
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So who is going to be the leader of the [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...to decide who will lead the group [inaudible], and then decide the actions to be taken. Anyone willing to lead the group?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I volunteer Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I volunteer. No I really am here because I want to understand better and particularly understand from your concept of [UA?] flow what that means, because I guess that has some specific background and does not translate obviously to other countries, to other legislations.

And the reason why I wanted to be here was [inaudible]... the question of trust. That's why [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, I'm willing to lead because [inaudible]...

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it's very important to know this background since we don't have Larry Strickling or [inaudible]... We don't have the drafters of the constitution today [CROSSTALK] You drafted it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, I thought you said the constitution. [LAUGHTER AND CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Any objection?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Plus one support to the [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Plus one. I support Carlos.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] plus one will make it into the dictionary.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I see there is one exercise that we did yesterday that might be of help, so basically got posted and we did a [inaudible], and headed to the areas. And then that might be a good place. It's exactly what [this group's work?] to do, and how it can put it together, especially for the final questions and answers.

[LAUGHTER AND CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You want to take the [inaudible], turn it off. It's going to [inaudible]...
[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Should we think about how we can then, how we can [inaudible]
[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What is the cost of the [inaudible] registration [inaudible] and do we
need to seek to reduce them in the future? Business model, [inaudible]
Jonathan's shorthand ones, and I don't necessarily recall what the meet
was on this one. Does anyone recall what the concern here was here?
[Inaudible] Jonathan if we need to, but does anyone remember?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it was part of the discussion with Jamie, innovation [with the
business model?]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, I think it had more to do [inaudible] but I could be wrong. I thought
it had more to do with different business models having different
safeguards [inaudible] like dot bank, but I'm not [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: ...because he has trust here, and then consumer behavior regarding trust. So I'm going to put these together.

Recommendations for increasing consumer trust, especially in developing countries. This seems to be in the general pocket of trust. [Inaudible] data, I think that's a process, this is a process issue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Drew, can you hear Lauren from there?

DREW BAGLEY: It's very muffled, so I can only hear a little bit. I'm sorry if there was something that I was supposed to respond to. I can hear certain speakers and not others.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can you hear me Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, now I can.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, I'll just speak louder. I'm sure you all will enjoy that.

DREW BAGLEY: And I apologize for everyone else's ear zone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So what we're trying to do now, Drew, is divide the things that we've already identified yesterday in Margie's brainstorming exercise, to try and put them into buckets, so that instead of a dozen or so issues, we have down here, we're trying to consolidate into smaller buckets. So that's the process we're engaged in.

So right now we have one bucket that talks about the cost of defensive registration, and then we have a trust bucket that reads of several issues. Increasing consumer trust, consumer behavior that demonstrates trust, business model that differentiates themselves by claiming to be more trustworthy.

Here is another one that relates to trust. Can new TLD reduce the risk of consumer confusion for a brand? Maybe that's a little different and we put that by itself for a minute. In terms of predatory pricing and defensive applications, that's going to go with our cost of the defensive registration.

Extent to which the public interest commitment have been consistently applied on how they have helped to promote or maintain consumer trust. So trust [CROSSTALK]...

Sunrise pricing and premium prices, brand versus generic. I think that system [CROSSTALK] with the sunrise pricing. Impact of public policy advice on safeguards on consumer protection. That's also trust that

goes with our public interest commitment, I think. What is ICANN's role in engendering trust?

Trust, yeah [CROSSTALK]. Safeguards in trust, experience from developing regions. That's also trust. So we might also have a sub bullet there for focus on developing regions, because those might raise distinct issues. So I think we can... And then have this underneath. [Inaudible] trust that's going to go up here.

How to base safeguards into the new gTLD process. I think this is trust issues? Yes, I think so too. Dispute resolutions, trust is written here too. I'm going to put that under ICANN, because this is a trust that reads as a procedural issue, so I'm thinking that might be another bullet point.

DNS abuse. It could also read as trust issues, but maybe that's also a... Procedure?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I think it's procedural.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Explain it to me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, there are things that you have to do to establish that there is not abuse, and then there is procedures for mitigating abuse.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And it also comes to how you're going to define abuse, and if there is also applying [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure, yeah. If you look at it [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Put it here for now. We'll put them next to each other. [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, no. That's fine.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Brand and IP protection. The person wrote trust, but I still think it's going to be grouped with these IP issues.

So, [CROSSTALK]...

Wait there is one more. There is a long one. Ways in which new gTLDs might or might not effect consumer trust and confusion in the marketplace, and then there is an example. For example, are criminals preying off of the...? Oh it's written, thank you. [Inaudible]

So are criminals preying on the fact that a legacy [inaudible]...?

So I think that's a confusion issue, a consumer trust and confusion. Unless I'm misunderstanding it. Does anyone want to speak more to this?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, that would be a confusion [CROSSTALK]

Yeah, the confusion of ambiguity because a person or an entity, a registrant that owes the dot com can't possibly by not having some of the same domain names with the new TLDs.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we can have four dot car, and four dot cars, and four dot vehicle, and four [inaudible] of dot vehicle instead it could be Bob's Used Cars lot better than four dot vehicles.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, exactly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So that was on the trust category. So then in terms of our bucket, maybe our buckets are, well we have a trust bucket. And then as [inaudible] said, we have developing countries.

And then as another subset... Well I think it's going to be a different bucket, so let me just get through the trust one, the developing countries. And then we have, then we have [inaudible] procedural, do procedure, procedural. And then under that, we have ICANN's role.

We have dispute resolution process, well processes I guess, there is more than one.

And sufficient data, which I guess is an overarching concern that when we draw conclusions, do we have sufficient data to back it up? So and DNS abuse.

So that's our trust bucket. And then our other bucket really has to do with IP issues. Oh, what I'm calling IP issues, but I'm open to other names.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is it IP network, or Internet Protocol, or...?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...it's really RPMs, but [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's true. I guess that's a fair point Jamie.

DREW BAGLEY: Are you considering pharmacies in that category?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What?

CARLTON SAMEULES: Are you considering pharmacies you said?

DREW BAGLEY: For the IP issues? So if there is a fake pharmacy, it's pretending...
[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...product that deals with intellectual property, but it also....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Another specific category, but certainly if there are issues surrounding promises, yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Maybe brands issues instead. Because I think you're right, Jamie, IP are these too broad? Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And that's very well from regulated areas, or the pharmacy bank and I don't know what name to use. You keep them now. But when the GAC advice came out is where they regulated....

