JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome to the Application Evaluation Sub-Team meeting. We need to go through a similar exercise to what we were doing in the Competition and Choice meeting yesterday, which is trying to look at some of these questions and take some of the abstraction out of them and get to a level of specificity that makes those questions answerable, if that makes sense.

We have a little bit of a status report on the applicant unicorn search that we can update you on and we're bringing in a vendor at 11:00 A.M. Global that's actually going to tackle this idea of finding. This is like Jordan's idea of trying to find the cohorts in the developing world to the people that were successful applicants in the Global North. So in Africa, Latin America, South Asia and the Caribbean, we will explore who some of the people were that should have applied and try to explore, you know, why they didn't by talking to them basically.

And we've all thrown out a number of hypotheses about that – and as Steve mentioned yesterday, the answer, and I think that it might have been [Drew] that mentioned before – the answer may just be they didn't want to. It might be that simple. And it wasn't a priority and this, and we can simply report that.

So at this point, it's merely an observation that the developing world was under-represented in the applicant pool and we don't even know whether it's something to be concerned about, but if it's something over which we have some control, that had to do with the applicant support process or cost generally, or that people just didn't even know any of it was going on, then that might be something worth making

some recommendations about. So that's where we're there on that piece.

I don't have control. Who's controlling the slides? Oh okay. Do you want to go to the next slide?

Another one of these eye tests. If you recall, these are the slides we put together that are basically the big questions that we asked as part of the brainstorming exercise back in Los Angeles. And there was this notion of addressing the needs of underserved markets. And so that's some of the things that we've begun to do some work on with trying to collect people to talk to because the more we looked at it, the more it seemed like that was the place to start this process.

We've already had some discussion on the last plenary call that if it was a case of people not hearing about it, what might have been the cause of that. So as we develop these as research questions, there's already going to be almost a two-tiered effort. In other words, if we hear from them, "We didn't even know this was going on," then we need to look into why.

I remember that Carlton, I believe, suggested that it might, part of it might have had to do with the type of outreach that was done. That radio, for example, is a more effective means of outreach in certain parts of the world.

Again, that question may not even need to be addressed if we found out they did know about it but that it just wasn't a priority to have new TLDs, that other things, broadband rollout or something, was more important.

And then, as Steve said, money wasn't even necessarily a problem in his mind, that it was expertise. So hopefully, we can get some of those answers as we talk to some folks that "should have applied," if that makes sense.

So that's kind of how we're addressing the questions that are coming up, at least the first pass of the questions that are coming up in this first box about serving the developing world because from that will spring questions about applicant support, etc. But we'll be guided into where we need to go next, I think, by those discussions.

The other one that's related but not quite the same is more generally, not just in the developing world, but was there a have or have-nots kind of problem with the application process? In other words, was the system kind of rigged for people with more resources and people with sort of insider knowledge or experience inside the ICANN community and things like that? So that's the square.

I wonder if you could just blow up the slide a little bit so that we can read the one that's in the top middle as we got through. And we'll just go through these things because I think people won't be able to see otherwise. Yeah.

So providing equal opportunity for participation in the program. And here again, I think that we're going to try and talk to some people again and try to get some answers. But this isn't necessarily limited to the classically underserved communities, the developing world, the Global South, etc., but just folks that were sort of outsiders to the system or

less endowed financially to participate in it. And so I think this might still be worth doing a little bit of brainstorming about how to get at this.

The one thing that we've begun is a process of determining the applicants who withdrew from the process but did so for reasons other than an auction. Although the auction people may be interesting as well, but then withdrew entirely. Like there are some applications withdrawals from applicants that have successful [strains] as well. So we're trying to sort of narrow it down to the people that walk away from the process all together. And so Eleeza and I have been doing some database manipulation to get to that.

I don't know if Eleeza, you can cover about where you are in narrowing that. You were going to get help from the team on narrowing that list further to get rid of the, to get down to the people we really want to talk to. And then maybe talking to Nielsen or someone about trying to reach out to them.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I can talk about that a bit. So the list, I think we have about 200 names on it now. I think this week, we'll be working to clear out any names that remain that are LLCs of other applicants that may have been successful in their applications. And I've been in touch with Nielsen. They're going to be sending me some pricing proposals this week, but they are up for the task of interviewing those applications, those applicants, about their experience.

I've given them the list of names and they're not too optimistic about getting everyone on the phone, but they're willing to try. They think a

EN

more realistic number of what we'd get in terms of replies is somewhere in the range of 15 to 40 depending on how many they actually have working phone numbers for. So that's one thing to bear in mind.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, it's good that we're starting from that list. I mean, I think for the other effort we're talking about in the developing world, because it's four regions and everything, we're talking about trying to get to 200 names there simply because that same process.

Now luckily, in this case, we're at least starting with people that did full-fledged applications. And so therefore, we should have not only the right contact person but legitimate contact information for them. So that should help.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: From four years ago.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's the only thing to bear in mind. These were applications that were submitted in –

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Four years ago. So if that's valid, then it will be great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I guess the question is do folks think we should do a little bit of work up front or wait until they're engaged to talk about questions that we might want to ask this community to suss out this particular issue? I mean, at some very fundamental level, we're going to say, "Why did you withdraw your application?" And that, in theory, could lead to some branching or something like that. And do we want to try to suss out what some of these issues are?

I mean, I don't know if anybody remembers being the ones that put these stickers on the wall in the first place: the risk of an unfair advantage for those with more money and insider knowledge. That was somebody's recommendation. Does anybody want to suss that out a little bit to translate that into a kind of a question or a scenario or something like that that we might anticipate for the kinds of Q&A that we'll ask these folks? Does anybody remember having put that? I mean, it's somewhat self-evident. Right? But why would they drop out in the middle of the process if they felt like they didn't have the money to run a gTLD. Thoughts?

Oh, sorry.

EN

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think I may have put one of these up here, the risk of unfair advantage. But if I were asking questions, I think I would start with why they applied in the first place because clearly, the application itself must have meant that they had certain hopes and expectations. And then move from there to asking questions about what challenges they encountered and what ultimately then led them to withdraw.

I mean, I would do a progression starting with what they thought the experience was going to be and what it turned out to be and then, perhaps there, observations about what they thought was required to be a successful applicant. I think that would get at whether this was a question of money, whether this was a question of networking, whether this was a question of technical expertise, whatever.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, Jonathan. I think the insider knowledge was the one I added into this which is not necessarily meaning to be a negative in any way. It was how do we assess whether the outreach even went out and whether it was just people who turn up at a lot of ICANN meetings that knew about it or not. So I think that was really the point there. So I don't know enough to think about, we would have to think about what questions.

But it could just be, I'm thinking sort of, obviously, the portfolio applicants where they applied for many TLDs, some of those that may have dropped may have a reason. Some of them may have lost in auction. There are those factors. But I think on the insider knowledge, it's really within [inaudible] – have you attended ICANN meetings before

you applied? How many ICANN meetings did you attend? And we'd get to factual part where we can classify or not. Though we won't be [inaudible] of "Are you an insider?" I think it's both.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: First, I think I agree with David that you would find a pretty strong correlation, not necessarily between the applicants and previous participation in ICANN, but certainly, the people involved in producing the applications and participation in ICANN. So many of the brand applicants, for example, were represented by consulting firms who had a long previous history of engagement with ICANN and those applicants were, in many cases, previous clients. Companies like Valideus or Fairwinds, they would be previous clients of those companies. A bunch of law firms did quite a bit this business as well. David might be familiar with some of that. But it's not necessarily the applicants. They were in an ecosystem where they would naturally become aware because they were working with a business that was motivated to make them aware and then help them through the process.

To that end, I think maybe what David was hinting at is that I think we should try to think of it as a consistent survey that we can send to both successful and unsuccessful applicants. I think we may find, even for some successful applicants, that we would find insights about whether it was difficult. Like, "Could you have done this on your own without some of this insider expertise?" I think might be an interesting question to ask.

EN

I think there were no applications that were deemed unsuccessful through the initial evaluation process. So certainly, once you got into it, it seems like there wasn't much of a weed-out process. So the main barrier doesn't seem to be like what happened once you got in. It's like getting into the funnel in the first place, but certainly learning from applicants about what barriers they perceived through the process might still be helpful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I think you'll find that most of that's the result of the contention processes as opposed to – I mean, there are some. There are some people who even got their TLD delegated but then decided they didn't want it. Those are interesting examples. But I think you'll find there's only a tiny handful of people who got into the process and, for some reason, felt that they were unable to complete it as opposed to uninterested in completing it.

But you may get all of the successful applicants saying, like, "Yeah, we were successful but there was no way we would have done it unless we were working with a consulting firm that already had the insider expertise" right? So the fact that they were successful doesn't necessarily discredit the notion that you need insider expertise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You were [inaudible]. It's just that their life was hard.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I mean, that would be my hypothesis. We could see what happens when we actually look at the applicants, but I think there's not very many that sort of winnowed out by the process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a clarification, I mean, there were some applications that were successful. And coming from those areas –

JONATHAN ZUCK: This one isn't about the areas anymore. This is just, it could be people in Europe or the United States.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That withdraw. Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or lack of insider knowledge.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. That was the question. Thank you.

KAILI KAN: Yeah. Look, yes, I agree with that especially for people in developing world, also, to provide equal opportunity. [Inaudible] the case for China. I think, well, as a matter of fact, those, it's well-believed that, first of all,

China has well over half, over 50% of registrations. And also, it's fully believed that well over 90% are for speculations.

So as a matter of fact, I believe this kind of speculation, large scale speculation, actually squeezes out the equal opportunity of other people from other nations all over the world. So therefore, I sort of think that whether it will be good to establish some kind of balance for this kind of speculation in order to provide the equal opportunities for other people. And so one possibility is to increase the cost of that kind of speculation. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just to get on the same page, it sounds like you're talking about registrations which is second level domains. Like premium words that other people might want or something like that.

KAILI KAN: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So this is so much about applicants, the people that wanted to try to run their own.

KAILI KAN: For the gTLD. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, correct. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, that's a valid point but luckily, not what we're tasked to deal with. I mean, because that's a can of worms.

KAILI KAN: Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The whole speculation, but thank you. Other thoughts on that in terms of other areas?

                        Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

FABRO STEIBEL: I like what Jordyn said about intermediaries that will mediate this process. Eventually, from the application, we can identify how many years of some kind of intermediaries. And there is a scenario where we're dealing with ten people who were responsible for 150 of these cases that were dropped out.

                        And then what we can do is look at that with two scenarios. The first one is if we know how many use intermediaries, then we can have some

perspective for the other [box one] other [than] the areas and other markets.

And the second one is that we can do a survey with these intermediaries. How many of them have a good reputation so that a consulting firm with a portfolio of clients and how many of them are just low budget expertise or just kind of reaching out to this low market for quick money, for example?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that might have been effective and less effective intermediaries is what you're saying, potentially. Yes, sir.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, I think it's both we need to look at. I think we need to look at the intermediaries for sure. But obviously, quite a bit of this could be confidential information which they may not be at liberty to divulge. I can name quite a few applications which we were involved in which didn't go through. Honestly, they wouldn't be saying why so you'd need to reach out to the applicant themselves. But we've got the primary and secondary contacts which are always going to be there so I don't see any issue on that, reaching out directly, and if need be, then to the intermediary.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So knowing that you are, in fact, an intermediary, how best would we go about evaluating the quality of intermediaries?

