

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Greetings, everyone. Thanks for being on the call. Those that were on last week, I apologize for sort of a void in the call in the middle but it turns out I had the flu and it was all just too much. But welcome to this call. We'll pick up where we left off. We will take attendance from the Adobe Connect room. Is there anyone that's on the phone that's not on the Adobe Connect so we can make sure we have you in attendance in the meeting?

DAVID TAYLOR: All right, Jonathan. I'm on the phone but yet on the – oh, I am now in Adobe Connect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You are. Anyone else who's just on the phone?

RAVI SHANKAR: Hello, Jonathan. I'm just on the phone and not on the Adobe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. So staff, please record that Ravi's participating on the call. And are there any updates to statements of interest? Okay. So let's dive right in.

I think the first thing on our agenda is to get some progress update. There were sub team calls last week for both the Competition and Choice Sub Team and the Safeguard and Trust Sub Team. I don't know

---

*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.*

---

who would like to go first but I'll just ask Laureen if she'd like to lead it off on giving us an update of how things are going to in the sub team and bring the rest of the team up to date.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. We had a good call last week. We continued to go through our –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did we just lose Laureen?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think we did.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Let's wait a little bit then. I don't want to just have Jordan launch in without her so we'll wait for her to try to get back on, I guess. Is she still on the Adobe Connect? Yeah, looks like she is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, Jonathan. She still is and I just disabled her mic. I mean, I just enabled her mic, excuse me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Enabled her mic.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Looks like she dropped out of the Adobe room.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Let me try to call her.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. If she wasn't ready to go, she just could have said so, very dramatic.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There she is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, can you hear via the Adobe Connect? Because if you can hear, we'll have [to] go ahead while you get connected.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, I think I'm reconnecting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You are. Great. Laureen, go ahead.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Sorry about that. Okay. So we had a productive call last week. We continued to go through our list of topic areas with an eye towards prioritizing them, which we in fact did. And we also came up with a reading list for our group so that we can look at potential data sources for our analysis. We now with the fine help of ICANN staff have a dedicated space on our part of the website where we can put that reading list, which includes the ICANN study that just came out on the DNS abuse and also includes the Secure Domain Foundation's paper on the business case for proactive anti-abuse and also a link to a – I'm not sure I'm pronouncing it properly, but a [Nujon] report concerning issues of consumer trust, among other things. So we continue to now think about what kind of timelines and deadlines we want to set for ourselves concerning our priority topics and also I think the reading list is going to help us with that.

I think that's about it. I'm still also hoping to get more information from our competition folks about how they're approaching this kind of interesting startup time where we're identifying data and waiting for data, and not quite analyzing data yet. So that's all for now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Laureen. I just want to ask you a little bit on substance as far as your prioritized list of topics. That might be the thing that's most interesting to the group. In other words, did anything fall off the list or how does that prioritization process turn out? What made the cut, what didn't, or what's likely to get deprioritized?

---

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Well, nothing fell off our list. I knew you were going to ask that question. Great. Alice [says] or some helpful staff person – I'm assuming it was Alice – had very helpfully put our document up on the screen. So what you can see is that our consumer end-user behavior was what our group prioritized as its first item and you can look at some of the bullet points within that list, public awareness of the new gTLDs, does the public know the difference between a legacy gTLD and a new gTLD? How new gTLDs impact user expectations and this goes to a lot of issues that I think David had raised in some of his prior comments about how the very name of a domain may create expectations. And, of course, that also funnels into the whole issue of domain names in regulated sectors and the specific safeguards that are connected to those.

And then you'll see that the issues delve a little bit into reporting problems and safeguards. And then further down within this same category, we have DNS abuse, of course, which is a huge issue, and consumer user behavior, registry privacy policies. So there's an awful, awful lot of topics within there and we probably still have more work to do to sequence those.

But then next you'll see we have [inaudible] CrunchBase, which has, is a whole host of separate topics dealing with outreach, funding, adequate access to assistance, the rules of the road, confidence that the process is fair, and then last, we have procedural issues, which include ICANN's role in enforcement of safeguards, public interest commitments, and dispute resolution processes.

And then, of course, we have like other categories for things that come up and some placeholders for data needs that we've identified.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great, Laureen, thanks. We do have a little bit of a conversation about the overlap, if you will, between the application and review process, and its emphasis on the developing world and where you guys were with respect to trust and safeguards in that same context. So it looks to me like you still have a lot of things in here that are about the application process, which seems more oriented towards the application process and less toward end-user trust, I guess.

But because we've defined consumers to include what we've, to include registrants. But I don't know that it's including registries. So I think we're trying to make that distinction. It might be worth trying to find a way to parse the developing countries section of this so that we divide it up into two efforts.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I agree and it may, in fact, make more sense for the issues that we've raised with the fairness of the application process to really be considered by the group as a whole when we deal with application process issues. So we're definitely open to sectioning that off as appropriate and perhaps refocusing more on how the new gTLDs are impacting the developing countries in terms of our efforts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I think that makes sense and maybe as we go over some of this in the application and review section of our discussion, if there were things that you guys came up with that we left out when we did our

---

---

brainstorming on the process, be sure and raise them and we'll get them into the list. And then you guys can focus on the end user stuff.

Does anybody else have questions or comments for Lauren? Either members of her team that have additional recollections or people that aren't on the sub team that have questions about these issues or things they'd like to add. Go ahead and raise your hand if you do. Or speak up if you're not on the Adobe Connect.

All right, Lauren. That was obviously a perfect presentation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bless you all, speechless.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just trying to recover.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks a lot, Lauren, for the update. And Jordyn, let's go to you. It's Jordyn Buchanan. Are you on mute, Jordyn? We're not hearing you. I think he's trying to get his microphone working. All right. Can we try to call Jordan then?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, Jonathan. I'll call him. I still have his number from yesterday.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. David, I doubt very much that computers inside Google can even navigate the thing.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm quite sure about that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Although I do remember a pretty funny news story where Google was [inaudible] see if Bing was trying to copy them, and they discovered that Bing [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan, [inaudible] if I speak like this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry?

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible] it's Megan speaking. I've been trying to test the microphone to see if you can actually hear me. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh. We can hear you just fine, Megan.



---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Oh, good. I was [inaudible] don't worry. I'm not going to say anything. [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: But you had promised us, Megan. We're going to have to add this to the trust, list of trust issues.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Exactly. Don't worry. I'll try to be quiet. I was taking advantage of the quiet here to say something.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hi, everyone. This is Jordyn Buchanan now on audio.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. Go for it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Now with two-way audio communication. Thanks, Jonathan. So the Competition and Consumer Choice Sub Team has spent most of the time since Marrakech taking a look at issues related to data gathering. I think right now staff is presenting a document that we've put together, which takes these set of questions, of high-level questions, that we identified that the sub team would like to address over the course of

---

[inaudible] the process of [inaudible] topics starting [to] identify what the [inaudible] around [inaudible] and the spreadsheet takes it one step further and starts to identify the specific data elements that we are interested in.

