

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey. How are we doing on attendance? I saw the recording was begun. We wait a couple of minutes still? Get stranglers, it's right on top of the hour.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Jonathan. We have [10?] members on the call so far.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Good morning. It's Jamie.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. We can probably get started. Hello everyone, and welcome to the CCT plenary call. Is there...? We'll take roll call off the Adobe Connect. Is there anybody who is just on the phone that needs to speak up and let us know that you are here?

KAILI KAN: Yeah. Kaili Kan, just joined.

---

*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.*

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi Kaili. And is there anybody that needs to make a change to their statement of interest, there has been an update? All right, great. Let's dive into the agenda. I think we'll start with a progress update from the competition and choice team, from Jordyn Buchanan.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Jonathan. This time I'm on a normal phone line, so hopefully the audio is better than the last time we tried this. This is Jordyn Buchanan. And wanted to give a quick update on the competition and choice and sub-team. Our principle activity, since the last review team meeting, was to have a conference call last week, in which our own Stan and in addition to that, Greg from analysis group, gave us a quick run through on the definition of markets.

This is going to be useful for the exercise that we're going to pick up starting next week, which is have our own discussion of what working definitions of markets we're going to try to use for the remainder of our analysis [inaudible]... competition topic of whether [inaudible] ...encourage competition.

I thought there was a good discussion with a lot of questions. And I know that we're hoping for the sub-team discussions to start to have a little bit more substance and less process involved, but unfortunately since this was, we only had an informational update since the last call. Don't have [inaudible] expect on our next call, we will start to actually talk through definitions of market as at least straw man, or at least start to categorize them [inaudible], at which point I think we'll probably have significantly more substantive updates for the broader group to

---

start talking about. In the short term, I think that's largely the updates in the competition and consumer choice group.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. Does anybody have any questions for Jordyn? I think a lot of folks were on that call, so that was very useful. So thanks again to Stan and Greg for leading that discussion. Anyone have any questions or comments?

Okay. Let's talk standards and trust with Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Good morning, good afternoon, and any time zone, so I guess that would include good evening. I'm so glad you went first Jordyn, because now I don't feel nearly the twinge of guilt that I had anticipated feeling about the lack of substantive updates rather than procedural updates in my own report.

So we had a call last week, and we focused on going through our priorities once more, and also talking about our potential data sources. And we have a reading list that we have started populating on our Wiki page. And our plan is to divide the reading, and have members of our sub-team present the data of more insights in those readings to the entire group.

And in fact, I will be sending out an email shortly after our call today, letting folks know what study they're going to be in charge of presenting. Right now we have, one, two, three, four, five, six, six sources. One from the Secure Domain Foundation, the business case

---

for proactive anti-abuse. A report concerning issues on consumer trust on the Internet. The ICANN draft report for the new gTLD program regarding safeguards to mitigate DNS abuse. An online take down study. A consumer awareness summary, and an anti-phishing working group report on phishing attacks trend.

And of course, that's phishing with a P-H. And in addition to these presentations, which I assume will take place over several calls, next week Francisco Arias has also kindly agreed to chat with us about the domain name collision issues. And he will be starting out our phone call for about 20 minutes or so talking about what domain name collisions are, how prevalent they are, may funnel into consumer trust and abuse issues, and will also be available for questions.

So that's going to be taking place during our sub-team's next call, but of course, anyone is welcome to join us for that call if you're interested in that topic or any other topic. So that's is what's going on in the consumer trust review team group at present.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Lauren. Does anybody have any questions for Lauren? I have one quick question, Lauren. Has Ron Andrew tried to reach out to you yet?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

No he has not. Should I be expecting something? It sounds like yes.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I think so. No, he's just been very interested in the picks issue, and particularly in from high stakes regulated industries and things like that. So you know, he's been talking to the GAC for some time and that has been his issue. So after the letter from Crocker on that issue, that it should be taken up by this group, which we were already planning to do, he got renewed interest in this group.

So I think he's going to be trying to reach out to you for some way to, you know, be a part of that conversation, at least that piece of what you're working on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone else with questions about the trust and safeguards sub-team?

Okay. Yes? Go ahead. Carlos, go ahead. I didn't see your hand.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you. This is Carlos for the record. Lauren gave us a wonderful [inaudible], and I started reading these very interesting reports on DNS abuse, and I came across this issue, [the big chapter?] of the WHOIS. And I don't know, I was wrong in the assumption that there were four reviews in the affirmation of commitment, and WHOIS was one of the reviews.

