UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Super. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Thanks for joining. I thought we could get started by just having folks who are on the call identify themselves, and then we can move through the agenda.

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew Bagley.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, sounds like Carlton is also here, and [inaudible] is also here, I'm looking at the chat. Eleeza is on too. Okay, and I know Jonathan is with us also, and then from staff it looks like we have Eleeza, Margie, Pam, Brian and Brenda. I don't think I've missed anyone. Good. I thought that we can get started by talking about data needs, because that is something we had identified as wanting to identify and make requests early on, and I wanted to see what thoughts folks had in addition to the Nielsen survey about what data we might be requesting.

In our Google doc that Alice and Pam have so kindly put up on the screen – and if you recall, this is the last document we had worked on

when we were in Marrakech. Right at the very end – and I think everyone has scrolling capability, is that right, Alice and Pam? People can independently scroll through that document?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, that's correct.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Terrific. Right at the end we have data needs, and we have identified compliance as a source for data, and we can talk more about what we might want to ask from compliance. But before we did that, we could discuss if there are other sources that we want to either look at existing sources for data, or if there is any additional data that we want to consider requesting. That's what I'd like to open up for discussion. Does anyone have thoughts on this? Drew, did you have some thoughts on this? I thought that you and I had some discussions about possible topics.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. Before jumping back to those, our discussions, something I wanted to bring up with you is I don't know if you guys have seen the chatter about the center data, but the CCT review team as a whole it looks like, [inaudible] Pam and [inaudible] are going to put together a request for data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I have seen the backup for it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think in this discussion, that's one we should consider, is what relevant ccTLD studies might be good for us in terms of context with regards to consumer trust. It might be interesting either from a methodology standpoint to see what's already been done for ccTLDs, or from a context standpoint as we get to comparing the new gTLDs and various consumer trust issues. It might be helpful for a baseline, so that's something I wanted to bring up, and then also I looked through that DNS abuse study done by ICANN, and I will reach out to them after this call, but I think a lot of the methodologies they laid out in that would be helpful, so I'm just going to pull that up here on my end. I'm not sure if anyone else had a chance to look at that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I have it with me, it's been on my take home to read pile for some time now, so I will be getting to that. Getting back to your first point with the center data – because I've seen the e-mails, but can you lay out for me why the studies in the ccTLD context are useful for our work regarding the new gTLDs?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I apologize. I got bumped off the phone call as soon as you said "With regards to the center..."

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's okay, I guess now I can repeat it more succinctly. The center data relates to ccTLDs, is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct, yes, that'd be ccTLDs.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can you walk me through why that's relevant for us?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. For us, one way it would be relevant would be the marketplace for geographic generic new TLDs, might be interesting to see some of the studies already done with .de for example if we're talking about .berlin and so on. That could be something, and then also with their data – I don't know yet if it'd cost anything, I think it's free though. I think it would be good to see the methodology [inaudible] for their own market studies. Assuming it's free, I thought that would be another good reason to look at it, because it would be a similar product in some ways, and to see what they've done with their market study.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I see, so looking at it as a model.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. As a model, and also like I said, a comparative baseline if we're looking at different things with the geographic ccTLDs and we notice that there's more consumer trust in the ccTLD than the new generic or vice versa, or more DNS abuse in one over the other, that might be kind of interesting to look at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so a model for methodology and also a comparison of the ccTLDs to the gTLDs.

CARLTON: Yes, but it's very important that there's one added bonus to the ccTLD [inaudible] Part of the issue is demand that we see from the region, for example we're very much interested in what the demand is from the Caribbean, Latin America. [inaudible] Carlos would be here, he'd tell you that. Those ccTLD studies kind of give us a sense of what the market is in geographic regions, and it also might indicate any unmet demand that could be fueling the next round, [let us say.]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just want to make sure I understand the last point you made, Carlton. What you're saying is that the market for ccTLDs may reflect an unmet demand in gTLDs in certain markets and certain regions?

CARLTON: In certain markets and certain regions, yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: If the right gTLD wasn't available or was too expensive or there was some difficulty, you would turn to a ccTLD.

