JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess there's a lot we can say now.

SPEAKER: Good morning.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good morning. Good morning.

TONY ONORATO: Hey Jonathan. It's Tony Onorato. How are you?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm good, Tony. You're in the right time zone for this call.

TONY ONARATO: I'm in a happy time zone. Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess we should probably just get started. Some folks who are listening to the recording of things they missed… Welcome everyone. We are rounding the last curve and on the home stretch for the Implementation Team for Consumer Metrics. It's very exciting. It's a process that was launched in Cartagena, so it's been a long time coming, but I think we're doing great and getting some good results here.

I think we're going to give some great tools to the Review Team when it forms, probably this fall, and then starts its work in January. Who is going to take the RFP update? Is that Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, it is. Hi there. Good morning everybody, afternoon, evening, wherever you may be. I just wanted to give you a quick update on RFP and then we can go through the metrics report that I'm drafting, that I'm planning on getting to you in the next week. There are still a couple of metrics I want to go over really quickly with all of you. On the RFP update it was published on Wednesday. Hopefully you've all had a chance to look at it, and the many documents that come with the packet.

We contacted more than 20 firms in total and 17 confirmed their interest, so we're slowly hearing from firms who want to participate and are going to start to get questions. I put the key point as the timeline in the next few weeks, up here, for your information. We're anticipating getting expressions of interest by the 22nd of July, next week, and questions are due by the following day, on the 23rd, with our reply coming a week later, and the proposals themselves due in August.

Our schedule is to have someone under contract by the end of September and I think we're on target to do that. I just wanted to thank everyone who provided their input on the RFP. It was really helpful and I think we've turned out a pretty good, comprehensive document. I don't know if there are any questions or comments on that? Otherwise I can move on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have a sense yet of how many firms are interested? Did you put it out to firms, or put it out in places they would find it? What's the process for collecting people for it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We did quite a bit of research, leading up to it being released. We were looking at firms that had, first of all, a reputation in doing this type of large-scale global surveys. I also did research at some firms that have done a lot of in-depth research on Internet usage or digital media, and things like that, and trying to find the intersection between those two.

That's how we came up with the list that we contacted. I think the final list was something like 25 firms, all of whom were who we contacted. There were several in the US, many in Europe, and a lot of these firms are also going to have offices all over the world. They have pretty good coverage. Of those, 17 got back to us and said they were interested, and we sent the RFP to everybody who was on our list. Then we also listed it publicly on our website.

We've started to hear back from some. I think we've heard back from five or six of those, who have confirmed their intentions to bid.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's excellent.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. Hopefully there will be a good cross-section. Go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just going to ask if anybody else had any questions. All right. That's great. I'm looking forward to seeing the responses. Let's move on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. I see Phil is asking a question here of who is interested. In talking with our Procurement Team, we're not really comfortable releasing the names of who's interested, since those can be publicly available and they'll be aware of who their competitors are, so we weren't planning on releasing those names. I hope that answers your question. Thank you.

I wanted to go through this outline. I went over it briefly while you were all in London. I've added a little bit more meat to the outline itself, so I just wanted to go through some of those and make sure everyone's [unclear 06:07] with that. Hopefully I captured most of the major points that we talked about. Obviously, when I put out the draft to you it'll be far more detailed and will give you a better sense of where things stand.

In short, I have an Executive Summary, in which I'm going to present the major recommendations, which of course includes the recommendations for the consumer survey and the economic study, and how we approach those decisions and the request that was sent to the Board. Then just a short overview of those metrics that were recommended for inclusion, as well as the ones that were

recommended for exclusion, and we'll go over that list again in a couple of slides here.

The background – I'd like to just go through the history of how the metrics themselves were recommended, how the gNSO and ALAC came together to come up with the original list of 70, and then how this group has then tackled the list and evaluated each one. Basically using that methodology, I'm going to break down how you cane up with your recommendations.

The first priority group, which was the one that you identified as requiring a baseline, that required immediate collection or that the data was internally available. Later in this presentation I'll talk about some of the data that we've already started collecting. The surveys and studies of course. I'll go through a brief overview of the RFP process and what's been done with that so far. Hopefully by the time we present this report to the Board in October we'll have taken the surveys and that'll be it.

There's [even 07:44] a media section. If you have any questions about any of this, please stop me at any time. On the remaining metrics, the ones that weren't easy to take or include in the survey, or the economic study, I broke them down based on the evaluation criteria that was provided in the group's mandate, which is feasibility, utility and cost effectiveness. How we used those tools to determine metrics that we could either collect internally or that would require third parties.

