

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hey everyone. So it's not a minute pass the hour, it's a good time to get the call started. This is Eleeza speaking. Glad to see you all on here again, and hope you all are settled back in after our meeting in Marrakesh. Megan, we're glad to see you on here, and glad to hear that [inaudible].

I just wanted to quickly say the agenda. We have a number of different housekeeping and update items. Just a moment, seems like [inaudible] don't seem to have audio. Make sure that we get that fixed.

I'm assuming everyone else can hear all right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I hear you fine.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay good. All right, I'll just keep going and hopefully [inaudible] will sort that out. So we have a number of housekeeping items that I have listed on the agenda that you should be, just a few minutes. Quick update. And then at Jonathan's request, we're going to spend the bulk of our time kind of picking up the prioritizing exercise that we started in Marrakech to identify areas with the group can work on first, and to coordinate a little bit better with the GNSO PDP working group, which had their most recent call on Wednesday.

---

*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.*

---

I had asked Carlos if he can give us an update on that, because I know he was on that call yesterday. I didn't hear back from him and I'm not seeing him in the room, so I might be able to do a quick recap myself, but hopefully Carlos will be able to join later on.

So the first point on our agenda is an update on the next face to face from Alice, who has been talking to our meetings team. Alice, would you mind?

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes. Hi everyone. This is Alice Hansen. So essentially, we're now on two locations. The first one being in Amsterdam and the second one being in Washington. As you can see up on the screen, we are targeting mid-May for Amsterdam, and then early June for Washington. So we're still working with our meetings team to identify potential venues for these locations, but we're coming close to concrete proposals for you.

In the mean time what I would suggest is send a Doodle poll to the list and ask if you could just complete it and advise us on what your preference would be in terms of dates and location. So if you're in agreement with this, I'll take the action item to circulate a link right after this call.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay. Thank you Alice.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's Jonathan. So the other thing I want to raise is maybe not about this particular face to face, but we've had a couple of folks that haven't been able to make any of the face to face meetings thus far, and so I just want to raise the issue of trying to get onto our list of face to faces, perhaps meetings in India and/or South Africa, so the folks that can't make it to us we take the meeting to them.

So I just want to sort of put that out there that we should set an objective to get everybody into a face to face meeting as best as we can.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you for your comment Jonathan. So there is a number of factors that we need to take into consideration. We're looking into venues. One being the bandwidth, but also the equipment, AV and so on, because these meetings require a lot of logistical arrangements, especially for recording, transcripts, and so on.

So it's hard for us to find a location, but I will bring that idea back to the meetings team for future reference, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alice. I just, if we... I just don't want to leave two members of the team out altogether here, because we're not accommodating them

---

---

enough. That's all. So let me know if there is anything that I can do to help, checking out venues or anything like that.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay, thank you Jonathan.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Thank you Alice. Any other questions or comments on that?

All right. So Alice will send out that Doodle poll and we'll keep you all posted on what we find out from our meetings team. The next item on our agenda is just a quick note on your statements of interest. Margie, I think you're going to address this?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure, yes. Good morning everyone. As you recall, when we were in Marrakesh, we had the policy update to include the language that we've been discussing back and forth. The only action item here is based on that new policy, if any of you need to update your statements of interest, then please go ahead and do so.

As you may recall when you applied for the, to get appointed to the group, you submitted some paperwork with the application, one of them being a statement of interest. So I just wanted to use this time to just remind you that based on the new policy, if there is anything that you want to add or change to do go ahead do so.

---

We'll go ahead and circulate the list, the form so that you'll have that easy for you to fill in. Any questions about that?

Okay. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Great, thank you Margie.

So, I think I am up next. If you scroll down, I have a couple of slides on the Neilson consumer survey. And the analysis group economic study work. We've been working with our sub-team on finalizing the survey and the study, and I just wanted to get back to the full group on this, not everyone is in either both of the sub-team.

On the consumer survey, the last outstanding item we discussed on our last day in Marrakesh, David Taylor had suggested adding a couple of questions that got asked, a little bit more to the purpose of creating a website and what you expect to be the purpose of the site based on its TLD.

There are some language that David suggested in a conversation with David [inaudible] from Neilson, we [nicked?] question 7 65 because it was a bit similar to what David was suggesting. And that was changed to the language you see here in front of you.

[Inaudible]... Getting a lot of feedback. I think it's Dan, if you could go on mute? I think it's coming from your line.

We also added a question 8 90 further down, which got a little bit deeper into this question as well, and this a new question, again, based

---

on David's language that Neilson helped refine a little bit. So I just wanted to share these to you, and let you know that we told Neilson these were the last updates as we agreed on as a team.

They have begun their translation work, and will be fielding the survey within probably the next week or two. So thank you everyone for your help in getting this put together, and we're really looking forward to seeing what the results look like.

Any questions on this?