DAVID TAYLOR: Obviously, I would take a great hand in assisting that particular endeavor. Is it something we should be doing? It would be a very interesting thing to do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was the recommendation. The only reason is if there was some that were better than others and there was a low rent version of an intermediary that certain people were able to afford or knew about, etc., if it were people that were – I don't know what the right way is to categorize them – but they were the ambulance chaser variety of intermediary that went out and found people and said, "Hey, do you have $200,000? Do you want a TLD?" I don't know, right? I guess I don't have a sense of what it is that took place.

I know several that I think were very good and I don't know if there were a category of them that weren't, that maybe a certain type of applicant we're using.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think it's very difficult to do that selection. I mean, I know that for instance, we did, for registry service providers, we did an official RFP for each and every one for certain clients and went in and visited them and when through their security. And there's not many clients who would pay for that. And then we came up with the conclusion which was then promptly ignored and another one was taken. So there you go. It shows you can do what you want to do.

It also reminds me that times, I think mine are probably over 50 outreaches to clients about new gTLDs. I'd go into a seminar for the day, talk to people in the morning, talk to people in the afternoon and at lunch, the people who were against it in the morning were for it in the afternoon and the ones who were for it were against it. I'd then go home thinking, "Well, then I've done a good job. This client now understands the issues and would clearly apply."

And, of course, then they didn't. And then the ones which I've said, "Well, you needn't bother applying; you're applying for a 15-character TLD; that's pointless," they would then say they're going to apply. So very hit and miss and even if I looked on what we do, I struggled to conclude what was, you know, good, bad and how we went about it. So I think to go into sort of how the intermediaries performed, etc. and again, an ambulance chasing, etc., to my mind, again, it's very difficult.

From personal experience, it was the other way around with how clients coming in at the last minute with two weeks to go saying, "Can you do this application?" We all know we can find out the price range. I know what we were charging. And again, you're charging different amounts to different clients so you're never going to be so avert with that. I don't think anybody will.

But, you know, near the end, I was seeing issues where to apply to financial questions, you were being charged $50,000 U.S. dollars, which when you look at what you were charging for the entire application, you think, "Wow." So there was a lot of money being made at the last minute.

Now again, how you ever go into evaluating that, to know which people are doing that, who is ever going to, I mean, it gets very, very delicate to go into that situation [criticizing] or not on the intermediaries. I don't know how we'd do that objectively. But we might find a way.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. I think, once again, if we just put together a survey that we can send all applicants, we can send them questions like, "Did you get help? Was the help effective? Would you have been successful if you didn't have the help?" I think that information would be informative without necessarily having to try to quantitatively rate individual intermediaries.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you agreeing there isn't a value in trying to talk to the intermediaries because there would be so much protected information and things anyway? You probably said yes and I just don't want to [inaudible].

DAVID TAYLOR: I'd reach out to the applicants first because we've got their contacts. Some of those contact information may be the intermediaries. So by definition, we may end up going by the intermediaries. I think the question that needs to be the ultimate applicant or yourself. I mean, at the end of the day, as long as we could differentiate it. But I'd go for the applicants and then we'll see what we get back and potentially, then we could go down through intermediaries.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yes, sir.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I would expect for applicants that dropped out that there should have been some trail of communication between them at ICANN. So I don't know whether that could be available as an input for us to determine the reasons why some of them dropped out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That hasn't been my impression. But I'll pass that back to ICANN to get a sense of.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't know. I would have to look into it. My guess is that would have to be confidential information, but I'm not sure. Maybe Jordyn knows better.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Just independent of what ICANN, whether it's confidential or not, the actual withdrawal notice doesn't ask for any reason why you're withdrawing. It just says "I'm withdrawing," so I think in general ICANN's not going to have very much useful information on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The e-mail before this, the withdrawal, "Okay, you bastard, I'm going to withdraw," and then they send the generic notice in, right? But that's probably, I think, is the least of that kind of communication is probably

private. Although, at ICANN, you never know, I guess. Yeah, it's just ICANN correspondence. Exactly.

Any other thoughts on the questions we might ask? So I guess this raises the question about surveying all of the applicants. There is a plan, at least, and I guess I'm looking at Carlos and Carlton. There's a plan for the PDP folks to survey applicants. Do you have any sense of the timing for that and whether or not it's something that we ought to try to combine efforts with or if we should just go to the applicant pool with our own questions right now and not worry about their timing? Because at one point, we talked about trying to add questions to their survey when it came to successful applicants. We were going to do some special stuff. Is that feasible or should we forge ahead?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Funny enough that you are asking. I think it's on the agenda to be discussed this week. And I'm not there, but I still think given what they were saying of timing, I think it might be useful to just add some questions to theirs. We should have something by end of September.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I heard Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry. I was actually going to add that I spoke to Steve Chen who's a staff member on the review and he didn't seem to have a clear sense of a timeline. He didn't think it would come that soon, but maybe there's been something new that I've missed since then. But when I asked him

because this question had come up for our review to see if we could start coordinating that, he said he didn't think it was going to be any time soon. So you may want to move quicker than they do.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Then we need to talk to [Averi] again, see what else. [Averi] is the person who has been doing most of this. So probably I'll just send [Averi] a note and find out what the status after this meeting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I ask either you or Carlos to try and dig into that a little bit to see whether it's feasible to work together on it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is a long questionnaire going out to the SO/ACs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are different. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. And this is in the very short term, so we expect to have some [feed] in there, some questions related to that, but to the SO/AC, not to the applicant.

CARLTON SAMUELS: The SO/AC ones are coming in now. I know the ALAC has been executed. But one of the ideas is that they would use the SO/AC's

responses to kind of take what we do forward in the applicant questionnaire. That was the idea. So I'll get back to them and ask.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We look forward to hearing from you, Carlton. David?

DAVID TAYLOR: Just on that point, when I heard mention September by itself, I thought that was way too late if we're going to join up and send something about. I mean, it sounds like it may even be a bit later, etc. so I would have thought we'd need to more far quicker on that and get something out to act prior to Helsinki, if not straight after.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I don't think anything will be fielded before Helsinki, but maybe. So do we feel we should just forge ahead and save Carlton and Carlos trying to make something happen inside the PDP? I mean, your confidence level is not high, right? What was the total number, 1,800 or something like that? Was that the total number of applicants?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 1,930.

JONATHAN ZUCK: 1,930. Yeah. I guess it's not worth going to them to see if they have questions they want to add to our survey. I guess we can just go out

with our questions. They're just going to get hit with two surveys. That's all.

Okay, so what's the best way to engage on this? I feel like we should set up kind of a straw man set of questions.

Eleeza, do you have an opinion on this?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have many opinions. Well, what I was going to suggest is if we really are going to push forward with interviewing all the applicants, you may as well design one survey, as Jordyn suggested, and push ahead with Nielsen and try to do this as quickly as possible because we have the list, we have the contact information. We do one for those who withdrew and those who didn't. To keep it fairly simple, I would imagine, I would say more than four questions, but I mean, still fairly simple.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so there'd be like a branch in the middle, I think, based on whether or not they stayed there. Some of the questions would overlap and some would be different.

So what I was getting at was already conceding that point and saying what's the best process to engage with Nielsen? Do we get them in and have a conversation like this? Do we get two people to work on a straw man set of questions? What do you think is the most efficient way?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	So what I would suggest is I already have them pricing out this questionnaire for those who withdrew. Maybe what I could do is put a pause on that and say, "I think what we really want is a larger survey with two branches or that splits and perhaps a small group from this team can come up with two sets of questions or a set of questions and then a branch for those who withdrew. Bearing in mind, if you want to use as an example, the consumer questionnaires ran pretty long at 35 minutes online with multiple choice. Do you view them as being more?
	So one of the questions I would ask, "Is this multiple choice? Is this an open-ended thing? Is it interviews?" I mean, if it's phone interviews, that's a far more lengthy exercise, I think. Those are a couple of things you may want to consider.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I guess my impression is that some of this is open-ended because we're actually trying to find, unless we can guess what the answers are, I don't think it can be purely multiple choice. That's old, right? Okay. Carlos?
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	I guess here the problem is to find the decision maker. Who made the decision, I mean, to apply or to draw back. It cannot be a multiple choice. It has to be targeted. It has to be related to the list of applicants. I mean, we have to find the person. You cannot send.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Oh yes. The questions themselves are the multiple choice. Like, "You withdraw. Did you do it A) because you didn't have enough money or B)?"
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Yes, but –
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Guessing the question, the answers.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Yes, you have to find the right person for the question first so it has to be open-ended.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Right. I think the qualification thing is separate from the survey itself, I think is the point. Just 2,000 interviews is a lot of interviews.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	We have 1,930 applications. Do you not want to at least reach out to all of them?
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yeah, it's one per applicant, not per application presumably.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's true. What is that number? Do we have it? What was that number of applicants?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If you take –

JONATHAN ZUCK: If we take donuts out, we've gotten –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Donuts takes off 300. We take off 100. Amazon takes off 76. Yeah. Even some of the brands, even L'Oreal takes off 20 or something. There's a large number of duplications.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm thinking that's a representative sample because when you would have removed people at the brand, people and so on and so on and so on, you get down to a manageable number that will make sense for us. No?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe. Do people think that we would drop out – I know you're still there, I'm not – do we think that we would drop out brands? Probably not. I think Jordyn's point is simply that the number of applicants is

smaller. So even though 800 phone interviews is not a small number –
but I don't know what's involved in that or what that would cost or
anything.

But I feel like at the very least, we would need some are going to be
interviews to come up with the multiple choice questions. So that one
approach might be to choose a sample to generate the list of potential
answers and then go out to figure out what the distribution of the
answers is in more of a formal survey format. That's one possibility.
Drew, I'm going to go to Drew first in case.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I think a group we should also add to this
pool whether we're doing a survey or doing interviews is the group of
nine applicants who are successful, were rewarded registries and
recently had their registries withdrawn by ICANN because they had a
failure to launch. And so, I think that might be indicative, perhaps, of
testing some of these hypotheses of what we're speculating on the back
end of why people withdrew their own applications once they realized
the full cost of getting a registry up and running. And that's a small set.
That's only nine to look at and that might provide some useful data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that obviously would be part of the applicant pool, but I mean, this is
often the case where you try to bias into teenagers, bias into those nine
or into the withdrawals or something like that. You're looking at me
with a certain – no, but I guess what do you think of the idea? Or should
we talk to them about pulling a sample to create a survey and then

turning it around into something that's multiple choice to make it more approachable?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not quite sure either. I feel like we need to have a conversation with Nielsen to get their input on how you construct a survey of this nature that can really tell you something about the universe of applicants that we have. So I'm trying to think of what the next best step was. It might just be to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's come up with a little sub sub-team here that are interested in this and we'll get on the phone with Nielsen and get a homework assignment from them and then do it. I think that's probably the key. It's either to come up with interview questions or a strong man survey. Stan?

STAN BESEN: How is this related to the survey that Nielsen's about to field for registrants?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's not related.

STAN BESEN: It's not related?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, that survey is for domain name registrants. This is for applicants for [strings].

STAN BESEN: But every registrant was, at one point, an applicant, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No. No, not for a top-level domain.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Stan, the people we're talking about for this portion of the review were people that wanted to have their own top-level domain, like .gallery. I decided I want to make .gallery available. And registrants are the people that buy fineart.gallery and buy the second level domains.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, or stanbesen.economist.

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. I thought you're surveying registrants. No?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Those who register.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Registrants and applicants are two different groups of people.

STAN BESEN: The survey that's going to the field is interviewing people who, in fact, chose a top-level domain. Not true?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Second level. David?

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm just going to go back to the point that we were talking about whether we solicit or go to brands and I'd certainly say we send it out to all applicants regardless of type, whether it was standard, community, city, brand, closed, and whatever because they're all involved in the consumer competition trust so I think that aspect makes sense to do that.

