RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hello folks. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to call number 11 for the CCT RT. Is there anyone who is on the phone but not on Adobe Connect so we can make sure you're a part of the roll call?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Jamie Hedlund. Sorry, go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: So sorry. David here. I'm on Adobe, but I'm not listed yet, but I'm here. Hi everyone.

JAMIE HEDLUND: And this is Jamie Hedlund. I am on mobile now, but will switch to Adobe shortly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good. Does anybody have any updates to their statements of interest?

[CROSSTALK] All right, go ahead.

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.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have one [inaudible] then we started out, so that's been reflected in the [inaudible]. We're going to upload that in due course.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. We'll look forward to seeing that and congratulations. So, first on our agenda is some comments on outreach to underserved markets that Carlton has agreed to share, you know, from the presentation we had on the last call about ICANN's outreach efforts. Carlton, are you ready to rock and roll?

You might be muted. We don't hear you. He's typing.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, but it's very dim. It's very dim.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. I don't know what's happening. I'm speaking as loud as I can.

JONATHN ZUCK: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it's just faint.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. I am [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Two comments about the outreach proposal… As part of the [AUDIO IS TOO LOW TO BE ABLE TO TRANSCRIBE]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey Carlton, your voice is very dim. Are you on the, you're on the microphone right? Not phone?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I'm on microphone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is it worth us trying to call out to you to get you on the phone?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes [AUDIO IS TOO LOW TO BE ABLE TO TRANSCRIBE]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could be that the record level of your microphone is down too low.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am current [inaudible] all the way up, as far as I can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You sound better now already.

                        Pam, can we try to call out to Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can you hear me better? I can hear background, so I don't know what's happening.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you better now, Carlton. Whatever you're doing now is a little bit better.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I was saying as part of the applicant support initiative, we had an outreach program that was supposed to provide information to underserved regions, and to the developing economies, would be

participants. And they had a program which included advertisements in papers, appearances by ICANN officials in certain areas of the world, or incident with other appearances.

And several different streams to it. What I do know is that this on the… They had, they went to the economists, I think, and a couple of other [inaudible] magazines, and they went to a couple of meetings, internet related meetings, and they made a push. My own view was that it was not just too little too late, but the channels that they used would not have resulted in the kind of exposure we were expecting.

For one, we decide to tell them that if we are going to do, that we have to begin to send both to the commerce, the Chamber of Commerce meetings in countries. We have to begin to use radio. I've always maintained that we can't do internet in developing economies without radio. [Inaudible], because most of the people who would be at the point of interest, [inaudible] radio, we can't just do online, purely online testing.

You have to use radio, and other communication channels. They didn't take up [inaudible] local newspapers, at least, as far as I know, there were very few of those, and we could decide that in the ALAC, for example, we had people who were looking for the communications in their [inaudible] that we use. We compile a list of possible channels in some countries, and they want to do.

So the bottom line was that although the outreach and [inaudible] was actually there was a plan in place, the execution of the plan did not result in the extra outcomes because we didn't choose the right

channels. We did not, we started too late. We did not pick advice of policy in place to help us with devising the communication plan, and for us, at least to the At-Large the major areas of weakness was the panels that were chosen for the community, and the lack of local participation in those communication.

So for example, they would hold a meeting some place in a country, and [inaudible] At-Large people assist them in the channeling and the communications content, that was not accepted, and that is where we left it. That's a little feedback.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Carlton. Thank you for that. Are there folks that have questions? I have some, but I don't need to go first.

I'll go ahead and start then, Carlton. Can we…? Do you have an example of an outreach program done by some other organization that was trying to reach the same kind of audience? That was successful? I want to get beyond the theoretical on this, and figure out how to put some meat on the bones of your recommendations.

[CROSSTALK]

Go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't have one at the moment. I think [inaudible]… I'll have to check with Tijani Ben Jemaa, because he had made some very specific suggestions added to, as I recall. But we were advised by the people in

the regions, in our, in the At-Large, of we [inaudible] people who would be interested in having new gTLD. And we were [inaudible] in very specific, we're targeting business people that we knew who had local brands, who might be interested [inaudible]… gTLD.

We were looking at who we thought might be appropriate for this. Let me give you one example that I can demonstrate. The telecom, which is the regional, political community of English, just English speakers, of Caribbean countries.   They have political unity called [inaudible], Caribbean community. They are based in Georgetown, Ghana, and they have 16 members, including Jamaica, Haiti, other members who are [inaudible] member, and the rest are [inaudible] countries.

The [inaudible] for information folks need, and ask whether or not if they could, people getting back [inaudible] as a community and [inaudible]. And I said, well, that's a good idea. They are looking at dot Caribbean or [inaudible]… And one of the things that I told them, well I gave them so information [inaudible] get them online, all of that.

There are meetings of the political [inaudible], that they had at the time. One of the things that we suggested somebody who [inaudible] one of those ICANN [inaudible]… We could get them on the agenda and they could be a good fit. It never went forward because they could not be convinced that the way ICANN thought of community was the way they wanted to think of community.

And so there was enthusiasm for dot [inaudible] because of the uncertainty in the classifications of the gTLD. That's one I know of. The second one, I can tell you a second one. We thought we could look at

regional meetings of the confederation of industries. We have a Caribbean confederation of chamber of commerce. And we wanted to position those people to give them the information, so we had sent information about where they were meeting and so on. That didn't get any.

