have a TLD, or to have a domain, sorry. And then later it's

either reported that they didn't meet that criteria, and lose the domain, just from a new gTLD perspective.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. All of which makes this feel [valuable].

NATHALIE COUPET: It does because you can see how consumer confusion would tie into that really easily.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Confusion or mistrust? I mean obviously trust is one of the most complicated things that has been assigned to us because, other than our survey, where we just ask people about their trust level, we're having to look at indicators of trustworthiness, I guess, as an indirect measure of trust. And a high level of domain take downs would suggest that something is wrong. If from a trustworthiness standpoint, and I think that's why the original group thought this was worth including.

NATHALIE COUPET: Are these metrics based on actual problems? Or are they just imagining all the problems that could happen? Because I mean, unless there is a reason to believe that this, there are significant numbers that would show that this is a valid metric, why would they choose that metric?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll declare some guilt on that because I was one of the they. And a lot of these are imagined problems, for sure. Except that domain take downs are an existing situation, if you will. They are part of the status quo, and they are generally the result of bad behavior on the part of registrants, and so the question then becomes if there is a market increase in that behavior, then it might suggest that there has been an increase in trademark violation, an increase in phishing scams, etc. that resulted from this expansion and from the new gTLD program.

And that's probably worth capturing. No one is pre-supposing that this will happen, Nathalie, instead that we want it not to happen, and we would have looked for this number not to have gone up. That would have been the hope and expectation, but this exercise is one of guessing things that might happen, and trying to account for them as possible metrics as the review team does its work. Does that make sense?

NATHALIE COUPET: It does. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Obviously, I'm more concerned about just our ability to get these numbers in the first place, and what the level of effort would be. Is there some 80/20 version of this, Eleeza, that we can try to do that isn't a huge study? A huge amount of effort? But that we might still get some benefit from?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm going to let Karen answer that question.

KAREN LENTZ: I just raised my hand. This is Karen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Raise it higher next time if you would. If you could just hold your hand just a little bit higher, than it would be easier for me to notice.

KAREN LENTZ: I will work on that. So, my thought on this, I've been listening to the discussion, everybody seems to support the value of the data if we had it. I'm thinking a couple of things. One is, I think that the comparison that the group is interested in, to start out with, would be what are the numbers, or have the numbers in a legacy space.

So I think that there is nothing that requires... We know that registries have policies on this and work with others to take down domains, but we, that's not something they would report to us, or require to give to

IDN if ICANN asks them. So maybe one way to go about it would be to approach the legacy operators and see what their willingness would be, and that would give us a good indication of what the general overall response would be going forward.

So that's one thing. And then the other thing, my other point is there is a subset of metrics that I think our sense after having engaged with them is, it would really be a best effort basis. You know, we may get partial data, we won't get everything. It won't be necessarily consistent from an apple to apples comparison, but we will get some and try to work with it.

So I think if you can establish, okay, these are ones that can sort of partially be met, and then you can look at all of those if we're talking about best efforts, and decide what are the most valuable areas to focus those efforts. So there is a couple of suggestions there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So we put this in the category of best efforts is the primary suggest then. Right Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes, that's my suggestion for now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so, can we reach out? And again, this is interesting because this is part of the work that we're trying to do in another working group on related to data driven policy development. It's about how to get people to part with their data, that they might consider to be competitively risky for them to share, and this falls in the same category.

I mean, I wonder if it's possible if we make some assurances about the aggregation of the data, because, again, the whole point is not any kind

of naming, shaming of any individual domain, or registry, or anything like that, but instead to try to look at the data in the aggregate to see whether or not incidents have gone up or down.

So if there is some way to make that request, and see what that feedback looks like, I think that this group would be interested in seeing, because it does seem to be [?] in the value, in the belief that if there was some data to be gathered that it would be worth seeing.

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, we agree.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. So you guys can make that request? Or do you want to draft something and circulate it? But I mean, because again, it's that anonymization and that aggregation of the data I think that's going to be critical for a lot of folks, so that they don't feel that they're... And I don't know if that needs to be collected through a third party or something like that, to accomplish, but maybe what are the conditions under which you would be willing to share this data, something like that.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. We'll draft something on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thanks. Shall I move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, please.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So next up is 1.18, quantity and relevant incidents of detected botnets and malware distributed using new gTLDs. I think with this one, I have a note in the slides, and when I email it to you, you'll see it again.

We're still trying to get some more information, but the initial feedback I got on this one was that, and I'm not a technical person. So I maybe speaking completely out of turn here, but there is some sensitivity surrounding how we define botnets and malware and how we measure them.

So I just wanted to raise that and perhaps ensure there are others in the group who can maybe provide some more context on that. But the suggestion was that we would require some outside experts that needs to do a good analysis of this. I think I'll leave it there, otherwise I'll probably sound stupid.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does anybody want to speak up on this one?

