RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Let's get started. So first of all, thanks everyone for joining us at everyone's different hours of the day. We're going to have this meeting be part of our extended timeline. So we'll be meeting for an hour and a half. And we do have a lot to cover. So, we will launch into things right away.

Just as an overview for our agenda, we're going to talk about our ever expanding reading list. We are going to have an update, and Drew, I'm going to ask you to lead this discussion so people don't get sick of hearing my voice, on the data requests.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So our last discussion late last week. And then we're going to launch into our presentation. And discuss any other business. And I would say under any other business, particularly if folks have any additions or thoughts about our face to face meeting that they'd like to share now, because this is actually our last sub-group team telephone discussion before the face to face meeting, any other business time would be a good time to bring that up.

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

So, with that said, I wanted to start off by talking about the reading list, which has now expanded greatly. We have about 60 or so items on our reading list. And basically we only divided up the first part of that reading list. So what I asked folks to do in my last email was really think about what subject areas you might be interested in, and plucking things from the reading list that fall into that area.

Fabro has been first one out of the gate here, and has sent a list of topics he's interested in and familiar with. And what I'm going to ask folks to do, at this point in the discussion, is to give me a sense of what items on the reading list and/or subject matters you might be interested in.

And I know that we don't have all of our sub-team on the call, but for those of us who are on the call, I thought we could do a round robin and talk about that issue.

So, who might want to start out of the gate. Let me ask the first question. Have folks had a chance to look at the reading list? I see Carlton is typing. Carlton has, great. Others? Have other folks had a chance to look at the reading list? Drew has, yes.

So what I… Has anyone else had a chance? I'll assume if you aren't answering, I'll assume that you haven't had a chance, in which case, I would encourage you to look at that list, but let's… Why don't we start with those who have had a chance to look at the reading list?

Carlton and Drew, do you have thoughts about what you might want to be tackling on that list? I think if we are going to divide and conquer that list, everyone is going to have to take a number of items on the

remaining parts of the list. Carlton, why don't you get us started? Can I impose on you?

Carlton do you have microphone connectivity?   Because I'm also concerned about that… You don't have the list yet, okay. Because you're slated to give a presentation, and I'm concerned that it may be hard for you to give a presentation if you… Okay, so you're going to call in, in a few minutes. Okay, good.

I just wanted to make sure we're having you in all of your vocal glory, Carlton. What about Drew, have you had a chance to look at that list?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I did. I read many of the things on the list. With that said, there are so many items, I don't think I can say, oh, give me these specific ones, but I'm happy to take anything needed. And so I don't know that there is a nice, neat, organized way where we can all grab the things we're most interested in necessarily, unless we submitted rankings of what we wanted to be responsible for. You know, priority and try to match it up that way or something.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.   And I'd like to actually make this as least labor intensive as possible. So what I think perhaps I'll ask our great ICANN staff if maybe we could just come up with a very simple chart of all of our reading list items, with boxes next to it, and put that document on our ICANN Wiki? And what I'm going to do is, I will perform the mass and take a look at how many items we each have to take, and we will do this on a first

come, first serve basis. So people can put their initials next to the items they are going to tackle. And that would be an incentive for folks to do this, because if you don't do it in the early stages, you will not have as many options for the things that are left.

And I think we'll handle it that way. And I'll set a deadline, and then if the deadline passes, I'll just suggest things for folks to tackle. But my strong preference would be to have folks pick things that they're interested in rather than getting them assigned. Okay. [Inaudible] has already signed up for something, which is great.

So we will get that chart made and hopefully that will be ready for people to start digging into. So while we're on this topic of homework and assignments and things like that, maybe I'll take a minute or two to express my empathy with everyone. I know, I know that everyone is really busy with their work lives, and their life lives, and the work of this review team.

But I am concerned that we are now several months into our process, and we still have a lot of work ahead of us. And I think that we all really need to focus on making sure that we are able to devote the time to dig into things, dig into, especially the readings, that we need to, because that is going to help us gather the information we need, and perform the analysis we need to actually make recommendations.

So this is my plea, my cajoling, my nudging, as your sub-team spokesperson, that we really need to pull together and set aside the time to perform this work, otherwise we're really going to put ourselves

in a jam. So, that's my [inaudible] for this morning, at least this morning where I am, for folks to really to start setting aside time to do this.

And I'm aware that there are lots of us who are already doing this, but I'm also aware, as I am for myself, that sometimes it's hard to fit these things in, and I'm just saying we really need to start being more consistent in how we're handling these tasks. So that's my lecture part of the call today.

With that, let's move into actually what I thought was really, really a productive and useful discussion that we had last week on data requests, and what sort of data we might want to request very shortly to help inform our analysis. So Drew, can I turn this over to you to discuss the really, I think, it's going to be a very, very useful data collection that you had?