As far as I know, we never appeared on the radio anywhere. And especially for Africa and the Caribbean, we have always insisted that if you have any kind of communication plan, that did not include radio, it is more likely that you will not be successful to reach the audience that you intend to reach [inaudible]. So those three things I can tell you specifically.

I will have to check with Tijani just to see what else is provided. I don't [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Carlton. Again, I feel like this might end up being a little bit of a research project, because the example you gave with respect to the community, doesn't really have to do with outreach. That feels like it's almost a separate problem where they were perfectly aware that the program existed, but something broke down in the communication after the fact.

So that probably wouldn't be solved by communicating earlier or by using radio. Those were people that were actively engaged, but then their interest waned as they got into the process, which I think is equally important, but it's not the same thing as outreach. And then on the other, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

CARLTON SAMUELS: …let me tell you why. The people who were trying to [inaudible] were the secretariat people. They would [inaudible] the policy [inaudible] and the technocrats from each country, that this will be, and that will be, that is why we want the engagement and the communications, from [inaudible] because they were struggling to get everybody onto it.

They're not decision making. They're simply the people in the secretariat who came to me and ask for information to provide it as support. But they still have another, they have another staff, they had to [inaudible] the policy directive in their 15 member community. So it required some work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, I guess, Carlton, the question, Carlton, is what the purpose of the outreach is. Is it to convince people that it's a good idea to do a new gTLD? Or to simply alert people that it's possible? That's an interesting dilemma, and one that we should try to record and consider, because I think really understanding what the purpose of the outreach is, is just as critical. And do you feel like this was a candidate for applicant support, or just a general sort of candidate in the developing

world? That had that managed to convince political leaders and the technocrats that it was a good idea, that it wouldn't have been a big financial issue.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I think a little bit of both. There was always a support for that kind of money, [inaudible] details and [inaudible]… But also, we needed a general, more understanding [inaudible] policies, within the community it's a good thing, then they would [inaudible] politicians, and the politicians that I know of, and even if they didn't, they weren't going to get applicant support, and they were still discussing [inaudible].

That's the whole idea that we wanted more people, in the communities, in the region, and on the [inaudible] to know about this, but we also wanted [inaudible] possibilities existed for them to [inaudible]… So I think [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. I mean, it's… So, and then this issue you mentioned of radio. I'm wondering if it's possible to, you know, do a brain dumb of some of what you're describing into a document about the avenues for communication…   We're getting some kind of feedback from somebody's line, I think.

About the avenues of communication, and why you think some are more effective than others. Is there anything, any kind of a reference for the issue of radio being a more effective means to communication in Africa and the Caribbean? Is that anything we can document somehow?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm sure there is. I will just have to go and look back for it. But this isn't what we know. Even the elites in developing economies listen to radio, and this is [inaudible] basically to get to them all of the time. There is [inaudible] very high, and when you want to get information [inaudible], [inaudible] and earlier [inaudible] radio still remains a very [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I think that's a powerful hypothesis. What I'd love to do with all of the questions that we're trying to answer in this review is sort of frame these things as hypothesis, and then figure out how to go about documenting, or conducting research, or whatever the best option is to try and support that hypothesis.

On this team, we've all sort of agreed to try and do less asserting and more documenting if we can. So I'm wondering if this is something that is of sufficient interest and expertise that you'd be willing to own this question, and talk to a couple of other people to try and determine what the best recommendations are to make for outreach in the future, and somehow document those recommendations. Does that make sense?

CARLTON SAMUELS: What I can do for you is just get, find some of the research about radio in regions, and I can provide that. That's what I'm prepared to do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: And that's [inaudible] clearly [inaudible]… One of the good things about it is you still have broadcasting [inaudible] in just about every country, [inaudible] and they do [inaudible] regularly. [Inaudible]… what that is, so I can, and I have access to that, so I can do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. We just need to get to a point where we are making some findings about the issues associated with outreach, and then making some recommendations. And so one of those is radio, I guess one of them you identified was making use of chambers of commerce, and then the third was somehow leveraging the locals in the outreach. And so, I'm interested in understanding that better.

                    Is it something where we could have used locals to get the right people to the meeting? Or how we might have better of used local contacts to expand the effectiveness of the outreach?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Are you asking me Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am, yes. That's one of the ones, one of the things you mentioned, sorry, yeah.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I can tell you probably [inaudible] one of the things [inaudible] outreach in the region, was [inaudible]… People in the region are the ones who always [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your voice has gotten very dim again.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't know what's happening…

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's better.

CARTLON SAMUELS: [Inaudible] in the regions have always [inaudible] providing on the grown knowledge of [inaudible]…   It's also different than the organization. One of the things that we've always offered is that when an event is taking place, if you [inaudible] operate some of the local [inaudible]…

It has never been, it's not been consistent. It's a lot better now, I can tell you that. [Inaudible] that they know in ICANN [inaudible]… So, back in the days [inaudible]…

I still think there is a balance to this [inaudible]… because they're right there [inaudible]…

We did a big document, and [inaudible] Tijani Ben Jemaa, who is [inaudible]…

…but he had some stuff [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so that's a document that we don't yet have or we do and I just haven't seen it yet?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't think you have that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And I'm not trying to put you on the spot, Carlton, I just, I think as a review team, we can't go out and say, we think this would be a good idea because it was offered and it wasn't taken advantage of by the outreach team. If there was some way to… Sorry?