LAUREEN KAPIN: Those are the more highly regulated [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So it separates brands from [private] sectors, from generic names.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. So under here we would have the defensive [inaudible] registration.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Shouldn't that be relative cost of registration? Because if it's just a defensive registration, that makes it sound like defensive registrations are in of themselves a cost, or a [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So the real issue is whether to hire, or then they were in legacy. I mean brands, in order [inaudible] if you want to, defend a trademark, there are things you need to do, and those include costs that you have to occur so that your brand or trademark is not [CROSSTALK]...

And so that's just [CROSSTALK]... Yeah, it's a given. So, if you know, with new gTLDs, there is a dot shoe, Nike is going to have to get a name, even if it doesn't want to to make sure no one else does. That's not necessarily a bad thing, in of itself.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, what's the other one?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So relative cost under there, impact of predatory pricing, so...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's a different thing.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Impact of predatory pricing and the defensive [application]. So I took this to mean, although you're saying it's a different, I took this to mean predatory pricing of the defensive registration, but maybe the person said something else.

How do you think...? You don't think it's that [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...I mean, I was thinking there was two things. One is the right [inaudible] defense of registration. The first one may have been thinking about TLDs like dot suck, which is, doesn't necessarily have anything to do with their...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] remit...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...market, market that they're in, but they may feel held up because if they don't get it someone else will and they will criticize the brand. But I didn't come up with that one, so I don't know for sure if that's [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Predatory pricing, I'm just wondering if it's the price in terms of the pricing what they would [inaudible] other than the defensive registration.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is defensive registrations, the second level. So I have Ford dot com, I apply for dot Ford, and I probably won't give up Ford dot com, so this is the added cost of, and then I have to defend that nobody gets Ford sucks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. That is to me what it's getting at. That, and the Ford dot sucks, at least the way it was priced, was a lot higher.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And before I had only one domain name, Ford dot com, for all purposes...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And you raised a good issue on this [inaudible] because I think it's something that we should look at, whether it was abuse or trust issues with the protections at the top level, because they're Ford did not have to necessarily apply for dot Ford, because if someone else did, and they [inaudible] plan to use it for automobiles, they could take it down under the trademark [CROSSTALK]...

Because Ford could be [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And then Ford wants to have a global strategy so it goes after all two letter domains, US dot Ford, DE dot Ford. So he ends up having what? 210 domain [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, it's not always black... I mean, people in the, for the launch who are arguing that you would, if you were a brand, you would have to defensively register in every single domain name, and trademark law says that's actually not true. The fact that if you're Xerox and you don't register in [inaudible], your brand isn't going to be [CROSSTALK]...

More like someone who is taking Xerox dot [inaudible], and you can go after them with an easier [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But being as one company, they don't want the delegation of the two letter codes at the second level anyhow, to protect their own local websites. [CROSSTALK]

...into 100 related domain names. So they had to hire a domain name manager, like [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] countries, pretty...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, in the countries [inaudible] Mexico and everywhere [inaudible]. In any case, they go from one to 20.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But that happens with any... I would argue that happens with, that would happen with [CROSSTALK] any form of media. New magazines, new newspapers, new websites, whatever. There is always the possibility that they're going to have to take additional action to protect their trademark.

And so that what I was trying to get the [inaudible] an unfair burden that they face now with top level domains, or at the second level, or the rights protection mechanisms effective reduce or eliminate [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That means we have two different types of cause, defensive registration, rights protection. Okay, that's good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, we're down to two then. We forgot confusion on [consumer trust] list, so that is that. And then the other sticky is brand protection, that's going to go under our brand issues. Reducing the risk of confusion per brand, and sunrise pricing.

Which may go under costs of defensive registrations, yes? Would that be a sub point? Sunrise pricing?

Isn't that the first dib to get at your brand?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, but that isn't necessarily defensive, right? Because you may, we, it's first to get at your brand, you may actually want that brand.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So let's put it in a separate one. Sunrise pricing.

Okay.

So, [inaudible] bucket. Are we missing anything? This is what came out of our brainstorming session that doesn't mean that we can't take some time now to think about whether this other...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...trademark issues, not every, because this is really about trademark, right? And not every trademark is a brand. I mean, when I think of brand, I think of, you know, Nestle, or Nabisco, or big...

LAUREEN KAPIN: It could be a little guy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right, not necessarily a brand but [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Trademark.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Let's say we have costs also.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We have two types of consumers, the end users and the registrant. And I'm not sure if you need to, or if you have enough Internet users concerned here. Because lots of registrants and trademarks, enough of the, [inaudible] enough for the brand, and then in the [inaudible] we have consumer confusion.

[Inaudible] end users... [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that really goes to our charged DNS abuse discussion, right? Because that's what we were, which I'm not sure really goes under procedural. I think to me that goes... To me, that [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I agree.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's own bullet or it's own...?

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's own little, it's in the trust one, but I think it's not a sub point of procedural issues, although you want to know how to measure it, you want to know how to protect it, that sort of thing, but I think it's own sub points under trust.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I agree, and then maybe put in parenthesis TBD, because we still haven't defined what that DNS abuse is.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: FYI, hopefully the report coming out will help a lot [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm actually looking at the draft report right now, and I think all of this is...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Then how do you define it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, that's a surprise. [CROSSTALK AND LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's all right. [Inaudible], that's good enough for me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, you're in the ballpark. The only reason I'm not saying anything is because we're still [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Actually one of the points is legal, it's sort of [CROSSTALK] be a little careful about, and so we're refining it, but we should know [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's okay. Knowledge has come up here, and I know we're in the ballpark. [LAUGHTER AND CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I think, so I think there is at this point thinking about the end user. So are there other...? And maybe Drew, you might have some thoughts here? Should there be any other end user issues, end user oriented

issues in our [inaudible] screen for this review? Whether it falls under trust, or whether it falls under, where it falls under something else.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The possibility, do we divide cross between registrants and consumers? Like according to Neilson? Or do we make a bucket for...