And if you can explain what it is in what I'm terming the Kindergarteners perspective for all of, those of us who are not so technically oriented as you are. And why it would be useful for us, that would be terrific.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, sure. So Laureen and I had a really productive phone call with Eleeza and Brian last week, in which we were trying to decide how best to spend money on resource related specifically to DNS abuse, which ties into what we're looking at with regard to safeguards. And so, what we thought would be probably a terrific use of funds, not only for the CCT review, but to produce data that could be used by ICANN and various members of the internet community for years to come, would be to get some entity, whoever would get the contract to go ahead and

actually do a comprehensive study of every single generic top level domain name, and its correlation with DNS abuse.

Because there are sample done all of the time, but nobody has done a comprehensive study. So to do this, the resources would have to obtain the zone files for every single top level domain name, the legacy ones as well as the new ones. And so the zone file would be the list of every single domain name registered in that domain for a specific period of time.

And so what we were suggesting is to do a very comprehensive study all the way back to when the new gTLDs were introduced. And so the resource would get all of those zone files, so they would know, you know, what was registered at dot COM today, as well as three years ago. Same thing with any new gTLD dot domain, anything.

And so, once they had that data, then they would obtain as much data as possible about DNS abuse from places such as Spam House, and ACWG, the Secure Domain Foundation, and anywhere else that could get reliable blacklist. And then they would also obtain as much malware data as possible from places such as, SUBLL, Virus Total, and seek out other sources.

And so with all of this information combined, we can draw correlations between the domain names and IP addresses listed in the zone file, and those that appear on these lists, and they would know the categories that the fell under, if it was dot net [inaudible] phishing, etc. And so from there, we could, we as, they turn over the analysis to us, [inaudible] if we had something to do with the way we would envision

it, they would then be able to draw correlations between DNS abuse and the registry, the registrar, or the reseller, which then would inform all of our work as they're looking at registry agreement, the 2013 RAA, and other safeguards that have been introduced.

We might be able to find trends between things that perhaps in areas where safeguards have already been applied have done better. Maybe they've done things, and would be able to also understand from a macro level, the potential impact of new gTLDs on the domain name ecosystem, with regard to consumer trust and safeguards as it relates to DNS abuse.

And so this, if we're able to achieve this, this would be, this would just really set a baseline to inform so many ICANN discussions going forward even. So I think it would be really important work, and hopefully something could use. I want to hear your thoughts on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you Drew. And thanks for that plain language explanation of what root zone files are, and how this would be helpful for us. Can you also speak a little bit to thoughts we had about who would be best positioned to perform this analysis?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, so something we discussed was that there is, because of the undertaking that this would be, we would absolutely want a party that would be, or parties, that would be objective. So we would really get respect from the community for the work. And so what we were

thinking was rather than going straight to a consulting firm, or what not, we would hope that we could get academics to carry this out, trusted academics who are experts in this field, or a combination of academics and expert NGOs that are in this field.

So maybe a coalition of them. Or a coalition of NGO that work in this realm. And so we were thinking if we had some form of a consortium, or just trusted academics, that would probably be the best approach. And then of course, if we weren't able to get any of those such entities to put forth solid proposals on this, then we would try to seek out private consulting firms, but we were hoping we could you know, probably get academics and/or NGOs so that way we could get more community [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Drew. Let me open it up then to the group. Questions for Drew, comments, thoughts? Now is a good time to talk about this.

Okay, Brian I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

So Brian, you may be on mute because I'm not hearing you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah, I was on mute. Can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I can hear you, and then we'll hear from Jonathan after you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. Just a real quick comment. After our conversation on Friday, we reached out to some of our internal security experts to see if there were any existing relationships we could leverage to collect this data, and there is a company. It is a private firm. It's called I Threat. And our security people have apparently used them quite a bit, and they're reputable in that realm.

But they are not the sort of academic NGO community that Drew talked about, and that we're all really onboard with him and Laureen on how important it is for creditability and objectivity to have those people on board.

But it could be a group we could fall back on or reach out to if we need to get this money spent in a quick way or before June 30th. So that's just an update on that. And I can reach out more on that as you all deem fit. So thank you very much. Bye.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Brian, just before we hear from Jonathan, just a quick question. Is the reason we'd be able to do this more quickly, or at least a part of it more quickly with this entity, we have an existing contractual relationship with them, such that we could hack onto something that already exists? Or is it just that we have an existing relationship that would be easy to do a contract with them because we've already been through it once with them.

I just want to clarify what the advantage is there.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Sure. My understanding is the first part, we do have, don't quote me on this yet, but my understanding is that we do have some existing relationship with them, that we could yes, tack on, which would make things quicker. So yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. That's good to know. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Laureen. Can you hear me okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, thanks for asking.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So, I think this is a really good idea. So I want to endorse it generally, and I guess I share an interest in credibility. I think that making it data driven in this way will go a long way towards its credibility, and maybe there is also some threshold over which the analysis becomes ours instead of the conclusions being drawn by an outside entity, which might help as well.

That the preparation of the data and putting it into a digestible form, you know, making findings, conclusions, and recommendations from it will still fall in our laps, I think. I think the time is tight, and so unless there was some sort of an existing consortium, that idea feels like it's too big of an idea for the timeframe, but if we found an entity or an

academic that had an idea for how to go about educating in that way, I guess they could still be the conduit for the execution of the study, as opposed to necessarily trying to put together such a consortium or group of folks in time for the contract process.