CARLTON SAMUELS: …I wouldn't even start there. The outreach that was done by African support is a matter of record. [Inaudible] discuss what was done, and we think, we know that, so that is part of the record and we can [inaudible] those records. So that is not speculated.

JONTHAN ZUCK: Agreed.

CARLTON SAMUELS: [Inaudible] and the result of that, we know, that is not speculated [inaudible]. What we can tell you is that there are other channels that sort of [inaudible]…   and our knowledge [inaudible]…   That is [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I mean, at this point, we don't know that it was, I mean, that the problem was that people didn't hear about the program, right? I mean, that's one of the things that we're going to try to test for, and we'll talk about that in a minute. And so we don't know if it was a lack of communications channels, or if it was too much money, or it was not interesting as came up on the last call that people were afraid that there wasn't a large enough market for them.

I mean, there is a number of reasons that applicants, or potential applicants may have not applied, one of which, maybe, that they just hadn't heard about the program, or hadn't heard about the applicant support program. So I mean, so… If we reach the conclusion, and the surveys will help us, hopefully, to reach this conclusion, if it's true, is that there is simply insufficient awareness of the program, both the program generally, the new gTLD program, and the applicant support program, then we should look at why.

And then if we pose the hypothesis that the wrong channels of communication were used, I'd love to just try to find examples of where those channels were used successfully, or somehow document that some channels are better than others, etc. And get beyond assertions about the [inaudible] of things. That's all. That's all I'm getting to is

that it's not a question of me not believing you, I just want the nature of the report to be documented in a way that is as evidence based as possible. That's all.

CARLTON SAMUELS: [Inaudible] we'll provide a [inaudible], and I will dreg through the At-Large outreach [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so maybe we'll talk about this a little bit more in the face to face. I'd love to identify a small set, a team of people, that are focused on the applicant support area generally, and working on the outreach issues. So if you're able to be a part of that discussion, then let me know and let's make sure that we're on top of it and try to design some findings and recommendations that we're able to document.

So Waudo has been… I guess you are able to hear now Waudo, but not speak, would you like to go ahead and say some of the things that you're writing?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello, you can hear me?

JONTHAN ZUCK: Yes we can, thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you.

WAUDO SIGNANGA: Okay. So I apologize, I've been on Adobe, so I was not really following much what Carlton was saying. I heard a little bit in the beginning about the applicant support program, the associated outreach program that went to this. So my past comment was that that outreach support program which was connected with ISPs. Okay, but we also needed to have a wider outreach program that is [inaudible] the ISP.

And this [applicant] support program, I think [inaudible] the [inaudible] to some extent. And then with regard to the issue that you're saying about the channels. They are different channels, like you mentioned, radio and TV, I think those are important having general awareness of the program.

And I think I just give you a small story. When I was coming for the ICANN meeting in Toronto, at the airport in Toronto, the immigration office asked me what I'm coming to doing in Canada. And I told him that I'm coming from an ICANN meeting. And he said [inaudible]. That the organizers have come up with a new, he didn't really say TLDs, but he said new names for the internet.

So I was impressed because someone was just [inaudible] some idea about this gTLD. That one impressed me, and that kind of awareness that come about by using much media, radio, TV, and so on. That they

keep saying these things on the TV, maybe someone who is being interviewed, someone from ICANN, or someone from another organization is being interviewed and is talking about this new phenomenon.

So I think that was missing in the developing countries or in the developing world. The general awareness. We can report [inaudible] for giving up the demands for this year, for the domains, whether there is the domains [inaudible] in this. The decision makers that want to make decisions to apply, if they have a feeling that there is going to be demand.

And then I think there should have been other kind of outreach. Now, which is [inaudible] particularly for business decision makers. Which, I don't know, maybe we have to discuss how that, what positions you [inaudible] but to me, I'm thinking more like small groups, or one on one meetings with decision makers, to explain to them what the gTLD program is all about, and what [inaudible] so that they can take positions.

And from Africa, I can think of really big organizations that will be interested in having their own gTLDs. They already somewhere, the plight from South Africa if you call and [inaudible]… So I think the market is there for them. And some of those people, organizations that are interested in, not so much the applicant support program. Although the applicant support program is important, [inaudible] importance, but there are organizations to whom that should not be the permanent focus, the applicant support program, nor they will be just going out to give the information, like the benefits of the new gTLDs. Thank you.

Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So who just said hello? Was that you, Waudo? Sorry.

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, no. Somebody else…

JONTAHN ZUCK: Okay. So I think that these are all interesting observations. I want to figure out how best to document them for our review. In other words, we can't leave the conversation here, we have to identify some folks who are willing to own this question of outreach, and turn it into more of a research project, which includes looking at the summaries that came from the staff and the joint applicant support working group.

And then go back and, as I said, kind of phrase these assertions as hypothesis that we then try to go about documenting. So in other words, we will be doing, and again, we're talking about this a little bit later in the meeting, but we're going to be talking about some surveys

of people that might have applied, but we need to also, if we're talking about communication channels…

Waudo, you're talking about the distinction between the general public and decision makers, how we spoke to those and what's realistic, right? As far as mass media, which is the most expensive type of outreach, obviously. I mean, trying to reach the general public is the hardest thing to do.