Okay. So the next update has to do with the analysis group and their economic study. I circulated to the competition sub-team, the data request that analysis group will be sending out. There were a couple of additions based on our conversations in Marrakesh with [inaudible]...

And Dan had suggested two more additions, which you see here. One whether third level domains are available. The names at the third level, are they available at [inaudible] information as well as whether any names are offered for free and what the qualifying criteria are for free names.

So I think those will provide us with some interesting insights as well. So again, we're treating these as the final versions of the data request the analysis group is going to send out to registries and registrars. ICANN is planning to send out kind of a heads up letter to the registry and registrar stakeholder groups this week, so that they're aware that this is coming.

---

The requests are going to a smaller subset, a sample of registries and registrars, which I think they discussed with you, but in order to ensure confidentiality, we're not disclosing who is and who is not in the sample itself. I've also talked to Jonathan about maybe reaching out more directly to registrars, and Jonathan that's something we can talk about more here now, or talk about further with the competition team on their next call, which I think would be next Wednesday.

But that's where things stand with the analysis.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is Jonathan. I don't think there is anything that we need to discuss. I think the request is going to be the request, and we're all going to try to do as much as possible the back channels to our friend and registrar community to, you know, make them more charitable to the requests.

So I think the request is a result of our noodling in this group, and then everyone will be working behind the scenes as much as we can to get the registrars to be responsible.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I think that would be great. Thank you. Any other questions or comments on that topic?

Okay. I will just scroll back up to the agenda here. So the next item we just wanted to bring to your attention, and unfortunately I don't have the link to this yet, I don't think it has been posted, but a letter was sent from the ICANN Board yesterday to Jonathan as the Chair of the review

---

team, and to the three chairs of the GNSO PDP working group, regarding picks reviews.

Jonathan, I don't know if you wanted to say a few words about this. We were hoping to send out a link to a letter beforehand, or you could forward the letter yourself. But wanted to just make sure everyone knew about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza, I don't think I received it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I saw you on an email that it had went out. I'm sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe I got it, because at one point you said you were going to forward it to me again or something. Everyone else had seemed to see it [CROSSTALK] letter or something else. But doing a quick search, I don't see it in my inbox.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, I will forward it to you right now, but I will just give a quick overview of the letter.

In short, it basically resulted from a conversation that the ICANN Board had with the GAC and the ALAC, suggesting a review of picks safeguard. And the Board's response was that a full review would be difficult, just in terms of community resources that are already devoted to some of



---

the other reviews and some of the other activities that are going on, the Board suggested that this was a topic area that the review team and the PDP working group was already intending to include in their work and suggested this particular area of work be focused on these two groups.

And sort of reassuring the GAC and the ALAC that that is, that's the plan moving forward and that's where that issue will be addressed.

And I will be sure that the letter is forwarded to the review team after this call.

JONATAHN ZUCK: Okay, so I mean the net is that it's our responsibility to take a look at it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. That's correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Which I believe it is already planned, but it was kind of an...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just amazed at how much discussion has been about a letter that I never got.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry. I thought...

JONATHAN ZUCK: The entire world has asked me about this letter.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, I see your hand raised.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So this is Jordyn Buchannan. My reading of the letter is that the GAC and the ALAC were asking for review of the picks. The Board said that some combination of the CCTRT and the subsequent procedures, PDP, would be looking at this and you know, essentially why don't you wait and see if those groups take a look at this before you decide, before we try to like have an independent review.

I think we're planning... My understanding is planning on looking at that already, but it also the Board letter, the letter from Steve Crocker, does commend both us and/or the subsequent procedures, PDP to take a look at this topic. And so it's certainly, I don't think we're obliged to consider an argument if we thought that the subsequent procedures, PDP was going to look at it instead.

Having said that, I think we're probably going to look at that anyways. I just don't think we should view it necessarily as, has to be us. It could be either us or the subsequent procedures PDP.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you Jordyn. Yeah, I think that makes sense, like it is an either/or, it might be an either/or but it is kind of up to both groups, but I think the intention is that one of these groups will look at it, or have indicated an interest in reviewing the topics.

So we see the letter now, and some of you, we will make sure that this is circulated to the list as well.

Any other questions or comments on that topic?

Okay.

If we can go back to our agenda slide. The next item was revisiting our terms of reference and work plan documents. So actually may be we can pull up our terms of reference document now?

Jonathan, you want to take over here?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. So I mean, we've gone through a couple of revisions on this, and then as we say in Washington, D.C., things were overtaken by events or OBE. But we want to just finally adopt the terms of reference and work plan. One of the areas that we went around and circled on a little bit was on the definition of consumer, and I think where we landing is kind of where we began, which was defining consumers as either registrar to potential registrant, and Internet end users.