CARLTON: Exactly. I'll give you an example. In the Caribbean, although we have ccTLDs, if you look at the registrations, they're fairly low. But there are a lot of registrations in this region, they're all in the gTLDs – mostly in the gTLDs. One of the issues is pricing. In some areas, the price for ccTLD domain is relatively high. I don't know what you'd get for a [inaudible] domain.

LAUREEN KAPIN: From the way you're phrasing it, Carlton, to me this sounds like a competition and choice issue rather than a trust and safeguards issue.

CARLTON: It bleeds, although I think any DNS abuse studies [inaudible] would be relevant for our purposes. That's where you would see some of the trust issues.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Okay. We have the center data and also the ICANN DNS abuse report on our radar screens. We have compliance.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, for compliance, we have not yet defined exactly what we'd want for compliance, is that correct?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That is correct, and I want to go back to that, but first I thought it would be helpful if we can generate a list of other sources that we're

considering, and then we can sort of drill down particularly in compliance. In compliance, we may want to actually have a couple of folks look at the compliance part of the ICANN website, which is quite specific and robust, and come back to us at the next phone call to discuss what would be useful to ask from them, because I think actually taking a few minutes to look at that part of the website will be very useful.

We have compliance, ccTLDs, center data, the ICANN DNS abuse study. Are there any other sources of data that we think would be useful to either look for or request? We also have the Nielsen study of course, that's in play.

CARLTON: I haven't read the report [if] someone sent it to me. There is a study of notes and takedowns, like a really big study on online takedowns, and it might be useful. I'm going to have a look at it, so I'm just kind of putting up a flag here.

It might be useful for us to see what it contains. I'll look at it before the weekend is over, and maybe [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, Carlton, and do you recall who did this study?

CARLTON: It's an academic study by some people from Berkeley and Columbia I think, and they use samples – they [inaudible] over 100 million.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that sounds like it could be promising.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laureen, there are a few hands raised in the room.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, I've been looking at my pad. Let's see if I can – I was looking at the screen which is very tiny for my mature eyes. Where do I see where people's hands are raised?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] it was Jonathan and Brian. They've both been in the queue.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it, okay. Brian, why don't you speak up, and then Jonathan? Brian, you may still be on mute, because we still can't hear you. Sorry, go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. A couple of things. One is that I think that to some extent, this exercise will be informed by the other thing on the agenda, which is the prioritization of topics. As you look at the topics, we can ask ourselves whether or not we have sufficient data or need additional data to answer the questions that come up, but the other thing I wanted to bring up was about safeguards. I don't know if David – David gave his apologies for this call, but we need to look at the affected communities of some of the safeguards, and see either through survey or focus group or whatever the best method is to try and get people's reactions to how they were to use and what that process was like.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can you flesh that out a little bit, Jonathan? Because the use of the safeguards sounds – I need a little more fleshing out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Like the PICS, trying to understand what the process was like for the registries that we retrying to implement them, what the enforcement mechanism was like, what the reality of them was, is something that I think we're going to need to study. I think the safeguards that came out of the GAC were implemented via PICS, and then the question is, what happened then?

                        There's potentially data from compliance, but then there's the question of how the registries implemented their own enforcement of the PICS, their selection process, their filter process or whatever that is. It feels like there's some kind of a survey or discussion that needs to take place with those folks that were affected by them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's very interesting, because certainly we can get at registries and registrars, assuming they will cooperate, but really, they're intended to protect the public, and I'm wondering how you get at that information. Because if you just focus on the registries and registrars, of course, you may tend to have a very partial perspective.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I didn't mean to say it was dispositive, but I mean understanding what the experience of them will help us to understand whether PICS are the best way forward to implement, whether compliance is the best mechanism for enforcement. It's an effectiveness question I guess at some level – like an efficiency question maybe is the way to think about it. So it's in addition to trying to measure consumer trust as measured by these safeguards, or the effectiveness of them.