I mean, you're example with the border patrol agent is an interesting one. It's also probably possible that 50 other people were arriving at the same meeting, and over time, he gained an understanding of what ICANN was by asking people why they were coming to Toronto. But still it's an interesting anecdote. So Waudo, you said mass media is cheap, and an interview on CNN, that's right. If it's not advertising, earned media can be cheaper, certainly, but even getting earned media can be expensive.

But let's try to form some kind of a sub-team on this issue of outreach, and focus our efforts on coming up with some hypothesis and then trying to document our findings and make informed recommendations. Because right now, there are just people's assertions, and we need to get past that if we can. Stan, you have your hand up.

STAN BESEN: Yes.   Eleeza   has   pointed   me   to   chapter   six   of   the   program implementation review, which actually, I think has gone over exactly the same ground that we've done here. It talks about adapting procedures and additional studies. So this is not a topic that hasn't been addressed

before. I agree with Jonathan, we have to identify projects that will move the ball forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right Stan. The decision we made in LA was to try and organize based on the applicant, on the program implementation review, and I think we're trying to reorganize around the questions that we're asking, and one of the inputs to that will, in fact, be that report. But we need to identify folks that are willing to own this parts of the review, so that the report becomes one of the inputs, and that we identify as soon as possible other research projects that need to be done in order to document the findings to support hypothesis that we are currently putting out there.

Waudo and Carlton, are you willing to be on a sub-team around outreach?

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. I am [inaudible] as I said earlier in this meeting, fine with [inaudible]… But this specific too is very important, and so I'm going to be very much involved with it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. We're going to talk about this a little bit more, but I think we want to try very hard to organize around a system of rapporteurs or champions for particular questions, so that someone is sort of driving the process of some funding or recommendations around that question. So I'll say this more generally, and we can it out on the last as well, we

want people to be part of a team around outreach, and then we want to have somebody identified as the kind of champion for that question around outreach, so that we don't lose momentum on that question.

So ICANN has to make some big news… Okay. Waudo, I'm interested to have you involved in that, and I'm happy to be involved in it as well, and let's try to find out who is interested. Please contact staff if you're able and interested to be part of this. I think we're going to ultimately organize kind of a Google Doc with all of the questions that we're trying to ask and get people to sign up to be champions for those questions.

So that's how the process is evolving. I hope that we'll come out of the face to face with champions around each of the questions that we're trying to ask as a part of this review. Does anybody else have any comments or questions on Carlton or Waudo's observations?

Okay. Great. Next is preparing for DC meeting. Reviewing the agenda, confirm meeting list and homework. What's the best way to proceed with that? Is something that Alice would want to go over with people?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Jonathan. Yeah, sure, I'm happy to talk to this. [Inaudible] you've got the agenda, it was uploaded last night to the team. So basically track changes, you will notice that we sort of reorganized some of the breakout sessions agendas, to match with where the two sub-teams are now.

And we've also incorporated reading list for each item, so you can have all of the documents, references, in preparation for the meetings. So

what we'll do for the agenda, if acceptable, is [inaudible] this version, and then send you [inaudible] and it will send a separate reading list whilst you have everything ready before you hop onto your flight to DC.

So I'm not sure if there is any questions here at this stage.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So are we trying to…? We're going to get to this, I guess, a little bit later in the call, but we're trying to divide up some of the reading materials for individual presentations, so that's part of what we're talking about for the reading list for the plane. [CROSSTALK] alert people, go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN: I was going to say the safeguards and trust and diversity [inaudible] from [Laureen?] on reading list assignment for their group as well. But I think we'll touch on that for the next agenda item. Yes, we will compile a list of readings for you, as you prepare for this meeting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And then I guess the other thing that Laureen asked me to mention on this call, is that we are going to be having a discussion with Larry Strickland and Fiona Alexander from NTIA, who were involved in the, you know, the drafting of the affirmation of commitments, and therefore the designation of this review. And so they're going to come and kind of discuss with us what the genesis was for this review, and why they thought it was important, and what they hope to see out of the review.

So, they're interested in questions that we might have in that context. So, part of what we want to do is ask each of you if you have questions about, for Larry and Fiona, that we can get to them in advance, that are on that question about sort of what they believe they had in mind for this review and what they hope to get out of it, etc.

So we're going to ask those general questions, but if you have specific questions, that they can spend time thinking about before they got there, then please let us know. Speak up now or send an email to staff and we'll put them in Larry and Fiona's hands. Do you have any questions about that discussion? That's happening on Monday. Isn't that right?

ALICE JANSEN: And Monday morning, correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Monday morning, yeah, there it is. 10 AM. Any questions about that discussion that you think of now?

Waudo says, how much data were they expecting would be available at this time? One of the things that's interesting, Waudo, is that the idea of data actually came from Bruce Tonkin, maybe after me being a pain in the butt about it for so many years. So I don't know that the issue of data even came up in the context of the original AOC document, that came up later as part of a Board resolution that Bruce Tonkin had proposed.

But we can certainly ask them about that question, but I don't think that was part of, that wasn't necessary part of their thinking. I think that's just part of our internal reform of ICANN reviews to make them a little bit more data driven.

So the AOC, as you know, is worded in a fairly vague way, which is, did the program enhance competition, choice, and trust? Right? That's the way things sort of were worded in the AOC.

Yes, Waudo, I think we're in the same place that we expect a review based on data. That's just never been expected of anybody in the past. And old habits die hard. Any other thoughts on the discussion with Larry and Fiona before we move on? Megan, is that what you were writing about?