---

But I went back to the affirmation of commitment because now I see that the WHOIS is like the sub-chapter of the competition consumer. So for consumer trust. And because this has been a very, very long discussion and it has had already iterations in terms of AOC reviews and so on, I just want to know that during our next call, my next question to Laureen is how are we going to relate to the previous, maybe future, [inaudible] efforts?

Because that may well be on what our small substantive is look at now. So I just wanted to comment on that. Thank you very much Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you Carlos. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You know, I had a little trouble hearing you Carlos, apologies. I think your question was, how is our inquiry into DNS abuse as a consumer trust issue going to relate to other reviews going on that touch on the consumer trust issues? Did I hear you correctly?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. In particular, WHOIS, because WHOIS has had already a lot of miles and reviews and so on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's a great way to put it. Miles to go before we sleep, and miles to go before we sleep. The words of Robert Frost. That's an excellent

---

question. And I agree with you, I think the WHOIS issues really do touch on the DNS abuse issues, because of course, an investigating DNS abuse, the accuracy of WHOIS information is of paramount importance to law enforcement who are looking into these issues, and of course, the security folks from the private sector who are looking into these issues.

So I think that's actually a good topic for us to consider. And perhaps we should also think about reaching out to the leads and the WHOIS review teams, the next generation DNS review that, or PDP that's going on. So I think you raised a good question. And... We just got a whole lot of static from someone who maybe should be [inaudible].

Great. So I think that's something we should talk about during, perhaps our next plenary call. I think it's working... [Inaudible] from review team to review team issue. Jonathan, what are your thoughts on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think that's a good idea as well. I mean, I think we're going to find ourselves, you know, with a lot of overlap between some of these efforts, and so I think some level of coordination is going to be, I mean, that's our next topic with the PDP for example. But that the, I mean the... I think the way to handle that probably is to figure out an angle or a certain swap, if you will, on that issue that you want to focus on rather than trying to replicate all of the work of the WHOIS review.

So it's about keeping it really contextual, I think.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That makes sense to me.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does that make sense to you Carlos? I mean, I think that's the exercise there.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, yes, of course. No, as I said, I believe like WHOIS was fully independent of our review, but if you go back to the structure of the affirmation of commitment, it's under our chapter, so I think we have to recognize a very, very strong link and we have to plan accordingly because that can really explode our review. We can spend another year just [inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, obviously. Agreed. Everyone, just to remember to mute your line when you're not talking. There is a lot more noise than usual today. Jordyn, your hand is up. Go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think Margie's hand may have been up before mine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh okay. I didn't know the order. Margie, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you. I just wanted to comment on Carlos's observation. Since I'm responsible for the affirmation of commitment reviews and have it



---

conducted at ICANN from the staff perspective. And we have the WHOIS review as a distinct review, separate from this one. This one is, obviously you already know the scope, but it's not intended to include the WHOIS issue.

Not to say that if it effects the trust angle, then yes, there is certainly ability to look at it, but I don't think you should think that your role is to do an entire WHOIS review. We have that stacked up for starting in October this year. We'll do a call for volunteers in October. We also have a separate review, again this is a little bit of overlap, in the review of security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

And that's scheduled to kick off in June of this year with a call for volunteers. Now there is discussion in the community about, among the leaders of the SOs and ACs about whether some of those should be deferred, and the one that's being considered for deferral in particular is the WHOIS, the second WHOIS review team, which I mentioned was slated for October.

So there is some possibility that that might get deferred. But I just wanted to flag that for you that those are distinct reviews with separate review teams that are part of the overall schedule.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Margie. I mean, I think there is some recognition that there are distinct reviews, and I think we'll all be vigilant about not trying to do an entire WHOIS review, but just sort of look for intersection points and see what portion to look at potentially in the consumer trust component. Jordyn, go ahead.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes. Thanks Jonathan. It's Jordyn Buchanan. I want to build on that last point that you were making and just sort of reiterate what Carlos said. There has been, you know, well over a decade's worth of constant, some combination of policy and review work on WHOIS within ICANN. And I guess I personally would argue most of which with very little constructive result.