And I'd probably just say or suggest we send out a set of questions to them all and at the end of that, ask them if they're willing to be interviewed. Then we'll have a subset who are willing and then we can follow up with those as a suggestion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So this still involves trying to guess, then, what some of the answers to these questions might be, I guess. Right? You get some subset.

So I have so far on my list of volunteers for this group: David, Jordyn, and Laureen. Who else? And Eleeza. Who else is interested in talking

with Nielsen and then coming up with these questions for a survey for the applicants? Anybody else? This is an alligator hands problem.

Alright. Let me help. Let me help. Alright. It probably is. Alright, thanks for volunteering. I appreciate it. So we'll try to set up a call for this group together with Nielsen, I think, and we'll get on top of this survey.

The other aspect of this has actually led to some reform already which is related to the guarantees and things like that. Is that right? Isn't there already, I thought I heard [Akram] mention that there was some reform that was taking place already to make it easier for applicants in the certification process or something like that. What am I [munging] in my head here?

KAREN LENTZ: Let's see, so what I think you're probably speaking about is [Akram] and others have mentioned the idea of a sort of a certification for backend registry operators.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [He pointed] that as a potential thing, but I thought there was something that change is actually being made. That's still an idea, right? But I feel like there's a reform that's already been put in place that's financial in nature. Just very recently. And I'll have to go back and find it. There's something.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have the vaguest memory of the same thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did it have to do with switching the burden of – the failure thing over to the service provider instead of the –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Are you talking about the letter of credit?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It might be. Because that was one of the things that he was saying was a continual problem for a lot of the applicants, was getting the letter of credit and so shifting the burden for what to do when you're closing the domain and shifting that burden over to the registry service provider or something like that. Does that ring a bell? Did that just happen?

Sorry, I don't feel in the center of it. I guess I'm only asking because, are there other aspects to this question that we ought to be exploring, right? So one of the things had to do, when looking at economic disadvantage has to do with the fact that beyond the application fee there's a lot of guarantees, there's a lot of credit, etc. that have to do with the running of the TLD and so there's some discussion at least of shifting some of that burden over to the RSPs. But I don't know what else we should be looking at here in terms of reform of this process or a review of this process other than what we're going to get out of this survey.

It's really just the application and evaluation process that we're exploring, not trying to make it easier to run a TLD, right? But I guess the question is, does anybody have any other recommendations that we

should be looking at? Most of the questions we have listed up here I think can come out of the survey. Yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So one other thing I wanted to point out is – I think it was in response to this and the first question I created that table with all the back end providers and their geographic regions to see how they compared – whether registries in certain regions were using backend providers in their regions. So that table might be useful to answer other questions here, too.

DREW BAGLEY: Very analogous to that, to the backend providers for these letters of credit, do we know how many different sources they're coming from, how many different financial entities that are actually funding or backing these letters of credit? Because I wonder if that may have had an effect if applicants in certain regions were unable, not because of their own merit and their own financial standing, but just unable to find a financial institution with the resources to support them or with the sophistication to understand what a registry was?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's good. That suggests a question probably for the survey, might be the easiest way to find that out, though. Okay. Well, that might be it for this then. I think the survey is probably going to be our vector into additional questions or research, but that we just need to find out people's feelings about it first, about how this process went. So I think

we're agreed, we're going to try to construct a survey, put it in the field, and then ask who's willing to be interviewed on top of that to get more anecdotal type of responses. Are there any other ideas on the –

Okay, so those are the ones that we have done the most on. So these other three areas we need to again figure out how we're going to explore. One is about the delegation of TLDs that would be confusing or harmful, one is about collecting information from the GAC, and then I think we downgraded the allowing specific communities to be served by relevant strings when we went into prioritization.

So collecting and implementing GAC public policy advice was something that a number of people brought up in L.A. I'm open to ideas about the best way to explore the effectiveness, the timing, and the ultimate implementation of that advice. So Laureen, maybe I'll come to you first with ideas about how we might pursue this question.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, I think it's somewhat complicated and we've actually been struggling a little bit with this issue also in our Consumer Trust group. There's a clear record of what advice was given by the GAC because it's set forth in the communiqués indeed many times it's set forth again and again and again in the communiqués. What is less clear is what advice was actually implemented, because the correspondence reflects that there's a difference of perception between the Board and the GAC as to what advice was accepted and what advice was not. So you run into this situation of the Rashomon scenario where people are seeing it from their perspective and the objective reality is hard to pin down.

Certainly there's a lot of correspondence about the fact that the GAC came late to the game. I mean, I think that's the subject of a lot of press and correspondence. As to whether the GAC advice was effectively formulated, I'm wondering what the key audience is for that. Is that for the successful applicants? Is that for the applicants who wish things would have been different? Is that for the public at large? I don't know that this is very useful but I guess my highlight is, this is very, very, thorny. Certainly I think you could ask at least the successful applicants and folks who were having to deal with some contract changes that were implemented after they expected them to be i.e. the ground rules changed. I certainly think you could get information on that, because my perception is that that was somewhat frustrating and increased cost. At least I've heard that reported. So it might be interesting to explore – to drill into that – is that actually the case? What burdens did this create?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which could go back to our survey.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, which could go back to our survey. I don't know how helpful that is. They're just kind of my observations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other observations. Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Looking at this last question – Was the GAC advice effectively formulated – I actually think there's probably two lenses to look at that. One is – and I think this touches on a point that Laureen was just speaking – is, was the GAC advice effective? Some of the GAC advice was essentially just sort of like ICANN looked at the language that the GAC said and said, "Aha, we'll copy that language and put it in the contracts," or something like that. Then we could look through the safeguards and did those things work when they were imposed upon applicants? And then we could look at the costs of them as well and see whether the cost-benefit analysis of those bits of advice sort of made sense. I think governments are probably used to doing that for their own regulations – cost-benefit analysis – and so we could probably do some reflection along those lines and perhaps that would be good for the GAC to see. Just like in their own internal administration, they take this into account but it's probably rarely done in ICANN as to whether or not… It's easy to see the benefits of things but even the benefits are very rarely measured within ICANN, much less the cost.

But the other thing, the effectively formulated bit, I think you'd just see a number of areas where GAC and ICANN have gone back and forth with the GAC saying, "You didn't do what we said," and ICANN saying, "Yes, we did." And I don't know whose fault is that. Is that ICANN's fault? Is that the GAC's fault because they didn't convey it in a way that it was implementable by ICANN. I think that effectively formulated, I would focus on the areas where there seems to be disagreement as to whether the GAC advice was actually properly implemented or not, and if not, try to understand where the confusion about the implementation came from.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn, treating this like the problems from yesterday, do you think it's a question of going through that correspondence to identify those things? Is it getting a ICANN and GAC person to go head to head in a room and you take notes? "Yes I did." "No you didn't." And then try to mediate a conversation between them? What do we think is the actual process for identifying what those issues were and how they were handled, I guess?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think finding the issues is quite simple because there's not that many. Formal communication from the GAC doesn't happen particularly often and you can go look at it and say, "Which of these involved the GAC telling ICANN that they have not properly done what the GAC previously said." That's probably very easy to determine.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Yes, but still there's like a letter every couple months or something like that. You don't have to sift through hundreds and hundreds of papers in order to figure this out. I think figuring out who is to blame, I feel like, may or may not be in scope for this group. Like we have a question there. I'm not sure that question is fairly within our remit. Although we may want to say to the extent that the GAC is going to be involved in the application process, here's ways that in the future

EN

we think it might be more or less productive ways for ICANN and the GAC to work together. But that seems to touch on a much broader – How do ICANN and the GAC work together, ICANN staff?

JONATHAN ZUCK: These would be the applications. That's how we [submit] the remit.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I suspect it's difficult to really tease apart the application process versus the general relationship. But to the extent we find things are specific to the applications, I think that would probably be in scope.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We could spend two years talking about the general relationship. I'd rather not do that. If there's a way to be more specific.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I'm suggesting that it may be difficult for us to find topics where we say, "This is materially a result of the application process as opposed to the general relationship." But if people think that that's worthwhile, I don't have a problem with it, I just think finding the issues shouldn't be hard because there's not that many places where the communication happens.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Just to add to what's been said both by Laureen and Jordyn, I'm not entirely convinced that this is the best question to be asking, unless it's

absolutely limited to the application and evaluation process. Then that's okay, but I'm afraid it's the kind of question that has a tendency or the potential to go far beyond and we've just been discussing it as someone said for two years in the accountability improvements. We have new bylaws that say Advisory Committee advice has to be justified and clarified, and we have a whole new process that is supposed to go forward with advice. So if it's limited specifically to advice that the GAC made that was related to application and evaluation to improve the life of the applicant, make it easier or more difficult, which is also possible, and did that have an impact? That I can understand and see. But for me it's a very de minimis part of the issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I would hope so, right? Once again, tackling the entire relationship between ICANN and the GAC would be problematic, but the degree to which we can look at it in the context of the application process and effectiveness of the application and evaluation process – that's the question we were asked: was this process effective?

And so Laureen and others brought up at the meeting in L.A. that part of that effectiveness was how well it incorporated GAC advice with a little A. So the question is how do we suss out what the specific and the minimis parts of that were so that we can make that kind of specific discussion. Jamie?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Just to add a little context. For background, I supported the NGPC in its dealings with GAC advice. So first of all, I don't think it's that small of a

project. You're right, there's only six or seven communiqués but there's more – the last count I saw – was more than 80 items of advice that were dealt with. So I don't think this is a small problem.

Then the other issue that folks will start to get into is the back and forth that took place between the NGPC and the GAC is, what did the advice mean? What did the GAC mean by the advice? What attempts were made by the Board to understand the advice and what clarifications was the GAC able to get? It's definitely important to look at this in terms of the impact on the application process, but this is in and of itself – even if you limit it just to GAC advice on new gTLD applications – it's potentially an enormous project.

CALVIN BROWN: Just to add some fuel to the fire, you've got an IRP process which kind of hints that when following GAC advice the Board has to at least go through certain measures of interrogation. It's really getting interesting then.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Not just to find a mutually acceptable thing but also when they go to IRP, so I don't think there were that many instances where the Board rejected the GAC advice. I think you were talking more about when the Board accepted it and it went to IRP.

CALVIN BROWN: Correct. And the IRP process into the Board having to make certain assurances with respect to the GAC advice.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Not providing a rationale.

CALVIN BROWN: Yes, rationales and so forth.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I would like to comment on what Megan just said and I see a very clear flow in terms of the application process which is the first step if somebody withdraw because of GAC early advice. The second step if delegation was prevented because of not early advice but GAC consensus resolutions and if it went to IRP or not. And that would exclude the .africa because Africa is a community application. Okay? Strictly speaking about GAC consensus advice.

