RECORDING:	This meeting is now being recorded.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I guess we'll give it a couple more minutes for people to join before we get started.
UNIDENTIFIED:	Okay. Thank you.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Hey, Rudi, are you on the call?
RUDI VANSNICK:	Yes, indeed, Jonathan, I'm on the call.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Excellent. Have you had a chance to talk to Evan at all lately?
RUDI VANSNICK:	Well, we had so many conference calls, so many meetings, yes I've asked him, and I just put in the Skype session, the link so that he can join the call also. I would like to have him here too.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So will he be joining?

RUDI VANSNICK: As far as I see, he should, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

                          Not yet, you aren't Cheryl.

RUDI VANSNICK: Evan just joined the Adobe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, good.

                          Somebody has their PC speaker on. We're getting feedback. So if you're on the phone and the PC, make sure and mute the PC. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that you Evan?

MATT ASHTIANI: Jonathan, this is Matt. We're dialing up to Evan now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay.

MATT ASHTIANI: And I think that's the last of the dial ups. So we can just go ahead and start.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

                        Welcome, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. [?]…was a kind of busy month for me, so I've been a bit off the grid.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, welcome back. We're going to put you on the spot, I think, a little bit today, because I think this is going to be a little bit of a house keeping call this time around to figure out where we are, some various action items, etc. And get some updates from staff. But I want to make sure that staff don't have any lingering confusions about any of the ALAC recommended metrics.

I saw an email from DelBianco on the other questions, but I don't know whether or not you've had a chance to look at the questions that the staff sent your direction.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Jonathan. Like I say, I've been like truly off the grid for about the last month, so I'm still catching up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. As a matter of housekeeping, Karen or Eleeza, do you want to ask some of those questions now and see if they are easy to answer? And if they're not, then we can narrow it down to a little bit of homework to get them answered going forward?

KAREN LENTZ: Hi Jonathan, hi everyone. This is Karen. So we had, looking at the agenda after the RFP update, the next step issues, on the last call we had gone through some of the individual metrics that we thought had a resource implication, or something to be discussed. And so our idea for that portion was to finish those slides, I think there were three or four more.

And then could include the, we had included the remaining ALAC questions, but we can jump into those first if you prefer.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't prefer, so I'm happy to do it in whatever order your slides are, I just want to make sure that we get those checked off our list, so that we can make a clean move forward.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay, great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So if you just want to go through from there, that's fine. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. Do you want to cover the action items as part of number one?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I'm not trying to undermine the agenda we work so hard to put together. I just wanted to make sure that, I didn't know if that was part of it, and I wanted to make sure that we dealt with those questions. Because I think our very next step, step three, is looking at metrics with hard to define recommendations.

I think that's probably the final phase of our metric analysis, and then the RFPs are happening in parallel to that. So I just wanted to make sure that we had this first part about any misunderstandings, or difficult to obtain metrics to accomplish first.

EN

KAREN LENTZ:	Sure. So, from the staff side, we had a few action items from the last call. Both of which, all of which, are in progress, really. One was to draft a note on the legacy registries on what they'd be willing to share in terms of the domain take down. There is a requirement for reporting in the new gTLD agreement that doesn't exist with legacy registries, so we were going to draft a communication on what they might have and be willing to share on domain take downs.
	That's in progress. We also had an action item to obtain a cost estimate for doing the additional work that we talked about last week on botnets and malware, and that is still pending as well. We're looking into getting a cost estimate for that. The RFPs I'll talk about in a minute. And then there was one other that we recorded which was for Michael Nelson, who I don't think is on the call, to look into some academic, possible academic paths, for getting some data around false identity and identity distribution.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I'll follow up with Michael separately.
KAREN LENTZ:	Okay. All right. And then in terms of the two RFPs, so we got some volunteers on the last call to work on one or the other of the areas. So we have started work on both of those, the consumer survey and economic study. We have some procurement guidelines that were published on the ICANN site around how we go about doing our RFPs. These are obviously large in terms of cost and complexity.

So there are a number of guidelines that we're working within. We actually have a procurement function within ICANN who is working to put in place kind of a common structure, and set up steps around RFPs. So we started to work with them on both of those topics. On the…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Karen?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry, it's Jonathan. I didn't know if you were about to move on. Often with RFPs, there is a lot of boiler plate that have to do with process issues in terms of conflicts of interest, and submission policies, and things like that. And then there is the kind of what we're after section, which is probably where your little committee here could do you the most good. Is there any way to do those processes in parallel?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, I think so. Yeah, absolutely. One of the other things I was going to mention is, I think Margie mentioned on a previous call that we've been discussing with the National Opinion Research Center, who has done some work previously, that they could possibly advise on the more technical subject matter pieces of the consumer survey. So we're working internally to create criteria and qualifications and templates that make sense for a survey and for an economic study.

With regards to your point Jonathan, on involving these teams in… The point that needs to be covered, I think that we can something, some discussions going there. In terms of timeframe for what we're working towards for a complete draft, we've been telling people that we want to have something ready to circulate to all of you that's fairly complete by the time we are having a meeting in London.