LAUREEN KAPIN: You mean registers, registrants, and end users?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Exactly. Like we have it in the Milton structure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: If we define consumers to include both in our terms of reference, so we can't use consumers, but we can use end user and register.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But then we have to rename the bucket, and we call it consumer trust and we are fine. Okay? That was my comment. If you call it consumer trust, okay, we have both below. Great.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. But back to my question, which is are there...? Are there any other sub issues here? Whether it deals with.... Are there any other sub issues here dealing with end user [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And here I go back to the revision of the metrics of [inaudible], and the revision on the questions of trust, of the Neilson report, etc. etc. that have been glowing, and we see it and it moves, but I mean, I don't know how long this group is going to work on these issues. Only for today? Or are we going to continue? Because we're going to continue, we have to go back and...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We'll figure it out in an hour. [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: We'll figure it out in an hour, but I think [CROSSTALK], I think we can retain the flexibility if we think there are things that needs [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's what I said. What's your definition [inaudible]? What are the metrics on trust in the long metrics list, and what are the questions of trust in both Neilson areas? Just footnotes. Okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. I mean, to me, what's important is that we want to consider how people behave, what information they're willing to give over, and then what risk they are, you know, for... What is the risk of harm? [CROSSTALK]

Those to me are some of the important issues. Which I think DNS abuse gets that a little bit, not a little bit, it certainly gets that, but I think this issue of what is the public behavior can give us some information on trust, and I also am interested in what risks are out there, and whether those risks are more in the new gTLD space as compared to the legacies.

So you just asked [inaudible] from my perspective...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So let me rephrase it so I'm sure I understand you. So in the case of users who will be giving my email, my address, and my credit card, an expiration date? That that is the, and in the case of registrants fielding the WHOIS is a truthful manner or not, because they're going to use it to cheat.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's apples and oranges to me. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's why I separate that [inaudible] two types of consumers. That's why we have finally [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...the same for new and existing TLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Exactly, that was my next point. That was my next point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If we go into WHOIS, we will never get out of there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, no, but that's my next point. What's the difference between the old points and the new ones?

LAUREEN KAPIN: As far as WHOIS, there is [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And about the user?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well there is the one thing that is different [CROSSTALK] verify, you have a verification...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well now, not necessarily. I mean, it's the public choice. And the legacy gTLDs, they're more familiar with. I mean, that's the speculation, but I assume they're more familiar with it and their behavior may be different. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is an obligation...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...to verify.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] it's verification, [inaudible] that if you are registering a certain type of TLD in a highly regulated sector, that you have whatever credentials are necessary. You warrant as the registrant that you really are [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's pretty much the same, yes. It's the same kind of routine. The same kind of routine. You have to verify and then... [CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry, I was just going to chime in real quick. And with the consumer trust from the end user perspective, visiting the website, there has been some interesting stuff that's come out over the past year and a half from the anti-phishing working group and I think a few other groups that have published reports.

And so I know that dot X, Y, Z, perhaps I think in 2014, was really well known for having tons of abusive registrations. And so therefore that would create a whole trust about that entire TLD where an end user would never want to, if they knew that, would ever want and perhaps navigate to dot X, Y, Z.

And so then I know that dot X, Y, Z went out of their way to clean up their TLD because of the bad press they were getting. And so there could be all kinds of things like that where some TLDs are giving more than others. And that could definitely effect consumer trust about a certain TLD.

And in terms of even what policies they have in place within how many days they respond to a report about phishing or anything like that. They're just, the looks can go on and on, but there is all of those aspects with end users, in addition to the other side of an end user registrant, whether or not they can trust that entity with their credit card information when they register a domain name and what not.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So maybe [CROSSTALK].... Well maybe [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would say consumer behaviors. [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Or end user behaviors, we have...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: For me, it's consumer.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I say consumer behavior.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: End user protecting the other [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: How about consumer...? How about consumer slash end user?
[CROSSTALK]
Let's do that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So at a really high level, [inaudible] I don't even know if this is possible, but don't we want to look at whether the, so the right protection mechanisms, actually what they call security mechanisms, you know, [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: ...I don't know if it's the right time, but I think it's a fair question to look at the impact of the picks. And I think a corollary question is, are the picks, are the gTLDs actually complying with [CROSSTALK]...
I don't know how you detect that, but I think it's, I think that's....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You look at reporting of you know [CROSSTALK]...
But I think part of what they would be interested in developing rules for the next launch, is whether the picks plus the obligations from the applicant guidebook...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you just call them future TLDs? Really neutral.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It has picks and other [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But that, I think, is really the next step, that I agree is a change between the previous TLDs, and then the new ones. Because the previous people [CROSSTALK]...

Okay, this is a change, this is a new bucket.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is a new bucket.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Exactly, because this is one thing that has to be followed over time, measured, discussed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and we would be able to set a baseline.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Picks, another safeguard...? Or there any others?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, there are. [CROSSTALK] And also there was some contractual obligation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: New obligations as well contractual.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They're all... But new obligations in terms of trust?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Trust building obligations?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: [Inaudible] as safeguards, but I mean, they're not all contractual because not all of them were, not all of them were endorsed by the Board. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because this is a change, this is a new world. [Inaudible] know about some kind [inaudible] looking into ways that we could measure what we're talking about with picks, right? And we're actually following up with that with different methodologies. And so [inaudible] will eventually have something that you guys can take a look at and see if [inaudible] feasible.

Also looking at mission and purpose, I think that's [inaudible]... guidebook. So that is the [inaudible] I guess, the applicant guidebook is the mission and purpose.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because there was also a discussion that all contracts or all TLDs lacked, and they had to sign new contracts, and they accepted new additions, the renewal?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, the 2013 RIAA.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's the registrars.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And if the registrars wanted to sell new gTLD names, they had to sign the 2013 RIAA.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Only if they got into the new [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: So what I suggest is, at some point, compliance is going to have some information here complaints about... Complaints regarding not adhering to the picks, and then we get an impact, I think the real question is, [inaudible]...

I don't know how you measure that, how you get at it, but it seems [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Measuring by [inaudible] creating trust, not if it produces...

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think those are two different things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's why I come back to you. What's your definition of [inaudible]? Because this is this other, which is abuse, and in the negative view, we have to police the views, and that there is [inaudible]. We have to enhance, you know? And I cannot do much with that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I think we should put our heads together to think about how we can look at that.

DREW BAGLEY: I think trust maybe needs to be looked at as a relative concept. So if any of us go to a dot com website, it could be a good website, it could be a bad website, we don't know but either way, we're making, we're probably thinking about the fact that it ends in dot com as something neutral.

And so therefore we're wondering if it ends with dot deal, dot Amazon, dot, you know, X, Y, Z, does that change something one way or another?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's an interesting way to look at it. I mean, to put it in more graphic terms, it might be the difference between at night, walking down a well lit street and walking down a dark secluded street. Which route are you going to take? [Inaudible] more inclined to walk?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, except there is a subtle difference though because, we're talking about trust navigating to the website. We are not talking, I don't think we're talking about trust of content on the website.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I think the way we've defined it in the terms of reference is it's not just navigating if you're, it includes your experience on the website, which is different from content, but it's I think in the terms of reference, it's broader than just navigating, [CROSSTALK]...