But added to that, the notion that it could be a government agency, or a business, that fell under the definition of consumers that we had laid out. So if we go down to, I don't know if everybody has scroll control...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We should, it's not synched.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, okay. So if you go down to definitions, you could see the consumers fall generally into two categories, registrants and scheduled registrants. And, I just lost the paragraph I was reading. And Internet users and I can't read it anymore, but that are expecting resolutions that happen online such as email and trying to get to a webpage.

And so under that end user, well under both definitions, you could see how government agencies, law enforcement, and businesses will fall under those definitions as well.

So that's the primary change from the last version that we've had on which we had broad consensus, and so I'm hoping that we can form up around this and formally adopt these terms of reference, and move on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So this is Laureen, Jonathan. Actually I think it doesn't quite reflect our last discussion that I sent around text in the chat to what I thought did reflect our last discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I don't have chat right now.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So I can... I'm happy to also read it out loud. But basically we had, in our last draft, this according to minor versions, we had had consumer being defined as a natural person, and this is taken from the UN guidelines on the recently passed UN guidelines on consumer protection, the conventional definition.

Generally referring to a natural person, I think primarily for personal family or household purposes, and may, depending on the context, include businesses and government agencies as well. And then we had switched the order of the Internet users and registrants. So we had for the purposes of this review, consumers generally fall into two categories.

One, Internet users and other market participants who make use of domains through DNS resolution, let me get to... DNS resolution such as by navigating to a URL or sending an email. And two, registrants and then in parenthesis, potential registrants. That seemed to me to be, based on my notes and recollection, where we ended up.

And then there had been debate and discussion about certain additions that Drew, and Megan, and I had also added. My recollection was there wasn't consensus for those, but I'm happy to open it up to the group, if their recollection is different or if anyone wants to make any other last crest for anything that they believe is essential.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is Jonathan. I'm certainly fine with what you just read.

Is there anyone else that has an issue that they want to raise on this?

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew for the record. I like Laureen's definition. I think that will work, and I like the fact that it actually comes from an authoritative source.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So let's... Is there anyone who is opposed?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible], I just had a really minor point, I think. Consumer trust has four problems, but it's numbered one, two, four, five. So maybe someone needs to clean that up, but I don't think it's material.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I will take care of that.

Any objections to that definition of consumer?

We probably don't need to say consumer twice.

Okay. Does anybody else have any objections to the document with those changes? Can we adopt this as our terms of reference? Laureen and Jordyn, I'm assuming those are old hands.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. I don't know a process-wise, but and maybe somebody from staff knows the answer to this, this is like one of the few times where we all need to have consensus something, I guess, and I don't know what consensus represents in the groups, and whether or not we have sufficient quorum on this call to make this, or do we have to put this up for vote?

We have pretty good participation on the call today.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Margie's hand is raised.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, this is Margie. There is no defined level of consensus. I think you might want to use the approach, as chairs, that the community is used to, probably what the GNSO generally does. And if we don't have enough coverage on the call, I think we've got pretty good representation. We could always send it out to the list for confirmation, but you know, you can take a different approach.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I think we've got good coverage. I mean there is 17 numbers, and we have...

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 11.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We have 11 people on the call?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, 11 members are present.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. All right, so I guess we'll, I'll say provisionally that this is adopted. We'll put it out to the list for objections. And then and take silence as consent on the group for adoption of the terms of reference.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great, that sounds good. To the other document that remains for discussion then is the work plan, which we didn't really make any changes to. Wondering if my team can upload that document? The only thing, I think, we would change would be our, the timeline because now we have kind of a better of schedules going forward. And we didn't really list very many milestones in there.

We could list some more if there are any from the sub-teams, but we can kind of use that timeline as a suggested timeline going forward and go from there. I don't know if there were any other comments, or questions, or edits you wanted to make to the work plan, Jonathan, if you had taken a look at that.

This would be the review call timeline.



JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So I mean, this maybe the first time that some of the folks have seen the review calls schedule. So it might be worth going over that. That just got finalized yesterday. So, I don't know if you want to talk us through that, someone on staff. Jordyn, do you want to speak up?

JORDYN BUCHANNAN: So I'm just beginning the work plan itself, though work plan currently envisions, has a number of milestones, internally envisions completion of the final report in December, which makes me really happy if we can do that, but I think I've gathered that we're actually targeting a later date for the final report.

So I think the general framework of the work plan is fine. I think the schedule, and it probably is not fine. And so we either need to revise the schedule somehow or pull it out. I mean, I would also suggest that we have like a separate living document, that's what I sort of planned milestones and schedule and so on look like, that's not subject to formal review in advance, but we keep up to date as a project management tool, and that we make transparent to the community as well.

But if we're going to bake a schedule into the work plan, then I think it needs to be more accurate than the one that we've got up there right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone else have any thoughts on that? I'm inclined to agree with Jordyn that the... I mean, we've been trying to keep the schedule as it

---

---

was originally proposed, but sort of in winking at everyone with the possibility that it would take longer, but making post it dates, and we exclusively schedule out into a separate open document may be the best approach to handle that, so that it can be more of a living and organic document.