So, I mean, I don't think that we should be afraid of the contracting process either, if we can get on top of this sooner rather than later, and just push the contracted folks at ICANN to create a new contract, if that's what needs to be done. But let's try to move quickly to identify a titular head of the activity kind of, and then maybe help describe to them the structure that we would like to see in place for its execution.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Jonathan. And we've actually already started to flesh out what a statement of work would look like, since that would be, as I understand it, a crucial part of the contracting process. So and I take your point seriously about, let's make sure we're acting in a timely manner because we can have the greatest consortium created, step by step by step, but if it happens after the end of our review process, that's not helpful.

So that's definitely a pragmatic issue to keep in mind. [CROSSTALK] Hand raising. Yes, Drew, go ahead. And then I think Jonathan wants to say something else as well.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. A question for Jonathan and the rest of the group is, this is something we haven't quite nailed down, is in a statement of work,

what would we need to put as the deadline, the absolute latest that we would need all of this research back by. Since I was thinking, you know, looking at our various work plan deadlines, we could say the end of August, all the way to perhaps mid-September, that's a month before we are turning over our first draft report.

That's a tight deadline, [inaudible] more time to do the comprehensive work with this much data. So I just wanted to see what you guys thought.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Drew. This is Jonathan for the record. And I think that these are probably the kind of timelines that we would be looking at for all of the research that we're proposing in the various groups. End of August or middle of September. The other point that I was going to make was that probably what we need to get from staff is a less amorphous notion of what the contracting process is like, so that we can actually have a deadline by which we initiate…

Maybe two different deadlines like, when do we need to have a research order in place for the new vendor versus when do we need to have a research order in place with an existing vendor?

LAUREEN KAPIN: And thank you Jonathan. To Eleeza and other folks on the call, do we have any insights into the question that Jonathan just raised about what deadlines we think we're going to need to face in terms of getting these contracting processes started with existing versus new vendors?

MARGIE MILAM: Laureen, it's Margie, if I can answer that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: It's not very clear. I mean, I'm taking the staff perspective, we prefer just working with an existing vendor, because we don't have to negotiate the base contract. We have a form we use with our vendors, and then that goes through a negotiation process involving the legal teams. And so, you know, it just depends on how many requests for changes that the other party asked for.

So it is a quite lengthy process, which is why we typically prefer to just add on to the existing vendor if we can, because all that is involved with that is a new statement of work. We don't have to touch the base agreement at all. It's just merely, you know, the prize, the scope of work, the date.

So that's a fairly quick process. It's not to say that it can't be done sooner, especially if the vendor doesn't want to negotiate, but to the extent that there is any changes that need to be made to the contract, it's just your classic contract negotiation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Well that's certainly good to know. So I think this is a very staff specific inquiry. For example, if we were able to locate a group that we thought had a lot of credibility, and they were very easy to negotiate with, it would happen quickly.   And if they were very difficult to negotiate with, it wouldn't happen so quickly.

So I guess we're going to have to take this step by step, but it certainly is good to know that there is at least one existing vendor. So…

MARGIE MILAM: And Laureen, [inaudible] most of the time, you know, we have obviously different departments at ICANN, and we have been talking internally to the security team. They do a lot of research on, you know, for their work anyways, to see if there is a vendor that would be a natural fit for this. And so, we will let you know what we will find, that's certainly something that…

And I imagine that the security team has a lot of insight [inaudible] because these types of analysis are something they have done in the past.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So maybe we should we have a conversation with the security team, at least someone on the security team, maybe Carlos or John, or Joe, to get a little more information on what's going to be realistic here. Can I put that as a to-do item that maybe Drew and Brian and Eleeza and I, and perhaps you Margie, if you wanted to participate, have like a half hour discussion with the security folks on this topic?

DREW BAGLEY: Sounds good.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I keep chiming in, it's just I think this question is going to come up a lot. So just pushing back on Karen and Margie. Do you have a sense of what the threshold is for the allocation of funds from a budget perspective? In other words, does this entire process of contract negotiation need to have been completed? Or is there simply need to be a whole plate on something and a vendor selected, for example, and a contract negotiation begun for it to be considered allocated from a fiscal year standpoint?

MARGIE MILAM: It's essentially, you know, you can ask any accountant, if there is anyone on the call, but essentially [inaudible], so that's the problem, is that if you have to go out and get a vendor and negotiate the contract, and sign it, you know, you're not going to get a bill until later in the year. So I mean, the next fiscal year. And it's not to say we won't have funds the

next fiscal year, it just means that the amount that we have for this year, you know, weren't spent.

And so I have to go through a process with our finance team to try to, you know, explain to them we may need more funds because we didn't spend the funds in FY 16, and some of the FY 17 planning assumes that we would spend those funds that we had in FY 16. So it's not to say that there won't be additional funds, but it's easier for us if we are able to get a contract done as fast as possible and have them start as fast as possible, so that they can bill for us for work, that can be considered as part of this year.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So it's tasked based is what you're saying, it's going to be… They would have to have already bill for the work for it to count this year.