I think it's a tar pit that many people have waded into, and very few people have gotten out of. And I'd be nervous about seeing a large portion of the cycle of our CCT review get tied up looking at WHOIS topics. So I would certainly would urge the safeguards and consumer trust sub-team to be very narrow in thinking about the remit related to WHOIS, particularly, are there reasons why we believe that the introduction of new gTLDs in particular would have had some effect on either the trustworthiness or the use of WHOIS?

And the only one I could think of would be the searchable WHOIS that many, that was included in the application process and that many registry operators committed. So one interesting thing to look at might be, you know, to what extent is the searchable WHOIS capability improving the ability to use WHOIS or something like that. But the... You know, what data is inside WHOIS?

How accurate it is? Etc. There has been tons of work on that. I don't see any material difference between the rules around that or the data between the new gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs, other than dot com and dot net, which are a special case.

---

It just seems like a potential quagmire and I urge the other sub-team to scope that extremely narrowly to avoid spending a lot of time replicating work that others have done with not much effect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed. Brian? We can't hear you Brian, you may be muted.

BRIAN: Hi. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes we can.

BRIAN: Oh great. I just wanted to point you all as well, in terms of this WHOIS question to safeguard number five that's reviewed in the DNS abuse report, which is the requirement for thick WHOIS, which is a requirement for all new registries in the program. In a relatively small section, we sort of provide some context, an overview of that safeguard. And some potential methods of measuring the effectiveness of it.

So I would encourage everyone to take a look at it. I think it would help overcome opening that WHOIS can of worms and keep it nice and contextualized within the remit of the safeguards sub-team. So thanks very much.

---

JONATAHN ZUCK: Thanks Brian. So I think Laureen you have your, plenty of advice on this. And I know you're going to want to be diligent on this to keep this from becoming a WHOIS review. So that will just be something to keep in mind to get to that section. It's just the parts that are relevant. [CROSSTALK] Oh, go ahead Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: [Inaudible] appreciate the comments about needing to be very careful. Quagmires, and tar pits, and cans of worms also [inaudible]... Thanks to everyone for the input.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we can't be afraid of every can of worms, but if it's already something being addressed, then we can try to side step it. Carlton, I saw your hand go up quickly and go back down.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I hope you can hear me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. I just wanted to pipe in on this WHOIS issue. I quite agree that we should be mindful of not straying too far into the WHOIS issue, especially with regard to all of the work that has been done. I personally believe that all the useful WHOIS work is already done. What

---

we have not had is compliance and enforcement. And the tension between what is collected, how it's collected, who gets access to it, other issues, etc. all of that has been gone over ad nauseam. What we need is to ensure that in this review, CCT review, we recognize that there is a trust element that kind of scrapes up against the WHOIS issue.

And we need to put a bright line so we don't cross over too much into it. But I really would not want to say that the WHOIS issue is, needs exploring anymore. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Carlton. I think we're all on the same page, and so we'll keep this discussion active when it comes up and work to constrain it, and find a way that this team could be most helpful to that discussion. Any other comments on that or more generally on the safeguards and trust sub-team?

Okay, great.

Leaders of the PDP working group to go over the discussion that we had last time on this plenary about the areas of overlap, and the areas of risk. And so we'll have the leaders of the PDP as well as Carlos, our liaison to that group, and I, and we'll be having a conversation and with them and trying to figure out areas to work together, like interviewing applicants where we try to get some questions inserted into that process, identifying the areas that are most important to us and areas that came out of the conversation a couple of weeks ago as less important.

---

So most of that, I think, should be predictable, but I'll report more on that after the call, and we'll start the actual process of coordinating with them on the overlapping areas of interest.

So Pam just said I was muted. Did everybody hear that?

[CROSSTALK]

Okay. Sorry about that. I don't know how that happened. But anyways, all I was saying is that we have a call tomorrow, with the leaders, with the chairs of the PDP working group on future procedures. And Carlos, our liaison to that group, and me, and we will be discussing... I'll be sharing the discussions that we all had a couple of weeks ago on the plenary, on the categories of issues from their brainstorming session and where we saw the areas sort of cooperative overlap, where we saw the areas where we really wanted to kind of own the topic.

And then other areas where we really saw it fall more into their purview and not ours. And that will be a dynamic discussion, but I think the outcome will be relatively predictable for that, but hopefully we'll get some plan of action out of it for some of the areas of overlap, and I will report out that call on our next plenary call.