Carlos, you asked about where are we in terms of using a tool for scheduling?

So I don't know what you mean by that question. We had in our face to face in Marrakesh, we had a conversation with staff and they had tools that they used to generate dependencies and [inaudible] charts and [inaudible] charts, etc. that they can keep published as we make changes, or as deadlines slipped, etc. But I don't know that we talked ourselves about documenting tools specifically for scheduling.

That's the... Does that sound right to you? Does that ring a bell?

Okay, great. So yes, so the schedule changes will funnel through staff. And then they will publish the schedule in, out of their project management system on a periodic basis when there are changes to the schedule to make those public. Does that make sense to everyone?

Margie, you have got your hand up.

MARGIE MILAM:

Yeah. I have a suggestion. So once we update this document that's on the screen with the more realistic dates, we can then kind of take that and start building out with the project management tool that we have at ICANN, to start fleshing out, you know, how we get there.

---

But probably the best thing to do would be to kind of get an [inaudible] from what do we think the realistic date is for publishing the GAC report, and then we can kind of work backwards as we take into account, you know, how long public comment needs to be, how much it takes to analyze things, you know, that sort of thing.

And we can, you know, take that as an action item, once we get a good sense of where you think the endpoint is, and then share that with the group.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Margie. So I think what we've been saying offhand is that it's probably an 18 month turnaround rather than a 12 month turnaround, but that's somewhat arbitrary. But I think that seemed to the group like a more realistic schedule given the amount of work to be done, and also some of the dependencies associated with additional data requests, and getting back results of phase two of this survey from the study, etc.

That we're talking to the competition team about, you know, waiting on the results of the registrant survey of phase two, where we're going to ask additional questions about alternative Internet identities, and whether that would lead to another study, etc. So I think there is just some dependencies that will mean that 18 months is probably a more realistic objective than 12.

---

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, so using as that as the day, are we assuming then that the June meeting of that year would be the right, I guess, next year, would be the right date?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, let's shoot for that.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay, okay. Then we'll go ahead and see, try to start filling in some of the details of a project plan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Margie.

And so, barring that, other than pulling the schedule out and keeping it separate, are there any other issues with regards to the work plan that people would like to raise?

Jordyn said it looks good. I didn't hear anything from anybody else. So I think, again, with the caveat that we'll pull the schedule itself out into its own, into the project management software and keep that as an organic document, we'll keep track of dependencies and such things, then I think the work plan is again, tentatively agreed to, and we'll pull it out to the list for objections, otherwise consider it adopted.

Before we jump to the next topic in the agenda, I wanted to briefly mention slack. We talked about it in the Marrakesh meeting. We looked at a couple of different alternatives for team communication

---

management. One that Megan had pointed us to that was created by the European Commission. It was more of a forum based approach. And then slack which is sort of an instant messaging based approach.

And then we settled on slack for a variety of reasons. And so we will be working together with ICANN staff to put slack in place for everyone, and I'm happy to do some kind of walkthrough or someone from staff can. It will basically take the place of group emails. Your schedules for the meetings will still come as regular schedule requests via email.

And as I mentioned to Carlos, it's not a scheduling tool, it's really just a communication tool, so that we can easily go back and find where we are in various conversations. So that's something we hope to get going here over the next week or so.

And then Carlos, I guess you just got on. You asked a question about whether we were going to meet during, after, before ICANN 56, and Alice addressed this earlier and put up some dates either for Amsterdam or D.C. And we'll be getting a Doodle poll that will be going out shortly, so that people can express their preferences for when and where they would like to meet prior to Helsinki.

Carlos, you'd be happy to know I raised the issue of trying to meet closer to India and South Africa, for the benefit for some participants that have had trouble making it. And ICANN staff are looking into that as well.

Any other questions? On sort of work plan or housekeeping, meetings? I think the other thing on which we were able to reach full consensus in Marrakesh, is that we don't want to have any more face to faces during

---

ICANN meetings. People were pulled into different directions and there seemed to be real consensus on that point. So we'll work around that in the future.

DAVID TAYLOR: David here, if I may, just quickly? Or does everyone go?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm still here David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Oh, you can hear me. Sorry, there was such a long silence, I thought I would fill it. Just on the venue as well, following up on what you said that with Carson and I, because we had that discussion with you and I've spoken to Calvin as well and he, for a South Africa option, just so staff know, and he thought that he could certainly help host something if we wanted to do something there, just so you've got that data point.

I don't know if Calvin is on the call. I'm not sure whether he is or not, but do reach out to him. We sort of discussed even our numbers, so he would be more than happy to host.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you David. This is Eleeza. I think I started speaking earlier and I was on mute. So...