MIKE NELSON: This is one of the questions where it's going to be hard for many...

JONATHAN ZUCK: And this is Mike Nelson for the record.

MIKE NELSON: This is Mike Nelson, yes. This is one of those things where most survey companies won't know how to ask this question. So you just have to be alert to the complexity and the room for misunderstanding. I think that it's good that we flag this, but I think it is an important question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Relative incidents. I guess this is going to be a question of trying to figure out what the effort would be to come up with a baseline now, because that would be the indicator of whether or not we have some chance of doing a [delta] of the relevant incidents of this. So I guess, yeah.

Is it possible to reach out to some of these sources to see what kind of data is available for the current set of TLDs? [CROSSTALK]...or whatever.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Sure. Some of them do have, and this is Eleeza. Some of them do have data available that you can download, which I tried doing and it just looks like gibberish to me. So, I think there is a degree of technical expertise that we need here. You don't see the decision metric on here because that's a little bit of an easier one to measure, and they're really good sources for that kind of data.

And we've been in touch with the anti-phishing working group about that. But my understanding, from a few people we've spoken to, that this would require, first and foremost, some technical person, and there is some sensitivities just around definitions. And I think it's all stuff that may require data, that it exceeds certainly my capabilities and possibly the time and resources we have available and how... That's why wanted to flag it here.

KAREN LENTZ:

This is Karen. Just to add, one of the reasons we have it here is, what we've identified... One of the things we've been looking at is resourcing and cost. So we don't think the cost is prohibitive, to engage them outside expertise to help actually interpret the data once we have it, but we are noting it as an item that does have some cost attached to it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, I mean, the difficulty, obviously, is we don't have a budget per se, right? So I mean, should we... This is one of the ones you flagged whether you want to ask the question about the relative value to the cost, and maybe what we'll need to do is, when we get through this conversation, we have a few of these things left and then have a conversation in more detail.

I mean I think the problem is that this group doesn't know what that cost is in order to make a comparison for that value, just that there is a cost. So I mean, I'm open to some suggestions on how we might parse that in a beneficial way for you, so that we can help make that assessment on whether it's worth it, because I don't know what it is, unfortunately. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. This is, your point about of us not having a budget is very valid. It's Cheryl for the record. We don't, but the review team will. And so, I sort of put that as a well, you know, that's what our problems are response, because there will be a budget and capability for the future analysis, albeit easy or [?].

But what will be a problem is if we don't have the baseline, and if we haven't reached out and got the current feed of incidents, so that a comparison can be done later, and we are aware, at the time we were putting these metrics together, that a bunch of these was going to be in that camp, and our response was, and I think still be, without a starting data, without the benchmark material.

We will therefore limit the choices the future review team can make. And that's what we're trying to avoid. So it's not a matter of whose budget that is going to come out of, it will come out of the review team's budget later, but [?] to the analysis, that having the benchmark and the established baselines now is essential.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, I mean I guess that's a question as to whether or not, as you've done the initial research on this, you view that this is data that will go away, or if it's data that can be ascertained later and to have times

attached to it. I mean, I suspected that a number of these sources are keeping this data, and keeping [stats] of this data for archival purposes anyway.

And so we may not need to collect a baseline for it to be used by the review time team. Karen?

KAREN LENTZ:

Yes, thanks Jonathan, that's correct. The research that we've done indicates that this is not one of the ones where there is a risk of the data going away. The groups work on this do have been working on it for some time and do, have records of it. So I think that aspect is addressed.

In terms of the couple of comments on the budget, just sort of as background for all of the groups discussion. There will be, indeed as Cheryl noted, a review team budget, most likely. Also within the ICANN budgeting process, that's in development now and I have made some requests to support, in anticipation of some investment requires to get started on some of the metrics, including things where we're all building a script or automating something, or the cases where we do need to engage an expert or a few others that involve market research.

So obviously the new budget is not final. I think it will be posted in May, according to the schedule. But anyway, that's contemplated. I just wanted the group to know that. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So I guess the question that I would turn back on to staff, and I don't mean to make busy work or anything, but if there is a way to spitball what you think the costs would be associated with doing this analysis,

then at least we can be helpful in trying to make some sort of return on investment recommendations surrounding it for the review team.

And think that's part of our job. Our remit is try to hand the review team something as close to turnkey as possible, and so for us to do that, we ought to at least figure out what the price of this might be. And try to contextualize that so you get an understanding of whether there is a sufficient return on making that expenditure. Is that doable?

KAREN LENTZ:

Sure. This is Karen. I think that makes sense, so we'll take that as an action item.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. All right. Let's move on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay. This is Eleeza. The next one is 1.19, quantity and relative of incidents of sites found to be dealing in or distributing identities or account information used in identity fraud. We've had some discussion about this one in the past, and we're still kind of digging around for data on this.