All right. So, next on the agenda is the studies and data requests. And I confess, I don't know how we're handling that part of the discussion. I think Jordyn reported on the last call that there aren't necessarily a lot of additional studies that they would be requesting out of their group, but they felt that they had most of the data they needed for the high priority issues that the subgroup identified.

---

So I think, Jordyn raise your hand if that's not true. Eleeza, do you have some insight into this agenda item?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi. Yes, thanks Jonathan. This is Eleeza. I was just going to say I can give you an update on where things stand with the consumer survey and the economic study data requests. I received an email this morning from Nielson updating us on where they stand. They currently have 3,419 complete, so that means completed survey responses. They are fully out to field in the US, UK, Canada, India, Nigeria, South Africa, Spain, France, Japan, Turkey, China, Brazil, Germany, Indonesia, Poland, Russia, and South Korea.

We started in Columbia, Argentina, and Mexico yesterday. And they've finished the work on [inaudible] and Brazil and Turkey. And are actually completely done in Japan, Nigeria, South Africa, Poland, and the United States. So they're getting pretty close to finishing their field work, which is very good news.

On the economic side of things, Friday was the deadline for the registries and registrars to provide their data to their analysis group. On the registry side, they've received potentially more responses than on the registrar side. Of course the registries are contractually obligated to provide any information requested for an economic study. So we always knew that would be easier.

On the registrar side, I'm sorry to say, we've gotten pretty low response rate, and in fact, several responses saying they do not plan to participate at all, which is obviously quite disappointing for everyone.

---

The group, the analysis group is actually going to begin their annual collection of reach out price data, so this is what they did last time in the face of [inaudible] that otherwise provided retail pricing data. They're actually going to go on to the registrars' website and collect different price points as they need them for the study in particular.

I sent a note to Jonathan yesterday, analysis group is open to receiving data from registrars who self-select, so those who are interested in sharing their data anyway. I asked if they had any concerns about incorporating data like that, because we can't say whether or not those particular registrars were identified, for example, from the outset. But they didn't have any concerns, I think at this point they have received more data obviously.

So that's where those two things stand.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you Eleeza. Has everybody...? Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you chair. Just to follow up on the registrar [inaudible] issue. When the link came up for the reviews, for the surveys, I forwarded it to Michele. And he responded about 10 minutes later and said this was the first time he was hearing about it. So I ask him to circulate it in the registrar constituency.

I don't know how helpful that was, but if Michele is not aware of it, then it says something to me, because he usually has his finger on the pulse.



---

So I don't know what happened, but certainly it raised the flag with me when he said he had not seen the request. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

If I could reply quickly. There are two issues there Carlton. One may be that Michele's company may not be included in the sample, so they may not have received or got a request directly from the analysis group. The other point though is we, actually Karen Luntz sent a note to the registrar directly, all of them, indicating that this is coming, that they should keep an eye in their inboxes for it, what the purpose of the data request was for, and that this is part of the CCT review, and so on and so forth.

So we've done quite a bit of outreach in that sense, and in fact, now have asked our registrar services, our engagement managers to reach out to those registrars who have not responded to the data request, and urge them using their business relationship to participate in this study.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Eleeza. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks. Jordyn Buchanan. So I believe, and maybe Calvin can [inaudible]... I think I heard that the registrar stakeholder group was about to start doing periodic conference calls. It might be useful to get someone from staff and/or analysis group to join one of those calls, if, you know, to address the community registrars, at least, that exist

---

within ICANN. And so to answer any questions that folks may have, and now that I'm saying this about the registrar, the registries do have, I would recall the next one is in a couple of hours, it's right at the end of this call, and it may be similarly useful to have staff and analysis group try to do a brief Q&A in that context as well.

I know there were a number of questions on the registry stakeholder group mailing list related to the data request, particularly around premium pricing. I think I was able to defuse some of the concerns there, but the, yeah. Having someone from analysis group and ICANN particularly to sort of talk about confidentiality issues, I thought would have been really helpful to have in a broadcast discussion.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you Jordyn. I think [CROSSTALK] would be open to joining those conversations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. I'll add that I reached... After you reached out to me, Eleeza, I reach out to Gram and Jeff Newman, on this topic, self-selecting registrars. And so I just reached out to them late last night, so I haven't heard back from them yet. But I'll continue to work that angle as well, to find folks that have a lot of data. That would be willing to share with the analysis group.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions for Eleeza?