And the third – I'm just looking at the flow of the applications because I tend to agree with Megan that we should focus on impact of GAC early advice and resolutions on the application process only. So we have these three steps: withdrawing because of early advice, negating a delegation because of consensus resolution, and the third one, impact on the contracts as Jordyn said. I look at this flow and take away the early enough participation of the GAC because right now I don't know the standard very well. I think if we focus our questions on these three steps is closely related with the survey or the interviews. And it's strictly delimited to the application process. I don't know if that's clear.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That reminds me that the other area of GAC advice being effectively formulated is on the early warning to applicants. And that's something we could include in our applicant's survey. We could say, "Did you get early warning advice? Did you understand what it meant? Were you able to take action on it?" That's much easier than the GAC Board interactions presumably.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Early warnings were not advice. They were just early warnings. They were not supported by the entire [GAC].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think this is lower case advice for a reason. I think this is a sticky from our L.A. session, not a formal Charter remit that's meant to mean GAC advice in the formal sense of the ICANN Bylaws.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I'm hearing all the contributions and especially taking note of Jamie's. What I'm mindful of is not falling into a sink hole here where we are becoming mired in a lot of complicated, time-consuming issues and I think what we need to think about is what would be the highest priority within this category to discuss. And I think the lens of how it affected the application and evaluation process should help us sift this a little bit. Because I wouldn't want to see us getting into these sticky issues of should the GAC have acted earlier? Should it have done this? Should it have done that? But to the extent that the application process or evaluation process was made more effective or less effective because

of the GAC advice. That could be the lens we need to look through it. And what I'd like to see us do is then prioritize our top three issues, our top two issues. Because otherwise, I think we could really get down the rabbit hole with this because there's such a lot of information and it's complex and people disagree about what happened.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And those same people are the ones that are going to provide public comments on our work. And so a part of the issue here is trying to look at this from the standpoint of an applicant, I think, and see how this touched them. Because if we miss those points, we'll hear about it, I think in a way, right? We don't need to be theoretical about this. I think it's probably going to be more about, "I can't believe you didn't address this. This was a nightmare," or whatever. And is there a way for us to get to those categories of things that touched the applicant, I guess, directly? That's probably the best filter because those are going to be the commenters.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So maybe one way of doing it is mapping what the GAC did against the expectations of the Applicant Guidebook which laid out the application/evaluation procedures. You'll get to some of the substance on the GAC advice by looking at safeguards and PICs and whatever, but if there will be plenty, I would think, to discuss just in terms of what was envisioned in the Applicant Guidebook and then happened subsequently and the impact that that had on applicants. That's a minimum. I'm not saying that that's all you do.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I agree that from the applicants that's the perspective, because they had a certain expectation based on the Guidebook and then to the extent that changes, that created problems or opportunities depending on it. What I'm concerned about is that a lot of the GAC advice was, of course, focused not just on the applicants and their experience, so to speak, it was focused on public interest concerns and whether the Applicant Guidebook took those public interest concerns into enough account. So I would just say that it can't just be through the lens of how did this affect the applicants because the bigger picture here is, is consumer trust at least in part – and a lot of the GAC advice was focused on the potential for confusion, the potential for undue risk to consumers – so I'm just adding that as a step back.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

About the step back, the PDP is going to take care of everything that happened between 2007 and they sent a letter. The letter will cover all comments made between 2007 and the publication of the Applicants Guidebook. So there is plenty of time for the GAC to collect all these comments and present them. So I think we don't have to go out and do this research ourselves if it goes as the PDP expects. Okay? So I want you to clarify if you're worrying between 2007 and the publication of the Applicants Guidebook, or are you worrying about GAC influencing the application process as it was already ongoing with their comments. Please, because that's a big difference.

The latter. So after the publication of the – well, that's a grey area also for the PDP because that's a period where interpretation of the Applicants Guidebook was done without clear policy work. It was decision by the Board. But this is a short period. It is only two years. So it's only five GAC advices to read there.

JAMIE HEDLUND: It's definitely the latter, but I think it's a little bit of both and I don't think you can punt the whole thing over to the PDP because – I mean, I hear what you're saying on public interest but the Applicant Guidebook was modified in response to GAC comments on the Applicant Guidebook. So the view, I think, of the applicants and of the organization was that the AGB encompass the concerns of the GAC. And some other things developed later, like it became difficult for the GAC to comment on individual applications like they had to comment on types in their review of application. And that was not something that came out as far as I know during the comment period on the implementation of the development of the Applicant Guidebook. So I think you have to look at both.

And this isn't ascribing blame or anything else. I think the GAC was sincere. No one questions that the GAC was sincere in its comments on the AGB and how the process should work, and when it actually started there were other issues that came to the forefront and that may not have been there at the time that the GAC formulated its comments. So I think looking at some level of the lead up to the Applicant Guidebook and then focusing much more on how it was actually implemented and the impact on the process would be important.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to preface this comment by saying many registries might disagree with what I'm about to say, but I will maintain at least. I think it's quite evident in the Applicant Guidebook that it anticipates some amount of GAC advice related to individual applications or classes of applications, but it's not well defined what to do with that advice or what makes it timely, etc. And I think that's where a lot of the confusion and frustration in the process came up is that the GAC advice sort of appeared at different times for different applications and that made it unpredictable for everyone involved, probably for the GAC it was unpredictable, for applicants it was unpredictable, and that ICANN sometimes didn't really know what to do with it, I think as a result of that as well.

So it's certainly one thing we could look at is just look at the language in the Guidebook related to GAC advice and see if there's any suggested improvements we could make in terms of implementation of intake and processing and timeliness of advice. I think those are the sorts of things that are very much related to the application process per se that we might want to take a look at without getting to the merits of the advice per se.

KAREN LENTZ: In terms of the GAC's advice and that being taken into account pre it opening up for applications, I see two areas of work and they differ as to what I think the PDP Working Group would focus on versus what this group might focus on. And that is, one of the key documents in terms of

the new gTLD program was the GAC Principles on New gTLDs, and those were taken into account quite extensively by the GNSO back when it was actually developing the policies. So those sort of principles of advice were already woven into the Policy Development Process. And that's something that I would think the PDP Working Group would be interested in looking at.

And then there's what we've been speaking more about I think is the policy implementation and working out with the GAC how the GAC input could be incorporated into that operational process of managing the applications. So I see two areas of focus there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I guess to drill down on this to get to a set of research projects, if you will, the first is to look at the Applicant Guidebook and the sections on it that relate particularly to GAC advice. That was Jordyn's suggestion. And then compare that to how the GAC provided advice during the application process.

Jordyn, if you had that – and I'm not trying to volun-told you at this point, but I just mean if I were – from a practical standpoint, how would you approach that exercise? What would you be looking at?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So as I said previously, I actually think if we're doing an applicant survey, I think that would be my first pass would be to ask applicants about their experiences. As Laureen points out, that's only one side of the story, but at least gives you areas to focus in on. And that could both

relate to early warning advice and then you could just ask was there subsequent GAC advice that affected your application? Tell us, did it go well? Did it go badly? Do you think the process was fair? Whatever. We could figure out some set of questions around that. And then where you got applicants saying, "No, this didn't work very well," that could give us some areas of study at least.

Similarly, we could send the survey to the GAC and say, "What do you guys think about this process?" I don't know if we'd reasonably expect it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] to GAC members, I guess.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Either to the GAC members or to the GAC Chair and ask him to disseminate it to the GAC membership. Whatever. I would defer to our GAC representatives on the review team to say what the most effective way of engaging the GAC was. I'm not sure I would expect much in the way of answers from such a survey, but to the extent we thought that that would elicit responses it might be useful as well. But I suspect it'll be easier to get responses from applicants as a first pass of cultivating responses.

MEGAN RICHARDS: There's nothing wrong with a survey but I think, quite frankly, you'll get a lot of noise on both of those. First of all, how many applicants are going to recognize and know exactly what GAC advice was, how did it

affect them, how did it impact them? Or they may think they have GAC advice and they didn't really. I think somewhere you have to have the black and white facts – here is where GAC advice was given, here is where it was changed in the Applicant Guidebook, or here is where something. You have to have that as a baseline.

Then if, by all means I'm not suggesting you can't ask the applicants what did you think or how did it affect you, etc. But I'm just afraid that we'll get a lot of bump – if you don't mind me saying so – that may or may not… It's not that perceptions are not important. Of course they are. But you have to have reality there as well. And asking GAC about this, I mean if you want to ask the GAC Chair or the Vice Chairs/the management, that's one thing, but if you do a survey of all the GAC I'm not sure how effective or useful that's going to be either.

For me it's more time-consuming than going through and doing a proper quick survey that I think the ICANN staff can probably identify exactly where the GAC advice –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, exactly. But in theory –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't think early warning was channeled through ICANN, so I don't think there's a central repository of early warning advice/lower case advice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] need to ask GAC.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There was? Okay. Great. So yes, if there's a canonical source, that's a fine place to start, too. And then you can just ask people affected by it as opposed to randoms.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm trying to break this down into a set of tasks. So the first one I think is to get a list of the affected applications from the GAC Secretariat – early warning advice, formal advice, communiqué advice.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that should result in a list of applicants from whom we want to solicit additional feedback.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's all available. That's nothing we need to reach out for. The question is what do you want to do with that list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think talk to those people.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: How?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. How big is the list? What's our sense of how big the – a hundred do you think?

KAREN LENTZ: There were 100+ early warnings. The number of applications affected by advice is also fairly significant, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So from a survey branching standpoint, we're doing successful and unsuccessful applicants. I think we can give them a filter that says up front that these particular people need additional questions, I think. Right? Since we're going to try to reach out to all the applicants, this will include them and we'll reach who we reach and we'll try to ask special questions of the people that fall in that category. Which we may in fact do with the nine. As we design the survey we're going to have some things like that, like demarcations. If it's from this list of applicants, ask these questions, too, or something like that.

So is the survey the best source of identifying issues in the first place? Do you guys think it's worth reaching out to GAC leadership to get a

perspective there? And is that just an interview type of… We're not going to have Nielsen do that, right? "Here, survey these two people." Send a letter.

Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think you'd also want to be mindful of reaching out to the people who were active at the time, which is different from the present set of folks.

MEGAN RICHARDS: But ICANN has a GAC Secretariat. We have our own independent GAC Secretariat for the GAC, of course. But within ICANN, there are at least two people who do nothing but GAC – Julia Charvolen and Olof.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are you thinking about talking to them? Are you suggesting talking to them or are we talking about Chair and Vice Chair or something?

MEGAN RICHARDS: They found that from the very beginning. Instead of going back to the old Chairs and say, "What was your impression and how did you think at…" I must say, I'm rather concerned about the black and white aspects of this. And again, as I said, impressions and perceptions are nice and useful, but I'd like to start with what's written on paper and then of course how the applicants perceive it, rather than asking the GAC Chair, "What did you think [of this] advice? Was it useful? How was it

developed?" this for me is perhaps of interest, but we have a lot of other things to do. And if we start getting involved in going off down the garden path that is perhaps not very useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We should definitely focus on the exercises we think would be useful. We want to make sure we're not just giving it short shrift because we're tired. But definitely we should apply a filter of effectiveness for sure on the activities.

I guess Laureen's point, although she seems to be coming around to your perspective now, or was that just getting the applicant's side of the story is only half of the story and that at some point we're going to need in some way to get – even if it's somewhat impressionistic – the feelings of the people that were involved, whether it was the leader, there might have been some subcommittee, maybe you can help identify who the right people are to talk to, but we should probably get that impression about how the Applicant Guidebook was written and how they felt that the advice was being delivered in a way that was consistent with it or something like that. Because it will probably be very different perspective than the applicant's.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I do take Megan's points that I think the starting point... There is a lot in the communiqués. The GAC hasn't really been shy about expressing in its communiqués why it thinks certain advice was needed and if it wasn't taken, why it reiterates that the advice was important. So I do think that that's a good starting point. I think if you start to interview

people, as anyone who's been involved in the GAC or watches GAC meetings knows, it's such a Gestalt. You cannot distill it based on just talking to a few people. I do see Megan's point very well that that partial perspective will not constitute reality. I would say start with the communiqués themselves, with the correspondence itself. There is an awful lot of information in there. There even has been, I think by the Secretariat, a discussion of the effectiveness of GAC advice. That probably has some information there, as well.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I think there's at least some objective measures that are available, as well. For GAC early warnings, for example, we could look at – I don't know if this exists or not, and I apologize to my colleagues if this makes work, but you can look at the impact that it's had on the applicants themselves. Did they withdraw as a result of GAC advice? Did they modify their applications as a result of GAC advice? Sorry, not GAC advice. GAC warning.