Obviously we'll circulate what we can before that, and want to get the ideas flowing before that, but that's kind of the target. And then one other thing that I wanted to mention that would be helpful at this point is, if…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I hold you up for a second? However doesn't have their line muted, if they could mute it. There is a lot of background noise right now. Just mute the line when you're not speaking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you have names as well as telephone numbers it would help, but perhaps you might need to re [?] the telephone numbers so you know who you are talking to, Jonathan. Because it's very hard to hear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I don't know, like I know my phone number isn't even the right one because it's on Skype. Can everyone…

KAREN LENTZ:	There are two numbers, one starts with 786, and the other is 661.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah. Can you check if your number starts with 786?
NATHALIE COUPET:	It's me. Hello?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes?
NATHALIE COUPET:	I'm sorry, this is my number.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Can you mute your line?
NATHALIE COUPET:	Yes. Hello?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes.
NATHALIE COUPET:	Is it better now?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	It is. It also looks like 661 went quiet too. So, I don't know what you did, but I don't hear it anymore. So it looks like it's muted. Sorry, Karen. Can you proceed?
KAREN LENTZ:	Sure. I just had one other point to add which was, what would also be helpful as part of the development process, we are compiling a list of relevant places that we could publish or distribute, communicate the RFP. So if the group has suggestions on any of those, that would be helpful as well. Thanks.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks a lot Karen. So folks, you know who you are on these relevant groups. If you have people in mind that you think would be good to push the RFP out to, let's start to compile a list and get that to staff, so that when this is ready to put out there, we can get as broad a reach as possible. Does anybody have any questions about that? Rudi, go ahead.
RUDI VANSNICK:	Thank you Jonathan. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. Are there any specific requirements that we have up front to the communities or organizations we want to send the RFP to?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I guess that's a good question, but I think other than the scale of each of these projects, which are both fairly large, I don't think that we have an

predetermined characteristics, other than the normal ones of wanting someone of good repute to respond to the RFP. I mean, I think wider is better when it comes to putting the RFP out so that we can see a range of responses and make the choice from there.

I don't know, beyond that, I just think to bear in mind the scale, especially with the consumer trust survey. Are there other questions? I know Nathalie sent around some articles that were interesting and can help inform the process of putting together the RFP, etc. So everyone take a look at those.

One of them was a survey about people not necessarily trusting the new gTLDs, which I think is interesting to put aside and see if that changes. But I think what we want probably still is an understanding, is the trust level of the DNS and on broader scope. But it was certainly an interesting read. There were a number of interesting articles. The *Forbes* article about pricing, etc. But as we found in our brainstorming session at the last meeting, there are a lot of different aspects of price and we want to make sure we're thorough in our understanding of it.

NATHALIE COUPET: There is also… Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Who is this?

NATHALIE COUPET: This is Nathalie.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, hi Nathalie.

NATHALIE COUPET: Hi. There is also, I found also an interesting article dated April 28th, on the launch of, at the end of Chinese [Ideas?] online, which is really having a very impressive results. [?], just shows you how also the public, the Chinese public is ready to welcome IDNs, anything that is not, I don't know how you pronounce it. A-S-K-I, aski? So that might be interesting also to see how this, these new Chinese TLDs are actually, they have a lot of success.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean, I think that's going to be an interesting characteristic of this review, is trying to make a distinction between the Roman and non-Roman, or I should say, non-ASCII, sort of a techy term, TLDs, and whether or not there is a difference between those who have not had a TLD in their native script and now do, and those that have had them and now simply have more of them.

So my guess is there will be interesting comparisons between those two markets.

NATHALIE COUPET: And also, how maybe the IDNs are, the Chinese IDNs have a lot of success, and also the Russian online also has a lot of success, but comparison, the Arabic websites [?] and a few others how much

success. And then [?] favorite of, TLDs, IDNs in English. So this also could be an interesting comparison.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. That will be interesting. I mean I think it's outside of our remit, because we're just a portion of that review process, I think, and there will be a subjective portion of it as well. But we're trying to, I think, in some measure, define some objective characteristics for analysis of the new gTLD program. But I'm sure they'll be looking subjectively in a lot of feedback, etc. from IDNs in various parts of the world.

Any other questions about what Karen just went over in terms of the RFPs and where we are with them? So hopefully sometime before London, maybe some bullet points or something like that, maybe we can see from you Karen, so that people can help a thing that you might have forgotten or not captured in the last couple of meetings, etc. in terms of the areas for study.

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah. I've added an action item for us to initiate communication to both of the groups on where we are on soliciting input for now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. Thank you. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Jonathan. A few minutes ago you were mentioning the issue of public trust in the DNS, and you refer to putting that aside. Could you elaborate on that a bit?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Putting that aside. No, I mean, I don't think that's what I said. What there was, one of the articles that Nathalie circulated, I know you've been underground for a bit, but she circulated a number of articles that are relevant to the issues that we are tackling with. And one of them is a survey you may have seen that had to do with people's concerns over the new gTLD program.

In other words, now when people don't know much about it, people don't have the same trust level in the new TLDs, or don't, I mean, don't think that they do, right? Then they do in the old ones. That's essentially the out process of that study. So I guess what I was saying is what we need to do with our own study, is look at their trust level in the DNS as a whole, so that we can find that delta a year out, 18 months out, when the new gTLDs have really had a chance to thrive.

So the study I think is interesting and one that we should definitely archive and the review team will look back on, but it's specially about do you trust dot bike as much as you trust dot com, that's what it is.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Got it. Okay, thanks.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Jonathan, it's Steve DelBianco. I had been writing to a couple of clarification questions a few weeks ago, is there more follow up needed on those questions? Or are there other questions that are in my lap that I haven't answered?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's my understanding that there aren't further questions in your lap, but it's probably good to hear from staff whether your answers provided sufficient clarity. I mean, I guess that's maybe the next thing we're going over is whatever the remnant questions are about existing metrics, and what was intended by them. Is this a good time to move to that next step Karen and Eleeza?

KAREN LENTZ: We can do that. Charlotte or Matt, if you can bring up the slide while we do that? And I'll turn it over to Eleeza in a minute, but we had on the last call, I think, or one of the other calls, decided to forwarded the sort of, one for clarification questions to the relevant, either GNSO or ALAC people. So we got the responses from Steve DelBianco, and I think we, so addressed the questions that we had on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. Steve, you have lots of bandwidth now for your new homework assignment.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah. The answers I provided though, I already responded on staff, Ron [?] and Jonathan, if that's not circulated to the full working group, I might ask Eleeza or Margie or somebody to push those out to the whole working group.