And then maps that to on the right hand side of this spreadsheet, which you can't see. Oh, yes, if you've scrolling powers, you might be able to. Yeah, you can see. Oh, no. This already is at L3, yeah. So each subtopic [inaudible] is an element of [inaudible] can actually...

So we've gone through this [inaudible] initially [inaudible] source piece that [inaudible]. In many cases, that data is either already available or is currently being collected or planned to be collected through the Analysis Group or Nielsen efforts. We've identified cases [inaudible]. We're still 100% [inaudible] to get the data. For example, the Analysis Group is [inaudible] these and [registries] for [inaudible] related to ccTLDs and [prices] respectively.

[inaudible] one of theirs [inaudible] and I think we're not very successful in getting [inaudible] enough set of ccTLD [inaudible] in this [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn, we're all having trouble hearing you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is definitely the only audio I have. I wonder if...

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: You sound better now. [How's] your audio signal?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let me look and see. I have many bars.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Well, you sound good now so just keep going.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I won't move from the spot, I guess. I will [inaudible]. In any case, I was hoping [inaudible] is the [inaudible] it obtained on ccTLD and registrar [inaudible] success. They're going to be looking [inaudible] that data and we will [inaudible] group of the [inaudible] more generally will be able to help reach out to those communities to get them involved with or get them more interested in participating in the Analysis Group study.

Other than that, we also went through a – [Stan] helped us go through a second exercise on data gathering, which was either [inaudible] where he started to map data elements into a basically [assessment] that will be able to [inaudible] the sub team where we identified specific [inaudible] and will specifically be [inaudible] silver bullet we [inaudible] appendix to the report or something like that, but it makes sure that we actually know how we're going to be using the data and how we'll lay it out at the end.

So once you finish this process [inaudible] I find [the data] sources, it will have to go through a similar exercise [inaudible] some [inaudible]

---

data with all the other analysis efforts that we think we're [inaudible] need to engage in as the next step. So that [inaudible] thing that we've been [inaudible] on the data gathering fronts. We had an initial [inaudible] last week's call to finalize what our data gathering would look like. However, I was very slow in putting together this spreadsheet so we were running a little bit behind schedule and we've now extended that to our next call a week from today for people to [inaudible] be able to allow this to go and actually [inaudible] the data [inaudible].

The other [inaudible] to be good on starting this week, [we] expect through the [inaudible] in early June is to start addressing the question of what are the definitions of market that [inaudible] using analysis. That I think is a very important question and [inaudible] worked out in the past I think [inaudible] whole has been sent the [inaudible] from several [inaudible] Analysis Group put together their own analysis on this in their initial study. We'll be making best efforts to identify probably not authoritative what definition is but [inaudible] few different [inaudible] and we will use that to then drive the rest of our work answering [inaudible] that competition [inaudible] what competition looks like within those respective market [inaudible].

That process is [inaudible] next week an educational section that I think Stan and Greg from Analysis Group are putting together. For those of us who are not [inaudible] Stan's [inaudible] of the what it means to defining market. So we're going to be getting [inaudible] on how economists [inaudible] perception as well [inaudible] relevant [inaudible] going forward.

---

So [inaudible] forward to that. Yesterday on the leadership [inaudible] this call [inaudible] some participating in that [inaudible] discussion and I think that sounds like a [inaudible] to [inaudible] one from the review [inaudible] as a whole who's interested in joining the [inaudible] hear the presentation [inaudible] as well [inaudible] so [inaudible] final [inaudible] data [inaudible] the educational part of the call first and then people that are not on the sub teams to drop off, they wanted to [inaudible] so [inaudible] I think that takes us to the point [inaudible] on the competition [inaudible] sub teams.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Jordyn. You [inaudible] a lot of it and dropped out for part of it. If I can boil it down to some big topics that are important to the group as a whole, one of the things Jordyn mentioned is that the Analysis Group has just sent out their request for data from the contacted parties. And if you recall, they had trouble getting data out of registrars at the initial part of the study. The registrars are not contractually obligated to participate in economic studies the same way that registries are.

So I think what Jordyn reiterated was that e-mail from Eleeza earlier that anybody with contacts in the registrar community, if we can all work together to kind of encourage participation in the Analysis Group data collection, then we could get better data than if they're forced to just do it manually via screen scraping as they did before.

We're going to do a little bit of outreach directly via the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Eleeza, I don't mean to put you on the spot. I know

---

you're in the middle of jury duty, but if we formulated some kind of question or request for the Registrar Stakeholder Group so that we can put Graham and others to work inside the community.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi, Jonathan. No problem. So we did send out a letter to them beforehand, before they got a request from Analysis Group actually went out. And so that went out more as a heads up. We haven't sent anything yet in addition and I guess I just wanted to work with the group to see exactly what we wanted to include in there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It seems like we want to get our insiders working as soon as possible. So are you saying you want to make that a topic of discussion for this group prior to our outreach to Graham and others on the inside of the Registrar Stakeholder Group?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I guess what I'm wondering is did you want to send something directly to Graham with the data request in it? I don't think we'd ever really settled on how we were going to approach this since we did already send something out to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Although, I know you wanted to do more individual outreach, so it's up to you.

I'm happy to put something together. I just wasn't sure what the best approach was.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I don't know the answer either, so I can take it as a to-do item to reach out to Graham to make sure that he receives that and to find out if – I guess it was Graham and Jeff, right – primarily that are signing up to try and be our advocates inside. So I will try to reach out to both of them to see if they need any additional information from us with respect to that data request.

Carlos, here in the chat, had suggested a letter from the review team to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Do other folks think that that's a good idea? Because we can draft a formal letter from the review team to the Registrar Stakeholder Group if folks think that's a good idea. That's Carlos's point.

RAVI SHANKAR: Just a suggestion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Sir.

RAVI SHANKAR: Jonathan, I'd just like to suggest if for the Asia-Pacific Region, the APTLD General Manager, Leonid, could be addressed, and since they themselves do an analysis of the ccTLD and also try to understand the average growth with the gTLD and the new gTLD's progressing, they may be able to provide insight on the Asia-Pacific Region, which is one of the regions in the review team study.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. What do we need to do to initiate that process?