Megan, that's a good point. The AOC has now been, well at least the sort of substantive parts of the AOC have been incorporated into the bylaws, so this review is now a permanent review, and it's certainly that we're doing this review on behalf of the community. So it's not on behalf of NTIA by any means, it's more a question about understanding where they were coming from and potentially getting insights into what they were thinking of that we may not have thought of, I guess.

Alice asked for a deadline for questions. Let's, I guess, let's say maybe the end of the tomorrow so that we can get them to them Friday morning.

Okay. Any other questions about that?

And then I guess, the other question I have is, maybe not easily handled via call, on the call here, maybe sort of an email question, but I'm wondering when people were coming in and who would be interested in getting together for dinner on Sunday evening.

Maybe it's possible to just use the voting function of Adobe Connect to get a sense if there is some interest in me organizing something for the evening before? I'm the local. The most local, I guess. I live quite near the venue hotel.

So just put a green check if you think you're going to be, if you're going to be in DC early enough for dinner, and you'd be interested in participating in a dinner beforehand.

On Sunday.

Carlos, something beer-y please. You would like it to involve beer, is that what you mean by that?

All right. I think beer can be part of it, although I don't want anybody hungover Monday morning for Larry and Fiona.

Okay, so I will figure out where we have booked for dinner for Monday and Tuesday, and look for an interesting alternative. Presumably, everybody would prefer that be like walking distance from the hotel, so we'll look for some things in the area to, that everybody can walk to from the Omni for dinner on Sunday evening.

All right. Perfect. All right, I think that's probably it for this agenda item, unless anybody has any additional questions. Yes Carlos,

[inaudible] is in walking distance, that's where I live. So we can certainly cross the bridge.

We can, you can all come to my house and we can get Indian food delivered, or something like that. So we have lots of options.

Photos of my place, Megan? Is that what you're talking about?

All right, so next on the… Oh, the [inaudible] edition, nice.

Okay, so next on the agenda is some progress updates from the sub-teams. So, this will be a little bit interesting in that both Jordyn and Laureen couldn't make this call, so I will attempt to talk a little bit about Laureen's update, and then maybe put Stan on the spot to talk a little bit about where we left off on competition and consumer choice. And then, but maybe to get us started, Eleeza can talk to us about where we are with some of these studies and surveys.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hey Jonathan. This is Eleeza. Sure, I would be happy to do that. So, on the… I'll start with the Neilson survey because it's a bit more timely. I should be sending to you, later this week, the draft report with the findings from the consumer survey. So that will be in your inboxes before you leave for Washington, so please take a look at that and come prepared with any questions for David Dickenson of Neilson will be joining us first thing on Monday morning.

In terms of the registrant survey, we, with the sub-team members for that particular piece of work, we finalized the questionnaire for the registrant survey, and included the sort of branch for those who don't

qualify for the survey, those who haven't registered a domain name, ask them questions about what are their alternate online identities they use.

So Neilson is now doing the sort of programming, testing, translation that needs to take place before they can actually push it out to the respondents. This actually takes quite a bit of time. It takes a whole week for them to get [inaudible] language translation and ensuring that they are accurate, and then programming their software and working with their, you know, cohorts in other countries. And although many countries, administrate the survey.

So we anticipate that that will actually be fielded in July, which is actually a little bit early. We feel that the last survey in August of last year, so we're a little bit ahead of schedule, but we figured a couple of weeks won't make too much of a difference and still allow for you to see some change, if any, within a nearly one year period between the two surveys.

Those are the updates on Neilson. As a sort of separate note, we have been talking within the application evaluation process of the review of, about doing some type of focus group, or focused interviews with applicants who had withdrawn from the process, and those were these [inaudible] that we know that have been captured throughout the program.

I'm going to be speaking with Neilson later today about their capacity for doing interviews like this, and I'll report back to the team on what I find out from them. This is something that they can do. They do focus

groups and more focused market research, I guess you can call it. So I may be coming back to you rather quickly with some, with an update on that, and hopefully we can all come to an agreement on a set of questions that you'd be most interested in asking to that cohort.

So that's an extra piece of work that we are hoping to, hoping that we will be able to take on. And then finally, I'll talk a little bit about the analysis group. There isn't much new to report here, being started to use some of the manual scraping of registrar websites for pricing data. They've also been in touch with two websites, I think it was Jonathan that recommended [Name State?] dot org and DN Prices, DN price dot DS.

And they've… It sounds like they'll be getting some pretty good data from at least the DN price website. I don't know if they've heard from the [Name State] website. They've had a preliminary conversation. But I've also had a call with the analysis group later today to see where they are with that.

Sorry I don't have a better update, but it's a holiday weekend and my usual calls got pushed back this week. And I also wanted to add, at least with regard to DN prices, I think that some of the data, or the data sets that they are offering, we can also make available to the review team, but I should know more about that later today and I will update you on that when I find out more.