KAREN LENTZ: Sure we can circulate that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And thanks for your answers, Steve, they were really helpful. This is Eleeza by the way.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Now I think we're getting the right slide deck back up. Thank you Matt. So I wanted to pick up on where we left off, and then go over, I added in some of the ALAC related metrics that I had some questions for. We can talk about that at the end, that's where I have those slides. Hopefully we'll get to those soon. So I want to start…

Well again, at least I can start talking about which metrics we're on as the slides are uploading. 5.2 to 5.4, and you'll see it as soon as it's up. These are the metrics that are related to growth and use of hosted pages. So for example, Facebook… As well as QL codes and URL

shortening services. So this one is more of a FYI than really something that we had questions about, but we've done some research on the data that's out there.

We've spoken to some folks at [Com score?], see what kind of data they have, and right now, I'm working on reaching out to a few other firms that have this type of market data. But I wanted to flag this one as something that will have a cost element associated with it. We don't yet know how much that will be, but my impression is that it's not something that would break the bank, or would be prohibitively high.

Just a couple of notes on these. Because we'd be using, thank you Matt, potentially propriety data, we would have to be sensitive about how we make this public. At least in our conversation with [Com Score], it was pretty clear that we'd be able to make some of this public, but there might be sensitivities surrounding that, so I just wanted to highlight that.

If there are any questions on that?

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve with a quick question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If we discover the sensitivities having to do with identities, there are ways we can anonymize, the generic new gTLD one, generic gTLD two, etc. The other opportunity is to aggregate the data in terms of averages and counts, instead of individual numbers. So when sensitivities arise with respect to confidentiality, our last resort is to suppress the information. The first alternative is to anonymize or aggregate so that we can publish it and use it. Would you guys agree?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If I could just jump in, I agree with you Steve. I guess the sensitivities that I was talking about are buying data that one of these firms sells, and they may be sensitive about what we make publically available. You know, giving away the milk for free in a sense. So, that's more what I was getting at.

But I absolutely agree with you that there are definitely ways to aggregate data, that's one of the more important elements, particularly in the economic study.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And yet when we purchase data, we're often allowed to publish our conclusions based on the data, and even which data we relied upon. But of course, we would want to avoid republishing the entire data set that we had paid for, we would as our custom. So that's different from confidentially. That has to do with appropriating their intellectual property, and making sure that we don't distribute it for free. I get that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Right. I should have been more clear. I meant business confidentiality, more than relating to registries and that sort of thing. Thank you.
	And I see that Rudi noted here that the European Commission has several studies and most of them are publically accessible. Rudi, if you could send those to me, I would love to take a look at them, or if you have some links you can send around.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	And we're hard at work getting the commission to release raw data on the work that they do. I don't know whether they are on these particular studies, but that's a broad initiative right now as well.
ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. All right. If there are no other questions, I can move on to the next slide.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Please.
ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. This is one of the ones that we had sent to around to the ALAC representatives for questions about software design networking. We asked some of our technical colleagues to look into this, and we're still not quite sure how this is meant to be an alternative to the DNS. We're wondering if this was meant to be related to the use of apps, QR code, other things that may not show full domain names.

So I'm wondering if maybe we can have Rudi or Evan, perhaps, may be able to answer that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. I guess right now the intent was just to try and… This went to the core issue of trust in the domain name system, was to try and see what the relative success was of alternative methods of getting from an end user to the information they wanted, thinking that domain names were one method, and all of those other things were alternative routes.

So if the use of the alternative routes increased, it might indicate a reduced confidence in the domain name system.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: In terms of alternate routes, do you mean what I've mentioned here? Like QR codes, URL shorteners, I'm not quite sure…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: When somebody takes a picture of a QR code, it takes them somewhere, yes it uses a domain name, but it isn't necessarily a memorable or even human readable domain name. It could go to anything. You know, things like an URL shortener. Again, it uses the domain name system, by it bypasses the concept of memorable domain names which is the point behind the TLD system.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. Yeah, absolutely. Well… Oh, Karen had a question here. Go ahead Karen.
KAREN LENTZ:	Yeah, I just wanted to… When Evan started talking about alternate routes, I was thinking of various, just ones that have popped up with their own set of TLDs and all of that. But that sounds like that wasn't what you were getting at.
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	I wasn't thinking of the, so to speak, competitors to ICANN, and the ones that were offering different memorable top level domains. I was thinking specifically that the idea… If you scan a QR code, you don't have to remember a domain name, and it could actually go to some totally machine readable domain name. It still uses the DNS, so it passes the concept of having a memorable domain name.
	That's what I was thinking. Same thing with URL shortening services, things like Facebook homepages or something else. But the point I was trying to get at was, you know, an end user is trying to get at their content. How did they get there? How did they… Did they get there through search engine? Did they get there by snapping a QR code? Did they get there through some other method?
	And one of those is the DNS. And so the point I was trying to make was, you know, is the relative increase or decrease of popularity of these various methods, how do they reflect confidence in the DNS?
ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. I see that Steve has his hand raised.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes, this is Steve DelBianco. In the report that the GNSO and the ALAC adopted, there were identical two sentences about this.   We said, "Alternative methods," we avoided the word routes for the root reason. "Alternative methods of the Internet…"

JONATHAN ZUCK: Because a route is what happen to Napoleon in Russia.

[LAUGHTER]

STEVE DELBIANCO: "Alternative methods of accessing Internet content and services, like mobile apps, search engines, social portals, and QR codes, are growing in popularity and present innovative and competitive threats to ICANN regulated TLDs."   We said, "As such, they should be considered in any complete evaluation of consumer choice, trust, and competition related to ICANN in general, and new gTLDs specifically."

So I'm not even sure that that is where Evan is now. I think what Evan described now is a better focus on this notion of non-visible domain names, while they still may use a domain name. If it's not visible, that indicates a reduced reliance of being able to see the top level domain. The domain name and the top level domain. That increased, decreased reliance on visibility, doesn't imply a lack of trust, but it might well tell us something else that's really interesting, right?