MARGIE MILAM: Right, right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I thought it just had to be committed, I thought that the funds just had to be committed.

MARGIE MILAM: Well again, it's the way the contract reads. When is the payment due, right? As a contract party, you can draft it in a way that it's due right away if you need to. So it's an art. I mean, the sooner we know who

we're going to contract with, the better. Because that way we can you know, ensure that we do what we can to maximize using the funds from this fiscal year.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So Margie, this is Laureen. Is there any flexibility with that process? I guess I have the same, perhaps, incorrect view that Jonathan had, that we need to basically to put dibs on the money rather than actually spending it, because actually spending it by the end of June, strikes me as unrealistic, and I also don't think we'd be in a great position if we're basically paying people in advance for work that's done.

I don't think that would be a great idea either.

MARGIE MILAM: I'll explore it. You know, I've never had this worry about, this [inaudible] before. So let me take it back, and I'll send you guys a note when I know.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's terrific, that's terrific. Yeah, I think this issue of allocating versus spending, it gets to the nub of what may be a timing problem, or a timing challenge at least. Okay, any other questions or comments on this topic? Jonathan, is that an old hand?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Okay, then with that, I think we can move into… Well actually, one more question. Other than this discussion of what I'll now colloquially call Drew's root zone files study, are there any other thoughts on data requests that folks would like to discuss? Any other thoughts?

Margie, I see your hand is up.

Nope, there, it's gone. Okay. Old hand. Okay, then with that, let's over on to the presentation. So, Fabro, who has happily been able to join us, is going to be giving our first presentation on the new [inaudible], March 2016 piece internet limbo report concerning issues of consumer trust on the internet.

So I will turn this over to Fabro. I did note that he had a link to slides, and I'm wondering if, oh great. I see the report here. Did you have separate slides that you wanted to present as well Fabro? Or is this what you wanted?

FABRO STEIBEL: There is one in the Google Docs that I share, just these ones. The [inaudible] is clear to everyone, it's here. Perfect. Yeah, no, these ones. Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, yes, I can hear you. I'm hoping everyone else can.

FABRO STIEBEL: Okay. There is [inaudible]…

                            Wait, not being shared.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I think that staff is still trying to pull up the slides. Is that correct?
                            Yeah, Brenda is pulling up the slides for us.

FABRO STIEBEL: Perfect [CROSSTALK] perfect.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect, great. Thank you Fabro. Take it away.

FABRO STIEBEL: Okay, thanks very much. So, well, basically, the report [inaudible] is on
                            internet abuse. So it's from a cost [inaudible] perspective for internet
                            abuse.   It's going to look at spam, and other types of abuses
                            [inaudible]… ICANN complete processes, how it's dealing with it. Very
                            critical of ICANN, it's very personal at some time, and it brings some
                            insights what it can do for safeguards.

                            One of them is [inaudible] discuss how practice ICANN wants to be to
                            receive complaints from users on abuse. And when it's the users, I think
                            mostly end users. So, if you see that, this is abstract of the report

[inaudible]. The document discusses [inaudible] ability [inaudible]… sources for internet consumers.

It's not 100% clear how they get the data, but this is data generated by end user [inaudible]… But they do some types of input to search for data, but basically they're looking at it from another activities that are reported [inaudible]… website, there will be instructions on how to do it.

They divide reporting for sections, [inaudible] into the third and the fourth. So basically in section one, they analyze ICANN's current state of mission. So it's a broad discussion of what ICANN should do, and why it's related to [inaudible] fraud. And basically, the criticism saying, if ICANN [inaudible] this fourth feature for the internet ecosystem, it should be more.

But this is why I'm not going to review, because [inaudible] topic directly here. The second one is ICANN's website. And it's asking, it's making a section about how the website is ready for people to tend complaints, and then there is a charge, it is saying that [95%] [inaudible] of the complaints that ICANN receives, is not related from end users and it's from abuse, are those the major problem. [Inaudible] relate that how the website is designed.

And then you have section three, which is very important for us, [inaudible] discuss gTLDs, legacy TLDs, and how it relates to abuse. And then section four is recommendations. So these are the slides about the [inaudible]. You kind of see what kind of have [inaudible] abuse…

LAUREEN KAPIN: Fabro, it's Laureen. Can I ask you to speak a little more slowly?

FABRO STIEBEL: Okay, yes. So, if you look about the [inaudible] part, [inaudible]… But then you have some type of…

LAUREEN KAPIN: Fabro, I'm going to interrupt for a minute. Whoever just joined…

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Carlton, I need you to put your phone on mute because we're getting a lot of static that's preventing us from hearing Fabro. That sounds better, thank you. Go ahead Fabro.

FABRO STIEBEL: Okay. I'll speak slowly. I [inaudible] the review, what I said. So the report is divided into four sections. The first one is [inaudible] commission, the second one is the website, the third one is on legacy and TLDs, and then we have [inaudible] here about the output. So basically, they have 1,400, 500 [abuses?] registrars [inaudible]…

[We do] have a big database, and we do [strike?] all of them, although they will find problems with some of them, and not the others. And even operate [inaudible] TLDs, [inaudible] is labeled [inaudible], but

mostly about the use. So the confusion is about the more a TLD is used, the more [inaudible].