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah, because it matters if you're more likely to be going to a phishing site, or a site hosting malware or something, if it ends with a new TLD then if it ends with a dot com. So that's something that's different then just, did I successfully navigate, you know, from my own IP address to the IP, to the destination IP address?

So there is something more there. And so that's something... For some of this stuff, and maybe we don't want to, before you go down this road, but the way that you look at some of this stuff would be get a hold of the zone files, compare what's in the zone files with what some of these third party groups do in terms of identifying domain names that are, you know, born into something abusive.

And then you would see which registries and registrars maybe have more than others, and then from there, you could start analyzing what types of policy that are in place and whatnot, or look at what types of complaints have been presented to ICANN about a specific registry or registrar or whatnot.

So there are kind of different ways to [inaudible] it. But either way, I think it is important to know that, to go beyond just navigating to something. Once we get there, there is an increased likelihood of something bad.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So that's fine. I guess my concern is, where do you draw the line? Right? So phishing, malware, that makes a lot of sense. But if you go to a website that then, you know, harbors your personal information, you know, if that uses a domain name, does that, is that something we're looking...? Is that something that we're looking for? [CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: ...what's already available to us in the, either the RAA terms or the new TLD registrar accreditation agreement. We can just use something that ICANN has already provided and use that list, so that way it kind of creates a nice space for us so that we don't, you know, go down a slippery slope that you're alluding to, because you're right. We absolutely don't want to do that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, maybe [inaudible]. Maybe one suggestion is the [inaudible], is that we could navigate and use two bullet points... And then, I'm looking at the terms of reference, we use both. We use the [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

...and then users can use the site. So we use both here. I think the focus should be navigate. There is no borderline withdraw, but then maybe there is things we can check and use. [Inaudible] user survey, and they say, for example, familiarity with new gTLDs. And report inside abuse.

And there might be things that we can use to measure consumer trust, but I think navigation is very important.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I think that's a good way to think about it. [CROSSTALK] I wanted to get back to one of the points you made, Jamie, about where you draw the line in someone harvesting PII for example, and I would say, okay, you might be walking down a slippery slope that way [inaudible]...

That's the extent, for example, you're dealing with a highly regulated domain, whereas [inaudible], and I'm not going to use dot bank or dot com, let's say it's dot mortgage broker, and it turns out that the entity that's running the domain actually isn't making sure that they're legitimate mortgage broker.

And that to me is an issue we might want to grapple with because then that is an issue with implication that you are a mortgage broker, so I can give you [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Right. So that ties to the contract and to the picks, because they're in the picks. You know, the people that are registered, they are supposed to have the credentials to be however they hold themselves out. So there is a tie there to that. There isn't a tie to, pick an extreme example, to be, you know, showing first run movies [CROSSTALK] on dot, you know, dot shoes or whatever.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What if there was a bad doctor, and there wasn't any picks like associated with it. [CROSSTALK] or something like that. I mean, it might not be anybody's fault. I mean, I think that's the only way to kind of separate it, that it's not ICANN's fault that it's not the case, but is a consumer [inaudible] being created by these specific personal domains, that are not met, so it's probably worth something, the question we're asking.

You know, this wasn't something they [inaudible] legally as a registry, I don't know.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I guess you can come up with a lot of examples like that to the extent that it's, you know, more closely tied to the contract, and to what falls within ICANN's remit, to you know, quote/unquote [inaudible] for compliance, I think it's going to be a more meaningful...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That argument makes perfect sense. It's the very act of adding 1500 domain names, creates an increase in consumer trust, and that is an uber question that rises above contracts and things. That was very present of this program [inaudible] have an impact on trust. Is it a separate question to solve, certainly, but it might be worth asking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So early on we talked about relative abuse, right? Or relative and you know, so it's, so you know, I'm sure there is going to be lots of that stuff on the [inaudible], but is it quantitatively or qualitatively different? I

mean, hopefully we'll find what the impact, the fact that it will be less in general, maybe it will be... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It might prove that picks are good ways to mitigate what would otherwise be a trend. I mean, that would be an interesting outcome.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that is a really, really good point. Because I think that, to use your word at an uber level, that's the really big issue we're grappling with is the fact that there are 900 and some odd new gTLDs out there. What effect has that had? You know with your dot doctors and your dot mortgage brokers and your dot accountants and your dot lawyers?

Some of which have adopted picks and commitments about verification, and some of which haven't, because that actually was advice that wasn't embraced. That was advice from the GAC that wasn't embraced by the Board.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] like deliverables if you have it [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just to make sure I understand what our task is for the next like, [inaudible] minutes, we're coming up with at least a preliminary list of buckets for us to be thinking about as we look at the specific issues that we're going to look at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so I think with the high level deliverables back to the group is identifying your chair, what you've done, creating a more sophisticated version of the brainstorming exercises that you appear to be doing, and thinking in terms of setting some deadline maybe by which you will explore what sources are available to you and what additional sources you might want.

That's something you might want to have done earlier, rather than later. We... Margie shared with us that the current fiscal year 16 budget for outside work for the entire team, so that's through to, into the summer basically, that's basically about 250 things, and I think 10 is another 150.

So you can we have got four to spend in between now and mid-summer, and then as we get into the new fiscal year, and if we have recommendations for what that budget should look like, that has to happen sooner rather than later based on the budget position we are in. So for reasons of giving researchers time to conduct studies and some [inaudible] for them, prioritizing in your work plan, determining what additional research and things are necessary should be high on your list of priorities.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That does not include Neilson or analysis of [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...doesn't include travel and things like this. So those are, that [inaudible] the whole team is just for like outside professional services. That's a budgeted thing. I mean, we've got to work backwards from a budget.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Or do you want to try to work from your wish list, and then fight about, you know, the budget. But that's the, kind of a ballpark, but you know that's probably the amount of money at the very minimum that got spent for one of those studies, and so studies like the WHOIS study or something, is you know, price tag, right?

So since it can be expensive, it just depends on what you're doing. You're trying to get data that already exists, but it costs money, or are you actually getting primary [inaudible] done...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: How much is the new [inaudible] and how much is the analysis?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's not published information. So [inaudible] contacting across that, I mean the notice that got thrown out of the IDN, [inaudible] when proposed to the Board was within the 500 to 750 range, for each of

them. And so what they actually negotiated down to contracting process and things like that, where none of this has transparency too.