EN

So, it's a lack of reliance on the visible domain name, as opposed to an obvious reduction in trust in the domain name system.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You're exactly right. When you're things like QR codes and shortening services, you can go to second, and third, and fourth level domain names that don't even require an expansion. So, that's sort of what we were getting at, is that, yeah, they use the domain name system… And in fact, Steve, when that original text was written, it actually still had these concepts in mind, that the idea that when we were first coming up with it, then the comment back was, look QR codes still go to domain names.

And the answer is, yes, they absolutely do but they don't necessarily go to memorable ones, or ones that require the TLD expansion.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Right. And I read the ALAC text, which is in red on our combined document. None of it gets to the concept of visibility of the domain name. And you first mentioned that term 90 seconds ago, and that's something we can measure, the visibility. I just think it would be challenging without a survey of some kind to assess whether that's a reflection of reduced trust.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm going to just say let's table that conversation. I think we want to get through the clarity issues right now, in terms of what data sets we're looking at. And then I think we'll do a pass through all of these metrics,

EN

and try to take a hard look at whether or not we can provide reasonable prescriptions for their outcome, because I think that will be an indicator of their value at some level.

And we should go through all the metrics and do that exercise to see if we're able to make recommendations for those metrics, and I think that [?] conversation will come up again, I think, in that context.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's a really helpful conversation. I think some of the confusion for us is that software design networking is also a technical term, and we were lost, at least me, as a non-technical person, was lost in that definition. So this certainly makes it more clear. Evan, did you have any more to say? I see your hand is still up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, lowering it now.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, great. Shall I move on then?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, please.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So, next up, 6.1, number of consumer complaints to government agencies related to confusing or misleading domain names. I think the

EN

biggest stumbling block for us here is defining confusing or misleading domain names. There is some data out there through the International Consumer Protection and Enforcement Network, which shares complaints from 29 member countries. Obviously, that's not a very representative sample. If you look at the countries on there, it's heavily weighted toward Europe, a bit of Latin America, not a whole lot of representation from Asia.

As I recall, I think perhaps just Japan. So there is some data there, but they don't slice in a way that would necessarily get to this metric. And that data lives on e-conusmer.gov, which the FTC maintains. I've spoken with someone there who helps maintain that data and raised some of our questions with her, and she basically said it would be pretty difficult and pretty time consuming to slice the data in ways that, at least to get to this question, and a couple of other questions.

So, I guess my question to the group would be, how can we define this and narrow it down in a way that might be more helpful? Or perhaps look at the data that is available through [I see pen?], and see if there are more, better measures in there that might get to some of these questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Folks, anybody want to…? I know at the last meeting, Cheryl came in and pressed for more requests being made on this topic, and the staff seem to have done that. Does anybody have any alternative recommendations for how we might go about getting this data? Or do we feel comfortable putting it in the best efforts category?

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve. May I ask, if we thought that 29 countries was insufficient to be globally representative, and that was the only data available, we might save ourselves the trouble by concluding we could not get representative data that would be sufficient to draw conclusions about global trust on this, and thereby park the item. As opposed to best efforts being, well, we got 29 countries and then critics of our efforts say, "Well, that's not representative. There is none of them in Asia, there is only two in South America."

Let's not go down the path of best [?] already know that's not going to be a satisfactory path to pursue.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza again. If I can just point out, that data still doesn't get to complaints related to confusing or misleading domain names. It gets to a lot of other questions, but not to this particular one. And I see Rudi has his hand up. Please, go ahead.

RUDI VANSNICK: Yes. Rudi Vansnick for the transcript. With regard to the complaint that we're looking at, I'm afraid most governments would not release information about that, and the other side, I think that these complaints could also be gathered by [?] registries, where I think domain names, especially in the ccTLD world, are almost convinced that they have lists of data, of complaints that users are given.

They don't arrive at the place they want to arrive, by misleading domain names. On the other side, I'm convinced that there is a lot going on, but most of the consumers just don't know how to complain at all. And I think that that's an issue we maybe should try to add to the question itself. Is there a way that we can have an indication that people don't know how to get, probably where they can have their information, or took their complaint.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: One point I would like to make, this is Eleeza again. I think you raise a good point Rudi, about consume confusion, and I think that's something that will be addressed, or at least some of the questions we'd like to include in the consumer survey, in terms of their understanding of the DNS. So maybe some of that would be included there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve. I might ask ALAC members, and in particular Evan, this metric came from the ALAC supplement, if you can shed any clarification on confusing and misleading, as well as the notion of whether it could be measured in a survey as opposed to a numerical metric.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm a little on the spot here, but on the issue of [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]…   Can the person who has got all that background noise, do they not know who they are?

RUDI VANSNICK: It's not mine.   Nathalie, if I'm not wrong.   I thought a little bit of discussions [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. On the issue of the consumer confusion, Eleeza, you're right, and that can be really problematic of how we deal with it. It's probably going to be the kind of thing that needs to be [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]… that we can really quantify.

Essentially, you know, [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]… Sorry, I really can't talk over this. Can whoever is doing this please mute or get off?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Did I hear the operator say it was Michael Graham?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. It has died down. I could barely hear myself think.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, the good news is, you said it pretty clearly and we could all hear you. I for one, at least, appreciate the flexibility that maybe this is better served by a qualitative assessment done as part of the survey

question, as opposed to a quantitative metric that we would have some trouble gathering. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I agree with that, yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you Evan, that's very helpful. Can we move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. 6.2, the system name we've come back to a couple of times, and set up some different contacts. Number of complaints to police agencies alleging fraud or misrepresentation based on traced to domain names. I think the trickiest part of this metric for us is based on the feedback we've gotten, is that law enforcement can't necessarily classify a domain as being intentional or consequential in determining a crime.