RAVI SHANKAR:

The letter that you intend to send from the review team to the registrar community, a similar letter could go to the General Manager of the APTLD, Leonid, so he could furnish or help the review team since the APTLD is part of the ICANN, I would say, overall group.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, so staff, I think barring an objection, let's think about a letter from the review team, both of those letters. Are you guys able to generate drafts for those that we can circulate to our list and try to move forward?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Jonathan, just jumping in. I'm not against any formal letter by any means, but I do think that these issues are more palatable if they are discussed first, person-to-person or voice-to-voice rather than someone receiving a very formal letter, so I would just encourage folks who have direct connections to give people a heads up and talk about why this is important and how it's much better to get good information directly from the source as opposed to relying on something that's less reliable or not as accurate. But I would encourage discussions to happen first before we make something that's looked on as very formal and perhaps resource intensive, for example.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Certainly, this wouldn't be in lieu of those discussions by any means, Laureen. I think we're trying to figure out all of the different channels that we have into the registrar community to deliver this message. I think Carlos was just suggesting a letter from us, as well. I mean, there's already been a "formal" data request that has come from the analysis group.

I mean, part of what we probably need to do is make sure that we get conformation from folks that the right people have received it because despite ICANN staff's best efforts, the feedback that we got from some registrar insiders is that perhaps the wrong people received the data request, so we probably need to actually get conformation that everyone's seeing it, as well.

I don't think any of that should stop us from thinking about what a letter might look like, and we can decide when and if to send it. But it might be worth thinking about what a letter from us looks like and making the talking points that we'll use individually, and we can decide later when to send it.

David, you've had your hand up for a little bit, so go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. I was going to say, "I agree." I think both ways work, Carlos's point is exactly as I just put there with Laureen on the chat. I think that works, as well,

I was just going to offer I know [Michele] well in the Registrar Stakeholder Group, so I'm quite happy to push that direction, as well

---

and get another inroad into the Registrar Stakeholder Group to get this thing moving forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Oh, that's excellent, David. Yeah, [Michele] is a good guy. Let's work all of our connections, whoever has them, and meanwhile, I'll take it as a to-do to reach out to Graham and Jeff to see what they can do in terms of just help us gathering at the very least about how that request is received and whether or not the right people got it.

But staff, if you can begin to think about what a letter might look like, then let's circulate something, then we can be doing those preparations in parallel. Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you. We're happy to work on a more targeted letter asking for people to keep an eye out for this.

I also wanted to add that our practice – and this was last year, I was thinking we would do the same this year – was to follow up with all of the contracted parties who we reached out to with our registrar services, our engagement team, and so it would be each of their accounts so there would be a little bit more of a personal connection there, reminding them, asking them if they got the letter and so on and so forth to see if they're planning on replying. So we're using our own resources, as well, to encourage participation.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great, Eleeza, and I think we definitely need to do that again. I don't know the source of the disconnect last time because as you know, some of the push back we got is that people didn't seem to think that they got a request. I mean, and part of it is that it's secret who got data requests so that increases the complexity of this process a little bit in that we don't actually know the registrars to whom we sent the request, right?

But again, if we can just create a little bit of a peer environment in which taking these requests seriously is a good idea that will probably help.

David, I'm assuming that that's an old hand.

DAVID TAYLOR: It is. I had it up for so long, it's gone rigid.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I know registries got requests since there's been discussion about it. Excellent. Thanks, Jordyn. The registries were actually quite responsive last time, so I guess we're less concerned about registries because they've got it built into their contracts a little bit more formally, as well. Any other comments on that process?

The other thing that Jordyn mentioned that you may not have heard clearly is that the next competition and choice sub team call is going to begin with a little bit of a lecture or lead discussion about how economists define markets, and so it's a little bit of a learning session.

---

Laureen had expressed interest in being invited to that call, and so we wanted to make sure that everybody was invited to that call. So in other words, the competition and choice, the next sub team call may be of interest to everyone because at least the first part of it will be a discussion of how markets are defined, and we can all get on the same page and get the same vocabulary about that. So we'll be circulating the schedule for that, but keep an eye out for it because it's a special meeting of the sub team that may be of interest to more.

Any questions about that for Jordyn? I guess that was it for the thing that rose to the surface for me. Jordyn, is there anything else you wanted me to emphasize? I guess I'm curious about whether or not this process has led you to believe that we can get most of what we want from existing sources or from additional work by analysis group, or do we think that there's going to be additional studies altogether in the competition space that we hadn't previously thought of?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Based on the exercise so far, we've been able to identify existing or planned data sources for almost everything with the exception of secondary market data, which there's still some discussion of how we plan to get that. But generally, it's looking quite good without necessarily the need for follow on data gathering.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Excellent. Jordyn, thank you. That was very clear. Any other questions for Jordyn and the competition and choice sub team?

---

Okay, seeing no hands, let's go ahead and move on. Eleeza is going to update us on the surveys and studies and where they are and in which process. Eleeza, take it away.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thanks very much. I'm just going to upload a document while I am talking to you here. So I wanted to give you just brief updates on the Nielsen and the Analysis Group. I guess I'll start with Analysis Group since we were just talking about that.

As Jonathan mentioned, as I mentioned, we sent out the data requests. We've been getting some replies, mostly from registries. As Jonathan said, they actually have a provision in their contract that requires to participate in any economic studies with any data that we might request that might be deemed necessary to such a study. We've started to get some replies on this.

I wanted to give the group a heads up on one point in this data request. At the group's request and after some conversations with Analysis Group, we also included a request for pricing information on premium domain names.

We've gotten a couple of responses back with concerns. Actually, we, Analysis Group, has actually received some responses from registries that are concerned about sharing this information in an explicit manner, so we're not yet sure if we're going to be able to receive enough data to draw accurate enough conclusions about it or to see trends. But that's an area where we might face some difficulty in getting the data that was requested, and I wanted to give the group a warning about that.

---

The problem with the provision in the registry agreement is it leaves it very vague as to what data a study author can request. It basically says, “Any data that might be deemed necessary to conducting a study,” so it leaves it open to interpretation. So we’re working with the registries on this and with Analysis Group on this.

In terms of the basic data that we’d received last time, that seems to be fine on the wholesale pricing and other points, so we anticipate receiving that. But the premium pricing area is some place where it might be difficult to get everything that we’re hoping for.

So, that’s on Analysis Group. I guess I’ll pause there if there are any further questions before I move onto Nielsen.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Eleeza, I guess I missed what category of data was it that the registries expressed concerns about, and is it a concern that transcends the notion of anonymization and etc. that Analysis Group would go through?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Yes, so the concern is related to prices on premium names, and basically, they’re unwilling to provide explicit data for strings and the pricing that associates with it. Every registry has a different response on this, but it may be difficult to get very detail pricing at the string level for premium names.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will we be able to get any kind of aggregated data out of them? What's the nature of the concern?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The concern is that it's highly sensitive, competitive information. Some may be willing to provide aggregated data, others may not. I don't have all of the answers yet, but I know that it's an issue that's been raised a few times with Analysis Group. I'm hearing all of this second hand, but that's the concern that's been raised.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Eleeza, just a quick question. So there's a contractual requirement to provide this information, but the thought is that it's not clear enough to actually enforce? I'm just a little confused about that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. I am not an attorney obviously, but the provision in our contract that requires cooperation with an economic study leaves it very open which data may be requested and may be required to submit, so it leaves the question open to interpretation in terms of what data a registry may be required to provide.