Remember those were two big studies, [inaudible] global study [inaudible] later on again, the first [inaudible] and on the other end is data that already exists, for example, that you have to pay for, right?

Somewhere in the middle is getting a smaller primary reason.

LAUREEN KAPIN: When are we due back in the room? At four?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Due to start up again at four, starting a break around quarter to four.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we're already... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just didn't want you to be held up by anything,

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's probably enough for deliverables [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 3:45 is the scheduled break, and then four is wrap up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Probably presentation by any groups.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So anyway, can we go to look at these categories and see whether or not we think there is an expectation of this [inaudible] if we have [CROSSTALK]...?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Before we go to additional data, so if we do actually, we have like almost [inaudible] so it's 10 of three now, so this is correct. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We can play some beach volleyball out there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. So are there any other issues or...? Are there any other issues we want to add, or is there any other sub points we want to add? And this is not going to be like a final list. I think we should go [inaudible] and think about this, and then we'll set a deadline for folks to give feedback on this list.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think, this is just a suggestion. So we have navigate music, also [inaudible] but if you're actually going below consumer [inaudible], because we're not using [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: So maybe we can put consumer and end user behavior up on the top and put navigate and use underneath?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm afraid of the use one. It can grow...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Big.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So a navigate user, a subset of end user behavior.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So there was one topic [inaudible] but it's in the user survey and how we discuss in the rest of the days, which is purchase restrictions. If you want to discuss these or not.

LAUREEN KAPIN: When you say purchase restrictions, tell me what that means. Do you mean that's a highly regulated domains or something else?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think maybe it should be what's up from the, I don't know if it's from the terms of reference, but safety of use. [Inaudible] safety of use, the one is consistency of domain resolution. Two, confidence [inaudible] that the users that the can [inaudible] the domain name without [inaudible] DNS abuse.

Confident that Internet users can find and use the site [inaudible]... registry operators for the registry data purpose. Confidence by a [inaudible] in the domain registration process and life cycle. These are the five [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we want to track those [CROSSTALK]...?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We can do that too, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] some of them are trademark, those are trademark. It says [inaudible] specifics, but not exactly.

[Inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's a fair point. Can we read that list one more time? Actually, let me look over your shoulder too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] for consumer trust, page four.

[Inaudible]

Terms of reference, page four.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just change, this is the prior version, we changed this.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We changed number three to consumers.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is actually the prior version [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The last version is only printed in your hands.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's only [LAUGHTER and CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do we have a new one?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. We don't have the [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We updated terms of reference under discussion yesterday.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, so that concept of safety is in there. That's what I'm hearing you say but we're not capturing, yeah, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can we go back to the...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They're not capturing in the definition [CROSSTALK]....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...a sense of, how do you measure that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: May have had the other session in mind in that, if [inaudible] about that, how I find [inaudible]... and most information that is there is currently [inaudible] to measure...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well that's why I wanted to [inaudible], if we see anything there we can get more better data on. That's my big thing now. Which one of those things you think we can get? More definitive? Because I really think that we should endeavor to make any [inaudible] that are data driven.

We can actually have some data we can back it up with, and to do that, you start with stuff that you can actually connect. Credible data.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well right, but at this point, some of these things we may find that there is data, and some of them we may find that there isn't data. I don't know...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh yes, I understand that. I understand that, let's try to make more of those that we have data on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Or think about what data we [CROSSTALK] a little bit of a budget here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And we have a budget. This is a point that we're getting to look at or that we think we have data and look at those that we think there might be data for. We may not have [inaudible] and then we have a budget, we can [inaudible] what do we need here? Could you find it? How much will it cost?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And barring that, if you can't get that it's an exercise in determining adequate proxies for some of these measures, I think, so that...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can follow in proxies, now that's an interesting idea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I mean, it's something like a little preview is that we've been looking at thick WHOIS. How do you measure whether thick WHOIS is like an effective safeguard in terms of DNS abuse? It's very difficult. One of the things that we have proposed is accuracy. There is an accuracy reporting system out there.

Is accuracy some way a proxy for effectiveness? Can we make an argument for that? And a lot of people say no, but you can make a sort of a cogent argument. And then barring that, if you can't find a good proxy for something, that is qualitative feedback from end users for something.

If there is no data set, you can find, can you go to, you know, people have used centralized zone data services. Is it helpful? Is it, you know, these are kinds of things that might be backups for you guys, if you can't... One of the things I've encountered is that it is, it can be hard to find data that is fulfilling or satisfying or what you want to measure. That will be a challenge.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. That's where I go back, and look at the metrics chapter on [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: You mean from the Neilson review?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, no from the [CROSSTALK]...

There was that list.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That list we just looked at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Do we have it somewhere? I [inaudible] in my bag out there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do you want to go get it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [CROSSTALK] In the annex, they rearranged the 66 by [CROSSTALK]... part in the annex....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, that annex has them by condition, so they're conditional is
[inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

Sure, you just have to move there...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can do it remotely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You can do better than...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you disconnect...?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh, from airplane?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

[CROSSTALK and LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So here is the [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because if they're unavailable, they will have to give reviews.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Exactly. So I've been going by, and I think a lot of people [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is the annex.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So this is the main...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is the main, yeah, but they have...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] in the annex, look in the annex.

They started doing some work in there and they needed a little bit easier to think about.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You mean these?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, the one that says trust, the one, go back. You see there? Yeah.

So you say there is the trust one in there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I think it's a little bit further down. There we go.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So we have all the ones [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...hard data.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, hard data.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, one to one point three, but those we were not able to publish those [inaudible] to publish those...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I understand that. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You're not able to publish them, but you can create an index of all of them and report it. I mean, what's not, what secret is the single...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not a compiled index.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Think of the... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...aggregate, so you lose track of it. So the first three are hard data. Survey of perceived consumer trust in the DNS.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well that's the Neilson survey.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There we go to the Neilson questions [inaudible] point five, registry services such as WHOIS contact info and complaints. Is there some

research on WHOIS? I think there is some report on WHOIS. It can be just [CROSSTALK] or new gTLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, but I don't know if we can pull out new gTLD ones on those reports are saying.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, no I mean, the recommendation is to keep doing that, not include the new gTLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: One point six, relative [inaudible] this is easier to [inaudible]... That's in the report that was presented this morning?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, [inaudible] has some of those. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Compliance report.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Incident of other breach relative to Internet or register of general complaints [inaudible] system. What's that? I think that's to start the clients in take the system.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And some of these in this annex are actually the originally proposed metrics, and that was [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Where is the current metrics?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The current metrics measurement that we're collecting?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. So that's going to be what we have.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So I'll just pull out the page here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can we just see how long the list is? [CROSSTALK] Before you go to a new page, then you scroll slowly and see how many trust metrics we have? [CROSSTALK] Just a final number. 11, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21. Okay, there we go. 22 out of 66. So a good start.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is that how it is organized? All of the trust ones are upfront, or they're interspersed? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There are some more down. There is about 30.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's about 30? No, I saw 22 only.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, when I look at [CROSSTALK]...