This is a point some of our colleagues really wanted us to emphasize. Clearly there is data available from law enforcement agencies about consumer crimes and things like that. I think it's a sign in causation that might be problematic, so we wanted to flag that in terms of how that data is assessed or analyzed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone have thoughts?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve, if I could?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Sorry I was trying to be quite for a second and see which one of the phones was being activated. Because Nathalie is 786, right?

NATHALIE COUPET: Yes. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. The background noise isn't yours, right? You're on mute?

NATHALIE COUPET: I'm on mute, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

NATHALIE COUPET: Let me try to, I hear, it's quiet. Maybe my phone, I don't know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It seems fine now, so maybe it's not your number. Steve, go ahead.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. With respect to this one, give Evan a little time to gather his thoughts on this.   This is another ALAC item.   But what staff is suggesting here, even in instances where law enforcement would be willing to give us the data, they wouldn't necessarily be able to say with a consequential instrument of a crime that involved a domain name.

And so the word… I would agree. The police might reveal that this is an element of fraud that had Internet or website in it, almost like a text search of their crime reporting. When there is an Internet or website fraud or crime, it's going to be impossible for us to know if that is related to a domain name, and even if it were related to a domain name, whether it was related to a new gTLD, which would end up making it very difficult to assess whether this affected the trust of the gTLD expansion, which is our mandate.

So it's not enough to get the police to say it had to do with the Internet. It's not enough to know if the police said it had to do with domain names, it has to go all the way to the actual domain name to understand whether it was a new gTLD. Thinking that through, it paints a little bit of a dead end on this, in terms of the viability of gathering the data.

And I haven't gone done the deadest of ends, which is whether the data would be representative enough on a global basis. So I think we're facing a bit of a challenge here that calls for us to be more creative or flexible, and how we get to the nub of the issue that ALAC had in mind

here. And I hope that gives you enough time, Evan, to gather your thoughts on what ALAC really had in mind.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually it has, Steve. I guess, the point of view here was, I think what was usable here, because if we can come up with a delta, if we know, if we sort of had a baseline saying, okay before the TLD expansion, we had this level of complaints about people either coming across, misrepresentations or whatever, and seeing when the roll out of the new TLD happen. Try and see if there is a signification change, if there is a significant delta, I think that's something worth tracking, that's something worth knowing.

If there is not a significant change, you're absolutely right. But if we see a sharp uptick in the amount of complaints that come in, even if we can't necessarily nail them down, that can be traced to the roll out of new TLDs, I think that's something that's worth knowing. And the fact that we cannot nail them down with the level of specificity that you want, I don't think is a reason not to collect them.

On the aggregate, if we see a spike, that's relevant. If we don't see a spike, that's also relevant. And I don't know if having to drill down too deep into the numbers, if that makes it, that this is useful or not useful. I think, personally, that it's worth knowing on the aggregate, if the expansion program is creating a lot more people complaining, and law enforcement is only one recipient of those complaints.

As you say, it's going to be hard to extrapolate beyond the generalities, but if there is a lot of consumer complaints that are being lodged, either

to ICANN, or to law enforcement, or elsewhere, that on a timeline, can be tracked back to the roll out of the TLDs, I think that's relevant. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: If I could follow up on that. Thank you. It's Steve. More than likely, I strongly suspect that the amount of computer crime that is reported to law enforcement and others, is growing over time, even before new gTLDs have launched. Mostly because criminals are pretty smart. They do crime where the money is, and an awful lot of money is available to online [?].

I'm sure that we'll have a growth line already. A delta from prior periods, other than to be challenged as invalid, it would be trying to show that we've been to the curve. There might already be a growth curve on computer crime reported, Internet crime reported. I shouldn't say computer crime. Internet crime reports. And then if it turns out that within a few months of the new gTLD program, that curve accelerates upward, that begins to get to what you're going after, even though we won't have any clue as to whether or not it was related to the domain names that were there.

And I guess we'd have to make that qualifier if we were able to get the data. But Evan, wouldn't you agree that it was more than just a delta, it's actually whether we're differing from an historical trend, which already may have some big deltas of growth in it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I understand where you're coming from, Steve, but I also have a concern that perhaps the TLD expansion has given a path for, a better path for the bad guys to do their deeds. And yeah, there is going to be existing trends going, but if the expansion facilitated the ability to confuse end users, that's probably something that we can clock.

STEVE DELBIANCO: My question for staff, staff has concluded that law enforcement doesn't easily or accurately classify a domain as being an intentional or consequential instrument of a crime. So my question would be, how do they classify it? Do they use the words, Internet, or the Web? Do they use any uses of their classification of crimes that allow us to know that it has something to do with the Internet? What level of specificity does that get us?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. I think you would find some pretty disparate descriptions, as you said, Internet crimes, web crimes. I think you both make very valid points here, particularly Steve, as you said, this may be something that will require a lot of context and contextualization of the data, which I think is the case in almost all of the metrics to be fair. Some of them may just represent general trends and pinpointing those trends, particularly to the new gTLD space, might be a bit more challenging in some instances more than others.

So, like I said, I think there is some data out there that could be useful to look at, but I think we have to be very careful in qualifying that. I don't

think any of these are just hard numbers. I think they come with long analysis with them.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I think we would benefit from one level of scratching the surface more to know, you said it might be disparate. If we had five, six, seven examples of the kinds of classification you're finding at places like Interpol, or it might be North America, regional, European criminal reporting. And if we saw that as an example, to see how they categorize it, when they began to do so, and whether they could give us trend line data, we don't need individual cases, I guess.

They have confidentiality concerns. But earlier, we were talking about the fact that only 29 countries were cooperating on the reporting on the previous slide, and we get to the question of statistical significance. Here, an example or two would be so helpful to understand what Interpol and a couple of other regional criminal reporting, cybercrime. Cybercrime initiative is another one that pops into mind.