We've had law enforcement folks coming back to us saying the stolen identity marketplace, as it where, is really an underground marketplace. I think it was, perhaps it was Nathalie or someone who sent to the email list a story about where there are some sites where you can find, for example, credit card numbers. So we're still digging around trying to see if there is more data collected on that.

But the other point I make here is that we may be able to collect some instance of the sites that collect identities, but again, this might mire the

metric that we've been talking about on phishing and botnets and so forth. So, that's where things stand on 1.19.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Comments?

MIKE NELSON: This is going to be one that's going to be very hard to do comparisons over time, just because where these sites are and how you get at them is not going to be consistent through time. Interesting metric though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean, it is going to be [?], I'm definitely aware here on this space that's something, there are from time to time ads for [laughter] cards that show up on YouTube and things like that, but I just did a search really quickly. And so presumably that would suggest there is a source to go to, but I don't know, again, if it would be easier to identify with, in any consistent way what TLDs are being used for that or something like that.

Because you can just be as happy to use, you know, changing IP addresses or something like that too. There certainly are sites that purport to, if only temporarily to distribute identities and account information. [CROSSTALK] Go ahead, I was just going to say I don't know what to do about this one. Go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, I need to learn how to raise my hand. This is Eleeza again. I think that there is another one we would group under, sort of the best efforts category. There is kind of bits and pieces of data out there, but I'm not sure we'll get a number, for example, 1,000 sites that deal in stolen identities.

I think it will be a bit more, perhaps more of an analytical response, a qualitative response rather than a quantitative response. So, perhaps that just means we're finding the metric to indicate that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, I guess that's right. I think that's sort of what we agreed. We listed this in Singapore and said that it would be a best efforts. And then Cheryl stood up from the back of the room and said something about making sure that we make our best efforts on it. So I guess it makes sense to make it a best efforts, because we don't know exactly what information we'll get from this.

I mean, again it might be a research effort, and have some cost associated with it. And I don't know, you know, again, I don't know the scale of that though.

NATHALIE COUPET:

What I understood about these websites, they are underground websites, but they're not so hidden. I think it was *60 Minutes* reporting, and I went to a couple of these websites, and there was thousands of numbers of credit cards, and you can buy it. You can just click on a button next to each credit card and you could buy them.

The problem was not there was so much hidden from the public, I mean they were underground but there was a way to get to them quite easily, but it's just that they seem to enjoy a political... A lot of them were based in the Ukraine, [?] and in Russia. And it seemed that Vladimir Putin was protecting some of them. And every time he wanted a bargaining chip with the West, he would raise the possibility of not going after those people.

But basically there seemed to be a big tie between these websites, the owners of the websites, and the Russian mafia or someone with political connections. It's not that they're hidden, it's just that they do it with impunity.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I mean this really calls into question whether anybody is really going to want to volunteer to be on the review team. [Laughter] We haven't addressed that problem, phone calls late at night, "Lay off the network sites..."

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: They're not on [?] staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Phone calls late at night [?] to all of us. Cheryl here. That's kind of not our problem though. The political or the geographical location of these industries, and it is an industry, and who is protecting that industry, because it's quite a profitable industry as well, isn't really the problem.

The problem we're trying to get to is, is there a change in the relative incidents, the [?] and the total quantity of those practices? And that...

NATHALIE COUPET: I just wanted to say that these sites are not so difficult to find, [?] would not be so difficult to figure out. It's already...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with you there Nathalie. I think maybe some anonymize researcher in a basement might be the right person to do that work, [laughs]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: So the question, I think that Mike raised that I don't want to lose sight of, is that this may be a case where the absence of a baseline could be really deleterious though, because the sites are probably changing all of the time, so if there isn't some kind of snapshot, even if it's possible to

find a number, we probably need to find a before and an after number, if possible, just because they're going to be so subject to change.

I think that was one of Mike's points about this, and one of the complexities of this is looking for that delta, because it probably changes every day.

MIKE NELSON: There is an important factor though. Even if you don't know that you're getting a representative sample of these malware sites, you could understand that a handful of the gTLDs, or some class of gTLDs, tend to be abused more. So that, even if you don't get longitudinal data, you can't say for certain that things have gotten worse, you might be able to say that these types of domain names are 10 or 20 times more likely to be abused than this other class.

So that's useful information, even without longitudinal data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And you can do that with a single snapshot is what you're saying.

MIKE NELSON: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl is your hand still up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I'm happy with what Mike was just saying, I think that that's pretty valid. I think any analysis of the data points would recognize that this is a very agile, I think [?] would describe it these days, industry, and snapshots, etc. are the only way forward. So it would always be analyzed through the lens of understanding of what this part of the industry is all about.