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: That may have happened to me too.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I felt pretty bad. So I wanted to return to our agenda, to the last portion, which was to focus on the application and evaluation process portion of the review. The... I thought we could start off this discussion by having Carlos give us an update on the PDP working group, which met on Monday. Carlos, I reached out to you on this, but I'm not sure if you saw my message in time.

So I'm sorry to bring it on you now, but I thought it would be helpful for the group to hear a bit more about what happened on that call, and what that purpose planning. So Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello can you, can you hear me?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, loud and clear.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello? Okay, thank you very much. I don't know if we are recording, I had trouble to setting this up. If we're recording, this is Carlos for the record. We had a very good call. The question of relation with other working groups like ours was raised very early in the call by Alan Greenberg, the Chair of ALAC.

---

And Carlton and myself who were on the call were able to tell him that communication is very important there. And we're all aware about that, and we'll rely on a good communication between the chairs of both groups.

Then they started presenting the same presentation we had in Marrakesh. A little bit more detailed. And it starts with a very good chart, a very good page of the presentation with a very clear hierarchy of what they're looking at, and our review team is mentioned in point number three or four, so very early in the list. I can look at the page again, it's number three.

And then they started discussing in the subgroups, but we were able to discuss only two of the subgroups, if I remember right Eleeza. And the subgroups was done by Jeff Newman, and it was very thorough, very interesting. It's a very, very long list of issues.

And the rhythm of the call is very fast. We're going to have another call on Monday, which I can't be because of the time shift, neither can Carlton because he's flying to New York, so we have a hole there. I hope Eleeza can participate at least.

And my general feeling to open it up for questions is that they are going to have a much slower pace than we are going to have. If that helps Jordan. It's a much slower process. For example, they have on the list a question about the use of the reserve proceeds of the applications and so on. They were not aware that we had already covered that point with a very good presentation by Xavier in Marrakesh.



---

Then after the call, I think it was yesterday, it was a very long brief by ICANN's Chairman of the Board, Steve Crocker, on the relationship between the different efforts and groups. So generally, I think there is a very, very high level of awareness about possible overlaps, and there are no negative issues we just have to continue participating as, between the chairs and liaisons, and I'm ready to participate in all calls, but next Monday.

And we have to keep our ears open. I have no worry, as I said in Marrakesh, we're looking back at what has happened. They have a much longer list of complaints, much more detailed issues. And so I'm ready to keep you posted and up to date on these issues. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you Carlos. We've uploaded that slide deck from Monday's discussion, if it might your, a couple of you to see how they're organizing their conversation. Larueen, I see your hand raised.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah, Carlos, I had just a question. When you say a much longer timeframe, I'm just wondering what you think the [inaudible], if you have any sense of when you say much longer? Are we talking two years? Are we talking six months longer? I'm just curious if you had a more defined sense of what the timeframe is?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, of course, Laureen. The structure of the PDP is to create sub-streams or working groups, they have not agreed on the word. And

---

there are some issues in some of the sub-groups that are really beyond the PDP I would say. So, I don't know how strong the working groups will be, because that will, of course, dilute forces.

Right now the group is huge, alone in the cold, 50 people were in the call, but the moment it goes into subgroups, it becomes more difficult because there are some thorny issues in some of the subgroups. For example, one I'm very close to is country and territory names and geographic names, and so on.

We really need inputs of other constituencies like the GAC and so on. So I can't say how long it would be, but you know, an average of full PDPs, PDP cycle is at least 18 months. And the way this one looks, I wouldn't assume it would be faster with that. This is a statistic I checked, I don't know. That we checked two years ago.

So really, 18 months is like a very reasonable time. So I think we're looking here at a two year cycle, if everything goes with the same speed as going. And but the most important thing is I think we are making a stop and looking at, okay, how good, how far has the new round progressed by today, and what has hindered a better progress and so on.

And we're not going to get into the level of the tail of some of the issues, particularly issues where there are no data, no numbers. I hope this helps.

LARUEEN KAPIN:

Thanks, that is helpful Carlos.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Carlos. Are there any other questions for Carlos?

So this is... Laureen, that's an old hand I assume.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, the primary area for overlap is a radically, the portion of our review that will probably be in some ways, the least data driven, which is the application and evaluation process portion of our review. So it's kind of important to remember that we have a review.

Somebody doesn't, isn't on mute. And has a child in the background, I think.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's me, I'm sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so, I don't think, and I guess this is a reasonable for us to discuss. It's not clear to me that there is a connection between the application and the evaluation process of our review, and our analysis of consumer trust competition and consumer choice. So it's not immediately apparent to me that the lens through which we should be looking at the

---

---

application evaluation process, is a CCT lens, but it is that a separate, you know, portion of the review.

So I feel like we should have that conversation to some extent, because it helps us define scope. And I see there are some hands coming up. So what I wanted to do for the next hour, is to begin the conversation, and I think maybe even using the slide deck from the PDP presentation yesterday, and look at some of the issues that were raised.