Also, the other thing I guess that we talked about at little bit – and I guess I don't know, Eleeza, maybe you can help me here, where we [inaudible] but it was some kind of a survey of the IT community about costs associated with the new gTLD program. I guess I thought that was in this sub-team potentially, of trying to understand what the downside consequences were to the massive explosion of TLDs, defensive registrations versus real ones, things like that. I don't know whether that's in Jordyn's group or here in Laureen's, but we need to get with David in INTA, whether they're doing something or we're trying to do something, but we need to try to figure out what happened with

respect to defensive registrations and other related things, like buying, blocking and things from DONUTS, etc.

LAUREEN KAPIN: When you say blocking, Jonathan, can you explain what you mean?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, some registries offer the ability to block a domain from being registered rather than having to register it, so it's a potentially cheaper way to kind of bulk protect yourself. It's a defensive registration lite. I know people are very concerned, because those blockings might not survive the sale of a TLD to another registry and things like that. it's defensive registrations in the classic sense, together with what other mechanisms registries created for mark holders to protect themselves in a particular domain, and what the costs were associated with that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. It's interesting, because that certainly raises choice issues and it raises confusion issues, so it certainly can live in both groups and maybe we want to think more about what the best group is for it. it could certainly live in both.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know David Taylor was trying to run point on it within INTA and the IPC, and I'm not sure that stands. He sent apologies for this call. Eleeza, has that issue come up at all on Jordyn's radar? I have a feeling that it hasn't.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is Eleeza. No, it hasn't come up with Jordyn's team, and that metric, as you said, that was a suggested trust metric, you're right. It's something that when the previous group [and] your group, implementation advisory group was meeting, there were a couple of folks, Michael Graham [inaudible] the effort to see if there's a way INTA [inaudible] survey for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And we have, in the past year, met with Lori Schulman from INTA a couple times, and she's really keen to do some type of a survey and has been trying to find the best approach to do that within the organization. She thinks there's a lot of interest, particularly from within their Internet committee to do something along those lines, that would capture a few things. One is the relative cost of defending trademarks in the new gTLD program, and then also whether the number of instances has gone up with the introduction of the new G program.

It's still pretty broad, [inaudible] question to be more narrowly defined, but they are keen to do it. We haven't spoken to Lori in a few months so I'm not sure where things stand with that now, but I know that both her and Michael Graham were still really interested in [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, if David is going to be the point person, it may make more sense for it to live in our group, so we'll put a placeholder there to try and sort that out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I just wanted to get it on the radar, and it could be that we need to help fund such a survey or something like that. I don't know, but let's have that conversation, otherwise we don't – most of the metrics we came up with in the working group to prepare for this were imperfect. Looking at a domain and if it's just a pointer, assuming that it was a defensive registration, for example. That's not a 100% safe measure of whether something is a defensive registration, so actually getting at people and kind of understanding what their strategy was now that the number of gTLDs is so high is the most direct way to look at it. So we just need it on our radar to delve into that, either ourselves or via INTA.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can we start populating the document with data needs to reflect some of the discussion we're having – we've just had with identifying some other sources? I would suggest – if you have access to that document – adding the center data with the parenthetical for ccTLDs.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Laureen, this is Alice. I'm actually taking notes in the Google doc, so I'm populating as you speak. So if you scroll down –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, good. Okay, so it's just not [inaudible]

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, it's not on the Adobe Connect screen, it's a [inaudible] Adobe Connect. You need to go into the Google doc to see the notes I'm taking.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That will be too hard for me.

ALICE JANSEN: I can even project my screen – if that helps – in the Adobe Connect. I'll just do that, it's easier for everyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, because between looking at my notes, looking at the chat and looking at... my attention can't – I only have so much wattage here, so yes, putting it on the screen would be great.

BRIAN: Hi everyone, can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, we can hear you now, Brian.

BRIAN: Fantastic. Morning, afternoon everyone. I just wanted to chime in on the data source question. We had a meeting with some professors from the University of California and San Diego who have worked a lot on DNS abuse issues, a lot of the issues we're talking about. One thing that's interesting about them is they combine a lot of this kind of technical analysis with more economic, or sort of business-side analysis, and we feel like we may have encountered something of a treasure trove of information.