Okay, and so the next phase, on our next plenary, I'm not ready on this one. But on our next plenary, we will start to go through the same exercise that competition and choice and the safeguards and trust have gone through to match up data sources we have to questions that we're asking and look at additional data requests that we may want to make or...

Data requests is sort of like a general term, instead it may be surveying people, etc. And some of that may be informed by the call with the subsequent procedures working group and we'll start having that conversation so if [inaudible] data requests coming out of the application and evaluation uber team that we're all on.

And we'll start that on the next plenary call. Our next topic is the data from Center. Who is leading that discussion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Jonathan. This is a document that Drew and Stan worked on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you guys give a little presentation of this information so that to form a framework for discussion?

---

STANLEY BESEN:

This is Stan. It is my understanding... Firstly, the document was prepared largely by David. I thought he was actually going to talk about it. Both Drew and I reviewed it, got comments back to him, and on that basis he was going to share with this larger group. But that's all I know at the moment.

I actually have a larger question, which is, and this I think, primarily, at least from my perspective pertains mainly to the competition subgroup, I have a sense that we're not collecting data in a systematic way as I would like. The Center data is sort of a piece of the puzzle, but there were lots of other pieces. And I'm not sure, quite frankly, where they all fit together.

Maybe that's a topic for the competition group to talk about next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Stan. I think that's a good observation, and while your question may be specific to competition, it's probably going to come up everywhere. So we might want to give some thought to discussion on how to be systematic in our data collection. I think some extent that was the purpose of the spreadsheet that you and Jordyn worked on, to do some mappings, to make sure there was coverage of the questions being asked.

But we might want to standardize how we look at data as well, so that we can help place a value on that data as well. If you have some thoughts about what you think a systematic, quote/unquote, systematic collection of data might look like, then please do share those I think with the broader group.

---

STANLEY BESEN: I actually circulated what I think was a partial list earlier in the week, some new... There are a variety of what I think of a secondary sources that various people have identified. I'm not familiar with all of them, but and of course, we have primary data directly from ICANN and the surveys. But I guess maybe other people know where these fit together. I really don't.

And it seems to me we just sort of go down the list and say this is a useful source, this one isn't, these are redundant. I sort of, at least with the competition group, I would propose that we take that up at our next week's call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm just wondering if there is anything we should do to tie the evaluation of the data sources that we have coming in for being [inaudible] you know, encompassing, or bias, or things like that. I mean there might be a standard set of questions we should be asking about the various data sources that we're beginning to ingest.

So this is something to think about. I'll spend some time thinking about it and maybe you and I can kibitz on it a little bit Stan. Dejan, you would like to talk about his Center data?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yeah. [Inaudible]. As I mentioned before, Center has a lot of data that might be useful for us. But most of their data are classified and only for, they can only share with their members. And as I mentioned, I spoke

---

with Peter at Center, and he told me that we can prepare our list of questions, and he will share with us everything he can according to their policies.

So this is the first draft of our questions, and we share it with the group to collect input from the other members. So also, we should discuss about who will send this letter to Center. It should be someone who, some of, three of us who created or staff of ICANN or chair of the group. I think we are not sure at the moment, and the other thing. When we have the final list of questions, maybe we should consider to send those questions to other regional ccTLD organizations, not just the Center. That's it from me.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Dejan. Stan, did you have a comment on that?

STANLEY BESEN:

Yeah. One of the things that we're interested in besides their data, is their methodology. They may be unwilling to share that with us. For example, I think, we should be interested in how they define markets, for example, whether they included ccTLDs and gTLDs in the same market. What they generally, how they would define markets.

If you recall in Marrakech, the lady who spoke in our session, public session, said that they have been [inaudible] HHIs. Even if they can't give us the results, they can certainly tell us how they define the market for which those HHIs were calculated.

---

JONATAHN ZUCK: That makes sense. Let's add methodological questions. [CROSSTALK]

STANLEY BESEN: They actually, they're actually in the first paragraph of the data request that Dejan talked about.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I see them. As far as who should send the letter, I'm happy to have staff do it, or it can come from me. Whatever we think could get the most, the best response, but I'm also happy to have somebody from the subgroup, or Dejan, to submit it on behalf of the review team as well.