And I think that's all. I'm happy to answer any questions.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks Eleeza. Any questions for Eleeza about some of the studies and the status of them?
	Everything is basically proceeding at pace there.
	No questions?
	Okay. Stan, do you…? I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but do you feel like ripping a little bit about where things are? And maybe we can even put up the problems document that Stan, you know, the questions document that Stan came up with, and kind of figure out where we are with the competition and choice discussion, and what kind of feedback, Stan, that you're hoping for the review team, etc. so that we can, now that we have everybody convened.
	Hopefully I'm not putting you on the spot too much.
STAN BESEN:	So this will be very brief. A while back, I circulated a project list, simply my first cut at a set of projects that I thought would be useful to do for the competition and consumer choice portion of the project. And following up our chairman's guidance, these are all evidence based. They all attempted to find, in an as precise a way as possible, a set of empirical projects.
	I must say, I'm slightly somewhat disappointed. I've only gotten really one set of responses, and only that, in the last day or so. But what I'm hoping we'll actually do between now and the meeting in Washington is that… Oh, sounds like a fire drill here gentlemen.

So Jonathan, I'm afraid I have to vacate the building. Jonathan, why don't you just complete this report?

Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a likely story. You probably have a button on your desk…

STAN BESEN: Let me hear the message. Hold on, no, I think people are leaving. Can you hear this? Fire? I'll try to be back in time to finish this, but I'm hoping people will respond to my set of projects with their own additions, or refinements, or suggestions for that. I'm hoping that we will end up in a room in Washington, where we'll refine these, determine the data we need, and I propose that we not let people out of the room until we do so.

Have fun gentlemen and ladies. I'll be back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, thanks Stan. So, I don't know how much chance people have had to look at this document, but I'm sure that Alice can once again put the link down here in chat. And so I implore everybody, just sometime today even, look at the questions that Stan has proposed, and make some recommendations to this document, if you have any.

I mean, the idea that we're trying to advance here is that we have sub-teams, so one for competition and choice and the other for safeguards,

that don't have all the members of the review team on them. And so, these documents like this are an opportunity for folks to speak up earlier rather than later, if they think that there is some aspect of the review that the sub-team is not considering.

So the point is, speak now or forever hold your peace. Don't wait until draft findings come out of the sub-team to suggest why didn't you ask such and such? These are the questions they're planning to ask so the time to provide input on those questions is today. So if you would please just take a half hour sometime today and look through this document, see if it makes sense, see if anything is worded strangely, or if you think something important is being left out.

Are there any questions about this document?

Okay, so I'm taking from that silence that everyone agrees that they will be looking at the document today, and providing feedback. Even if it's just tell Alice that you like the document as it is and you don't need to see any changes. So hopefully, you'll get back even with neutral comments so that we know that everyone has had a look at the document.

All right? That's your assignment for today. So the other aspect of the competition and choice sub-team is actually the definition of markets to explore. One of the things that has come out of discussions by the sub-team is the notion that we won't come up with just one definition of the relevant market for competition, but instead, look at a number of different types of market definitions so that we can provide

commentary on what the competitive effects of the gTLD program were, on each of those different market segments.

And so there are sort of categories of markets that the team came up with on one call, that include geographic and linguistic, and thematic, right? Like sports, music, education, etc. which is similar to what the analysis group did in their analysis of relevant markets, and they did a thematic overview. And so the sub-team has begun the process of coming up with different, putting the TLDs, if you will, into those markets, and then seeing which ones have, are missing relevant TLDs, etc. will be the next exercise.

And so we have different team leads on the competition and choice team, different rapporteurs for these market definitions. Perhaps I'll put them on the spot as well. Waudo, do you want to share a little bit about your thoughts on the geographic market segmentation?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Well, I don't have anything else. I think we just continue to have the momentum.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So I mean, have you shared the definition on our plenary call at this point? Or just sub-team calls?

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, I think we have not really reached 100% agreement on the definition. So maybe I will just hold it until we meet in DC we can try to discuss that with the plenary.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay Waudo. I think we're trying to actually have the market defined by DC, if we can. I think that was the [CROSSTALK]…

WAUDO SIGANGA: …ongoing work, maybe [inaudible] refinement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. All right. [Inaudible] do you have anything to share?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't think [inaudible] is on the call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, he's not on the call. Okay, let's try to, let's just set an objective to maybe circulate some market definitions by Friday, if we can. Waudo, you're the only rapporteur on the call, but we'll reach out via email to [inaudible] and Stan, because Stan is watching his building burn down apparently.

And so let's set that as an objective to try and circulate some market definitions by the end of the week here. Alice, thanks for sending the

email, I appreciate that. Okay, any other questions about the competition and choice team?

Okay, great. Alice, can you put up the notes from Laureen on the presentation screen?

So, Laureen couldn't be on so sent this email to sort of talk about what's going on currently in the trust and safeguard team. And I welcome members from that team to speak up as well. I know that Drew and David are both on that team. Jamie is on that team. So they may be interested on getting feedback from anybody on what's going on on that, and what the needs are from the plenary.

What Laureen has been doing that I think is a really good idea, is having individuals report on the different reading materials, the different references that have been made available to the team, so that people are reading a particular document and then making a presentation on it for the group.

And so, it may be possible… Again, putting you on the spot, but if it's possible for the folks that have participated in this thus far, David and Calvin, on how to maybe give a two line summary of the document and how it relates to some of the questions that we're addressing, that might be interesting information for the whole group.

Carlton, can you give an elevator summary of your presentation from the trust and safeguards team?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I could. [Inaudible]…

I did a [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry?