See what words they use to categorize crime in a way that would give us a clue that it had anything to do with the Internet.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, we can do that, and I see that Rudi has his hand raised, go ahead.

RUDI VANSNICK: Yes, thank you. Rudi for the transcript. What comes to my mind is, a question related to this point is that, [?] I think that those criminals

EN

would try to do whatever they are able to, to interfere with collecting, a clean Internet operation. What I would also pointing directly to having information on is, actually know, and the criminals also know that they are tracked down, and most of the existing registries and services around are perfecting from those type of damages.

What's going to happen is this information is going to be shared with the new registries, and new operators, so that they are informed up front of what's going to happen in order to protect the fraud, avoid having you, let's say, rush of actions going on. Is that something that we would also try to put in our questionnaire, or do we just keep that in the background?

STEVE DELBIANCO: This is Steve. I could try to attempt to answer that Rudi. This is a look back study that will be done no sooner than a year from today, at which point nearly all the new gTLDs would have been launched. And so we are trying to assess whether the new gTLD program enhanced consumer trust, and this is one metric among many, to help to dive into that question. There is nothing in our charter about feeding that back into live delegations to help them.

Everybody is free to use what we've learn, that goes without saying. It will be a year after the TLDs have been launched. So it's a little late at that point, to inform a new TLD launch. I hope that answers your question.

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you for the information. Indeed, I know that in the future we're going to receive the input, but while we are doing this action, would it be an idea of informing new TLD operators that there is some information, that they could eventually use quite quickly to avoid [?].

KAREN LENTZ: I'm sorry, Rudi this is Karen.   Could you please repeat your last comment? I don't think we quite captured that.

RUDI VANSNICK: Yes. Rudi for the transcript. I know that we are going to have in report is for one year, which is too late to help actual registries new gTLD operations.   But although I will be interested to know if virtually, we would inform the new gTLD operators that we'll start soon, and we'll roll out in the next year, about the [?] information such as what we are getting now, so that they can avoid [?] to that [?].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Rudi, this is Eleeza. I guess I'm trying to understand what you're getting at. Do you mean sharing the data that we're collecting now sooner with the registries to help them avoid pitfalls in operations? I apologize, I'm not quite getting what you're trying to say.

RUDI VANSNICK: Yes. Giving them something back in order to enable that there is a good cooperation, and that while they are starting up, they could eventually help us, having already [?] from new gTLDs, in order to have an

improvement of the process we're going to, collecting data and having reporting one year, well that's nice. But at the end, I'm wondering what is the value? If you can capture data in the concept, the new process that is rolling out, I think that could be much better even.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Rudi, this is Steve. Let's all concede that in the course of our work, if we ever discover anything that could be relevant and valuable to the ICANN community, in real time, that we would immediately ask staff to pass it to the staff members that are handling the new gTLD program. And I'll bet everyone on this call would agree, as a general matter, and not focusing just on this item, but on anything we learn that could be valuable in real time, and we would pass it on through staff. Would everyone agree to that?

RUDI VANSNICK: Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you Steve. I see that Rudi is still typing there. Rudi mentions that it is important to put this into the RFP. Do you mean the economic survey and the consumer survey RFPs? Is that what you are referring to? Okay. So, I think Jonathan is trying to speak and he has lost his voice.

I'll just read out what Jonathan typed here. We just need to make sure that we don't dip into the realm of prescriptive behavior, or we try to

expect the behavior of contracted parties. Okay. And I see Rudi still typing here.

Okay. Maybe Matt or Charlotte, can you help Jonathan there?

If everyone is okay with it, I'd like to move just because we have a few slides left, and I just want to get through a couple more questions that I had. If there aren't any objections, I'm going to keep going forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think I'm back on now. Is that right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I don't know. Maybe the operator thought I was causing all of the noise, and maybe… A subjective judgment on her part. I just wanted to clarify my comment, which is I agree with Rudi and Steve that we share data as we collect it. I just know that the topic has come up in this group before of including using this group as a vehicle to produce a code of conduct regarding registry/registrar separation, etc.

So we just need to be careful not to walk outside our remit, and get into the business of trying to affect the behavior of contracted parties, through this process. That's all. We're trying to do measurements in the aggregate at the end of the process, and I think we'll run afoul of

EN

our mission if we get too individualized in our data collection or dissemination.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Good point. Thank you Jonathan. I think with that, I'll just move forward. This is sort of a similar issue, 6.3. Number of fraud investigations where WHOIS information positively assisted investigation and identification of offending parties. This is another one where the feedback we received that law enforcement would be unwilling to share this type of information for fear of exposing their own investigative techniques.

So I think we had talked about this one before, but I just wanted to bring that one again and see what you all had to say about it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: In the table, when the ALAC prepared the advice, the only source identified was law enforcement agencies, and when Evan and I came up with things to consider, that's where we came up with the idea of having staff quickly ask the GAC and LEA. You've brought back an answer that seems definitively no.

Did that answer come from the law enforcement agencies? Or the GAC? Tell me, who responded to that and gave you this answer.

KAREN LENTZ: This is Karen. We have spoken to [Javier], who is our security team, I believe, who works with a number of law enforcement agencies and

EN

representatives around the world. It was kind of using him as an intermediary, so I guess we can go back and find out exactly how broad and specifically who that came from, who that feedback came from.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. If it was a broadly representative answer, if they are unwilling to share, that the investigation technique involved WHOIS and that it was a positive factor in the investigation, if they're unwilling to share that, that would take this item into the infeasible, this metric would become infeasible. So, we are about to draw that conclusion.