Does staff have an idea about the best way to get this data request to Center? I know Peter pretty well, so I'm happy to do it as well. They have [inaudible] I mean, those are old hands.

DJEAN DJUKIC: Old hand there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'll go through this and I'm happy to submit this to Peter on behalf of the group. Are there other questions or comments on this document? Do you want to go through any of the specifics of this Dejan to see if there is any discussion about this? Or do we think that it is good pretty much as is.

---

Has everyone had a chance to look at this? Jordyn, I know you had some questions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I did. No, I just wanted to make sure... I thought it was useful to discuss this today, but I didn't have any specific questions around it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Any other questions or comments about this data request? It's pretty straightforward, and I'll formulate it into, what did Megan say? [Inaudible] not ICANN staff. Understood. So I'll send it to them on behalf of the review team then.

Okay. All right. So that's great. We will send out this data request. We have our face to face coming up here in D.C. on the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of June. And we need to begin to talk about what we want to try to accomplish there and how to make the best use of being face to face, I guess and what kind of discussions we want to have. So I open that up for some conversation. I certainly want to begin some of the discussions around the application and evaluation on that face to face.

But I'm interested in hearing from Jordyn and Laureen about how you imagine making the best use of the face to face for your sub-team work. Are there speakers we want to have there? Is there anything else we want to have besides the team, for example?

Jordyn, go ahead.



---

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks Jonathan. It's Jordyn Buchanan. Yeah, I just want to say briefly. I haven't yet had the chance to give this much thought as to where we'll be. I think it probably makes sense for me to work with staff a little bit over the next week or so to figure out the work plan, including our next couple of calls, and where we think that's going to land us at the meeting.

You know, I think the hope is that we'll have, by this point, come up with some straw people definitions of market that will be trying to narrow down and potentially use for the remainder of our work on the competition topic. So you know, maybe it could transition time to start thinking about once we have the market definition, how we actually want to go about doing the analysis, and you know, getting to, spending some time looking at the sort of like tables that sort of stand and put together, to start to think about what the actual output is going to be in the next phase of the work.

So that would be my rough guess, but I think we just need to plot it out a little bit more, and haven't yet had an opportunity to do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. Laureen, did you have some...? You started to talk.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Sure. [Inaudible] I have a very small computer screen now, looking at... So, I'm hoping that by the time of our face to face, we should have gone through the studies that are on our radar screen, and I think the face to face will be a good opportunity for us to evaluate sort of a work plan

---

going forward about how we're going to then synthesize what is in those studies to our analysis.

And I'm hoping the face to face provides a good opportunity to brainstorm, and really put some flesh on the bones about our work going forward. I'm also considering the topic that we've raised several times but haven't really had a chance to dip our toes in the water of the compliance group. ICANN compliance has a lot of data, and although we've identified that as a high level of the potential source of information, as I said, we haven't taken a deep dive into that.

So I'm thinking that the face to face meeting might also provide an opportunity for us to identify what's available, and perhaps even if it's not available on the ICANN website, there actually might be information that we can request. So those two issues seem to me to be some good areas of focus. But I'll also have it as an agenda item for our next sub-team call, because both may have other good thoughts.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Carlton, did you want to go ahead and speak up and share your thoughts from the chat?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Okay. Yes. I was thinking, I totally agree with Laureen. We have some the safeguard interest sub-team, we have some action items that are outstanding. I'm sure we'll try to get to them and have those settled before we get to D.C. But one of the things I would be looking forward to in D.C. is that the team, when we get to D.C. and leave D.C., will have

---

a very solid panoramic view of the safeguard issues and the trust issues, and what they look like, and those that we can have measurements for.

I like the idea of, Laureen mentioned the compliance data. There is a lot of compliance data that we might wish to evaluate because those who speak to the safeguard and trust objectives. I think, some of it, and that will help us to kind of cement what we mean by safeguards, what is it that engenders trust and so on. So yes, I agree with Laureen that those two issues will be top of line for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Carlton. Laureen, I have a couple of questions. One is, have you ended up getting much communication from [inaudible]? I know David Taylor was going to reach back out to Michael Gram who was sort of heading up that effort inside of [inaudible]. Should we be trying to, you know...?