Any other questions?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess not, Eleeza. We'll just have to cross that bridge when we get to it if we need to try to find another way to look. I mean, I think premium pricing is pretty important to the group, so we may just need to look at other ways to get to or derive that data if we have trouble getting it from them directly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly, and as I said, it's not that it's a blanket, "No." It's that in some cases, we may be getting aggregated data, in some cases, it may be presented in a different format, so it may be difficult for Analysis Group to do the type of analysis you discussed with them. I just wanted to present that as a heads up, and also, it might be a topic you want to discuss with your registry friends if they're asking about the studies and what data you're requesting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Jordyn's done, chose a very interesting time to go silent on our call. I guess maybe that wasn't a coincidence. But we'll ask Jordyn to potentially work his contacts in the Registry Stakeholder Group on that issue.

Do you want to move onto Nielsen?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I'm happy to.

So on Nielsen, Nielsen has begun to translate the survey and program it into their software so that they may actually start fielding it to their panels of consumers. Last week – I think it was on Friday – I sent an e-



---

mail specifically to the Nielsen team. We're looking ahead a little bit to the registrant survey, and Nielsen anticipates getting us the draft of that questionnaire I think within about a month or so. So in preparing for that, I put together this document you see before you in the Adobe Connect room of questions and topics which have come up in various discussions in our face-to-face meetings and on our calls about questions that we thought we could postpone to the registrant survey.

So I went through the consumer survey, I went through notes from past meetings, and these are the major topics I found from our e-mail lists and so on and so forth. This is by no means an exhaustive list, and as I think I said in my e-mail, this is not your last chance for getting feedback on the registrant survey, but I wanted to give Nielsen a little bit of a leg up in terms of preparing any updates to the registrant questionnaire from last year's version so that by the time you received a draft of it, it starts to at least reflect some of the conversations we've had to date.

That's pretty much it. I've circulated this list. If you have any additions that you'd like to make sure Nielsen addresses before we get to the first draft of the questionnaire, I'd ask that you send me any comments or feedback by this Friday, and I think that's all I had on that project.

Any comments? Megan, I see your hand up.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Can you hear me at all? I [inaudible] get it squashing my cheek against the gain as David recommends. Can you hear me?

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can hear you. Yes, Megan.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Is it working? [inaudible] finally got this darn thing to do it.

I just put a message in the chat. I had added that .eu [inaudible] be added to this question. I asked this quite a while ago. Any European [inaudible] because you have two [inaudible] for every European [inaudible] that matters, their national ccTLDs or that they are EU ccTLDs.

If you don't ask that question, you get a rather skewed answer, so I think we should add that somehow. If you want some specific language, I can have it. But I have asked this a couple of times before. Okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, Megan, your microphone is distorting a little bit, but if I can clarify, you're just reiterating what you put in the chat, which is about including .eu in the question asked to European respondents. So, Eleeza, does that ring a bell, and is that something that we can still do?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, it does, and I think the list of responses you're seeing on here is from an old version of the survey, so I think that will be reflected. But thank you for the reminder. I'll add that into the list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you. Any other questions for Eleeza on the current state of the surveys? Like I said, the next process for the Nielsen sub team is to

---

look at questions for the registrant survey, so if you have an interest in that and didn't already get an e-mail on that, let Eleeza know that you want to be a part of that discussion. Any other questions for Eleeza?

Okay, great. Thanks a lot, Eleeza, for the update.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think I'm next here. I want to pick up the conversation that we began a little bit last week and that we've done a little bit online because the staff have created this great document that went through the slides that Jeff provided with the brainstorming that the PDP on subsequent procedures had done in their brainstorming session.

We're looking for areas of interest to our group, areas where we consider it to be a low risk for the [inaudible] to proceed in parallel to us, and areas where we think there's a high risk that we'll be making some substantial suggestions that might change the course of their process, and so that's the discussion that we're trying to have with the subsequent procedures of PDP.

There's been a little bit of discussion on the list, but what I wanted to do was boil this down a little bit into some discussion topics so that we're not just going point by point through that spreadsheet. I just created a quick little PowerPoint to get our juices flowing here and have a little bit of a discussion about this topic, so I just went into each one.

---

Does everybody have control, or should I say next slide? What's the nature with the PDF? I don't see a scroll bar. Oh, yeah. There it is. So if everybody could scroll down to the application review slide.

In going back and looking at the document that we created as part of our brainstorming session, really our interests boil down to three big categories. One was accessibility and awareness. I put awareness there, but it all comes down to the accessibility of the process, whether that was the developing world or underserved communities, and so part of how I thought we should look at the overlap with the subsequent procedures PDP is that there are going to be areas where we are looking at similar topics, but through a different lens or through a specific lens that may affect how we want to interact with the PDP.

So for example, on the issue of the application process itself, the PDP folks in their brainstorming process suggested that they're going to sit down and interview the applicants and just get feedback on what that process was like and how it might have been improved and when was it inconvenient etc. and get down to a fine level of detail about the process itself.

I think that where we ended up with our brainstorming is that it was less of a focus on the process at such a granular level, but about how well the process served communities and the developing world, and that was the lens through which we looked. I think what that would likely mean is that we would try to coordinate with them in their interview process, but probably let their interview process proceed but try to perhaps eventually have input into the questions that are asked or coordinate with them in how it's done.

---

But it also may mean that we are trying to ask questions of some different people. We may want to look at the people who dropped out of the application process, or try to identify those who in some way did or should have expressed interest and didn't and interview them. So it could very well be that we're going to be trying to reach out to non-applicants and try to find out why they didn't apply, or aborted applications and why that happened.

The second big subtopic in our brainstorming session was end-user confusion and harm from strings. That was something that received a lot of attention in our brainstorming session.

Then finally was this discussion of GAC participation in the process. That boiled down to the advice process, how GAC interacted with the formulation of the guidebook, etc., how advice was formulated, how it was [injected] by the process, and also, how things were expressed as public interest commitments and the efficacy of that.

I wrote this slide because this is really what we ended up saying we wanted to study, and I wanted, first of all, just to ask if people feel that this is enough and a good focus for the team, or if there's anything that we're leaving out from the standpoint of the application and review process because it is a fairly focused way of looking at. The application and review process is much more focused and a more focused vector if you will into the question than the subsequent procedures [PDP] will be taking.