This meeting was just yesterday, so we're all kind of thinking of – well, [inaudible] what they have and we're going to try to maintain contact with them, but it seems like they're going to have some really good research and metrics that may feed into this. So just to have that on your radar, and we should know more in two weeks by our next call, so I will let you know more about that. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Brian, just to follow up a little bit, can you give us some idea though of what the subject matter of the information that they may have?

BRIAN: They're some of the only academic researchers out there that I can tell that focus specifically on new gTLDs, the prevalence of abuse, how new gTLDs are being used, the intent behind registrations, for registrars, registrants and in registries – sorry, it's very early in the morning but I'm trying to bring it all up. But just to give you an idea, yes, that's the kind of thing they're looking at. I'm going to circulate one of their latest papers that is an analysis of what they call the new TLD land rush. They

talk about abuse, intentions, these kind of things, so I think it will be very interesting for you. We all got very excited when we talked to them yesterday, so thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And they're from University of California and San Diego?

BRIAN: They're based there, but they work with people from Berkeley, University of Michigan, and sounds like computer science departments all around the world. Like I said, one of the more interesting aspects is that it's not just the technical analysis, but has those sort of more economic or commercial analyses tied into them as well, so I think there could be some good stuff there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great, that's great to hear.

BRIAN: We're putting together kind of a summary report, and within the next two weeks I'm going to try to go through all of their work and put together some kind of bullet point type summary, so hopefully that will help out as well. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you.

CARLTON: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

CARLTON: I just wanted to – [inaudible] for one of the At-Large structures, [inaudible] They've been doing work on DNS abuse for many years, and [inaudible] is supposed to send me a copy of his latest study, cleaned up. I just want to put a notice that it may contain some useful information, so as soon as I get it, I'm going to [inaudible] forward.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great, so we'll add that to the Google doc, because I've looked at their work over the years and it often is very on point. Okay, why don't we move on then to prioritization, since during our last discussion we had come up with this document, but we really hadn't focused particularly on what order we want to do things in. So I thought it would be a good idea to talk about that, so that we can then move on to a timeline, which is going to be our third topic.

We have a document, at least at present, that starts with the impact of PICS and other safeguards and then moves down. Can you scroll down, Alice? Moves down to consumer and end user behavior, which includes the literacy issues, DNS abuse, we have developing countries and then we have procedural issues, and I think that ends the substantive topics.

Do folks have thoughts on which would be the logical starting point, at least for our work?

I can jump in, and then people can jump in and agree or disagree. In looking at this list, my thought is thinking about the consumer, end user behavior, and the literacy issues may make a good starting point, because I think the awareness issues and the ability to distinguish between the gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs, and expectations seem to be at the start of a lot of the rest of the issues.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I completely agree for the reasons you laid out for the other categories too. I think that will help guide what we do with the other questions we posed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Other thoughts?

CARLTON: I agree with that part, Laureen, and right after that, we look at what has come out, so [inaudible] looking at DNS abuse and seeing what has happened, and then we might go back and tie it to the [inaudible] issues, see how we pair them together.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laureen, Margie has her hand raised.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, too many things. Margie, please speak.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, hi. The thing about consumer perception is we still won't have all the data until the Nielsen study is complete, so I don't know if that affects your – at least the second phase of their study, so I don't know if that affects the timing of when you want to take a look at that. Eleeza, you might be able to give more background on when you think that study would be concluded.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. We're expecting to have the report from the consumer survey by June, and hopefully in time for your next face to face meeting in June, and then the registrant survey would come later in the year, I think more in the third quarter of the year.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just to I understand, Eleeza, the survey results of what we've been discussing in all of our small Nielsen group discussions, that's what we're talking about when you're talking about the June results, yes?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct, yes, that's right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, and the registrant survey, that really hasn't been the topic of our discussions thus far.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, not yet. We're hoping to begin discussing that questionnaire probably in a month, or four to six weeks I would say.

LAUREEN KAPIN: One question I have then to the group is, do we have any other sources of data for basically public awareness of the new gTLDs, or literacy questions that we could look at in the interim? Whoever is not on mute and their phone is ringing, put your phone on mute. It might be worth having someone at least take a look to see what – just articles have been written about awareness of new gTLDs, because I know there have been several articles, and I'm wondering if they point at any data sources. I mean, this actually would be something helpful to research, because the fact is, there is some information out there.