[Inaudible] what if on, I put a [inaudible] there, so it's a [inaudible] ordinary internet user, navigation [inaudible] second [inaudible]… public services [inaudible]…

…that they are looking for end users, and they are considered ICANN responses for end users as well, and highlighting that ICANN is not [inaudible]… The next slide, we look, for example, to dot academy. And it's just an example of [inaudible] MIT dot academy. So, one thing they have, is the idea of how generic TLDs are being used for spam or phishing or other types of abuse.

Certainly, MIT dot academy might need to [inaudible] in conclusion that it's about MIT, but it's not. So, this is a kind of [inaudible]…

Most of them have very few [inaudible], so basically [inaudible] on how to use generic TLDs abuse. When you look to X, Y, Z, then we do have more [inaudible], so they have [inaudible], 1,000 instances when it's a main has been used for abuse. At least some of them, and most important, they related to [inaudible]… is the top one of 7,000 reported domains, and then inside this registrar, they [inaudible] to see who is registering more.

And the one thing they will find is that although not every TLD is related to abuse, some of them are. Some of them are concentrated in some registrants, and some [inaudible] registrars as registrants that are deeply related to [inaudible]… So they will ask for more [inaudible]

safeguards, to attack in these cases, [inaudible] few evidence that there is abuse happening from the source.

So you can track who is doing it. [Inaudible] slide where they present a pie chart. They say a 96.57% of compliance complaints are for contractual matters. So, [inaudible] they will say who is [inaudible] why it's mostly [inaudible] complaints of the abuse itself is a minor part. And they would say, ICANN should be more proactive in reaching out for end users, and position themselves as a problem solver for the users, not only for WHOIS, but mostly end users.

And then, there is a section on [inaudible] for compliance, what they referred to as [chair?] [inaudible]… we have with ICANN officials, and they explain it as a [inaudible]… So it's trying to make an argument saying that not only ICANN is not doing it, but senior officials from ICANN are actually not meaning to do this [inaudible]… solve the complaints for end users.

And then section three point [inaudible]… So point one, only four of the TLDs we highlighted in the review are legacy, and not new gTLDs. So you'll say, who is abusing the most according to my data? Legacy. Although, it will say, the legacy TLDs [inaudible] issues is mostly [inaudible] general [inaudible] registration, and this leads to point three and four.

Point three is particular TLDs, and overall low percentage of [inaudible] domains, as compared to the new TLDs, and it means that the general frame is that [inaudible] new gTLDs, [inaudible] embracing existing legacy from abuse. So the argument here is that, is there a specific

trend on what TLDs are used for abuse? It's basically a matter of combination of [inaudible], a combination of opportunities.

Legacy TLDs [inaudible] because their volume is high, but [inaudible] are displacing them, slowly because the numbers are too slow, there is [inaudible] gTLDs to use abuse as much as legacy. And then he will say, for example, dot [download?], which is [inaudible] as a top generic TLD use for abuse, [inaudible] percent of the [inaudible] from [inaudible] all domains.

And then this is the case of [inaudible]. So he is going to say that look, dot [inaudible] has a problem with abuse. But if you look at who is registering, we do [inaudible], and this happens with [inaudible] and others. And then there is a list of TLDs, legacy abuse, dot [inaudible]… dot review and so on. So it's good to have this information, although if you look at 11, 12, and 13 place, it's when we see the legacy.

So the top ones are generic, and then 11, 12, 13 are the ones that are related to the legacy. Then [inaudible] related to the registrar data, and then the registrar has [inaudible] about the situations [inaudible], although some are not. And then you'll ask for more enforcement in that case, and we bring some information about that.

So conclusion recommendations.   ICANN is not connected to consumers, but the abuse parties are connected to consumers. And then they actually [inaudible] compliance [inaudible], ICANN's website [inaudible]… accept complaints. So, recommendation finally, what ICANN can do to publish information to get [inaudible] same way it has

[inaudible]. So it's saying, ICANN should treat consumers as more important thing [inaudible] when it comes to abuse.

[Inaudible] navigate [inaudible] to guide internet users, so making [inaudible]... Three, conduct outreach to focus groups as recommended by consumer experts, it's kind of the job [inaudible]... with the ICANN staff was not...

...with ICANN allocated to that. [Inaudible] information and collect report back to use the data. So, in short, just to conclude the report. It argues that ordinary TLDs, more use for abuse then legacy not yet in terms of volume, but there is a string here to be used. So it's legacy that because it's generic or some specific [inaudible], most likely this is more related to the safeguard procedures for [inaudible] and registrars, then for the generic TLDs per se.

And this would be the main conclusion they have. And this is it. Any questions guys?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you so much Fabro. That was excellent. So, any questions as Fabro has asked? Any questions for Fabro on either the publication or Fabro's analysis of it?