I just do different then 15, 20, 30. I also do it that way because it makes it relative...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 20, 22...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I put a relative thing in my head. No, there is others there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is another list. Okay. 22. Now we can go to, thank you.

[Inaudible] [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Actually I have procedures four to three ones that have been categorized as trust.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I count about 30 because I looked at the list, and then just did a quick scan, and it's about 30, because those are just like split on two pages.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Drew, are you able to see this? [CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: No, I can't see it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So what we're looking at are the current metrics that ICANN is collecting data on, which includes trust issues. You know, among the competition issues and the choice issues.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What I can do is I'll show [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That was what [inaudible] this one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so this is everything that is published that has to do with trust. so we try, just because trust if you [inaudible] report, you don't really, I mean, trust [inaudible] mean as much to you. We try to make this a little bit more accessible generally. But yes, this is what we're reporting on.

And then [inaudible] have to do with compliance. Notices of breach, without compliance.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And these are just for the new gTLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, this is all...

LAUREEN KAPIN: For everything.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: For everything, because these are [inaudible] that are published by compliance, so compliance has a dashboard and they do [inaudible] they have an overview of complaints, etc. And they also have a daily report, and then... So that's where the detail is. What I tried to do is to aggregate, like you're talking about because something, but within their

report, there is a lot more detail like linked to their dashboard, they're report.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And if we wanted to compare the new gTLDs to the legacy gTLDs, could we do that with this data?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so what we, I mean, they don't collect... I can probably see if they have the ability to sort of parse out new G's versus legacy, that's hwy we tried to have a baseline for all of these. [Inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

Right, so you have that 2012/2013 rate. So you can see, you know, are the new gTLDs revolting? Obviously there are probably going to be more with complaints because there are more new gTLDs. And that's sort of the issue [inaudible]...

Is it because of the new gTLDs? Or is it just because there is a larger number of TLDs in the root?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] look at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I would say that one of the [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]

...might be a way to use the money to...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So in terms of one of the things we need, it would be designed compliance that is to new G, and legacies.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] because I don't know how we are going to collect these [inaudible] data, but that would be, yeah. The same thing going [inaudible] and eight point one. I would just do the aggregate of that of complaints received by ICANN.

But I know that compliance has very detailed account. And so that is also something that, you know, if need be, that they can get specifically for a full time [inaudible], I know those are available.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And they post it on the compliance website.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The aggregate.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] in terms of where, in terms of data abuse percentages overall.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, because they have very good statistics, so my question is if they were able to get divided so we can actually to see and compare.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: These are two, sort of, I mean, these go [inaudible] complaints regarding improper use, and then complaints about [inaudible] understanding. So I think there are more categories that you can [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] by the policy. I think this might be another one we should look at.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] in the compliance.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: New gTLDs and legacy sometimes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Privacy policy is clearly [inaudible] end users. And breaking down...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is a big... And what I try to do is we have a system is the way to weigh that is pretty, combined seven point one to seven point three together so that the ability to look at them. So this is the baseline, because it would [inaudible]...

We went through ever registry's website, and then linked to the privacy policy or the different policies. We have a lot more registries. So you know, would that be something that you were thinking? That if you want for each individual registry that you could get something to go through, or write a script to go through.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...related to consumer trust in the way that you can see what kind of information you have access to. It might be a good metric.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Or how information is shared, and that's always a big issue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We don't have an issue with some things, but we, I think we could use consumer trust, the privacy.... [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's privacy policy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Privacy policy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: About what?

[CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: What they are telling us is that there is a whole metric that is being collected on privacy policies and how easy they are to access. And it sounds like they is also content.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Allocation and there is some....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Privacy policies of the gTLDs?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Of the registries, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And the question is whether or not it is usually acceptable? So it's something, do they have it? Is it something [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Two scenarios here. TLD suggest [inaudible] in terms of...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What would that tell us? Is that a fresh [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...rather than generic.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Trustworthiness? There is the trustworthiness issue.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I think it is. But if I can't even figure out how my information is going to be treated, that effects my willingness, in certain cases anyway, to... [CROSSTALK]

So should we add...?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would add it. Privacy as the one, privacy policy [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: We had privacy policy to our consumer trust.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In its own....?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Registry....

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There are only five. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So how many do you have there? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 17.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 17 metrics published.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 17 out of 45, or [inaudible] 30 or the [inaudible] 20?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And this is all available on the CCT RT metrics.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: For free, we don't have to pay for that. [Inaudible]

Where did those come from? [CROSSTALK AND LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...percentage of know [inaudible] domains. [Inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Four point four. On here?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Now all of these are going to have a file that's [inaudible], that includes every TLD. The problem is that in less than a week, I can give you an entire month, an extra month, because we can only publish, we can't publish the last three months. [Inaudible] issue, so I'm waiting [inaudible] instead of, you know, keeping...

But anyways, these are the file that contains every technical TLD and a percentage as well. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...well that's really good to navigate. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] but can we trademark issues, [inaudible]...

[CROSSTALK]

...the brands, the global, [inaudible] exactly like that. They had one metric that they have [inaudible]. It might be [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So it would be [inaudible] that we put in navigate, as well as...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: When we check and we group them, of course, what kind of [CROSSTALK]... We might have business models correlation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So community brings them protection?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You know, we may see... I think [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...around the section.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And then we do have the right's protection mechanism again, as per se.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, and so...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Which will be good to [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] group also could do to send, you know, to contact [inaudible]... directly and see if they have any more data that's not public [inaudible] [CROSSTALK]...

...maybe there is more data, you know, state specific data or region specific data that you want to look at, or something like that.

LAUREN KAPIN: So we have about half an hour more. Should we focus a little bit on what information we might want to fund on...? This first one we're going to see if compliance can...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We know that [inaudible] [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREN KAPIN: But is there additional information we might want to think about gathering?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] and the other one, maybe [inaudible]... We don't have to spend the money, I mean...