And I think we can, with some [inaudible], find the things that are not going to be high priority issues for this group, or that go into a level of detail that we would consider to be policy implementation and not the purview of the review. And then try to come up with a kind of prioritized list that says that, that performs a kind of risk assessment, that says we are going to look at these things, with the areas that we just said are going to be lower risk for contradiction down the road, and a lower risk for the PDP review process to proceed.

So that we can convey some confidence to the PDP working group, that there are areas that are lower risk than others as they proceed down their own review process. I think it's not enough to say they're looking, that we're looking backward and they're looking forward because the entire first half of what they're going to be doing involves looking backward as well.

So the problem is about the findings portion of both of our review processes, and what will happen when there is conflicts between them. So for that, I'll open it up to discussion. Carlos and Larueen, are those new hands or are they old hands?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry, I thought I had lowered.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, my hand is not raised.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then Carlos, your hand is not raised either?

Okay. Then maybe I'm not, maybe it's a connectivity problem. I apologize. So is anyone's hand raised that maybe I'm not seeing?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't see any in the room right now Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thank you. So can I, I take that to assume that what I just said makes sense, and that we should go through the process that way, and do kind of a risk assessment, that we can then, that I can then take to Jeff and Steven and Avri to, you know, talk about where we are with respect to their lists? Does that make sense?

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, it makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. I'm sorry, I'm under the weather here. So, I think the best place to start is probably on the work stream one slide, which is slide number five. Does everybody have scroll control now?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We're going to upload those slides again. I think you're seeing an old screen Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh am I? Okay, should I try to do a refresh maybe?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You might want to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, hang on. I have to upgrade my parent's Internet connection, obviously here.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: If I may Jonathan, I just want to, I could check page number three in this list that I consider is a very, very good, very good guideline to keeping minds, and we're pretty up high in the list. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So we can look...

Hang on.

Are you giving everyone independent scroll control, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, everyone should have scroll control.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So following Carlos's recommendation, if we go to slide three, overall questions... You can see that the very first question is probably outside of our purview, about whether or not there should be [inaudible] procedures.

My understand that the purpose of our review is to say that if and when there are, it would be better if these reforms were in place, you know, prior to additional procedures, or something along those lines. But that we've not been asked to assess whether or not there ought to be for the procedures.

So that's certainly a question for that PDP and not for us.

But here is where it gets a little bit complicated. It's things like predictability, separated out from consumer trust, for example. I think starts to become an interesting problem. I think, again, as we look at our review process, we have a separate portion of the review which is, in fact, looking at the application evaluation process.

---

And so the note the degree to which the implementation, you know, enhanced or discouraged those objectives, I think is a big portion of what we're reviewing, but in a separate portion that about the application evaluation process, will be looking at other questions as well.

Predictability, etc. because there was a big issue among our group about whether or not the process was sufficiently open and available to developing world, for example. So there is going to be a number of different areas for evaluation that cut through a number of these questions about predictability, community engagement, etc.

So that's, I think, going to be where a lot of the overlap potentially occurs. One of the questions on slide there they have is on TLD differentiation. There is a one size fits all approach [inaudible], community, etc.

And I know, and I may be ask Jordyn to speak to this a little bit. This came up a little bit in the competition arena about when we were doing our own prioritization exercise, and maybe Jordyn, you can share a little bit about the conversation that took place, with respect to, you know, the differentiation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, certainly. I think we ended up putting this on our lower priority set of questions. It was something that was flagged, for example, you know, do GOs or community TLDs have an advantage or a disadvantage when it comes to competition or providing consumer choice? And



---

decided that just in the interest of prioritization, that we move that to the lower prioritization tier.

I think there is not many... The GOs, I think, are the one category of TLDs that you could probably take a reasonable look at right now, in that there is a sufficiently large number of them that had actually launched, that you could perhaps draw some conclusions about their advocacy versus other types of TLDs.

The brands and communities, I think in general, very few of them have launched at this point. And so I think it would be very hard to draw conclusions. So at least in the competition and consumer choice analysis, I think we decided that we weren't going to... We were going to look at other modes of competition as opposed to what kind of TLD it was.

It may end up showing up a little bit in some of the lenses that we look at the market analysis. So for example, when we say, if we've got a geographic based market analysis and we said, what are the TLDs that people in Germany would want to register? You know, some of the GO TLDs might show up there as a result. But I think that's through the lens of the market analysis, not really focusing on what type of TLD that it is per se.

So that's what where we landed on the competition and consumer choice. I do think that this seems like a topic area that we could probably in general defer to the... It's a big chunk of topic that I think there is a lot of policy latent in it, and there is not a lot of data to try yet.

---

So I would in general say this might be a good area for us to defer to the subsequent procedures, PDP.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. I mean, [inaudible] to the finish line on that conversation. Hopefully not too quickly for the group, but the... I think the issue here is that there are a number people in the group that are concerned about us simply letting things go and deciding not to review them, feels early in the game to do that, etc.