The problem with that though is because it's not GAC consensus advice, the applicants could take it or leave it, and the quality of the warnings differed. I'm not sure there was a whole lot of consistency in what made up the warnings themselves. Looking at whether or not GAC early warnings was effective, you can look at the objective indicators of impact that it's had on the applications withdrawn or modified.

On the advice, you can look at the advice that was adopted and compare what was advised to what was incorporated into the contracts.

That's another objective. Whether it accomplished the same goal, that's a much more difficult [exercise].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jamie, do you think that we're going to be able to identify if the withdrawal or the modification was in fact the result of early warning? Because as Jordyn said, they didn't have to specify why they were withdrawing. It might take us back to correspondence or something like that that we don't have access to. You thought it would be easy to figure that out, and I don't know if it is.

JAMIE HEDLUND: That's an excellent point. You may not be able to know if you combine it with the survey, maybe the applicant –

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what I was getting at. Is the survey the right way to suss out whether or not it had that effect on the applicant? Are we finding our way back to the survey, rather than something we were calling an objective measure? There may not be an objective set of data for that I guess.

JAMIE HEDLUND: They're indicators. It's not conclusive. If someone withdraws immediately after getting –

JONATHAN ZUCK:	I know between me and Eleeza, we can come up with a list of folks that both received a warning and withdrew. I'm sure that's doable.
	Eleeza, do you have a sense? I don't know how many of the fields you've had a chance to look at, but is the notion of a modification of an application something that's captured in that table? Because every time I see a table, it comes out as an Excel spreadsheet and it's very hard for me to believe that that's how the data is being managed. Ever since I heard from Maggie that the compliance database was a folder in Outlook when she arrived, I guess it's possible.
	You said some of it was Salesforce and things like that. Normally, there would be a join table and there would be versions of applications and we could count versions to see if there had been modifications. That's database geek stuff, but if it's just a single table, then we might not even be able to capture whether there's a modification.
ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I don't know if the modifications to the applications are captured in a single table anywhere. I know that when you go the application status page and let's say you click on one application, there it is. That's where all the versions or changes are posted. I don't know if that's being automatically captured anywhere. This is actually something we've been trying to write some code for. One of our interns is trying to write some code for it to actually crawl those pages so they can see when, for example, an assignment change happens after the fact, after it's been delegated.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're scaring me by saying that they're writing code to crawl pages.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I know. That's what I'm telling you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: As opposed to just requesting the data and making a query.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That item is not captured in a table anywhere, whether there's a change to an application. I don't have that on me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But that page is coming from a table, the webpage.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, it's not. Not the actual application status page. That's not coming from a table, from what I understand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's just like a Word doc or something like that, you mean?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's uploaded in HTML. There's no backend table to this, as far as I'm aware. The output of all the different applications and their statuses,

that's coming from a database, yes, but whether all the different applications [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We may have some specific technical recommendations to put into this review. I'm going to reserve a couple of pages for myself, things to make it easier on the next review team.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I don't think there was a question. Are you modifying your application in response to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I think we're back at the survey probably, to suss that out. Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Do you have the voluntary commitments? They came later. That can be followed up? It's just a follow up question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who are you asking?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I'm sorry. Could you say that again?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	There were some actions after early warnings, like voluntary commitments. Can that be followed up?

KAREN LENTZ:	You can capture all of the applications that did submit voluntary PICs. Some of them we believe were in response to early warnings, although again, they didn't necessarily have to describe why they were putting forward their voluntary PICs.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	I need another clarification. A survey for me is taking a sample. When we say we're going to take the list of the early warnings, we're going to ask them all. We don't know if they're going to respond, but we're trying to [reach them all].

JONATHAN ZUCK:	We'll end up with a sample, I think. I think that's right. We're going to try to send a survey to the entire applicant pool.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Thank you.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that what will probably have something in it like, "Did you receive GAC early warning advice? If no, skip to question 17. If yes, answer these three questions." Then hopefully from that, we'll end up with a subset of people that we can reach out to for more anecdotal conversations.

The other side to this is probably just reading the GAC communiqués and correspondence with respect to that to get the "official" GAC perspective.

JAMIE HEDLUND: There are two other documents that might be helpful. One is the GAC Secretariat support, AG whatever it is. The Australian.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND: They did a report on GAC advice effectiveness. The NGPC, also in response to GAC communiqué, compiled a lengthy chart itemizing each item of GAC advice and how the Board addressed it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Eleeza, those two documents, maybe we add them to our document repository. Then we'll work on getting assignments out to people to go through those.

It's those two documents plus the GAC communiqués in question. We believe there's five of them that would be relevant?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Beijing on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Beijing on? That's more than five, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. 2012, 2013. The Australians weren't hired not until 2014. That's why they produced the document. We have to be aware that in these two years, there was no GAC secretariat officially. That was one of the problems and that's why they produced the document.

Yes, but they didn't produce the communiqué. There was staff support, but they didn't produce the document. It was not a writing secretariat like it exists now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think you can look on the GAC website, which has correspondence. Someone would have to sift through it because not all correspondence is on this topic, but certainly all the GAC correspondence is on the GAC website.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that an intern thing to identify? I know you're [telling] your interns. Or they're planning to tell you. One of the other. Microphone. Sorry.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Just to capture what you're asking for here, it's to catalog all of the GAC correspondence that's related to advice, acceptance of advice, implementation of advice, so on and so forth.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] application [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Early warning.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Early warning and advice. Exactly.

LAUREEN KAPIN: To be fair, there isn't a huge amount. It's just you're going to have to –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: To actually read them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You have to actually read it, although to be readily apparent early on because these letters are usually on a specific topic. It's not a group of topics, usually.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I volunteer to help you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Carlos. We'll be sharing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think those are our two vectors into this. One is the survey and one is looking through the GAC communiqué and correspondence. Once we've identified them, then we will assign people to read them. Then we will work to develop a set of common questions and try to reconcile them into some findings and potential advice. Does that make sense to everyone?

Yes, sir.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you. I might be a little bit new to these GAC issues. I'm just wondering. I'm seeing some kind of a report here that came out of the GAC communiqué from Beijing. There's an area here where they meet with the ATRT team. They say they provided input on governmental processes and challenges and successes that arose from the

implementation of the GAC related recommendations of the [inaudible] accountability and transparency review team.

My question is, is there no way that we as a committee can also communicate with the GAC to ask them the same kind of question to get a response from them, either from the GAC Secretariat or the GAC committee or something like that to get a response as the challenges and successes? They also talk directly on the issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudo, I think we discussed that a little bit and what some of the complexity of that might be. There's already been some communication from them and some research done on the topic. We're starting from there and I think supplementing with conversations to get additional clarity or something like that. We believe that there's already been some analysis of this that we should leverage to gain a better understanding of even the questions we should be asking.

Anything else on this topic? I personally feel comfortable that we have a plan of action on it. The survey team obviously has a big job ahead of it, but I think we have some buckets of questions that we need to come up with for different categories of applicants. We can help Nielsen construct something to get in their hands. Yes, sir.

BRIAN AITCHISON: I just wanted to note that on our Safeguard sub-team, we're also somewhat in survey land, as you said. So there might be some potential

EN

for synergies there if we do decide to construct a survey. Just wanted to put that on your radar.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of applicants?

BRIAN AITCHISON: No, this is related to safeguards, but we would potentially survey people who have had experience with the safeguards. It's on a different track, but it's in the survey bucket if we're creating surveys. There also may be potential overlap with the GAC conversation, GAC advice and safeguards, too.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's stay on top of that because the natural inclination will be to silo this, for sure.

Anything else on this topic? Coming away, is everyone aware you're not off the hook? Once we compile this list of documents into the spreadsheet, we're going to be trying to reach out to people for volunteers who are either voluntary or otherwise to go through some of these things and begin to compile a list of issues. That's still coming. Watch your inbox.

I think the last section of this is about delegation of TLDs. When are we supposed to be due for a break? I don't mean to steamroll anybody. Why don't we take a break then now? We'll launch into this. Your

homework for the break is thinking about how we will review the delegation of confusing or harmful strings.

This is a tough process to get through, and everyone has varying levels of interest and expertise in it, but I think that we will get to some tasks that will be handled by a subset of people that report back. These large plenary versions of this conversation won't be the norm. We just needed to drill one step below what we did in L.A. and just haven't gotten to it because of the work of the other sub-teams. I appreciate everyone's perseverance. We're almost through it. Stan, I'm talking to you.

STAN BESEN: What was that, [sir]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nothing.

STAN BESEN: You were [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I bequeath you.

Presenting the delegation of TLDs that would be confusing or harmful. One of the issues was these are very interesting white on color SlideShare. Standing in the objection process, string confusion, singular versus plurals, which is related to string confusion, and inconsistent

decisions on appeals. I would love for people to speak up that proposed these.

Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi. I thought it might be helpful here where I could point out the research we've done so far that you might rely on. There were a couple of projects that we did in response to requests from the team. One was compiling all of the reconsideration requests and summarizing those. That's a pretty robust chart that you have already.

Another one is – I think this was a request that came up to in the L.A. meeting – was to look at all of the contention sets and who were the applicants within them and have that all in one place, and the application status and so on so forth. That's another data set that you have that I wanted to point out.

In terms of other items, if you go into the data table in the Google Sheet that introduced you all to yesterday, there's a few more things that might be related to this. For example, the registrant survey where you get at people's familiarity with different names. That might be another piece of data that might feed into this discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Microphone. Thank you, Eleeza.

Those are three sources of information. Can I get volunteers to look at them and put them in the context of the questions that we are trying to ask?

I will name volunteers if I don't see them. You're better off self-selecting something that you at least have some interest in. I don't know who remembers maybe putting these things up on the board in the first place who's got an interest in it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. I see. A couple of people have been volunteered, too. David, Jordyn, and Laureen were volunteered. You volunteered the second time [inaudible]. Twice. I need other people that would be willing to take a look at those resources.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan, are you looking at the four bullet points on the bottom left?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's correct. White on yellow.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Chartreuse. White on chartreuse. I think that's the color. Presuming there's data somewhere and that ICANN –

JONATHAN ZUCK: There's three types of data. One is going to be the survey that we don't have yet, but we're getting a sense of whether or not strings were in fact actually confusing potentially, etc. Then the two things that were compiled were the reconsideration requests and the contention sets to look through, to look for some of the issues associated with this.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'm happy to do something on string confusion and inconsistent decisions on appeals if someone gives me the data, if you see what I mean. I can't [inaudible] searching for the data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I do know what you mean, and I'm not sure exactly. Part of the data for string confusion will be the registrant survey. As far as the inconsistent decisions on appeals, we haven't compiled those appeals decisions yet, right? There's only two?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't think ICANN technically calls it an appeals process, even though that's obviously what it is. There's not very many of those. I think there were a number of areas where inconsistent decisions were rendered, but the appeals process was unidirectional. The only way you could

appeal was to make it not confusing. I think there's some singular/plural decisions where the exact same strings resulted in different decisions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. I think pet/pets is an example.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. In those cases, the only appeal mechanism was if you were an applicant who it was deemed that your string was confusing with another, sometimes but not all the time, then you could appeal and say, "No, it's actually not confusing ever." But there was no mechanism for someone who had said, "No, this is confusing sometimes but not all the time," to say, "Yes, it is confusing all the time." That somewhat limited the scope of the appeals process, but remember, that set's very small.