Before I talk to those folks and present this, I wanted you to see that it really boiled down to these three areas and make sure that everybody was comfortable with that. So I'll pause for a second to see if people

---

have questions or suggestions about that. But this is what it boiled down to in our brainstorming [inaudible].

Okay, I don't see any hands, so I'm going to move on. If you would, advance your screen to the next slide that says, "Some Questions," across the top.

Oh, Megan, your hand is up. Go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Thanks, Jonathan. I put my comment in the chat because I'm not sure that you'll be able to hear me, despite the almost [inaudible] in my computer.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I don't understand the question given the context because accessibility and awareness is the first thing that I mentioned, so that's what ease of access for applicants is. That was in fact, yes, a very big part of what we wanted to study, and that's what I meant by accessibility.

Okay, so then back on the next slide, some questions that fall under this lens. In the document that was prepared by staff, they may have interpreted things differently than the group would interpret, so I wanted, again, to raise them as questions for the group and reach some conclusion about it.

One of the things that was shown to be low interest in the staff document was the notion of application fees. But it occurs to me that application fees could end up being a big part of the accessibility question, so it seemed to me that we wanted to make sure that the fee

---

structure was something that was an area of focus for us. But again, we would look at it only through the lens of accessibility. So I'm going to go through these, please raise your hand or comment, and I'll read the chat as well, as we go along.

The same is true for the application submission period. There's some mention of it that there might be some interest, but again, I think we will look at this through the lens of accessibility, so stop me if you think that doesn't [look good].

And finally, one of the bullets that's in there is about registrant protection, and again, I think that this might be an area where we're looking at the filter process, the evaluation process, and whether those bars were set too high, made too complex, or in some way disadvantaged applicants with fewer resources, etc. So this idea of applicant review and some of the registrant protection mechanisms are probably going to be relevant to us as well.

Okay, so Jamie asked the question. "Does accessibility include cost for operating in TLD as well?" I think that's a good question, Jamie. The context for that might be in the registrant protection or applicant review process sections. In other words, were we setting a bar that was too high for people to participate? You may mean that in a different way. In other words, should we be looking more generally at the cost for operating a TLD, and maybe we should – that isn't one of the things that they looked at in the subsequent procedures, but maybe we should add it as a bullet ourselves, which is looking at the cost structure for being a TLD and seeing if there's a way to make some recommendations

---

around that. If the application fee is zero, what is the impact on the applicant [inaudible] run a TLD.

That's right, and Stan mentioned it's also something we talked about with competition, and so I'm going to get to that as well. Stan, the competition – this is just the application and review process right now that we're talking about, but in our focus on the developing world, it seems like we need to probably address the cost of running a TLD. That makes sense to everyone.

Carlos, you have your hand up. Megan, I think that's an old hand, but if it's not, leave it up. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I can.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello. Okay, thank you very much. I want to add to Jamie's question, and as far as I remember, we had a very early slide in the [inaudible] report that showed that just registering the domain name was only a small part of having a full presence on the Internet, a webpage and services and so on, and I think this is really relevant, and is more on our side than on the side of the subsequent procedures people. They will remain focused only on the application fees, I don't think they care about the follow-up cost, but I think it's very relevant in the developing



---

world, underserved communities, the question of all backend services that you need additional to your domain name. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's great, Carlos. I think we agree with Jamie's question, as an addition to the application process, that whether or not the new gTLD program serves the developing world, we need to look at cost as well, and I guess we'll do that under the application evaluation process, since it's already part of the registrant protection and review process. So let's just make sure that we add that, but I think we're in agreement on that.

The other issue was an accreditation program that the subsequent procedures PDP might recommend, and I just wanted to raise this for discussion and it may or may not be of interest to us, but right now or in the previous round, the process was to evaluate each application in total, and even though a number of applicants were using the same backend service providers, those backend service providers got – apparently – evaluated again for each application.

So I think there's percolating the notion of some kind of a backend service provider accreditation program that would allow there to be a kind of list of approved backend service providers, so that that evaluation wouldn't need to be so redundant going forward in any subsequent procedures. That sounds like a very practical suggestion. I guess my question for the group is, again, from an accessibility standpoint, and I guess in particular in developing worlds, do we think that there's a possibility of exclusion in such an accreditation process,

---

and should we be trying to pay attention to that conversation, or express some caution about that recommendation?

Carlos, I think that's an old hand, or is it new?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sorry, it's old.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, then Stan, I'll go to you.

STANLEY BESEN: I'll just point out there that one of the data sources that I've been looking at has information on backend providers linking them to registries, so I think a question we should be looking at is the extent to which backend providers are in fact being used. I suspect that their presence makes it possible for smaller registries to be viable, because they're able, in fact, to take advantage of the scale economies that a backend provider offers. And that's a question we can answer empirically: to what extent are backend providers being used?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Stan. I think that's a great question to be answered, and again, I think as we're looking at it in the competition [inaudible] sub team, we want to remain aware about whether or not those economies of scale that you mentioned were sufficiently large or are going forward that the

---

particularly small registries are able to exist in the marketplace, or whether something else needs to happen to support that. Thank you.

Carlos says I should be able to just put people's hands down. That could be a staff member capability. Okay, so that's the application and evaluation process, so I think that that will give us a lot of guidance in talking to the subsequent procedures chairs about the things they're looking at, and the [inaudible] which we're looking, I think we'll participate with them in some of their applicant surveys but probably supplement the questions, and potentially look to more broadly survey a broader category of wannabe applicants, or partial applicants, if you will.

On the Competition and Choice section, I wanted to just open up the discussion that started on the list, which may just come down to semantics, which is this issue of market segmentation or gTLD differentiation, and the implications for non-price competition. I think that Jordyn had attempted to find a generalized way of expressing that the distinction between types of TLDs might not be an area of focus for us, which is different than talking about a string differentiation as a type of choice and a type of non-price competition.

So really, the source of this was actually talking a little bit about brand TLDs and their relevance to our process, and in the competition sub team prioritization process, this notion of drawing these types of distinctions, which was basically between brands, communities and generics, and whether or not that was going to be an area of focus for the competition and choice team. So Stan, I don't know if that clarified it for you, I think it was about communicating with them that that type of

---

distinction in application type might not be a priority for the team, but I think that's very different than the string differentiation as a form of non-price competition.