And so I think that's why we're talking about this in terms of risk, that we're not going to shy away from exploring some of these issues, so that we can communicate to the team that we think there is a low likelihood that they'll have a significant impact on our review.

And I think that that's the lens through which we're going to try to look at some of these issues and communicate the results of the PDPs so that they can kind of go full steam ahead, and with a lower risk of conflict, you know, a year from now when we're both pretty deep into our report.

Carlos, is that a hand up?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, this is a new hand. I like very much the way Jordyn put it. I like very much the way Jordyn just put it. I mean, there are some issues where we have elements, or data, or cases to discuss. There are areas where probably we don't have this information or we would lose time. I

---

would like very much, this kind of benchmark that he mentioned. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Carlos. Again, the only caveat out there is that I don't know that the application evaluation portion of our review will be quite as intensive as the other parts of the review, the CCT portion of the review, but if there is not evidence for us to make an evaluation of them generally, then I think that again, we can make it a fairly low risk discussion with the PDP.

Are there other questions about that particular issue?

So we had, when we had a conversation in Marrakesh, admit with a subset of people, there was some discussion about brand TLDs generally and you know TLD separation, as being lower priorities for us. And so, is there some general agreement that that's probably a lower risk area for the PDP process to proceed, in parallel to ours with a low list of conflict down the road.

And I've just lost connectivity again. So Eleeza or somebody, if you could tell me if there is a hand up or something like that, please let me know. It looks like an old hand from Carlos.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I don't see any hands up at the moment right now.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Great. Okay, so if we go to the next slide here, the, slide four of Jeff's slides. As Carlos mentioned in his review, things are pretty specific, and in this presentation, and there is going to be areas where they're diving into a level of specificity that we may not in our review.

But because we're looking at this thing through a different kind of lens, so if you recall, as we looked at some big questions we were going to ask about the process, one of which came up quite a bit was serving the developing world, and so rather than asking the general question about whether the applicant guidebook is the right implementation of the recommendations for all parties, I think that we would probably try to look at this through the lens of the larger questions that we came up with as part of our review priorities.

And so a large portion of this we have through the developing world, and so that we might turn this around and say, you know, that the application, guide to applicant guide book is a sufficient communication tool for underserved communities in the developing world, for example.

The clarity of the application process, you know, things like that. And so, part of this may come down to carving out specific portions of these questions that we have established a high priority on.

And again, things like accreditation programs, I don't think that we'll be getting linked to that level of detail [inaudible]... Although they may come up in discussions about the accessibility and the availability of the application of the evaluation process in the developing world.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn has his hand raised Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who does?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Jonathan. It's Jordyn Buchanan. So, on the one hand, I feel like this is an insane level of detail for either the CCTOT or the policy development process to be taking a look at. A lot of this seems just purely like implementation questions.

I do feel like there is going to be a lot of overlap in terms of the initial, to the extent that we can call it data, the anecdote gathering process. In our review of the application process versus the topics that the subsequent procedures, PDP, seems to be interested in looking at here.

So it strikes me that this sort of area, which I'll describe as applicant experience, at least the first two sub-bullets here, I think that's also an area that we had identified that we were concerned about. This just strikes me as an area that we really need to work very closely with the subsequent procedures, PDP to figure out essentially how we're going to go to applicants and/or staff.

---

I think the staff side may already be largely covered the implementation review, but certainly the applicant side. How are we going to learn about their experiences, I think we'd want to do that in collaboration with the subsequent procedures, PDP group, such that we can just do a single pass.

And I just think there is going to be no way to do that either than to either, you know, do interviews collaboratively, or put the other questionnaire that someone else administers collaboratively, etc.

So I think we'll figuring out how to split this stuff up, but the initial pass like talking to folks, I think would definitely... I don't think it would be impossible to split it up, we're just going to have to do it combined.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, thanks Jordyn. Anyone else have a comment about that?

So I mean, I guess what that adds is another category of item for this initial pass through which is items for closer collaboration, or something like that.

I'm sorry I don't have a better idea up front about how to organize this particular process, so thanks Jordyn. I think that's a good recommendation. So let's try to capture that notion of another category. So low risk, high risk, and then also just an area in which we just need closer collaboration, like pulling the survey together, conducting interviews together, or something like that.

Any other questions? I can't see anything in the Adobe Connect.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: There are no raised hands.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, thank you. Okay.

So then that's probably this, as you say, the applicant experience probably falls in that category.

This might just be too hard to walk through piece by piece because it is such a level of detail. It may be something that it's just worth just taking a pass at and circulating around the group.

Sorry, I'm just reading.