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew. I'll have to jump off this call in a second for our phone call with CENTR, but I had a quick question for you Fabro. I was just wondering, so this study, this paper brings up a lot of good points. I was wondering what you thought one way or the other about the

methodology? If you thought the methodology was sound, or because this was a known critic of ICANN, if you thought it was, you know, the evidence was put together to prove their thesis or their narrative?

FABRO STIEBEL: [Inaudible]… and test it, [inaudible]… they type these things really simple, so they basically used [cross heading?]. But maybe in a simple, maybe the [crosses?] by them, it's not a lot of transparency [inaudible] details. I would say there is, they do have a reputation, but it would not be a good methodology for [inaudible], to use it as evidence, it probably would need more information and more strong [inaudible]… data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you Drew. Drew is a crucial point, of course, as we embark in this processes and look at sources, which is let's make sure what we're looking at is credible. Then also to distinguish between information sources that are based on data, and information sources that are based on more of a case study or anecdotal perspective, all of which have their place. We just need to be able to access things in terms of what bucket they might fall into.

That said, the recommendations are certainly that this paper comes up with, are certainly thought provoking, and I'm glad that Fabro has been able to distill it for us. So again, Fabro, thank you for an excellent presentation.   Any other questions or comments for Fabro on this report?

Okay, I don't see any hands up. I know people are typing, so there will probably be comments in the chat for us to read. That said, I think it's time to move on to Carlton's presentation on the consumer awareness summary.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay, can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Wonderful. Good morning everybody. So we are looking at this survey, consumer awareness survey. And this is background. We don't have baseline data for consumer attitudes for the domain name system, so ICANN commissioned a survey to collect some data. And the survey focused on the new gTLDs with the greatest number of registrations, and those happen to be email, photography, link, Google, realtor, club, X, Y, Z, and they said reasonably relevant TLD.

They build the survey around a subset of the 66 metrics that were used. 11 of those 66 recommended metrics were used in the survey. They looked at over 6,000 consumers in 24 countries, across all continents. The survey was administered in 80 languages. The participants were supposed to be 18 [inaudible]. And that survey was conducted in February of last year, 19th, February 2 to 19.

We have a second survey that is going on right now, that we will get the results of shortly, I think. So, the results of the survey. First thing, and I think it's curious that they equate awareness, and we're speaking specifically about awareness. They create awareness to [inaudible], so they, which you can easily quantify it anyway [inaudible] aside, they would know about it.

But of all of those who visited that, in the new gTLD program 46% almost are, of those surveyed, were aware of at least one new gTLD. And remember here, at the time that they were doing the survey, almost 700 new gTLDs were then in place.

Of 65%, of those who visited, went to most likely [inaudible] link, because again, these were the ones that they were more aware of. And it seems that they were more aware of them because according to the Neilson domains would implied purpose, and functional association were the ones that they were most aware of. The ones that they recall in the conversation.

So, again, 46% of those surveyed, 6,000 odd surveyed, reported awareness of at least one new TLD. And of those that were aware, 65% of them visited at least one new gTLD. And they visited those that had implied purpose and functional association. And those with implied purpose and functional association, that email and that link were the ones that came top of that bundle.

Here is something that I think we should flag, and this is about now issues of safety and security and so on in the DNS. 74% of those surveyed said they were familiar with malware, phishing, or stolen

credentials. Things that happened that were bad for the DNS [inaudible]. Interestingly, only 37% of those were aware of cybersquatting, and remember, the thinking was that a lot of this activity in registration of new TLDs, were really to protect brands, brand protection.

That is one of the [inaudible], and of those who were aware of the new gTLDs, only 37% were deemed aware of the cybersquatting problem. I think that pretty much summarizes what transpired. If you look at the original report, and if staff could load the original report.

You'll see one of the things that were important to me, at least I thought, would be important for us to look at, is the identification of that survey group, of those who were small business. And the level of awareness in that group, how low it was. Now this was the dated information, so I would be very interested to see how this number is turned around in 2016, the level of awareness in small business owner.

This is one of the things I think we might want to look up, very closely. The other metric that I think we should look at, is to see how many of those who said that they did not intend to purchase in the new gTLD, what that number is today. How many of those who originally said they had not intended to purchase, would have purchased, because that would give us some idea of asking the next question, what changed their mind? And why have they decided to change their mind about purchasing?

So, I think those are the highlights from the Nielson survey. Questions?

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thank you Carlton. That was very, very useful. I appreciate the presentation. Questions for Carlton?
	Okay, I don't see any hands, or hear any questions. So, thank you Carlton. If folks think of questions for Carlton or have any comments, then I would encourage you to communicate directly with Carlton, but let's move on then to Calvin. I know David was not able to join us today, but Calvin, would you be able to chat with us today about the notice and takedowns article?
CALVIN BROWNE:	I probably can. Very briefly, because I haven't really gone into it in the kind of detail that everyone else has. But it's basically… Sorry, can everybody hear me, first of all, before I ramble?
LAUREEN KAPIN:	We can hear you.
CALVIN BROWNE:	Okay. All right. Basically, it's a 140 page report that looks at three studies of various types of takedowns. And most of them originating them from the NCA, which is an American piece of legislation that is a compromise between service provides [inaudible] that are referred to in the report, and copyright holders whereby probably [inaudible] expeditious takedown of copyright infringements, in return for a couple of things.