CARLTON SAMUELS: [Inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we can't hear you Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I did the consumer awareness survey. And I update document as, you know, both… [Inaudible] did a [inaudible] survey [inaudible]… for regions [inaudible]… The survey was administered in 18 languages. And they use a subset of the metrics, recommended metrics, in the survey, ask the questions. And they executed the first one in 2015. Some basic [inaudible], they look at existing gTLDs, and they focus on a couple of email [inaudible] links [inaudible] X, Y, Z.

They found 46% of [those who took] the survey were at least aware of at least one new gTLD. And [inaudible] of those who said they were aware, actually visited one new gTLD. And it appears that the ones that they tend to be those that [inaudible] purpose and functional association.

So for example, dot email and dot link, they were the ones that people tend to visit. They compared visitations with the new gTLDs, the legacy

gTLDs, legacy domains, that come later on. They found that in comparison, 79% were aware of the legacy domains, and 71% of those who were aware actually visited.

So, we had a big [inaudible] there. 46% aware of [inaudible] of the gTLDs, and of the 46% that are aware of the new gTLDs, 65% of those reported visiting at least once. Compared to the legacy domains, dot com, dot org, 79% were aware, 71%... The study also picked up some information that would be useful for [inaudible].

74% of the people surveyed [inaudible] surveyed, said they were familiar and aware of things like malware, phishing, or stolen credentials. But only 37% were aware of [inaudible]. As you know, this is a big issue with the new gTLDs. The new survey is supposed to be happening now, the updated survey, and presumably those results will be available.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great Carlton, thank you. Calvin, do you have an elevator pitch on the notice of takedowns study?

CALVIN BROWN: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes we can.

CLAVIN BROWN: Okay, great. So basically, well let me try and give you a three line summary. Very epidemic, 140 page [inaudible] examination of three other studies on the effect of the takedown notices, mainly with regards to Google search and the effects, as well as Google image search. And it made particular reference to the DMCA, the US takedown law.

Since it's really US-centric, and I think if I were to try and summarize it, it's one line, it's basically warned against [inaudible] such registration. As to its applicability or our work, I wasn't totally convinced that there is too much of a link there with the [inaudible] content issues.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay great, Calvin. It looks like we don't have Hal on the call, or Laureen, so we won't do more summaries. We'll get those later. One of the things that we're going to talk about is a kind of template for reporting back on data sources, that we came up with and Laureen circulated too, for her sub-team, and we want to you know, modify some variant of this for all the work that the review team does, if possible.

So we'll talk about that next. But just to finish up on Laureen's report, there is a new data request that's about gathering the zone files for all of the new gTLDs, [comparing?] levels of abuse in legacy gTLDs with new TLDs. And so the sub-team has agreed to do this and they have begun drafting the statement of work.

There is a fairly large reading list for the trust and safeguards team, and there have been assignments made for individuals to read different things on the list, and report back to them. And there has been a

template, and you can see Alice has pasted into the chat, the template that we came up to again make these summaries tied to the underlying questions that were kind of asked in the reviews.

So, trying to identify the question and then the hypothesis surrounding that question that might be addressed by that research product, and try to guide the summaries, the elevated pitches around that. So the [inaudible] by Calvin that a particular document isn't relevant is just as valuable as one that says that it is, because we need to really focus in on the questions we need to ask and determine what evidence we're able to glean from the different reading assignments.

So again, just a reminder to the folks that are on the sub-team, that the reading list has been published, that's that first Google Docs link, and then the template to use for sort of reporting on that, and when giving the verbal presentations on those, is the second link that Alice circulated.

So Waudo asks if the five presentations are available, I think that they were verbal, Waudo, and so there is not PowerPoints around them. So part of what we're going to try to do is fill out the template that's in this second Google Docs link that Alice has pasted, and then use that as a mechanism to let these presentations kind of endure beyond their verbal presentation.

It sounds like Carlton did a short doc so he can share that. He'll make it available to staff and they'll make sure and post it on the Wiki then.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Jonathan, this is Alice. Actually, there are already available on the Wiki. I've just pasted the link in the chat box.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, great Alice, thank you.

Okay, so that's… So we're going to try to, you know, make use of this template that we're talking about across the work of all of the team. I don't know if there is an easy way to bring it up, Alice, because it's pretty small. If it's possible to bring it up in Adobe, now is as good as time as any to share across the group.

Are you able to bring it up Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Sorry Jonathan. I didn't quite catch that. Bring which page?

JONATHAN ZUCK: The template, can you bring the template up?

ALICE JANSEN: Oh, of course, yes, one moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

STAN BESEN: Jonathan, this is Stan. I'm back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I saw in the chat. I'm glad that you're back Stan. We were all envisioning you standing in the front lawn, watching your office burn to the ground.

STAN BESEN: Unfortunately, it's just a fire drill. [LAUGHTER] Or fortunately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So yes, fortunately Stan. Okay, so this is the template that about which we were speaking, and this may give some refinement, but this is the basic structure that we're going to try to identify for the questions that we asked for each of the reviews. So if you remember in LA, we came up with questions that the review team were trying to ask for each of the sections, each of the three sub-teams.

And then for each of these questions, there is a kind of an observation. And so this is a particular example, lackluster take of applicant support. And then there is different hypothesis that are advanced for each observation to suggest why that might have been the case, and then we're looking at the research that would be used to document that hypothesis.

And then from there, we would come up with findings from that research, and possible recommendations, and identifying a champion then for each of those larger questions. And then the last part, or the

last column, if you will, is hopefully as part of our recommendations will try to assess whether or not we need to resolve that particular issue prior to any subsequent procedures.