Is there something else we need to be doing to spur along the trademark owners survey or whatever form that study was going to take? And is this a good opportunity to do that? To get some people in the room from [inaudible] or something like that? For that portion of your research?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

This is Laureen. We have not heard from [inaudible]. And David's not on the call today, is that correct? I don't think so.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    That's right, I looked at the list...

LAUREEN KAPIN:                    Yeah. And I think we've missed him in the last sub-team call. So I think that's a great idea because this is something that is discrete, that we could look into and perhaps make some substantial progress on. So maybe this would be a good opportunity to try and get that brought to the table.

So the quick answer is no, we haven't heard from them. Yes, it would be great to pursue this. And get it developed and concluded as soon as possible.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                    To preserve the chain of command, Laureen, could I maybe ask you to reach out to David to see how those conversations are going and identify somebody? If that breaks down, I'm happy to reach out to Michael Gram directly and, or Laurie [inaudible], or somebody like that, to get them there. But perhaps if you can take this action item to reach out to David in the near turn, and then let me know if you get no joy.

LAUREEN KAPIN:                    Absolutely. I will reach out to David. And I'll loop back with you if there is an issue.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sounds good. I'm not ignoring your suggestion, Megan, I'm just sort of waiting until we get out of the sub-team discussion to go over the notion of NTIA. Eleeza, I see you have your hand up. That may be to reiterate what you have in the comments about compliance data, so I want to hear that, but I'm also interested in whether or not the timing works to have a discussion with Nielson at the face to face about the registrant survey, because we're going to make some changes there and do a negative branch from the disqualification survey and some things like that.

So that might be a place to have some of those conversations. Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi Jonathan. Yes, this is Eleeza. Yeah, you are right. We've actually already spoken to David Dickenson from [inaudible] and asked him to keep his calendar open for those two days, because we wanted to go over the registrar questionnaire with you. Actually the more primary reason we were hoping to have him there was that they would have a good first draft of the results from the consumer survey, so it will be a chance to discuss those results as well.

So that's definitely on our radar as well as on Neilson's. And then you're right, I did just wanted to come back to the slide on compliance to add, I think when you, when the safeguards team was discussing in Marrakech, I was with the competition team. But I just wanted to point out that we do have several metrics related to compliance that we are tracking, and I put the link on the chat there.

---

There are many others, of course, if you are interested in, we can work on that, but I just wanted to point out what we do have already, which kind of lines up with what compliance already pushes online. So I just wanted to pick up with that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Great Eleeza. Thank you for that. So, Lauren and Carlton, maybe it's worth looking at the metrics that are there on the next sub-team call to identify what the primaries of discussion might be in the face to face in terms of what you want in addition to the stuff that was already collected as a result of the metrics working group work that went before.

Okay, excellent. So Megan has suggested in the chat that we might want to hear from NTIA on their thoughts on the review. Do people have, and Jamie has agreed it was a good idea too. Does anybody else have thoughts on that idea? Do we want Fiona or Larry to come and talk a little bit about what they envision at the point which they were [inaudible] for this review?

I got a plus one from Carlos. Seems like helpful context. That appears to be the trend of the thing. I can reach out or Jamie can, either way, we can reach out to NTIA to get them engaged during that time. So let's take the assignment of that offline, but it seems to be a consensus of the call to have NTIA involved.

Any other D.C. based organizations or more general topic areas that we want to try and cover at the face to face?

---

Oh, thanks for your deferral Jamie. Either way, it's fine with me. Any other questions about that? Or discussions about the face to face? All right. I'm very much Ted Cruz, yes. Let's get Ted Cruz involved in our face to face meeting. Any other suggestions?

Oh Trump, oh my goodness. Okay. Is somebody speaking up?

All right. Any other topics for discussion? We've actually reached the end of our agenda early today. Do folks have any other business that they want to cover? I've been a little bit out of commission the past few weeks, but I'm starting to kick in again on all cylinders going forward, so I appreciate everyone's patience.

Life was a little bit strange for the last few weeks. Any other business that people want to bring up?

All right, so we'll let you off the hook for the second half of the call here. On the next call, we'll be drilling into the data needs of the application and evaluation work that we're going to be doing and discussing the coordination with the [inaudible] subsequent procedures. Okay? Thanks everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**