STANLEY BESEN:

I guess I'm not entirely clear. I assume that we've talked about analyzing non-price competition. It seems to me, in many ways, the principal form of non-price competition that's a result from the new TLD program is in fact the wider variety of TLDs that are now available. Different languages, different character sets and the like. I just want to make sure that in fact we're going to address those.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, and the answer is for sure we are. It's a more technical question, which was how to do the applicant guidebook, and the differential treatment of brand TLDs and community TLDs, Stan. So it's not at all about different strings being made available, it's more about the fact that different types of applicants were treated differently, and whether or not that was relevant to our work.

STANLEY BESEN:

Okay, that helped, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. What I want to do is confirm that we're probably going to communicate to the PDP chairs that this treatment of different applicants did not turn out to be a high priority issue for our group, and

---

that they therefore want to look at that issue themselves, [whether] that's a low risk area of conflict in the future, and how that will probably manifest itself most visibly will be about potentially proceeding down the path of looking at allowing more brands, because they might be sufficiently different from the other gTLDs. Are there questions or discussion around that, before we communicate that to the chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP?

Okay, great, so we will do that. The next area was that of universal acceptance, and again, I think that we're going to be looking at that as part of the competition and choice group, because the lack of universal acceptance can have a dramatic impact on the validity of additional choice. In other words, if you have a choice of a new TLD, but then that new e-mail address is rejected by your airline reservation system or your bank management web portal, then is it really a legitimate choice? So I think that's probably going to be an area that we're going to look at in some detail, is the question of universal acceptance.

Jordyn said it was moved to our lower priority questions. I just wanted to raise that, because it's going to be something that the other team looks at, and is universal acceptance that people think is important? Jordyn, go ahead. Are you on audio?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:                    Hopefully.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                      Yes, you are, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Excellent. I'm in a moving vehicle, so let's see how well this works. I just wanted to say I think that the topic of universal acceptance is indeed very important, but we decided to only look at it to the extent that we identified that there wasn't competition, or we thought that there were impediments to the competition and then we would look into whether this was the sources of it. I think if the new gTLD PDP were to look into this while we looked into other things, it's possible that we will just have a happy confluence of events.

We decided that we needed that information, they might have already learned something about it. I also think there's a number of universal acceptance issues that are – I don't think they're necessarily in the policy realm either, but they're closer to what the GNSO will care about than we'll care about, just in terms of rules and whether ICANN is doing it, and so on. So I'd be inclined to identify this as another area we should let them take the lead on. [inaudible] after the fact instead of the other way around.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. I think it's probably going to come up again in trust, but Jordyn, your suggestion is noted. Do other people have concerns or objections to that if we deprioritize this and let them take the lead on universal acceptance?

Carlton has put in the chat that the technical barrier to competition. So again, I think Carlton, what Jordyn was saying – I know sometimes it's hard to hear on his cell phone – is that we're going to look at whether or

---

not competition was enhanced, and if it wasn't, look for the reasons why, and that universal acceptance might be identified as one of those barriers to competition. Hopefully I summarized that okay for you, Jordyn.

So it's just a question of how we'll get to it, Carlton, and it'll end up being potentially one of the explanations for problems with competition, as opposed to fitting it as a general topic that we're trying to address for its own sake. Okay, great.

Jordyn, since I was able to hear you a little bit, you recall that there were other issues? I thought that there was one that Jeff had asked us about, that you ended up adding during the public session. Do you recall what that was? Oh, vertical integration. Okay, great, and has that been added to your document? Okay, great.

We need to then make sure that vertical integration is part of what we communicate to them as a priority. Any other questions about the competition and choice team, and [intersection] with the subsequent procedures PDP?

Jordyn, I'm assuming that's an old hand. Carlos, I'll look into how we can automatically lower people's hands after they talk.

Okay, Customer Safeguards. So the issue of universal acceptance comes up again here, which is there's obviously some negative consumer consequences to registering a new TLD and then not having it be useful. I know that my wife has had trouble with American Airlines, Bank of America and others with her .gallery TLD. Laureen, perhaps you can

---

answer this question about whether or not universal acceptance is a priority topic for the trust and safeguards team.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

This hasn't been a topic that we have focused upon, which I guess at this point means it's not a priority. However, I certainly could see this feeding into developing countries' issues in terms of impact and trust. Again, we haven't really focused on it, but I'm happy to have other folks on the team chime in.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And again, this isn't like we're blocking it from discussion for all future moments. This is really about a coordination call with the subsequent procedures PDP, and whether or not we are comfortable with them taking a lead on looking at the universal acceptance issues. So I just want to reframe Laureen's question for the broader sub team, to see if they have issues with that. So raise your hand if you want to talk about universal acceptance in the context of customer safeguards, because otherwise we might follow Jordyn's recommendation to let the PDP take the lead on this issue.

Okay, great. The next issue was name collision, that I know that Jeff directed towards us during the open session. Laureen has name collision and the effectiveness of the name collision prevention process. Has that come up in your discussions within your group?



---

LAUREEN KAPIN: That specific issue hasn't really come up, the only related issue that has come up is consumer confusion caused by the use of singular and plurals of the same name, and just in general, the issue of similar sounding domain names.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. So this is a little bit of a different issue, and again it may not fall – and this is part of the question about security and stability – this is an issue of internal to an enterprise network, they may have had been making use of .mail in their internal network, and that the presence of .mail being added to the public DNS what would normally internal request to get broadcast externally. There were some [inaudible] put in place to mitigate the potential for a name collision, and so the question is whether or not those were effective, whether name collision turned out to be an issue or not.

It's sort of a – as Jordyn puts it – a technical trust issue, and I guess the question is whether or not we're – Jack was hoping we would look at this, but are we going to tell him that we're probably not, and put it back in their hands to look at this? I guess that's the question.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Now that you have defined that far more clearly than I first understood it, that has not come up. However, when you frame it as an issue of trust, and what I'm hearing really is an issue of security and privacy, i.e. the internal portions of your website, which certainly could conceivably contain personal information, financial information, etc. Are those being

---

broadcast to the world because of some technical snafu? That is a potential issue, but we haven't discussed it. I guess –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, go ahead, I was going to say we can raise the issue now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I would like to raise the issue now, and I'm just looking to see if we have a broad enough participation from our sub group. Yes, we do have a number of people from our sub group, so I raise it now to see whether this is an issue that falls under either privacy or trust issues for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll give people a second to absorb this and raise whether or not they feel that name collision is something that you guys want to address on your sub team. We can also ask you to put it on your agenda for your next sub team call, but if people want to speak up now, then do so.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I see people are typing, but I'm just going to ask you a question. Do we have a sense about how big an issue this has been? Do we have any data on whether these type of disclosures have actually occurred, taken place?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I think you're asking the relevant question. We don't know the answer, and so it's really a question of who takes this hot potato and