It basically looks at three studies, and they're quite academic studies, so they're tend to be fairly comprehensive and [inaudible]. There is a study from was for a general look at takedown notices, for US based online search providers, and how that was effective.

Study two was, it looked at something like, I think it's 180 million takedown notices [inaudible] which is a government Harvard study, which consists mostly of [inaudible] results. And study three, was a breakdown on takedowns of Google Image Search. And I think very broadly, there is referring to, or they're suggesting that, and I'm going to be quite [inaudible] on summarizing it.

But basically, there has been a whole ecosystem [inaudible] copyright searches that have sprung up, and a [inaudible] system of, with major responses to it, which makes it, [inaudible] takedown of this. And the bonus of the study actually suggests that more information is probably not the way to go, and we should be very careful going, if there is any legislation in the three years since, but if there is any legislation as proposed that would broaden the [inaudible] method of takedown notices.

The whole report is not just summarized [inaudible] 11 to 15, for those of you who want to get into it. It's a shorter read then [inaudible] to the and something, 143 pages of the entire report. So you guys are welcome to go and have a look at pages 11 to 15, and then it would give you an overview of it.

I think this is a good summary of my take on this. Any questions?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you Calvin. That was actually very useful, which also proves to us that not everyone needs to present via slides, verbal presentations are great as well, particularly those that hone in on the most pertinent parts of the topic, which is exactly what you did Calvin.

I have a question. Do you think that it's a useful source of information for us to look at based on what you've read? Or do you think it's too focused on US scenarios?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes, that's an excellent question because that was one of the things I was thinking, was I'm not exactly sure how relevant this is to our work. It's a very specific content takedown procedure, and I know that ICANN has, or should be, I'm not sure of the right wording of it, ICANN is not really involved in content issues, and tries to stay away from that as much as possible.

And yeah, so my thinking is that it's not probably the best place for us to look at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, that's very useful. And I'll say in general, it's going to be as important for us to determine what is useful, as to what is informative but not really central to what we're focusing on. So thank you for that. Any other questions for Calvin?

Okay, not seeing any, I think we're going to go straight to Gao, with the anti-phishing working group's report on phishing attack trends. And Gao, I'll turn it over to you.

You may be on mute because we're not hearing you.

So, Gao, we can see your slides, but we can't hear you. Do you want to respond in the chat and maybe tell us what's going on?

GAO MOSWEU: Hello. Can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Very, very, very faintly Gao. Not very clearly and not very loudly.

GAO MOSWEU: [Inaudible] some volume on my phone. Is that better?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's much better.

GAO MOSWEU: Okay, all right. So I looked at… Can you all hear me? The upside of speaking is that, now I can't hear you all. So I'll just go on and present, if that's okay with everyone?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That sounds good, Gao.

GAO MOSWEU:

Okay. So, I looked at the report, the ACWG report, and first, you know, let's define phishing. What they define as phishing is it's a criminal activity that uses both social engineering and what they call technical [inaudible]. Okay.

To steal customer's personal identity, and financial account credentials. That was the most common form of phishing. And the social engineering schemes basically use spoof emails to get information from legitimate companies and individuals, so that they can trick you into divulging certain key data that can connect with your financial data. And then the other type is basically where most of the time, what they do is like you get, you download certain software, and then it comes with some other planted [malware?] that steals your credentials directly.

And uses certain questions to sort of intercept your information online, like user names and [passwords].

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Gao, you just dropped off and we can't hear you at all now.

GAO MOSWEU:

Hello?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Now we can hear you, but for a few moments you were just silent. Still problems.

GAO MOSWEU:

Oh, I'm sorry, okay. And so, the summary of the report is that over the last… I looked at two reports, actually. I looked at the report that looked at the last quarter of 2015, and the other report for the rest of the 2015 quarter, quarter one, two, three. So from time to time, I'll toggle between the two.

And so, the report shows that the 2015 quarter report shows that over the holiday season, over Christmas, these hunters and gatherers actually looked at the retail sector as perhaps the most lucrative market. And they targeted and came and attacked them with a vengeance. We'll look at the figures in a little bit.

And then, [inaudible] over here, ISPs are the most targeted industry. And there is also an increase in what they call PUPs, P-U-P, which are programmed that come without your concerns as part of banners, that comes with other software. I know I have experienced this before. But some of them are really malicious and they don't, you don't know what kind of information they are getting from you.

Belize and the US were top hosts of phishing sites, and throughout the year, the US remained the top hosts in terms of Trojans and other downloaders. And the number of domains that were targeted by phishing, basically remained constant throughout the year. And of course, new companies and institutions are always being targeted.

Okay, and then the methodologies and data sets. What APWG does is they check the number of unique phishing reports, i.e. the email contains the receipts. And what the email contains is basically a unique

email that is reached out to multiple users, and they direct you to specific phishing sites. And sometimes they use multiple campaigns to point to the same website.