MARGIE MILAM: Jonathan, it's Margie. Can I make a suggestion?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

MARGIE MILAM: If it's helpful, we could create some sort of, I don't know, poll or something. Maybe I'll ask [inaudible] about how this might work, where you could prioritize... Like we can just put these items that are in the PowerPoint and assign, and have everyone assign a priority level to them, you know? Like a one, a two, or three or something like that, and

---

then come back to the group on the ones that didn't seem to have any interest.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right. I think that makes sense. The other thing that might make sense is sort of creating like a cross hatch with the priorities, the questions that we decided were priority questions for this portion of our review as well. And that that might be a good initial filter, right?

I mean, I think there is probably some things that this reveals that we didn't think of and that we're going to want to make priority in our review, that doesn't, in large measure, our own brainstorm about our priorities will help guide, you know, which of these areas are least likely to delve into too deeply.

So some kind of a document that goes across... Sorry?

MARGIE MILAM:

So you're thinking some kind of mapping document that matches this, our list of issues that were developed by the various sub-teams, and then identify the ones that obviously are outside that. That could be a helpful tool as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. And so then, and then because again, I think some of this had to do with whether or not the issue itself is important, but also how we will be approaching the issue. You know, the applicant experience, we may be less concern about what it was generally and more about



---

how specific communities were affected by it, for example. And so we need to...

We may be doing a different type of analysis of it, talking to different types of applicants. We may be more inclined to be talking to people who didn't apply, or who dropped out of the process, and more so than people that went through the process, just sounded frustrating.

So I mean, I think that is part of what would come out of that exercise.

And that may be the best way to get through this.

So developing one, the best [inaudible] GAC advice was another one for us. I know that string confusion was an issue [inaudible]...

We've got a lot of feedback on the line now it sounds like.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Jonathan, may I?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, please go ahead Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, the GAC advice, we should refer to the letter by Steve Crocker directed to you and the chairs of the PDP. Because I think this is a rather relevant issue that we cannot put aside.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh for sure. You mean the letter from...

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, exactly. I think it came out yesterday and so this would could not avoid having our list...

JONATHAN ZUCK: No agree. I mean, I think we were already planning on incorporating that into our review. I'm not just, coming off the top of my head, trying to remember what the issue areas that were, that we had raised already.

There was a question about communities, there was a question about confusion. You know, question about the best way to absorb GAC advice, what's the best way to do that, for example. So we just need to get back to that, back to that list.

And then see if there is areas that we want to expand on that list based on the brainstorming that the PDP guys did, that may point to areas that... I know they did raise the areas of competition that we hadn't thought of, for example, and so we need to make sure that we're incorporating on this as well.

Universal acceptance was a big part of consumer choice, for example.

So yes, Margie, if you guys can help with the document like that I think it may prove a better exercise than going through this slide presentation, which is what I thought we would do.

MARGIE MILAM:                   Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                Just because I think it's too.... I think we want to look at this through the lens of our priority.

Do other people have other recommendations associated with this? I may close this topic down until we can get that organized. I apologize for not being more on top of this. It's sort of a dynamic issue. And I'm at a dynamic [inaudible] at the moment.

So I think we have some agreement on what our approach should be in terms of the framework for discussion with the PDP folks.

High and low risk areas of overlap, and then areas of the need for strong cooperation so that we're going to try and go through and interview applicants, and things like that, we find a way to do it together, from further areas that fall into that category as well.

Are there any other categorizations that people think that we should add to that framework? Is everybody happy with that? Because otherwise what I think we will do is maybe close this topic for now and try to get this organized more around our priority list, and then we open it on the, and circulate it on the list and reopen it on the next call.

I don't see anybody's hand up. Who knows, I haven't been in the room for half an hour, so.

---

Jordyn says circulate it on slack? Yes. Jordyn, have you logged into slack yet?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I have. It looks like Laureen and I are the only two that have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're the only ones invited so far.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I need to turn you into an admin and then you need to add channels.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. All right, so we will get slack up and running here in the next few days as well. I'm talking to staff, I believe, on Friday about what they need to do on their end. So no one else has received an invite, Carlos. We were just trying to get it setup.

Okay. So, I know that we have a lot more time left on the call, but I just, I may just make a command decision here that we let this go for the time being unless anybody has any objection, and so we can organize

---

the topics in a way that's more suitable to us. And call it on the call. Is everyone comfortable with that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yup.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right folks. Thank you. I'll go through these with staff and we'll come over the document, [inaudible] some more central questions, and we'll circulate it and bring it up on the next call. Other than that, we'll get slack up and running, and we should have that running before the next call. And then the sub-teams will be meeting next week.

Does that sound right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jonathan, this is Eleeza. The sub-team, yes, will be meeting next week, and I think we'll circulate a schedule of calls to the group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Megan, we'll probably schedule some kind of a special session for training on slack. That would be an easy thing to do. So everyone have a happy holy tomorrow, and get yourselves covered in pain. And then

---

for those of you that celebrate Easter, put paint on the egg. Thanks everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**