One of the examples I presented here was the statistics on the prevalence of bot nets, phishing and malware, and all of our research pointed to that being a more external party activity. Other metrics that

maybe we couldn't quite reach a consensus on – targets or unnecessarily the best data source that we still think are important to include, and what contextual analysis would be necessary to hopefully provide the Review Team with some meaningful data for their evaluation.

I just wanted to go through, once again, the five metrics that this group has identified for exclusion. 2.13, the one on the survey of consumer choice, I think this one we agreed was redundant with another survey metric, and that was where that one was removed. 5.6 on the growth of software design networking – I think basically because we determined this was effectively referring to QR Code, URL shorteners, those types of tools, that we'd already captured that in the metrics that are going to measure the growth in the use of those tools.

6.1 on consumer complaints to [government/governance] agencies, related to confusing or misleading domain names. The group determined, after we did some research on the staff side, that this would be a really difficult metric to capture and get data from across [governments/governance 10:04] that could be [unclear] and compiled.

6.3 on fraud investigations – again, similar, the feedback to ICANN staff, was that this would be something that either governments don't track or would be unwilling to share, and it would be difficult to capture meaningful data. Then finally, on 8.2, as I explained on the previous call, our Compliance Team doesn't suggest registries to compliance activities based on [unclear 10:37] breaches of the RAA. We talked about other compliance-based metrics that capture some of the incentives behind this metric.

Finally, the only new metric that we agreed on for inclusion was on name collision and reports of name collision, and we're still talking with our tech services team on what would be the best way to capture that data. Then there will be a conclusion, and the appendices will have the original metrics and the final recommendation. I'm happy to take any questions or comments on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Christopher is not on the call. We had some discussions around some of the issues that were created by the registry/registrar relationships. If you could remind me, did we find a place for those in the economic study?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The way I was going to capture that and include it in the report, you might recall the metrics that Christa put together? That was capturing all the different, new issues that we may not have included in the current metrics. The consensus on that – I think this is from the London call – was that a lot of these could be captured in the economic study, particularly those that related to registry/registrar relationships.

For example, I know one of the ones he was interested in is which registrars are [selling12:34], which TLDs, which registries do they have relationships with? Because the culmination of relationships there is so extreme, and the implications for that, for pricing, are pretty substantial, we thought it would make far more sense to have a more nuanced look at that in the economics study. I think a number of the new

recommended metrics in there would [unclear 13:00] appropriate way into the economic study.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's my recollection as well. Does anybody else have any other questions? Okay, let's keep going.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. I just wanted to come back to these three metrics – well, two of them. I know a couple of group members had agreed to go back and do more work on these. Michael Graham, I just say that you sent me an email on the 1.11, which related to the quantity of intellectual property claims and domain name policing. I didn't get a chance to read it. Did you want to give an update to this, Michael?

MICHAEL GRAHAM: Just a general update. I apologize this has moved slower than I would have liked, but that's due largely to the fact that I'm changing jobs, changing coasts, and such. However, in London I did spend some time speaking with a number of people on the International Trademark Association Internet Committee, particularly John McIlwane and Susan Payne. They both seemed fairly enthusiastic about trying to put together something so that INTA Members might be surveyed to obtain this information.

What I sent out this morning was my early outline for them of the elements of 1.11, with the types of information that would respond to each of those different points, to give us some metrics. I sent that on to

them, and asked for their input, and also asked if this is something that we might move forward more quickly, so that we can try and get the information.

There are a couple of points that will be of concern, and I will discuss with them. That's the fact that I imagine that a real difficulty in obtaining this information will be desired not to provide this information in a public way, by identifiable companies or law firms. It's how to address that, and then also how to best ensure that the information that we're obtaining is accurate and can be tested.

I sent out that outline to everyone on the IAGCCT list, and if you would, after this call, take a look at that. Any suggestions, comments, questions, that any of you might have, I'd appreciate receiving that. I'm early in the conversation with INTA, but they seem to be enthusiastic about this, and of course since this is of concern to INTA Members, I'd hope that we'd get buy-in and also participation on that.

Any help in looking at that draft outline that I sent out, I'd much appreciate. I can try and move that forward so we can get something going, certainly by the end of the summer, with them.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you for doing that Michael. [Others 16:48] might be taking a look and providing comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Definitely. Thank you. I think Mike Nelson is going to be changing jobs as well. I might need to try to find some other vector into these

academic sources to see what the best approach is. I'll take on 1.19 for a week or so and see what I can come up with. I think Michael's life is going to be in turmoil here, changing jobs.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I would say, I think he'll still be staying at Georgetown, so he may still have some contacts in that regard.

JONATHAN ZUCK: He definitely has the contacts. I'll try to reach out to him as well. I don't want to stress him.