LAUREN KAPIN: No, no... [CROSSTALK and LAUGHTER]

Drew, are there things that you think that we might want to take a look at? Whether it's something that exists already, or something we might want to consider thinking about?

Did we lose you?

Drew? Are you on mute?

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes. Sorry, I'm home with a newborn, so I'm getting very ADD. But I completely missed the last thing said.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh. So I was just asking you, and... I'm sorry we're intruding on your new daddy time. [CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: No, I will be in Morocco and I will be much better rested then. I'll be much more engaged then.

LAUREEN KAPIN: What I was asking is, do you think that there...? My first question was, are there existing things you think we should be taking a look at that relate to issues of consumer trust, or maybe the related issue of DNS abuse? Or conversely, do you think that there are things we should be looking into getting more information on whether it's a study, or going to certain sources to get information?

Because now is the time where there are funds available and if we're going to ask for something, it's better to do it sooner rather than later.

DREW BAGLEY:

Well, yeah. [Inaudible] more about specifically what we want, but yes, absolutely. I think we definitely would want more data about DNS abuse specifically. So we would want to know the number of complaints coming into the registries themselves, perhaps. Maybe about the behavior registrars even, I don't know. And then we would want to certainly, if we're all in agreement, we want to look at, you know how much more abusive one TLD could be over another, once we agree on which categories we're going to use for that.

Then maybe we would want access to zone files to analyze, just so we can make that comparative judgment if there are trust issues, and are these trust issues valid? Is there an actual correlation between a new gTLD and it could be abusive or what not.

And I would think that that data would be useful too and whatever we do with privacy as we look at different privacy policies, to see if perhaps if there are trust issues in new TLDs that don't have privacy policies in place, or don't have as strong as privacy policy, maybe there is also other issues [inaudible].

I don't know. But I would have to think more about what other types of data sets we want, but I think that would be a good use of funds.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I heard is complaints to registries, maybe number of complaints to registrars, yeah. This is [inaudible] that they'll be willing to share this information with us, because that's separate and apart from what ICANN receives. Those are totally different...

DREW BAGLEY: Right.

LAUREEN KAPIN; And then I heard you talk about root zone files, and that's too technical for my little brain. But I know you can explain it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] someone to write an algorithm to do that for you.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, those would be simple to analyze. If there [inaudible] maybe we wouldn't even do it for, you know, every TLD [inaudible] do only, you know, only new TLDs that have X number of registrations or something, and basically we have to identify then an entity like ACWG or some, or [inaudible] for some group the data we would use to query that off of to see if there is a correlation between domain names known to be associated with maliciousness and the percentage of TLDs, or percentage of domain names at a certain TLD.

So that's how we would use those zone files. And then what I'm thinking is that if we, if that was useful data and we were able to draw

any sort of conclusion, maybe that is sort of one of the lenses through which we're looking at other potential consumer trust issues such as privacy as it relates to privacy policy in place, DNS abuse in terms of whether or not there are not complaints going unanswered, whether it's complaints going unanswered to ICANN level complaints going unanswered at the registrar or registry level, or what not.

So there are just some thoughts about that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I would love, any correlation between domain names associated with the views and what else? That's where I'm getting confused.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, so you're talking about... I'm sorry, you were referring to when I was explaining how we use zone file data?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Any correlation between domain names associated with the views and what?

DREW BAGLEY: Oh sorry. And then we could look at and the TLD itself, so then we would know the registry and then we could look at perhaps even the registrars depending on detailed data we get, they would all be tagged. And so then we could find out, and we would definitely have to take some sort of subset to really view, because of the amount of time it

would take to perhaps do the really meaningful substantive analysis of this.

But we could then look at, you know, whether or not maybe there are, there are certain new TLDs that are not where the registries are not doing enough about abuse complaints they're getting, or maybe they're not doing enough about their finding which registrars they're doing business with, and those registrars don't have strong policies in place, and therefore are more likely to allow registrations that are then used for malicious purposes.

You can draw a lot of correlation if you can get that data, and look at those things that were, in my opinion, directly relate to consumer trust of new TLDs.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So that sounds very interesting, although I'm not exactly sure of the new understanding of the nuances, and maybe if we're, maybe, would you mind like drafting, like say just a paragraph explaining it at the kindergarten level at least for me...

DREW BAGLEY:

Yeah absolutely. I apologize.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

No, no. it's not you Drew. It's definitely, it's me. But I'm thinking at least I would benefit from just seeing it in black and white, and I think maybe the group would then be able to...

DREW BAGLEY: Sure, yeah. I can definitely do that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. So are there any other focus of data that we're interested in? I mean, I personally would be interested, at least for the highly regulated gTLDs in knowing which one actually have some sort of verification process that they engage in.

And maybe it's two questions. One, is there a public interest commitment they have that's, that you know, that they themselves have signed up for in their contract. And then two, is it actually, even if it isn't in their contract, is there some sort of verification they do just as part of their procedures? And I guess that would be a sort of survey.

We would have to think about who to, what would make sense to chose, but the high regulated sectors is [inaudible]...

And so thoughts on that?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. I think the highly regulated sectors are one of the more interesting aspects of these new TLDs because part of the purported purpose is to create trust so that if you know you go to dot pharmacy, it's a pharmacy and what not. So I think that would be worthwhile [inaudible] enough data.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Excuse me, this is Carlos Drew. Jamie, have they been delegated? Weren't there some delays with this highly regulated...?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Not with the highly regulated [inaudible] themselves. Some were delegated early on. Some have yet to be delegated. There are two things, right? There are some strings were like dot bank, where the applicant voluntary agreed, or volunteered to do certain things to validate or qualify the registrant. Dot bank would only allow commercially allowed, you know, regulated financial institutions.

There are others which are associated with highly regulated sectors where the registers, they have to comply with an additional [CROSSTALK] in the picks itself to, that go above and beyond someone who is not [inaudible] and is not highly sensitive.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Okay, thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I can take a look at that, about the highly regulated domains and maybe just make some suggestions about ones we can take a look at, because the GAC actually has, and sort of, there are lots of charts that actually separate those out. So that might be interesting.

Are there any thoughts about any other information that we may want to take a look at?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm checking the website [inaudible] to see if there is any idea that we could do like, look at a private policy, but I'm not finding anything that is...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are you looking at legacy ones?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I want to go [inaudible] and then I'm just see if they have [CROSSTALK]...
Or any public information that we can research and say look, these are now [inaudible] doesn't have lack of privacy towards policy. They also have [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: We also could, I mean, we also could ask. I mean, it just gets down to what [inaudible] they don't have it.
Well...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We have to formulate the question....