The singular/plural issue strikes me as one where there's a large surface area that ICANN's initial string evaluation process deemed them not to be confusing and it was up to the applicants in order to file confusion objections. For full disclosure, [inaudible] registry, Google registry filed string confusion objections against a number of singular/plural cases because we thought they were confusing. Although, not web and webs.

I don't know what webs is. Spider webs, I don't not think, are the plural of the World Wide Web.

In any case, we were participants in that process, but there were other singular/plural potential confusion areas where the applicants all just decided it wasn't confusing so there were no objections filed in those cases. We don't really have a consistent lay of the land in terms of all the possible contention sets there. You'd probably have to manually go look to see other possibilities for plurals, as distinct from the ones where objections were actually filed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: To turn that into an action item, it's identifying a list of same words and their own plurals, I guess, right? Just among the allocated strings?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The very naïve way to do that would be just to look through the list of TLDs applied for and see if there's one with an S at the end.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what I meant by it. I was presenting the naïve way of doing that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If I'm not mistaken, we should also be looking at what the requirements were because the confusion is not general confusion. In other words, "When I look at something, I'm confused." It was confusion with existing strings.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or between applications.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It was between, too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or between applications. Existing strings or between applications. You have to look at the exact criteria.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I confess I'm missing the nuance that you're trying to bring to that, though. What's the difference between that and general confusion? I thought confusingly similar was really the issue, not just general confusion.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. It's confusingly similar, but it has to be similar with something that exists or could potentially exist in the sense that it was applied for at the same time. It's not something in a new TLD.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I understand. I know that one of the reasons that this is on this list is so that if there is subsequent procedures, we don't get a whole round of plurals of the most successful TLDs in the previous round. I think that's part of what folks are afraid of.

David, go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think you were just looking at my facial expression and deciding I'd got a question or something to say. The singular/plurals is obviously a subset of the confusing similarity and the confusing similarity because there was two, as Jordyn mentioned earlier. I can't remember what they are now, but there was the two, unicom/unicorn, which weren't singular/plurals, which was identified. The singular/plurals came about as a second issue because some people found that there was a pet/pets, sport/sports, etc. That's where you got conflicting decisions. There's those ones certainly to look at. I'm quite happy to help Megan on that, whether we go through and look at the singular/plurals and put that list together of where there's been an s [inaudible]. We could do that. Could we look and take a view as to whether other strings are confusingly similar, which is going back to the string confusion panel of ICANN? I don't think we should be redoing that. That would take ages to guess which ones, and it's very subjective as to whether it's confusingly similar or not. Even the singular/plurals is debatable.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Debatable whether they're confusing, you mean.

DAVID TAYLOR: It's debatable that the outcome is confusing. No, sorry. It's clear that the outcome is confusing, but it's debatable whether they are

confusingly similar or not, depending on which law or which jurisdiction, etc. Disclosure we filed cases on those as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The outcome was not consistent, as [it was meant]. I think that's more problematic than the actual confusion in some ways.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think the interesting thing is, having had this discussion with clients, it's the sort of thing when it was happening, we were going through it, we were looking at going, "Yes. What's going to happen when more TLDs come along and someone says, 'Can we apply for one with an S?'" I'll say, "I'm not sure." They'll say, "But aren't you an expert in this?" "Yeah. Not sure." "How much are you going to charge me for that?" "Well, I'd have to review all these cases, decisions, the different laws. It would depend where you apply, where you do this…" "I just want to apply whether I can apply with an S or not." "Well, I don't know." "I'm going to go see some other lawyer."

That's the sort of issue you've got, and it's just completely unclear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Confusing, in other words. Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks. I'm confused. Are you saying that it has already been determined that there should not be plurals of singulars for the next?

Because it sounded like what you were just saying was that people didn't want that for the next round.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What I was expressing was not anything that related to policy or anything like that, to be clear for the record. This is David Taylor.

[laughter]

No. I believe that part of the motivation for having it in the review is a concern expressed by some that the next set of applications might be requests for plurals of the TLDs that turned out to be popular in the first round. Nobody has made any kind of decisions about that, but I guess we might at some level be tasked with trying to make some recommendation about that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: That's fine. I misunderstood. There have been offered reasons for why allowing plurals for singulars would increase competition if a very large company had a generic and had market power in whatever that generic represented. Having a dot with an S at the end could actually help offset the cost of the confusion. Anyway, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Obviously, this is going to be a debate probably within the group about this topic. It could very well be that all we will be able to do is try to recommend a process that results in consistent outcomes, as opposed to this group trying to decide the answer to that question,

which might be more better thought of as a policy development question. I don't know.

Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's roughly what I was going to [suggest]. I think the question of whether singulars and plurals ought to be allowed as a general rule seems like a policy question that's beyond the remit of this group, but we can certainly reflect back on the process by which it was adjudicated in this past round and say, "Was that efficient? Is the fact that we got wildly consistent outcomes, is there a way that we could avoid that in the future?" I think that would probably be helpful and within our remit, as opposed to the general question of whether they ought to be allowed or not, although I continue to have an opinion on that question, as well.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I think I support what Jordyn has just said. We really need to consider it on that process and see whether it was effective or not. I just looked at some of the notes that came out from some of the things that were happening at that time. I can see one of the issues was it was only applicants that were allowed to file these objections to singular/plural strings and not registrants and not users. That's just an example of perhaps something that we could look at and come up with a recommendation for the next time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I remember somebody tried. Was it Steve? Was it [BC]? Somebody tried to intervene as a third party on this question and it wasn't effective. There wasn't any standing to do that. That was part of the first question, standing and the objection process.

How do we boil this down to brass tax? David said he'd be happy to help Megan, which sounds a lot like two people volunteering to be a little subgroup on this particular question with the caveat that you were engaged in a process. But if we create boundaries on this that's about the process itself and not the general policy rule about singulars or plurals, then we don't have to try and address that question. That's maybe outside of our remit.

David.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think our goal is obviously to reduce confusion and reduce expense at the end of the day because if there's confusion, there's going to be a lot of litigation. I'm quite sure every applicant who's applied for a singular might not be that happy about a plural coming. We could have a lot of contention if we don't make a recommendation that this has to be consistent at the end of the day. What that recommendation is, I agree, I don't think we should be [appointing] on whether singular or plural should be allowed or not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: One is the question of standing. How do we go about getting a stage beyond just opining about the fact that maybe it would be good if other

people had standing to object? I could also see that being a can of worms, as well. How do we test the hypothesis that there was a downside implication to a lack of standing in the objection process, and then in order to make a concrete recommendation? Because we're just going to be talking about process-related questions here.

Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I agree that seems like a hard question to get to, and reflecting back on Larry's advice to us yesterday to tackle the manageable problems, it seems like there's a really obvious problem in front of us, which is even when people that have standing filed objections, we got a randomized set of results. That seems like a problem that we could maybe take a look at and make some concrete suggestions around, whereas the standing thing seems like we have to mostly speculate because it's going to be very hard to gather data on that topic, I think.

Rather than trying to reach these questions that are a little bit more speculative, why don't we just tackle the ones that are more straightforward to address?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Similarly to singular/plurals, should that question of standing that we formally in our recommendation suggest that the PDP process take up then, maybe? Since we know it to be an issue that we're not trying to draw a conclusion about it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, exactly. We could say, "We identify this as an issue but we didn't do it, so if some other group wants to, feel free."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But we should look at the facts first before we decide on what we're going to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. The facts primarily is just looking at the objection that took place and the inconsistency of those results. Can the two of you together with Eleeza get a list of those and look at those? Okay. Then report back to us.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Look at objections specifically?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right because we're looking at inconsistent results from the objections on string confusion and singular/plurals. Both. Then it looks like standing is something that we'll punt.

We have some marching orders on these things. We downgraded [community] and the last thing. So I think the next thing that we want to do is just have a little bit more of a conversation about the prospective applicant from the underserved communities that we've talked about a little bit. For those who haven't met him, this is Andrew Mack, who's the head of a firm called AM Global that does a lot of work,

public/private partnerships and corporate social responsibility and things like that in those markets. We've identified his firm as being ideal to try and identify those companies that would have applied for strings but for some of the types of problems that we've identified.

Eleeza just invited him here to today to hear it from the horse's mouth a little bit about what we're trying to accomplish with that. I can start, but I welcome people to providing the color commentary. Most of you have seen the paragraph I ended up writing about what this task looks like, so this is more to give him a sense of what we're trying to get out of this exercise.

I'll start. When we were looking at the effectiveness, the question we were asked in a rather vague way was to assess the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process for new gTLDs. There's a lot of different aspects to that, and you just heard part of our conversation about the objection process. We've looked at how GAC advice was ingested by that process, for example.

One of the things that came up from a number of different angles in the original brainstorming session that we had in Los Angeles was the notion that the developing world, the Global South, was underrepresented in the applicant pool. As we heard from Steve Crocker yesterday, the reason for that may in fact be lack of interest. It may not be an alarm. It may be that there's more important things to work on in those regions than getting their own string. That conclusion might terminate the exercise in a way.

If we find instead that people had no clue that there was a New gTLD Program, if we found that people knew there was one but didn't know enough about it and were just intimidated by the thought of it, didn't know there was an applicant support program because it wasn't properly put out there. It could be that they realized that the applicant support idea was a little bit of a joke because helping with 185,000 doesn't help with the other 1.8 million you needed to actually run a TLD.

Did it have to do with the letter of credit situation that happened, the financial guarantees they had to make? If it is those things that kept people out of the process in the face of what otherwise would have been interest in having a string, then it might be worth us pursuing further and trying to make some recommendations about how to make the process more accommodating for them.

If it's that they just made their own determination that, "We don't think there's a market for that here. There's other problems that are a higher priority," etc., then that could be the answer. Then it's just an observation that this happened, and let's not freak out about it. It was a conscious decision not to participate. Getting the answer to that question is our overall objective.

When discussing how to figure out who we might talk to about that, Jordyn came up with the idea of trying to identify the cohorts of the people that did successfully apply for strings, so there were types of brands that went out for generic strings, that went out for brand strings, so brands did both kinds. There were communities, and then there were registrars, for example. Categories, and maybe at this table we can even come up with what most of those categories of applicants were.

So the idea is to look at those successful applicants and figure out who they were, and to some degree, who it was inside of those organizations that took the lead – that's potentially something that ICANN staff can help with – and then figure out who the analogs of those people were in Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean and Asia, and from that, come up with a list of people that "should have applied" for a string, all things being equal, and reach out to them to ask why they didn't.

And then depending on that answer, ask them other questions, right? So that's the exercise sort of in broad terms, and so we initially saw this as a two-phase thing that was finding a couple of hundred names of people that sort of fit that criteria, and then as a second phase, reaching out to them with some sort of a survey instrument to get answers to those questions that then might be followed up with some interviews or something like that. It could be that there's an interim step of going out to a sample of them to help construct the survey, but I think the very first phase that we're trying to accomplish in the very near term is finding those people.

So the organizations and the people within them that we ought to try to talk to is the exercise. So I'm happy to take questions from you, but then if anybody else feels that I left anything out of the description or wants to add some color commentary to it, then please speak up and be sure to identify yourself.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you. I'd just like to join you in the welcoming – the name again? Sorry. Andrew, Andrew Mack. Yes, sorry, I got a blank. He's a guy I know

very well, so sometimes when you're thinking of a guy you know very well, you get a blank. Andrew actually is a gentleman I know very well, and we worked together on the [BC] for many years, and I know he knows Africa and the developing world in general quite well, so I think he's quite suited to this particular task, and I think he'll be able to come up with very useful results for the committee. So welcome, and I wish you the best on the task.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was just a joke. I'm not going to speak in the microphone for that. [inaudible] go ahead. Introduce yourself.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, I want to welcome Andrew. I have known him for quite a while and we've worked together beforehand. He's always been very supportive of us and the At-Large, and I think he knows enough of my region to take a good stab at what needs to be done. So welcome.