MICHAEL GRAHAM: I might be able to help out with that too, if you find that you want some other leads. My brief foray into academia, I did make some connections with several of the intellectual property clinics, and the clinicians. Several of them I know are working in this area, so if you need additional contacts I can provide some of those for you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Definitely. I'll reach out to you separately then.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. The only other one that I saw some questions on is 1.21, which referred to the incidences of error in gTLD zones. I actually sat down with our Technical Services Team this week and [unclear 18:49]

start to gather some of the metrics that we've identified, that fall into their expertize.

The feedback on this one, from Steve, from a few calls ago, was that this metric came from Olivier and the ALAC, and the suggestion was that there were objective ways to test for syntactic errors in the gTLD zones. I presented that feedback to our Technical Services Team, and they said they still need to get a more precise definition of what's mean by "errors". Exactly what kind of errors are they referring to?

I could pose this back out to the group. I don't know if Steve's phone number is listed here… Or if anyone else who's perhaps involved in the formation of this metric might have feedback on what those errors mean. I think we need a little bit more direction on that before we can really determine if this is something that can be accurately measured.

JONATHAN ZUCK: On that particular one, was that a gNSO metric or an ALAC metric?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was an ALAC metric, was my understanding.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I don't see anybody from ALAC on, so let's reach out to ALAC folks for that answer.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry. In my chart it says the gNSO metric, but then I guess there was some feedback from the ALAC on this as well. I'm not exactly sure, I guess. In any case, I'll send a note out to the full group, asking for some more feedback on that one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sounds good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I just wanted to provide you with a little bit of an update on the data that we have begun collecting. I mentioned that our Technical Services Team has started to collect a number of metrics.

Just to give you a brief overview, something that we've included in their bucket, these are the ones related to DNS service availability, [unclear 21:16] availability, gTLD registrations that have the same string in the legacy space, the geographic diversity of domain name registration in gTLDs versus new gTLDs, versus in the legacy space, the metrics related to DNS traffic, growth in ccTLDs versus gTLDs and universal acceptance of new gTLDs, and then the name collision metric, which I mentioned earlier.

They've started their work on how to collect some of this data – whether that's building algorithms or doing the technical things that they do. Those metrics, I've included a chart here, and it's something mainly for my benefit, but I thought it might be helpful to you to see how we're charting this out. I've identified all of our metrics by phase one, two, three, and then I have 4.a through 4.c.

Phase one, as you can see here, is nearly halfway complete. It's just the baseline data for the phase one metrics. These are the ones that are related to, for example, there's a subset on what kind of policies are available on registry websites; user policies, privacy policies, things like that. There's another subset of metrics on the national regimes, where registry operators are located. Interestingly, we have a summer intern, who I've put to work compiling some of that data.

For 2.7, which relates to registry operators' location and national regimes, for the new gTLDs, of the 300-some that have been delegated, they are located in 34 countries. Roughly half are from the US. 9% are from the Cayman Islands. 6% from Germany. 4% each from the British Virgin Islands, Ireland and Japan. 3% each from Australia and China. Interesting numbers that we're seeing so far then, comparing that to the breakdown we had for the legacy registry operators.

We've started the work on some of those metrics. The next phase I've also begun work on is the Technical Services metrics I just told you about, and we're aiming to get baselines on those completed by the end of September. The last key phases I've broken up, based on whether they're related to, for example, Compliance, where we want to look at a particular time period, for example the first year of new gTLDs being delegated – all of those phases began in October and beyond.

I've just broken those up so they're not all being done at one time. That gives you a picture of where things stand now. We're starting to see some interesting baseline figures, but it's still quite incomplete, with only 300-some new gTLDs being delegated so far. They're still very early in the registration and sunrise periods. Finally, just as a reminder, in our

London discussion we talked about a timeline for a report coming out of this group, of whether or not we should include a public comment period.

It was agreed that that didn't seem to be necessary for this report and this group, but that you all agreed that you did want to keep your respective communities up to date – the gNSO and ALAC. This was just a request from us, or a reminder, to maybe share the report outline with them, and the recommendations they're making so far, so that they're kept up-to-date. Then of course the draft report I'll have to you by the end of next week. That's all I have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. What about the economic study?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We had a few discussions on potential firms or consultants we might be able to hire, to do scoping work similar to what NORC did for us on the consumer survey. At least one of those didn't work out, but we were hoping to have it worked out by now. That went a little behind schedule, but we're planning on picking that up next week and focusing a bit more on that. Our whole team has been in training this week, so it's been a little challenging to focus on that right now. That's the next priority.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. You folks have other questions? I thought we'd be having a short call. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. I'll send out some of the things I'm hoping to get some more feedback on, and hope to hear from all of you soon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That sounds good. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]