And they also check the number of unique phishing sites that are found. Unique phishing websites, which is determined by the, excuse me, URLs of the phishing sites, and [inaudible], and they also look at the registration [inaudible]. And then lastly, [inaudible] on rogue, anti-virus software, desktop [inaudible] and other related things.

So in terms of the first quarters, I just picked up key highlights that I thought might be interesting to ask at the moment. Statistical highlights for quarters one, two, three of 2015. You can see there, January and September, the number of unique phishing websites [inaudible] actually doubled in number. And if you look further down at the number of sites that contain some form, the number that contains some form of target naming the URL increased by 20%.

And if you look up, you realize that between January and August, the US was leading in hosting phishing websites. And Belize led in September. And the number of unique brands that were targeted by these campaigns, toggled between 400 and 420 in those three quarters. And then in the last quarter, the number of unique [inaudible] kept increasing by about 25%.

And the number of unique phishing email campaigns actually reduced, which is a bit surprising. I guess consumers are getting more astute. And then Belize led again in October. So September Belize led, being the host for these malicious websites. And the US led the last two

months of the year. And the most targeted industry sectors. The first three quarters, as I said earlier on, these [hackers?] are basically targeting ISPs.

And then the these ISPs are [inaudible] at the end of the year. But we are now on slide 10 of 17. So the, the ISPs less [inaudible] because I guess with all of the Christmas shopping, it becomes a lot easier to target retail customers. In terms of, yeah, country hosting phishing sites, the last quarter of the year, the US and Belize came out tops.

And followed by The Netherlands, the UK, Belgium, Hong Kong, Germany, and lastly Ireland and Russia. Oh, and France, these are the top bottom three. Where are the phishing? It seems like Asia and Latin America were the most highly infected countries, and the lowest infection rates were found in Europe and in Japan.

The types of malware that were detected are, there are three types, okay. Or there are two types, and then the third type is basically a more general and less common. So it's [inaudible] and the data [stealing?] Trojans. And the second type is actually the most prevalent, like if you look at the table on slide 14, you'll see that Trojans actually come out tops.

And on the pie chart that we have there, we find on slide 15 that generic data stealing, they dominate. And then the [other?] is a mixture of all of the other ones that do happen. And so the general data stealing is the most common that is, what's the word? Okay, there is like a standalone type of malware.

And actually that is the end. I shared the two reports that I based my presentation on, and they're on the email. So you should be able to get them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you Gao. That was very useful and informative. I mean, I'll table questions for now because I know we only have six minutes left, and I at least wanted to talk briefly myself about ICANN's compliance data. So I will encourage folks with questions to Gao to communicate with her directly, and if there are points to be shared with the group, I will encourage you to circulate that via email.

So I'm going to talk for the last five minutes or so about ICANN compliance. And the headline here is that ICANN compliance has a treasure trove of data available. I would encourage people who want to find out more about the resources that ICANN compliance has, to go to the ICANN website, and look at the reporting and performance measurement resources that ICANN compliance has, particularly the performance report.

And when you look at those performance reports, you can find monthly data. So for example, what's posted now on the ICANN website is what ICANN compliance calls its contractual compliance taskforce for April 2016. And there you can see with nice visual pie charts and also conventional charts, you can see the number of complaints that ICANN compliance has received in April, in the last month, and then they also categorize the reports into topic areas.

So for example, if you went to the websites and just looked at the [inaudible] report, you can see that the largest category of complaint, of category for complaints is WHOIS inaccuracy with over 1600 complaints. And then the next largest area is complaints about transferring domain names.

Then when you think about abuse type issues, that is significantly smaller. There were 56 complaints regarding abuse. So, that is one set of information that the ICANN compliance gathers. They also gather information on who is being complained about. So if you wanted to know what registries were the most frequent subjects of complaints in any category, you can also find it in the ICANN compliance website.

They have a registry complaint volume and distribution reporting. And then they also provide information on their own statistics, how long it takes them to handle complaints, how long it takes them to close, how many complaints, in fact, are closed, and that sort of information. So that is one bucket of information, and I certainly think this could be something that would be useful for us to look at, and could inform our recommendations.

They also collect global reports. So if you wanted to compare the number of reports registrars in one area of the country get compared to registrars in another area of the country, you can use the data collected by ICANN compliance to do that. And so if I'm looking at one of their charts with complaints over a year period, April 2015 to April 2016, and I can see at a glance that in Europe, the area with the largest number of complaints is Germany over that yearly period. In Asia, the largest

country with complaints is China, with 97 complaints over the year period.

In North America, it's the United States, etc. So it actually has a lot of useful information, which, as I said, would be the headline. So, that's sort of a very, very brief summary but the bottom line, I think, is there is lots of useful data there that we can use to inform our recommendations, and I suspect that if we had requests for more granular data on some of these areas, that ICANN compliance would be able to provide that for us.

So, we are now at 10:30 of our extended time. I am going to thank everyone for participating in the call. I will be sending out a reminder to folks to select their reading items, and I'll probably have other communications proceeding our face to face meeting. But for now, I just want to thank everyone, and encourage everyone to dive into the reading list and think about what you might want to select.

So good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone, and a special thank you to all of our presenters. Take care everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]