But again, that doesn't negate the desirability of taking those snapshots, etc.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey Mike, can't you or [Milton] or somebody talk some Master's or PhD candidate to doing this work for us for free? [Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What a good idea.

MIKE NELSON: I'm not teaching at Georgetown this semester, so Milton is the better person to talk to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're still very well connected and have lots of alumni connections apparently.

MIKE NELSON: Yes, apparently. [Laughter] Only the best students.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

MIKE NELSON: But I do think that it's possible. This is something that is not an expensive thing, it's time consuming.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, which is usually, in my world of filmmaking, that usually finds somebody really young, with low rent to put on the task. I wonder how we might pursue some of these things, because academic exercises, I mean because there is several people, obviously, Milton is a person that came to mind and you, but we have people – I mean, we're inundated with people like in the ICANN community.

So the question is, is there a way for something like this, it feels like something we would benefit from the data from the work being done. I

wonder if it's the kind of thing that we can try to push out to the academic communities somehow.

MIKE NELSON: Well, crowd sourcing is the new answer to all problems.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know about crowd sourcing. I would like to find someone or some small [?] people felt that this was an interesting thing to hang their thesis on.

MIKE NELSON: Well I think just, when we announce the questions we're posing, I think that might generate some interest...

NATHALIE COUPLET: Do we have enough time though to find a student who wants to spend time doing this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know the answer to that. I mean, yes, it would have been a good idea to come up with a year ago, Nathalie, for sure.

NATHALIE COUPLET: Right, yeah.

MIKE NELSON: It might be, I mean this is an interesting question. Are we going to make sure that the data sets that come from this work are available for re-analysis and reuse by the broader community? I guess that's one of the questions we can put in the RFP. The few Internet in America life projects, which does all of these incredible surveys of how people use the Internet, have done really a great job in making their raw data available.

Which is then reused in 101 different ways. That's very cool.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, no definitely that's... There is definitely a sort of ICANN related open data initiative that is brewing, that is certainly the case as well. [CROSSTALK] ...part of our remit, but separately promote that...

MIKE NELSON: As we write our RFP, we should come back to that question. I mean, it may mean some companies that don't want to do the work, because they want to hang onto the data and reuse it in other places, but I think we should be... Err on the side of openness and reuse, and that could spur a lot of academic research, derivative research that, even be more useful in the original survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, or the original analysis anyway.

MIKE NELSON: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Once again, I'm not sure that we have a clear picture of what to ask staff for. This might be a question, again, of trying to look into what the cost of doing some kind of a baseline study on this might be. And then, again, to facilitate making a ROI analysis. Does that make sense Eleeza and Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes. I think we're unsure of where to start with that, but we can certainly start thinking about it. It's one that we continue to struggle with, as you can tell.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I can tell that, and I don't mean to leave you hanging with that. We're just trying to figure out what the best way is to make the assessment that you want to make about it, in terms of its value relative to its complexity and cost. Yeah, I don't know.

I mean it might be just worth asking somebody that's done some of this kind of work what it would take to, from an academic perspective, what it would take to...

MIKE NELSON: As long as we're not looking for a comprehensive analysis, as long as we're trying to do a sample, to see kind of what's out there, I don't think this should be that expensive. And it should be useful.

NATHALIE COUPET: How often will this kind of survey recur? Is it every year? Every two years?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's with the potential of the frequency of the review team. If the review team ends up deciding this was an important data point, it might get done again for the following review team. And I don't remember what the frequency of that... Is that every two years? Karen or Margie?

KAREN LENTZ: I want to say two, but I should check first.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's two as well. As Mason reminds us, we're sort of at the end of our call time here, and I don't want to abuse anyone's time. Mike? Can I impose on you to talk to a couple of academic connections about what might be involved in doing this kind of a study? Even if it's not about them doing it, but getting their sense of what it would take to do it so that we...

Since staff are floundering a little bit on this one, and maybe it's something that you can help provide some direction to with the input of some of your colleagues?

MIKE NELSON: Sure. And this is... Just looking at this one back piece, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I say that, but the other thing, we ask them to scale as well, if you are have that – if you have time over lunch, and to ask about both and why not? But I think this is the one that staff feels the least direction on, if that makes sense.

MIKE NELSON: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

MIKE NELSON: Very good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right great. We'll pick this up at the next meeting, but I think we made some good progress here. We have those two RFP teams assigned. So staff are going to start the process of those, outline of those RFPs, and we'll start going around on the list. And then if like Karen or Eleeza or someone can sort of remind me of the things that we were going to discuss on the list with respect to the duplication metrics, then let's circulate something at the beginning of next week to get clarity on those duplications, and we can put those to rest one way or the other.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay, we'll do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And I'll circulate those [?] as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, great. Thanks so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]