---

looks at it, to see whether or not it turned out to be a real issue, what the traffic really looked like, and whether the processes that were put in place to mitigate the risk were sufficient. So we don't know the answers yet, but that's the problem in a nutshell.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is in the chat, I think it is going to be a fairly standalone process for an analysis. Jordyn, do you want to try and go verbal here?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, we'll try. I do think this is definitely within the [arena] of the CCTR team. I think the main question is whether we want to invest the time to understand it and to try to make recommendations on it or even findings on it, because it will be quite a large amount of work that has no interaction with anything else that we look at on the safeguards and consumer trust area, even though it's clearly in the scope of that. I think we have to decide it was important, because I think it will be quite hard to analyze and requires a lot of special data that we're just not looking at gathering at the moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. Hopefully everybody heard that, it was pretty clear. It is sort of a standalone topic and will require some standalone research and standalone analysis that's kind of disconnected from the priorities

---

that we've put up, but as Jordyn says, it's fairly in scope, so it's just a question of whether or not it raises to a priority level, which gets to Laureen's question about whether or not it turned out to be a big issue, and I guess the problem is we won't know without studying.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I would like then to raise this in our phone call next week to give our group a little bit more of an opportunity to think about this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Eleeza, did you have something on this issue?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, I'm sorry, I dropped off in the middle of the conversation. I'm assuming we're still on name collision, is that right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, ma'am.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, so what I was going to add is one of the metrics that we're tracking is the reports of name collision that ICANN received, so we have some data on this. We haven't figured out the best way to publish it yet, which is why it's not up on the CCT metrics website yet, but it is something that we're tracking. Laureen, I don't know if it will be helpful for you for us to talk about that, or maybe to have – if [it's appropriate] for our technical services team to talk about the work they're doing at

---

monitoring this, that might be one way to introduce the topic, or talk about how you might address it within your team next week.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that would be helpful, to have just a short conversation about that, because frankly, it hasn't been identified as a priority but I agree with Jordyn that it's in scope, so I would be very interested in figuring out how prevalent this is, and if we have data on that, that would be very helpful in informing the way we approached deciding where this sits in, whether it sits in right now.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, great. Let me talk to my colleagues, I'll send them a note right now, see what we can work out, and I'll follow up with you afterward.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Absolutely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great, Eleeza. Thank you. I think that'll help a lot if we identified it. another issue that came up in Jeff's slides that came up in the brainstorming session is interestingly worded, which is whether or not the GAC safeguards, etc. sufficiently allows for freedom of expression by applicants, and so I guess I wanted to again to raise that with Lauren

---

and the customer safeguards team about whether or not you wanted to tackle this issue of freedom of expression. In a sense, the way that it's worded suggests the leaning of that group, right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, in lawyer speak we would refer to this as a leading question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Which kind of stacks the desk. We certainly are interested in the issue of the safeguards. We've prioritized that, we've identified that. We don't necessarily connect that with freedom of expression, so if what you're really asking is are we looking at this through the lens of freedom of expression, we have to say not at this time, but we are looking at the safeguards.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, and Carlton says he's struggling to configure freedom of expression into safeguards.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, as are we all.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I get it, I guess I just raised it because that's the context in which it will be discussed in the PDP, so we can just let that go, or suggest that it'll be something that we'll look at. That's why I raised it. Jordyn is typing something in the chat. Jordyn says let them have it, so if people feel that way generally, then we can – as Jordyn says – marry their analysis with ours as we produce our findings about the safeguards.

Laureen, do you have anything else? I saw you typing.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Actually, I'm responding to Jordyn's offer to chat about what Google is doing in name collision, and saying, "Yes, I would be interested in hearing about it."

JONATHAN ZUCK: So maybe they're going to have ICANN and Google talk on the next [inaudible] call. Okay, and I guess I'll ask around here, as Laureen, we'll probably need to coordinate with the write protection mechanism PDP as well, so they have that as a bullet in their slide, and we're going to need to do that as well if you look at that portion of the review.

That's all I had, I feel like that's enough discussion about these to guide a discussion with the chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP. Does anyone else have anything they'd like to raise? Eleeza, I think that's probably an old hand. Is there anything else anybody would like to bring up on this particular topic?

I see Carlos typing, but I don't know which topic he's going to type about. Oh, copy the PowerPoint. Sure, I'll circulate that as well. It's just

---

a way to guide our thoughts from that larger document that staff will have to put together, and look at it through the lens of our own prioritization.

Okay, great, thanks everyone for that discussion. Let's move the conversation over to project management, and for that, I think Alice is on the agenda.

ALICE JANSEN:

Thank you, Jonathan. Hi everyone. We have two quick updates on project management. The first one is we, staff have produced a draft project plan, further to your request for an interactive planner, you can follow throughout the exercise. So what you see on your screen now is what we have, and it's drafty, if that's a word. Maybe we need to enlarge that so you can see what's on there. There are different categories here, the first one being the task, and as you'll notice, it's very sequences and step-by-step, a step-by-step approach, and then we've sort of lined up the responsible entities for these talks, along with the status, so in-progress, complete and not started, etc.

We've made some suggestions here on when these different activities should occur. It starts in 2016 and goes through 2018. This is a draft, and we're still working on it and we're having conversations with the leadership on refining it, so we'll make sure to circulate a mature version as soon as it's available. The second update we had was that we sent an e-mail to the list yesterday to follow up on the conversation you had with Xavier Calvez and [inaudible] during your first face-to-face meeting, Xavier had given you a presentation on how he needs some of



---

you to be working with ICANN staff on project management and especially the budget, so we sort of lined up some tasks and responsibilities that we would think could help you define who the right person or people should be for that. I know, Jonathan, you had a couple of remarks on that that you wanted to share with the group, so I'll...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure, yes, I don't know if you folks remember from the face-to-face, the conversation we had with Xavier about project management. This has sort of sprung out of the – and maybe Alice, you can put up on the screen the criteria that you're referring to, that you sent out in the e-mail. So this is a little bit of an outgrowth from the CCWG discussion on accountability, and getting community participation in project management and budget accountability, as well as some of the other processes that are a little bit less transparent at the community, such as the contracting process.

Xavier is trying to use our group as a kind of getting more involved in the budget process with them for the review team, and what we had said at the face-to-face is that I think that folks will be interested in taking on some responsibility in the budget discussion, especially in the context of when they're potentially given greater access to [RP] processes for example and contracting processes that might otherwise have been closed to the community. One of the things that's interesting is that thus far in the competition [inaudible] team, there hasn't been identified additional, sort of large study issues that are going to go out to [RP] and so we don't have a good example to hang our hat on.