I know we might be able to go back and be creative and flexible about it, but Evan what are your thoughts on that? If the answer is just no, they won't share it, what happens to this metric?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Unfortunately, exactly what you say is going to happen to it. Some of the commentary that we've had resulting, came about as a result of conversations that we'd had with law enforcement, coming in with government people saying that there is confusion coming. That their interested, they have to protect, if when push comes to shove, we ask them for details, and they say either, "We can't give it to you," or "We don't have them."

That sort of makes their case weaker and you're absolutely, that there is very little for us to work with. So, at that point then, we end up having to rely on things like points to ICANN itself. ALAC has had repeated engagements with compliance department about trying to make it

easier for people to bring forward their complaints to ICANN, about problems that they've had using domain names.

And in fact, we're hoping that there will be some kind of a consumer campaign, that, you know, if you've got problems, come here. If that ends up being a better source of this kind of thing in law enforcement, well then, so be it. We've had to make the attempt. If the attempt has been made and comes up short, well, you know, you can't do what you can't do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, it's Steve. Metric 1.20, just above that, the ones that we had all consensus of, it's probably what you just mentioned. 1.20 was to ask ICANN to tell us the quantity and relative incidents that complaints that ICANN receives, regarding inaccurate, invalid, or suspect WHOIS records, in the new gTLD space. Great.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I know that metric was already there. I'm saying if it turns out that government and law enforcement can't hold up their end of it, this may be all that we have to work with.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. Thank you.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. I was just saying, I was muted. Thank you. I see there are a couple of more comments…

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I think you should probably move on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. All right. Thank you. Next up, and we're getting back to the compliance question now. We're at 8.2. How many registries are subject to compliance activity based on reported breeches our AA? So I think the key stumbling block here is that compliance doesn't initiate activity on a registry based on a complaint about a registrar.

The kind of work around we saw to this after seeing our compliance staff, was whether this might capture mis-categorized complaints about RAA breaches, but which are then correctly treated as registry compliance issues. That's something we might be able to track. I had another point about this.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. Another way to count it is effectively how many registries are impacted by a registrar breech, based on how the compliance numbers are tracked. This is something we may be able to provide, but to say that they are subject to compliance activity, which we're kind of interpreting as enforcement, that would be a little bit more tricky to definitively state.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan knows this as well, one of the metrics we all agreed on, 1.7, does track breech notices that are issued to registrars, and all breech related notifications, by that they reference one or more gTLDs. So we have some of the compliance part of this, which is breech is by registrars by their RAA obligation.

But Evan's right, there was no other place in here we attempted to tie our registrar misbehavior to the impact that it had on a registry operator.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, Evan, does that compromise make sense to you?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It sounds like there may not be much of a choice. I mean, we had sort of hoped that law enforcement would have more details to back up what we'd heard from that, if that isn't the case, that isn't the case. I mean, my retort would be, if law enforcement isn't getting complaints in various countries, and there might be consumer protection agencies that do, but then that's going down another potential route, that would have been nice to do, but at this late in the game, that's pretty hard to track down.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, this is Steve. As written, number 8.2 was suggesting the data source was only ICANN. What you were just going through right now, being creative there, that was about potentially considering other data sources? Because I think we're hearing that the ICANN data source that

was originally anticipated,   At least currently, compliance does not do an enforcement action.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Unless, at this point I'm less interested in the enforcement actions than I am in the actual volume of complaints. Since we're talking about trust. You know, the resolution of the complaints is a different thing from how many complaints are being tracked in the first place. For the purposes of what we're doing, I'm actually more interested in the reporting than I am in the resolution.

ALAC, of course, has other interests in compliance resolving things, but for the purpose of what we're measuring, I think we should be more interested in the incidents of reporting than have their result.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That would make this item then, mostly fulfilled by the metric 1.7. That tracks, at the primary point of intake, breach notices that come in. I think that you get to a really point, is that a breech notice only comes very, very late in the complaint game, right? Complaints might come in much, much sooner, and only a fraction of those get turned into an actual breech notification.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right.   And you may have complaints, and then by the time the complaints is investigated, the domain doesn't exist or things have moved on. But the fact that the complaint exists to me, goes to trust issues.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. So breeches of the registrar accreditation agreement are one thing, and complaints about domains.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The kind of complaints that could lead to breech notices but don't necessarily follow up that way.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Metrics 1.9 and 1.10, 1.9 was complaint received, for RP and URS. And those are against registrants, not registrars. And we are measuring the complaints at the intake point, not just the decisions. Because the decision is another metric, 1.10.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And that's sort of satisfies it for me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. That's 1.9, let's make sure we record that in our notes here so that we don't come back later on and say, "Whatever happened to 8.2?" Oh yeah, 8.2 couldn't be answered because they don't investigate registries for registrar issues, but we discussed and agree that metric 1.7, sorry, 1.9 comes pretty close.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Excellent. Thank you. All right. I only have two more slides to get through, hopefully we can do that now. The last two are related to the ALAC suggestion metrics that we still have questions on. And so this one is 4.5, number of complaints received by ICANN regarding improper use of domains.

So, again, this is a matter of definition that is difficult for us. How are we going to define improper use by whom? Whether it's registrants, registrars. And if there is a scenario which you would think would capture this metric, or would be captured in this metric, I think that would be helpful in terms of focusing what data sets are available to us.

And then I also noted that in our matrix, the group would know this metric specifically indicates this should not count domains that result in any UDRP action, which as you just mentioned, are captured in 1.9, 1.10. So what types of domains would this capture?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	This is Evan. I mean, again going back to this, it's sort of the kind of thing is not necessarily a trademark related dispute, but for whatever reason, somebody says, "I thought I was going to this domain. I thought I was getting this. I didn't get this." I mean, it is a bit of a catch all, almost by definition.

Any kind of instance that isn't specially to do with a trade name related problem, where somebody calls to ICANN, saying "I expected to get A, I got B."