Someone doesn't have their phone on mute, because I hear their private conversation. So we can put that as an action item. Is anyone aware of any studies or other information that's available on this general topic of just awareness, perception of new gTLDs?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Laureen, I know I've seen articles on this topic. I've been dubious about the sources of them, but I know that I've seen it come up. It may be that they're fine and perhaps it just wasn't presented in the best way, but I've seen it in sort of the industry press [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Marketed by or supported by a registry or something like that, so sometimes it can be hard to tell, but there has been some research done in this regard, and certainly my team can take that on then, and do some digging, if you'd like.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just think that would be helpful, because I know I've read articles from time to time that are right squarely on this subject, but what I haven't focused on in the past is what are they relying on? So I have your same skepticism, but perhaps there's more behind it than we realize, and I think that would be useful to take a look at.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We'll take a look and get back to the team.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That sounds great. In terms of prioritization, we have our first topic of the consumer end user behavior. Let's take a look at what's under there. We have the literacy issue, we have user expectations... I'm looking at "[Did] consumers know where to go to report problems," and I'm wondering if there's been any systematic looking at websites in connection with the new gTLDs about the prominence of basically the abuse point of contact on the websites associated with new gTLDs, if

that's something that has been the topic of inquiry or studies. Can anyone speak to that?

DREW BAGLEY: I believe ICANN compliance maybe has looked at that in the past.

CARLTON: Yes.

DREW BAGLEY: I think that I remember seeing a presentation on that.

CARLTON: Yes, I was about to mention that ICANN compliance have some data as I recall on abuse contacts. I can't remember specifics of it now, but I can also tell you that [inaudible] put a lot of work into validating the contact information on websites where there's abuse, and that's been one of his bugbears with compliance over the years, that they don't seem to monitor it very well, but I remember Margie providing some data a couple years back on the abuse contact data and what transpired when they tried to reach them. So I will definitely go to ICANN compliance I would suggest, and one other thing I'll ask [Garth] to provide, because I know he has some information on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's great, and maybe in our Google document under compliance, we can at least note that as one of the issues, abuse point of contact

information. So if we have the consumer end user behavior as our first priority, which would then also cover some abuse issues and behavior issues, what would be the next logical area to move into? Alice, can you scroll up to our other – this consumer end user behavior actually is going to take us through quite a lot of issues. Can you scroll up beyond consumer end user behavior so folks see the other topics?

So we have impact of PICS and other safeguards, and then I think we have developing countries after that, and procedural issues. What would come next?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laureen, Margie and Carlton have their hands raised.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Margie, why don't you speak up, since you may talk about some data issues, and then Carlton.

MARGIE MILAM: Actually, I was going to point out the overlap on some of the issues with the PDP that's underway on the rights protection mechanism, and so some of the analysis that we've been doing for the other PDP, the one that's on the subsequent procedures, that kind of analysis you might want to think about here. in other words, if you could get to the trademark issues early, you might be able to send stuff to the PDP for their consideration sooner rather than later, so that their PDP doesn't get held up. I just wanted to flag for you that there may be good reason to start some of the trademark issues sooner than the other ones.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so I think we'll need to chat with David then, and flesh this out a little more, but that's a good placeholder so that we're aware of timing, and then we can – if we prioritize it, we can feed into the trademark PDP and write protection mechanisms. Okay, Carlton.

CARLTON: I was about to mention that the study I spoke about from the UC Berkeley people, it might be useful to look at it, even just the summary of it, because it might generate some questions we could ask or could put into the PDP process. [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do you want to send that around to the group, then?