ANDREW MACK: I'm talking with Eleeza and trying to understand your timeline and things like that, it strikes me that it makes sense for us to start off – if we have a very narrow window – to start off with perhaps a couple of regions and then go to a couple of other regions based on where we are in your budget cycle and the time frame, and that's just what I'm gathering from the e-mails and conversation. It sounds great. It's a lot to do in a very short period of time. We have a great team and a great

network to call upon, and I may be calling upon some of you to expand that to get the information as quickly as possible.

I think this is a really important task, as someone who's shared a lot of conference calls on the [jazz], we know that there's a big world out there, and I think that reaching out to the developing world and understanding what's going on with them, both what happened and what is potential for the next round is extremely important, and a big part of what we're trying to accomplish as a community, so I appreciate the chance to be part of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: At a purely logistical level, I think we're trying to get the first [inaudible] of names if we can by the end of the month, actually, so I want to make sure that we carve out something for you that's manageable, and what is it that you think that you'd be able to accomplish in that timeframe with your team and network in the regions, given now that you sort of know what our objective is. It's 200 entity names and 200 people or offices, etc. within them to try and reach out to, and of course, spanning across the four regions.

ANDREW MACK: My recommendation based on where we are today, the fact that everybody's also got potentially Helsinki coming up and other things that are going on with life, would be to divide and conquer. I would suggest we start with Africa and Latin America, where we have both staff and very deep networks, and we can call upon our friends and really dive into it quickly. Getting 200 names from the four regions I

think should be fine. That's getting 100 names from those two regions that we're looking at, I don't think that's going to be a difficulty.

The only challenge that I would suggest we may have is I think we can find the analogs with the right amount of digging, networking and research. One of the biggest challenges that we have seen, having worked on some new gTLDs trying to get into Global South and just generally understanding this process a little bit is that there have been very different people who have had the ball, had the lead on this in different organizations, so it may not be obvious if we find an analog, who the person to talk to would be.

So all I would suggest is your understanding if we – in some instances we will know the right person, in other instances it may take more digging than we will have time for between now and the end of literally this month, and so what we'll do is our very level best to find the exact person, and if not, have a reference point based on other analogs. These are the kind of person we think it likely will be, and then part of our look into the next phase – assuming there is one – would be to help dive into that, confirm that those are the right people. If they are not the right people, work with them to find the right people. That kind of thing. Make sense?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense to me. Do other people have questions? My line of discussion for you would be what – beyond what you've gotten out of Eleeza and me right now – do you feel like you need to [inaudible]

ANDREW MACK: Expected level of response. So the lack of response based on the size of the market, or their leadership in the Internet world, their penetration, things like that would be good to have. If you have some specific countries – let's say we start with Africa and Latin America, some specific countries in Africa and Latin America that you would think it would be wise for us to start with, that would help our task. Obviously, that's a lot of countries to look at and those are pretty deep markets, so narrowing the task is going to make it more successful.

There isn't a right answer in my mind as to who would be on that list of 100. There are probably a number of lists of 100 that we could go with, we're going to go with the best one we can get done in the timeframe, and we can always add to those lists in Africa and Latin America later on if we choose to, but if you all had some specific people that you'd like to add, some specific markets you'd like us to focus on or some specific sectors – we talked a tiny bit about that, Eleeza and I, but maybe there are some other things. I guess really, the more you can give us about what success looks like in specific terms, the people you'd like us to reach out to that we'll be looking for, that'll be helpful. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I welcome anybody to – are these cards all up from before? Okay. Oh fuck. Way to mess with me, people. Alright, Megan, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Thanks. Well, I'm just wondering, I mean, obviously this will depend on your context in Africa and Latin America, but I would have thought that to have a successful outcome, you would look at countries where

Internet penetration is already relatively high, there's a relatively active community, let's call it an active market, etc. So if you're going to – I'm not going to name any names, obviously, but if you go to a country where Internet penetration is extremely low, there is no real activity, the country uses language that is not recognized internationally, there are all sorts of factors that you could take into consideration.

My point is that if you concentrate on a handful of highly dense, highly Internet penetrated, high market areas, you might get some really interesting results.

ANDREW MACK: I absolutely agree. All I wanted to do was to make sure, for example, that if you have some particular feelings – not to name names, but I think at some point we'll probably want to – if there are particular feelings about countries that either you were surprised were not represented, or that you'd like more data on, A, and B, if we are thinking in terms of – for example, regional distribution, there may be, as a perfect example, French-speaking West Africa may have lesser distribution, because there just aren't as many – there are a number of countries where the penetration level is much lower, but if we decide as a group that it's worthwhile to reach out and dig a little bit deeper in a country like Senegal or Morocco, that's a resource allocation issue. Again, it's about just fulfilling your task and getting to success the way you'd like it, what success means to us as a group.

DAVID TAYLOR: It's good that Megan and I are both on a subgroup, because now we're thinking in an identical manner on these things, and I was going to say exactly that same thing, to be looking at the countries with a high internet penetration, but I was also going to say to look at those with a low Internet penetration, to see if we can come out with something that's very clear, that no applicants came out of a country where there's low Internet penetration, because I think there's possibly an angle there which would be interesting to see, see what we can come out.

ANDREW MACK: So we're going to narrow it down by having both the high and the low?

DAVID TAYLOR: And then something in the middle.

ANDREW MACK: What we might do – again, just with the total desire to make this a doable task and get you good data, we can certainly do that. Maybe [when we're] offline, we can talk for a couple minutes about what would be a small subset of countries that would be worth looking into. I have a couple of ideas, but obviously, there are people in this room who also might have some good ideas, and we'd be happy to do it. I just want to make sure we're not trying to boil the ocean between now and the end of June.

DAVID TAYLOR: Oh, yes. And just to be clear on that, what I was meaning is whichever countries we look at, we look at the baseline Internet penetration so that we can see whether that is the factor which is affecting the new gTLD applications. That was one point, and the second point was just obviously, on the applications, quite a bit of the time the contacts change. There is the prime and there is the secondary, and ICANN are communicating regularly with all of the applicants, so I would have thought internally, there's some –

JONATHAN ZUCK: These are people that didn't apply.

DAVID TAYLOR: So we're trying to find people that didn't apply.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're trying to find the people that did apply, it was the VP of marketing, so therefore, we're going to try to find the VP of marketing at the telecom company or Mexico or something like that, that might otherwise apply and didn't. That's sort of the idea, right? Just to keep the task – and so, also to this – I'll come right to you, Jordyn, but to answer David's question, I think there's an objective exercise whereby we don't necessarily need Andy, or maybe we'll use him, but it's a separate exercise to look at what applications did come out of those regions and where they fall in terms of Internet [inaudible] that's the statistical exercise, which is a little different than this kind of networking and thought exercise that we're asking him to do now, which is to find

people to talk to. But as far as who applied and from what the correlation of Internet penetration is, that's statistical exercise that we may be able to do in-house and we should probably discuss separately, and not complete with –

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, no, sorry about that. And it's just now they have objective data, and [inaudible] process seems to be a great thing to have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For sure. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, so my personal opinion on how to sort of figure out where to go look is – and my initial rational for my exercise was essentially look in places where we would have expected people to have applied, so therefore, that anywhere you look and sort of say "Oh, if this is a market where there's very low Internet penetration or there's not a lot of businesses of the sort that did apply," by definition, we shouldn't be looking in those places, because those are not the places that we would think would be likely to apply and didn't.

So I think the way I would approach the exercises is roughly look in parts of the world where we didn't see very many applications, but in the markets in those parts of the world that were most likely to have produced applicants based on the profile of the people who did actually apply. So hopefully, that will make your job a little bit easier, if everyone agrees that that's the approach that we should take.

ANDREW MACK: The only reason I mentioned it is because there is a desire to be multilingual and multiregional in a lot of this, and for example, Lusophone Africa, is it worthwhile for us to do a quick pass by Portuguese-speaking Africa? It's up to you. We can do it either way, or just trying to be as inclusive and get – we recognize that there's both a data and a political aspect of all of this, and trying to be sensitive to it, nothing more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll suggest -and I welcome disagreement – that we're less interested in the political aspect of it, and more in the practical aspect. In other words, the only reason to include another type or category would be because we thought we might get different insights into how reform of the system might take place. So it's less about regional targeting or things like that, and more about the practical issues that led to them applying or not applying, which is lack of information, lack of money, whatever those things might be. So unless the Portuguese somehow would have not been reached because all the outreach in Africa was in French or something like that, then that may be a question, but I think that's our criteria, is more practical than political.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And I guess I'd say even if that were true, Jonathan, even if it were the case that no one in Lusophone Africa had heard about the program because all the outreach in Africa was in French and – I don't know,

some other language – English doesn't matter, because we had hardly any applicants from Africa even from those existing languages.

So it's much better to say "Okay, people that actually knew about the program in wherever – Kenya or South Africa (where they actually speak English). Why weren't you applying?" Seems like a much more practical question at this point. We don't need to get off into the weeds of "The people that were least likely to have applied, why didn't you apply?" That's not that interesting a question, but there ought to be companies in these regions that had the same incentives and motivations that we saw from the developed world where we saw companies applying in masses, why didn't that same effect happen in the Global South? And I think that's roughly – what I at least had hoped that we would get out when I proposed this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I think we all agree. Andy may just be asking, do we have any thoughts on that, but you're probably just as qualified as any of us to make that assessment about those markets, so I'm not criticizing your question, I'm just saying the answer is probably we don't know any better about that, so once you look at the characteristics of the existing applicants, you'll find that some of them are – for example – multinationals, and there are certainly multinationals in non-regional, i.e. non-[inaudible] kind of entities in the Global South that could have reached – that already reached a lot of the market with some of their product. They could have gone for .perfume or something like that, the way that L'Oreal did, and so there's that classification and there is the regional ones, etc. So you'll see that in the applicant pool, and then just

EN

try to find those analogs I think is the – wherever they most likely live is the core of the exercise.

Sorry, does anybody have any additional thoughts or commentary for... Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I just want to chime in with something that we've been repeating all morning, but just for Andrew's benefit, is that part of the idea is that after you would identify these candidates, we would then be able to determine if one of the potential conclusions was just that there was a lack of demand that was completely unrelated to a lack of awareness, so that you would find these candidates, perhaps multinationals in some of these countries, and then we would be able to interview them, and perhaps their answer might be "Oh, we heard about the program, and for us it just didn't make sense from a market perspective. We don't know what we'd have achieved by operating this new TLD." Or – and perhaps we would see correlations with – I guess, what I believe Jordyn brought up with Internet penetration in the country or other characteristics, but that's one potential outcome for I guess what we're looking at.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I know Steve raised that as a possibility yesterday. I would find that a terribly unsatisfying answer, unless there was a why afterwards. So if it was like "Oh, we didn't think that was worthwhile, because all of our users are on mobile devices and they never type in domain names," that would be a satisfying reason, but it's not obvious to me why a TLD

would be less in demand for a giant corporation in the Global South than in the Global North. So if we are going to end up with answers like "Oh, we just didn't want it," ideally speaking, we'd end up with a because, not just "We didn't want it."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, and at this point, you're not asking any questions, so that is the next part of this exercise, definitely, but we may try to – the other thing he raised was that it might be expertise rather than money, so those are all things that we want to explore to try and find the answer to the question. He was trying to push back on the notion that just because we didn't get any application, that was necessarily a bad thing.