---

I think as Laureen's group proceeds and as our overall group on the application review process proceeds, we'll begin to identify some areas where we may in fact be making use of our research related budget, and that will I think create a natural call for volunteers in that context. I think otherwise, with the overall budget for the team, for the meetings, the face-to-faces, I'll probably be the de facto participant on that, but if someone is particularly interested in volunteering on monitoring how we're spending our money and our allocated budget, etc., then please do speak up and let staff know.

One of the things that we need to discuss is the location of some of our face-to-face meetings. We have one coming up in DC, but there's definitely been a recommendation that we need to move this around the world a little bit to make it easier for some folks to be at the face-to-face-meetings, that haven't made them thus far. That will obviously have some budget implication, so we'll have that conversation that comes, but...

So I think, Alice, the answer is that on the general terms it's probably me, but then as we begin to identify additional expenditures, there will be natural volunteers to manage the budget around those additional expenditures. Does that make sense?

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes, thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did any of that make sense to anybody else, and would you like to ask a question? Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, I have a question. Having been in the position to deal with budgets in public entities, I don't understand very well what exact relationship of team members and the staff [inaudible] in this process. Being far away, not knowing exactly what the procurement process is, having just short conversations or e-mail exchanges over the web, the question for me is very simple. What's the liability of being involved in these type of processes, or even decisions? I don't feel comfortable with this. I didn't feel comfortable with the idea in the beginning, and I don't know what is the underlying process inside of the corporation to have external people participating in the process, in terms of taking up some responsibility of the decisions and the expenditures. I really don't get it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos. I'll let someone from staff answer as well, but this issue of liability did come up in our face-to-face discussion with Xavier, and he made every attempt to reassure us that there's something that he was asking for, that was going to introduce liability for anyone outside of his office. It's more about playing a kind of liaison role and being an active participant in kind of managing our budget so that it's not something that we feel is just imposed on us, Carlos, so that – again, like I said, it sprung out of the accountability discussions, and [it's] one more way that Xavier is trying to make ICANN accountable to the community is by

---

having more active participation of the community in budget management, resource allocation within the team and things like that.

I don't think there's a liability issue. He was pretty clear about that in Los Angeles, it's just about finding a kind of liaison role and project management role so that there's good visibility to how resources are being allocated for the review team.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. I agree, and I trust very much Xavier, but when I compare this with the discussion on the paper we have to sign, it seems that we were in two very different meetings. My only suggestion is we should try to treat people that do it as a sub team maybe. I think that would help, that's my only additional comment. Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos, and I'm certainly open to that. I'll be the default liaison on this, but if there are others that have some interest in this as an accountability mechanism and want to participate in a little bit of a sort of project management sub team, I'm all in favor of it. Carlos, I don't think there's anything to sign for this role. That was related to our conflict of interest document that I think we had the discussion about, and the subsequent statement of interest, and I don't know if we've actually gotten everybody signed, if we got all those signed when we were in Morocco, and if there are still other people that need to sign new statements of interest, so we may need to get that on the agenda on Other Business.

---

But that was the only thing that needed signing, was the statement of interest, Carlos, and the conflict of interest portion of that document was our discussion, about ancestors and everything else. But this particular thing doesn't require a signature, it's just a process question about getting the community more involved in things that have [inaudible] been the purview of ICANN staff. I think we have a way forward, which by default is me, but I would welcome other people to participate in [inaudible] sub team and then as individual requests for budget allocation come up, particularly in the context of research, we may identify particular liaisons to get us actually involved in the contracting process and things like that.

Other questions? Okay, great. Let's go on to the next thing, which is an update on the face-to-face meeting coming up in early June.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Jonathan, Pamela will be delivering that update. She's posting a slide, I see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, thanks Pamela. Thanks, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Pamela, I think you're on mute. Pamela, I think we're still having trouble hearing, I'm afraid.

---

PAMELA SMITH: Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay, great. Sorry about that, folks. The face-to-face meeting, the location is going to be in Washington DC. The dates will be the 6th and 7th of June, 2016 and the venue is the Omni Shoreham. Please let me know – as Ravi did – if you need any help with visas, such as an invitation to attend, or to help with – from constituency travel. Constituency will be connecting with you regarding travel arrangements in the next few days. They do have your sheets, the goal will be in on June 5th and out on June 8th. I will be forwarding a chart of the revised schedule for the meetings once we are done with this call, so that you know how to plan. That's all I have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so does anybody have any questions for Pamela? Presumably, obviously we need to do whatever we can to support folks coming from overseas with visas and things like that, so let's get on top of that. Megan, the Omni Shoreham is the biggest hotel in DC, actually, up in Woodley Park. Any questions about the face-to-face, or logistics for the face-to-face?

---

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, Jonathan, just to say – I'll let Alice and the others know, but I'll probably be late on the Monday, because flying over from Europe. I've already arranged things that weekend unfortunately, so I'm kind of tied up until about 7 PM. I don't know if I can get a flight out at 10 PM on a Sunday night. If I can, I will.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello, everyone.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'll likely arrive later on the Monday.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm so sorry. Can everyone hear me okay, or no?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can, okay. Yes, the Omni Shoreham is a hotel, and we were [inaudible] going to do the [Mayflower] and we had to change the venue because of meetings accommodations, so the Omni Shoreham is much more comfortable for our needs and for yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it's much better for me, because like I said, I can walk there. Thanks, David for the update. Let's get you here as soon as we can. We

---

don't want to disrupt your fishing trip on the weekend, but we all look forward to seeing you.

Any other questions about the face-to-face? Okay, great. I think we're on to Any Other Business. I will mention the fact that I'm in conversations with IT, with Chris Gift from IT in ICANN about our use of [inaudible] He's been giving me some [inaudible] about it, so some pushback, but we continue to have conversations about transparency. The biggest issue is just IT bandwidth, because they have so many that tasks on their hands related to the IANA transition, so that's the principal pushback, but I think we're working through most of the issues, so hopefully we can get up and running [inaudible] before too long. We have another call scheduled on Monday with IT.

I guess I will also ask staff, do you have updated statements of interest from everybody, or are you reaching out to people individually? Is that something we need to deal with? I know a bunch of us signed them in Morocco, but not everyone was there.

ALICE JANSEN:

Hi, Jonathan, this is Alice. We sent the [inaudible] version of the statement of interest form and asked the review team to send their updates if needed based on the new conflicts of interest policy. It's not a requirement, as I understand it, but if you feel like you need to submit a new one, please do.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, great, that's pretty simple. Any other issues that people want to raise before we end the call? Okay, great, thanks, everyone. That was a great call. I really appreciate everyone's participation, and again, I apologize for my condition on the last call, but I think we got a lot done on this call, so thanks a lot, and I'll be liaising with the chairs of the subsequent procedures PDP and sharing our thoughts on this, and we'll report back to you. Thanks, everyone, and thanks to staff for all your help.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**