CARLTON: Yes, I sent the study and just the blurb on it to Alice [inaudible] the safeguards team. I hope you all get it by now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I received it in my inbox.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. I'm looking at the time, 9:52, because I want to make sure we can cover some of these other topics, but sounds at least like we have a first priority. I think we'll have to discuss our next priorities during the next

call, because I'm not hearing folks weigh in on that, so what I'll ask you to do is take a look at this document and think about what would be next in sequence for us. We'll have a placeholder to discuss the trademark and rights protection issues with David who hopefully can join us for the next phone call, and also I would ask people to look at the consumer end user category, because there are an awful lot of topics within that, and when we generated it, we didn't necessarily generate it in a priority order, we just listed it.

So for the next phone call, I think it would be very useful to think about whether that is the logical order that we should be looking at things in. before we get to timelines, I want to make sure we discuss timings of our calls, because Fabro has indicated that this time is not good for him, and I'm wondering if there are alternative times for folks that would work, so that we have the opportunity to include Fabro in our call.

I also don't have a sense for the people who aren't on the call, if they are not on the call because this time poses a problem, or they just had a problem today, so let me put it out to the group about timing of calls. Is this time of day good for people? Let's start with that. Is there anyone who has a problem with this time of day? Okay, it doesn't sound like it. Brian is typing. I know it's hard on the California folks, [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sorry, can I make a suggestion,

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just wondering – oh, Brian just typed it, he was going to say maybe we should do a doodle poll of the members, figure out what the best time is, but I'm not sure if any of the folks in East Asia are on this team, because I know for them this is kind of the cusp of late night.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, why don't we put a doodle poll out to consider days and times? My sense is at least thus far that this time is fine, but days of the week might be a good thing to do also, so let's do that, because I want to try and include as many of our folks as possible. Carlton says the time is good for him. Let's try and get that out this week, so by the time of our next call we can come up with a standing call that works for everyone.

Okay, so we haven't really discussed timelines, and I don't think in the time left that we're going to have time for a wholesome discussion of that, so let's push that over to our next phone call, but let's also have that on people's radar screens so that we can start to think about our schedule for moving forward. But in the last few minutes, I want to just open up the discussion to any concerns or issues that people have, or things that we haven't discussed that we should be discussing in our next call.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laureen, Carlson has a suggestion in the chat.

LAUREEN KAPIN: "Can I suggest we anchor that we will have examined the datasets by the time of the face to face?" Which datasets are you talking about?

CARLTON: This is Carlton, are you hearing me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

CARLTON: Yes, Laureen, I was thinking we have some data sets that we can look at right now: DNS abuse, some or a few others. I would like to suggest that we would have explored them and extracted the information that we think is relevant from them, or consolidation by the time we get to face to face. There's a lot of streams, yes?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. I agree, and actually I can suggest a couple of things besides the ICANN study. There's also a secure domain article that Drew kindly pointed me in the direction of, the cost of doing nothing. This is case for proactive anti-abuse, that's something that I can send around. There's the ICANN study that I think we all have access to, and then [inaudible] has a March 2016 report concerning issues of consumer trust that I think would be useful as well.

CARLTON: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	I think those are things that we should at least have taken a look at by the time of the next call so that we can discuss them and see what's useful in there. Are there any other things you think we should be looking at?
CARLTON:	I'm still thinking, but those to start. I think what we need to do is to extract what we think is useful so we have a consolidated list that we can concisely present. [inaudible] data that supports it. This is how we think it's shaping up.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay, so we all have access to the ICANN study because that's been sent around. I think I have the other two things, but if I don't, I will try and get my hands on them to circulate links to them to the group. How does that sound, so that everyone has them easily accessible? Although unless staff thinks we already have them and I can just point folks in the right directions.
MARGIE MILAM:	Laureen, I don't know – Eleeza was – I was just chatting with Eleeza, I'm not sure we have all of them. If you give us the links, we can post them on the wiki page so the members don't have to scan through their e-mail list to find the documents once they're posted on the wiki page, so it's to make sure that we know which ones you're referring to.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, okay, I will locate and then send links to Eleeza and Margie. Who would be the best person to send them to?

MARGIE MILAM: Eleeza and Pamela I guess, and then [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got you. Okay, I think that's great, and an excellent suggestion, Carlton. Does anyone else have any parting comments? If not, then I think we will adjourn until our next call. I want to thank everyone for participating and look forward to our next discussion. Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]