That was his pushback, is that it could very well be that it was a perfectly natural thing, so it was a different set of priorities for them, and so getting that out. So maybe priorities that may be likely market – as Drew has suggested, etc. but we'll try to piece that out. That's why I said there might be an interim exercise of doing a few before we hand the list over to a survey firm or something, having you reach out to some of these folks in July, and get the list of possible answers so that we can construct a more intelligent survey for the entire group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that that makes sense, and hopefully maybe a little bit more than just two weeks in July.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: A question for Andy. You're aware that the outreach program of ICANN has also been analyzing the Middle East market, the Latin American market and the African market, and for example, in the Middle East, they came to conclusions that there were very few really sizeable ccTLDs. If I remember right, in the Middle East it was just 30 for Iran, and I haven't seen the reports on Latin America yet, but that might be a good guide to discuss which countries can we focus on. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there anything else for Andy? Oh, Stan, I'm sorry, [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: I'm just thinking of a way of playing off your idea about statistical analysis, and sort of relating it to what you described here. I don't know if this is practical, but let me just sort of describe what it would look like. You have an equation, the dependent variable is some measure of the number of applicants, the explanatory variables are things like the ones that David has already mentioned, Internet penetration, something like that, but I would imagine a series of other variables that would explain it, and to go back down to Jordyn's point, what you really would be interested in is the places where the equation predicts badly, if you like. That is based on the objective characteristics, you ought to have expected a lot of applicants, but you didn't. In a sense, if you had the time to do that first stage first, I would look for the countries where based on objective criteria, you would expect lots of applicants but

didn't see them, and that would be the place that you might get the most interesting results.

ANDREW MACK: I think that makes a tremendous amount of sense. Given the time frame, we're probably not going to be able to do a lot of modeling, so we're going to have to go based on our experience, but we have a fair amount of experience and a lot of great resources on your team and in our network, so we'll do our best to replicate that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In an informal model.

ANDREW MACK: In an informal model, exactly, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks for joining us, Andrew, and good luck. Did you bring your card reader with you or we'll just [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I would actually suggest – because we allotted this time for the application evaluation process – to perhaps use some of the discussions you have around each of these topics. I don't know if we talked about communities yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we downgraded it [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We downgraded it. And to start populating that template with your hypotheses or observation, and I feel like that might be a useful exercise when you're all in one room, to put those thoughts down on paper, so to speak.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I get that, I just feel like the room has got some fatigue on the topic, and that there's – it might be an exercise for the little sub-teams, so we could divide into the little sub-teams that we talked about. We could start trying to work on the survey, we could start trying to work on the objections or something like that, but I don't know that having the whole group start throwing out hypotheses feels –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: In that case, yes, just because you're all here together, because there's more work to do on this topic I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. There is, for sure. Some of it was going to be reading assignments based on the collection of those things, and some of it was going to be some analysis of documents that need to be identified. So the only thing that might be able to start right now probably is the construction of the survey, which includes the leaders of these other two sub-teams, so it feels like sub-team work I guess is where I'm coming from. But I welcome other thoughts, that's just the impression I'm getting from the room.

David, go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: I was just going to say [inaudible] both points there while we we're all together, and B, the fact of the fatigue which might be around the room is suggesting that Laureen take us through a little session like she did yesterday for the subgroup, and I feel a little bit that only our subgroup shouldn't have the benefit of that, and perhaps everybody else can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was just going to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I'm not – it's just tables, I'm trying to get through the queue though, and then we'll –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was just going to agree with you, Jonathan. I feel like we're in a better place to make progress, certainly, at least our sub-team, we've got a little bit of a breakout into sub sub-teams that needs to happen in order to get to our goals here, so I'd personally rather have the time for the sub-teams than this, especially since – as you point out, the breakouts into the smaller groups wouldn't include everyone here. And Laureen and I would both not be able to make progress with our other sub-teams, presumably, if we stated constructing the survey.

KAREN LENTZ: No objection to that. Just before we move on from this, I wanted to clarify when we're saying that the last topic [to community] is downgraded, are we saying – in terms of characterizing what the group is working on for this, for the application evaluation process, we're focused down on these three buckets, is that last one about communities and IDNs sort of off the table?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, [inaudible] went through a prioritization exercise, evidently, we did a prioritization, and it's four – there is another bucket to the last, so there are four buckets, actually. This one sort of fell off the bottom of that, but again, I'm not trying to be authoritarian about that, and it's just a question of defining it and communities was something that got downgraded essentially when we were trying to prioritize, but if anybody – look at that and raise the point if it's important. I'm not trying to steamroll by any means.

Megan, do you – and David, is that new or old?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Were you asking me? Two aspects: one, I think on communities, there's been a whole series of things the Ombudsman's done a report, it's been agreed that the process wasn't very useful, it should be improved the next time around, etc., so I think we have already a fair amount of information. Which isn't to say that more couldn't be done, but given all the other things we're doing, I'm not convinced that it's one of our top priorities, which isn't to say that it shouldn't necessarily be done at all, let's put it on the backburner.

On the other hand, on the IDNs, I think that is an aspect that's particularly important for the underserved areas, and I presume – now that Andrew's left – that this is one of the aspects that he would look at in his assessment. Latin America I think falls in with [inaudible] and the [manyana] and things like that. I think officially, they're considered IDNs, because they're different characters from [inaudible] and then in Africa, I don't know how many other non-Latin scripts there are, but I assume there must be some. So that's something that in part – I'm not saying the whole answer would be there, but in part – it could be addressed in the underserved communities aspect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Certainly. I think, again, part of what happened with the community component of this is that we punted over the PDP when we did the coordination with them. So the IDNs question, I'm ignorant about what the process was that made it harder, more difficult. IDNs always felt like a separate thing that was going on, right? So I don't have a lot of

knowledge about what the barriers to entry were for IDNs and things like that, so I don't know if it's a part of the underserved communities discussion that we're already having, and it'll be part of the applicants that we're already talking to if there are specific questions we should be asking about IDNs. So they can't come from me, I don't know what those questions are. Did anybody work with any IDN applicants? I guess you did. Right.

So Jordyn, what's your thought on this, and what, if anything, is unique that comes out of the – that's different, do you think, than what we're doing in the first block?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm not sure our applications were a good – I mean, two of our IDNs are brands, so they're I think particularly bad examples of trying to serve a particular community, other than the community of Google users, perhaps. We did apply for .minna, which is Japanese for "everyone," but I don't know I took away any particularly unique experiences from our – I think there are a lot of challenges unrelated to the application process to actually making an IDN successful, but IDNs were prioritized ahead of other applications in the process, so it's the first one that we launched. The first TLD to launch generally was .shabaka I think. They've had similar market acceptance issues.

But in general, I think as an IDN application as part of a portfolio, as opposed to someone from that community trying to apply in order to serve that community, I didn't see any particular differences in how the

process was handled, or any deficiencies relative to the rest of the process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess that back on Andrew's question, do we have suspicions about there being problems specific to IDNs that we want him to look to try and find some cohorts that are in non-specifically – I mean, I guess some of them may come up organically, but should we be asking them to try to find people with non-roman alphabets in his search?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it should be more around outreach and application, in the fact that the applicant speaks another language perhaps another script that isn't represented by the existing outreach, or by application materials or something like that. But I don't think that the fact the string is an IDN is as material as what the rest of the process looks like.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza, are you still talking to –

CARLTON SAMUELS: We had a very active group in the At-Large looking at the IDN process. I didn't keep close track to it, but Edmun, [inaudible], Rinalia Abdul Rahim, I just sent them a note, because I didn't keep track of it, but I know that they brought it up from time to time in the ALAC. I just asked them to supply us with what they know, we start from there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So you've already asked them to – really just identify issues, because I feel like where we're headed is that the issues are not specific to the application evaluation process, probably, and so what we want to do is be alerted that we're wrong about that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: So what I think the sentiment of this is look, we're looking at issues, challenges surrounding the IDN, specific to IDNs application outreach process, and I want negatives and positives.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. They can do lunch at 12:15, so we'll do that.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, embodied in that, or embodied in the confusion that we're discussing, because of the potential for an IDN to be almost entirely similar to a word that's already taken in Latin script.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do we know if there are objections raised on that basis?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are there Latin script applicants that this IDN was going to be confusingly similar, or vice versa?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I don't recall any like that, but I'd have to look.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I have a wonderful case of –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of what, Megan?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Of theoretical potential confusion. Not new gTLD, it relates to ccTLD of .eu in Greek, where there is a theoretical confusion in uppercase, which is impossible to happen. The probability is so close to zero that it's an absurdity, just to put it on the record, and yet it's claimed to be a confusion. But that's another story, I'm on the war path on this one. But in terms of new gTLDs, I'm not sure if there are any cases. That's specific to the ccTLD area. It's theoretically confusing to something that doesn't exist and never will exist and could never be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think applying the Megan filter to that means that it's probably not part of our remit.

MEGAN RICHARDS: You asked for an example.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I regret asking, and I apologize.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: As far as I know – and staff can probably confirm – none of the IDN applications as part of this last round as opposed to through the ccTLD process were flagged as string confusion problems. The only string confusion problems flagged by ICANN were not the plurals, like unicorn and unicom, and hotels and hoteis.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, that was through the objection process, not through the ICANN process. So there weren't any IDNs that were deemed problematic in this regard, as far as I know.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Just to go back to the earlier point, so there were a handful of string confusion objections filed against IDN applications, looking at – right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not by –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The process that Megan is talking about is an ICANN process to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, but the part that we were talking about was the objection process, right? So there were some that were filed.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so I'll try to distinguish it into two processes. There's an ICANN string evaluation process, string confusion – ICANN string evaluation process, that is what the Greek – similar to what the Greek EU process is caught up in. That process didn't flag any of the IDN applications. Certainly not based on visual similarities. Some IDNs were objected to, I believe, but it was semantic as opposed to visual issues, as far as I know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Phonetic, you mean?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, like this Chinese word means "shopping" and I applied for .shopping in English, and therefore they're confusing and they shouldn't be allowed to proceed. So not –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So it was semantic, as opposed to visual, whereas the ICANN process was purely visual.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So the ones that you found, Karen, do they all fall into that category of semantic, do you think?

KAREN LENTZ: Well, I'd have to look at the actual description of what was in the objection, but there are about – let's see, probably – I don't know, eight to ten string confusions in the IDN category, so it wouldn't be hard to categorize them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, so let's try to get that list to David and Megan as they are evaluating the objections. Maybe they would come across it anyway, but flag them I guess.

Okay, so my inclination here at 12 is to give you a 15-minute break – oh, in which there's a voluntary participation in Yoga, followed by lunch, but let's try to reconvene into the subgroups by 1. So in other words, get your errands done before lunch instead of after, so that as soon as you're done eating, we can reconvene into the sub-teams.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So lunch is available –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Lunch is available at 12:15, so in other words, do everything that you would normally do after lunch now, and then as I said, you can go straight from lunch. Okay, 1:00, and it's reversed rooms, right? So Competition and Choices here, and Safeguards and Trust is in the – whatever that room is called.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Forum room. I think some people did, although it's not cold in here today at all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's different. I don't know better is the way that I'd describe it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] comfortable.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, exactly. Now the forum will be freezing. Okay. So thanks, everyone. Take a break, but come back to your respective rooms at 1:00. Alright, thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]