STEVE DELBIANCO: Evan, this is Steve. I'd like to support you in this regard, because this is all within our reach. We ought to be able to ask compliance, what are the codes that you use when you do complaint intake and classification? And if we got that list of the codes that Maggie's team uses when they tag a complaint, my guess is that Evan would spot a few of them that would fit neatly into 4.5 that weren't already handled in 1.9.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Not everything is going to be the kind of trademark based dispute that is going to make it to a UDRIP, PDRP, or URS. But nonetheless, the person making the complaint still says, "I had a problem. I expected this, I got that."

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. This is Eleeza. We can certainly send around the list of complaint code, and you can take a look at that and let us know. As I said, there isn't something now that captures improper, but there are different ways that might be classified, that might be helpful to you. But we'll send that list around.

STEVE DELBIANCO: And cross reference it to this [CROSSTALK], if you don't mind. Cross reference to this slide in metric 4.5, and then give the ALAC folks a chance to reply, but I'm sure the rest of us will read with great interest what those categories are that they use in compliance. Thanks.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you. Karen.

KAREN LENTZ: So this is Karen. I just had a question for you Evan. When you're describing the scenario, I expected to go to A and I got B, is this primarily about being redirected, or misdirected, or…? Is it a matter of navigation or is it a matter of something else?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: To be blunt with you, I would say all of the above. Any kind instance where somebody tried to get somewhere on the Internet based on a domain name, and didn't get where they expected to. It could have been through their own error, it could have been through a misdirection. It could have been for whatever reason. All of these things go to trust. You know, if we have a situation that car.com goes to a different location from cars.com, and people are figuring, "Well, I thought I was going here but I was going there."

It's not a trademark problem. It's not even necessarily incorrect from a technical standpoint, and yet it leads to a consumer trust issue. So, I would actually want to be very broad in the scope of what this allows, because at the end of the day, the person coming into to complain, it may have been their mistake, it may not have been their mistake, it may have been a technical issue, it may have been a marketing issue, but, you know, the summary of it all is that a lot of these aggregated together to become a trust issue.

[CROSSTALK] …that's just my take on it. I would deliberately want to keep that reasonable broad.

KAREN LENTZ: Okay. Understood. Thank you Evan.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. Christa, do you want to go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Christa?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You might be muted Christa. We can't hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe she's using sign language… [CROSSTALK] …icon.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Typed in the box. Christa, if you can type in your comment, I would be happy to read it out.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Can you hear me now?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, great.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Sorry.   One of the items to consider would be community based applications, or what are the user policy and people aren't following it. So therefore somebody is going to get a different user experience than they expected, i.e., say there is a dot kids, and there is some kind of activity on there that is definitely not for kids.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you Christa. This is Karen. The scenario that you describe, where there is an usage policy for domain names in a particular TLD, you think should fall under this complaints on improper use bucket as well?

CHRISTA TAYLOR: I would think so, I know it might be a little bit outside the boundary, but I'm just bringing it up just as one of those items that we might want to consider as part of that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. I don't know, I would be very, very careful about that because now we're starting to touch on the whole public interest commitment stuff, and does a TLD, does a registry live up to what they promised to do? That's an entirely different bag of worms, and while that's possibly worth tracking, I don't know if it's within the scope of what we're doing here.

What that's talking about is the trust in any particular given TLD, as opposed to the entire TLD system itself.

CHRISTA TAYLOR: Point taken.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Steve, you have been around the block on the PICs, what's your take?

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. I for one think that it is a part of our remit to look at the ICs to some extent. [CROSSTALK] …measures of trust we have.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, I'm in complete agreement. And the good news is, promises made by applicants, whether they made their promise in their application, or a promise they made to a government to get around the early warning, or just promises. There was a time when our whole consumer trust work group used the word promises, promises made in the application.

Fortunately, all of those promises have been moved into an ICANN enforcement issue through the public interest commitment. And that move alone, made it an ICANN compliant, made it so much easier for us to capture, because we'll get to pick it up as a breach of contract issue.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. I can just mention on the picks, we do have a metric that is related to that, and then in terms of compliance, they will be tracking complaints based on picks, so that will be very explicitly captured.

STEVE DELBIANCO: When you give us a list of complaint, it would be a great opportunity to dump the data model, the record layout, for the complaint intake system. Know that each complaint has one of the following categories, one or multiple categories. We'll know whether each complaint records the domain name, including the TLD of course, date, country of origin, things like that.

They're really interested to know all the fields that are captured by Maggie's system.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, we can do that. Sorry, one last one. I'm sorry. Christa, you have your hand raised. Go ahead. Okay, great, thank you. So, if I can quickly do this before we have to cut off here, we're coming back to complaints again on 8.1. How many complaints are received by ICANN related to confusion, or misunderstanding of TLD functions. And I think some of this may be answered when you look at some of the data from compliance, or the fields that are being captured.

But again, this is something that doesn't have its own metric, or excuse me, its own complaint code. There is a code, I mentioned here, for invalid complaints which are frequently attributed mis-categorized

EN

complaints, or complaints that might be based on an old or expired registry/registrar agreement.

So we're wondering if this might meet the spirit of the metric, but I think it might also be useful to slide this one when you're looking at the complaint code.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, great idea, reference it in [CROSSTALK].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.   And I think that's it, the last one I had, yes, was related to software to find out working, which we already talked about. So thank you very much for your input. That was extremely helpful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess what we might also find with the complaint codes is that there is other, or something like that, that they don't have a predetermined code for.   It's in addition to mis-categorized, I guess.   Just random complaints. But let's look at those codes. I doubt we could affect them at this point. Does anybody else have anything that they want to raise before we close the call?

All right. So I guess next step is staff is going to reach back out to the sub committees on the RFPs, substantive bullet points. I'll circle back with staff to look at next steps, but I think what we'll try to do is go through the metrics and data sets for which we didn't have clear

recommendations, and make that the next framework for discussing metrics and clarifying them.

So for now, thanks everyone, appreciate your participation.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]