LAUREEN KAPIN: Say it again?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I am feeling that for those kinds of queries, you would have to formulate the question. So within the probably will be needed pushback, because they were the only [inaudible]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, we can think about. Just because we get pushback doesn't mean we should... Being realistic.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That won't stop me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So...

[Inaudible] taking notes, but I'm wondering if we can capture this also into the [inaudible] categories. [CROSSTALK]

That [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...between legacy and new TLDs, we can number of complaints to registries. Number of complaints to registrars.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think actually it's going to be under the what else do we [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What else do we need?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, which is [inaudible] slash data.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And then another line after [the divide?].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Number of complaints in registries.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. If we could go to the registries and registrars and get information on their number of complaints. [CROSSTALK]

Drew is going to... Whatever you put down for this, put Drew in front to see it afterwards. But if there is a correlation between domain names associated with abuse and TLDs and registrar.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You mean second level domain names?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Chime in here Drew, because I'm probably....

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, so what I was thinking was perhaps we could take, we could figure out how we'll identify them, but will identify new TLDs that have X number of registration, and then get a hold of their zone files, and then check the domain names, their registration. Then we would have to of course take a period of time, and then we see how, what percentage of those have been associated with DNS abuse, based off of a database provided by an outside entity, such as Spam House, or something.

And so then we would from that, be able to identify whether or not new TLDs were any more likely than other TLDs to have DNS abuse. And if so, we could maybe even break it down by registrar following these new TLDs.

And then from there, maybe I think that data could fit into other things we're looking at, such as the privacy policy, the you know, maybe the abuse policies and what not of these TLDs to kind of see how that's all related together. And then we could draw some conclusions about consumer trust.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm not going to put down [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. Okay. [CROSSTALK] I think you've got the essence of it.

[CROSSTALK]

DREW BAGLEY: And I could do a write up and email everyone. Do you want me to email you guys now or later?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Whenever is good for you, because this is a placeholder.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, so that would be a placeholder and then will you need that, and then you guys return to the other room? Or [inaudible] be a group that's going, like beyond today, are we now officially a group...

LARUEEN KAPIN: This is going to be a working subgroup.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, perfect.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And then saying, we [inaudible] highly regulated sector domains, looking at... Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So do you want to...? What do you want to do?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We want to look at whether [inaudible] in either voluntary or mandated verification, validation, [inaudible]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, so we know that there are...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well we know that there are some voluntary ones.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right, there are some voluntary ones...

LAUREEN KAPIN: And there are some mandated ones.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Some, but so what? Are you trying to show that there is less abuse than those...?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that would be one....

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Lower rate of abuse.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Is there a correlation between the existence of verification or screening requirements, and a lower level of abuse?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I think that's really [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: And I was involved in a study a year ago through my organization, the [inaudible] Foundation. And we looked at that a bit, just using survey method, and we're able to draw some conclusions about whether or not those who were proactive and actually did something on the frontend, would benefit by having less abuse complaints on the backend.

So I think...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But how are you going to do the comparison, right? Because you're not going to have like a dot bank with and a dot bank without.

DREW BAGLEY: Maybe what you would do is you look at registrars selling dot bank, and you would see if some have used those methods and some don't perhaps, because of the different ways in which the ICANN requirements can be interpreted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But if you fall down the registry ultimately to...

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, but for the registry itself, right, I mean, because then it could be apples and oranges.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's going to be... I just wanted... My understanding from survey, from some research that's been done already that we [inaudible] ICANN has no right to registrar, this kind of information from registrars. So it may be hard to get that. I mean, I think it would be interesting to look at like that bank versus, you know, if there is like a dot finance...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, that's what I was thinking. There is some similar...

DREW BAGLEY: That's where we differentiae the categories. I think that's a great idea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...big enough, you know, mandatory, or you know, voluntary versus you know, sort of, you're fine as long as you're not kind of, you know, you... If you hold yourself out as [inaudible] you have to have all of those credentials.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So that's another, to be defined.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Five minutes to go.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. So maybe let's just, I think we're all going to have to look at this, and decide if there are things we need to flesh out. If there are things we're missing. So why don't we set as a deadline...? First of all, can we...? How do we circulate this?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Send it by email? [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: How does this get to this screen to our little hands? Can you send it to us?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are we sending Word documents? Or are we opening a webspaces?

LAUREEN KAPIN: [Inaudible] because I have no idea. For now, we're going to stick with email.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not email. I don't mind the email.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is it Word?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, it's not the Word. It's that we're fixing a piece of paper and we have to print it out or start drafting on it, and somebody makes one change, another one makes another, and then we have three versions, and that we need... We never find the latest version, and [CROSSTALK]...

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's where we are right now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are a lowly subgroup, so.

LAUREEN KAPIN: But I will adopt whatever fine solution Jonathan is able to identify. But for now, it's going to be lowly email. So we'll circulate this, and could

folks take a look at this and maybe circulate comments back to the group by what's reasonable? Wednesday? Would Wednesday be reasonable? Would Thursday be reasonable? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm leaving early, I make a stopover. I'm leaving Tuesday.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So what's reasonable?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Friday next week. [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Could you do it any sooner than Friday?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can.

LAUREEN KAPIN: How about Thursday? I'll compromise. Okay, next Thursday. By next Thursday. Whatever time you want to pick. By next Thursday at the close of your business day, how about that? Circulate that to the group comments and then we can, in Marrakesh maybe we can find the time to meet as a subgroup on the margins of Marrakesh.

I'll send around some proposed time. [CROSSTALK]

Well, let me check with Jonathon about whether any of that time is going to be devoted to subgroup work. If it is, we don't need to add any. If it isn't, we may need to add. So I don't know.

I'm just going to add.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Don't we have 18 months? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Why are you making it longer? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, I heard a year was not realistic...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not realistic [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Anyway, I will check on that. Seeing your widened eyes [inaudible] extra time. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think two days of my Marrakesh time [LAUGHTER AND CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Anyway, if it's already in discussion, then we don't need to add to the schedule. I have no interest in adding if we don't need to. So let's ask that. Are there any other questions we want to ask Jonathon when we get back to the big group? No?

Any other thoughts before we draw to a close?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe just one thought, is that we have [inaudible] the group has been set, maybe we share the documents to come? We can create another column with what kind of data we might be collecting.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's a great idea. [CROSSTALK]

I think that's a great idea. Good. Okay, so I just want to say, for the record, that I'm relieved to leave two minutes early for the break. [CROSSTALK]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]