I know that's just a typo on Alice's part, making reference to next round. So, you know, there is a need to be resolved prior to any new, receiving any new gTLD applications. And so this is the basic template. Welcome feedback on the template itself, but we're going to try to kind of organize our work around this method, and all the way through findings and recommendations.

Happy to discuss this or take questions on it, or just give you time to absorb it, but this is what Laureen circulated and we'll be trying to adapt for all of the work of the teams. A big part of what we're going to try to do, as I mentioned, is really identify individual champions for different hypothesis so that we have individual rapporteurs associated with them.

Any other questions?

David Taylor.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks Jonathan. Just a quick question on that table. It looks good to me. I like the way this is going, and it finishes up there with the resolution required for next round. Is that resolution that the problem needs to be done before the next round? Yes or no? So that's what that question means, yeah?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right. I think there is, you know, one of the problems that has happened in other review teams is there hasn't been any prioritization of findings and recommendations. And so, we're going to be treading through waters of a lot of interest in restarting the application process, right?

And so, kind of identifying the areas where, before we do anything, we make sure that we address problems X, Y, and Z versus, these are ongoing things that we should be trying to work on, as we're receiving new applications, etc. I think making that kind of distinction will help give guidance to the Board and staff about how to prioritize the work and what needs to be critical path for any subsequent procedures. Does that make sense?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, and it does, definitely. I'm wondering now various degrees of that… We've got resolution required to be saying resolution recommended before next round. But we're not supposed to say rounds, are we? But also whether we shouldn't say something like… [Inaudible] like a highly recommended, or we have sort of a variation on it. I think some are going to say we really have to get this sorted, and others will say, we'd like to see this sorted, but it's less critical.

So I'm just wondering, there might be some, so just a yes, no, we might have some sort of split along there, which we need to think about.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Maybe it's not a yes or no, maybe it's a temperature scale, or one to 10 or something like that that we should consider. So let's… We aren't close to answering that question yet, we just wanted to make sure that we were proposing it as one of the things that we'll be supplying as part of our report.

So let's put it on our list to talk about that further in DC, to you know, finalize what this document, what this template looks like, which would include how we might go about making those recommendations, and what kind of [inaudible] that we might have. Any other questions? Margie, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. It was my suggestion to put in that last call, and the reason why I made that suggestion was that I believe in the Amsterdam meeting, there was a lot of discussion about, at least from the contracted parties, about you know, what are the… We can get more definition on what's going to trigger the next future allocations? And I don't know, you know, if you guys are thinking about this, but it is possible to perhaps do interim recommendations on some of those things that are, say, high priority, absolutely need to get done by the next round.

I said the word round. In any event, that's what this is kind of meant to tease out, and obviously it's up to you guys whether you feel that you want to do something like that. But I thought it at least would be a useful tool for prioritizing and getting the temperature of the group on the particular issues.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks Margie. I think it's a perfectly reasonable category of recommendation, and Waudo has said in the chat that he prefers a more binary, so we'll have that. Let's make sure that we've got that on the agenda to discuss in DC. You know, sort of fleshing out this template, but obviously question won't be answered until we get to the findings and get a sense of the severity of those findings for the objective that we sat on in the larger question.

So just hypothetically, if one of the questions is about better serving, you know, a gTLD program that is more encouraging to the developing world it could be that awareness was a problem, but not the biggest problem, but that insufficient funds to operate a registry downstream, so beyond applicants, application support, but just the cost of managing a registry and providing sufficient guarantees about financial stability was too large a barrier.

It could very well be that that question will have, will be above the bar that says we need to address this before there is any new applications, whereas awareness is something that we just need to gradually increase over time, for example, right? So, within that question, we're going to find areas of prioritization based on our findings, and we just want to reflect that prioritization in that last column.

All right?

Laureen has already circulated this template, but we'll be trying to use it across all of the teams to the extent possible. Karen, you have your hand up. |

KAREN LENTZ:

Thanks Jonathan. I was just going to narrow, in relation to the template and the column about the next round. There is also a clause like this in the new bylaws that says, I'll put this in the chat, but it says, for each of the recommendations, the CCT review team is to indicate whether the recommendation is accepted by the Board, must be implemented before subsequent rounds of new gTLD. So I'll add that in the record. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Perfect Karen, thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Okay.

So, let's jump in a little bit into the application and evaluation process. And got some slides there.

So if you go down to the first slide, you can see the questions, these large questions that we were asking for this. When we prioritized the questions, the one in the lower right hand corner about specific communities, go the least amount of support. So that's a little bit of the red-headed step-child of this particular part of the review.

So we'll see where we get with that, but these other areas all had fairly strong support. And you can see that there are sort of these larger questions, that we address the needs of underserved areas and markets. There is a kind of related but different question that was about equal opportunity participation in the program.

So this has to do with cross-markets, was there some kind of a quality of opportunity for potential applicants? Or did the program favor the

wealthy and insider, you know, ICANN insiders, for example. Collecting and implementing GAC public policy advice, and preventing the [app?] delegation of confusing or harmful TLDs is another area. So those are the big four, if you will.

And then there was, if you scroll down further… I'm assuming everybody has scroll support, is that right? Or am I scrolling for everyone?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Everyone has scroll control, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. So and then there has been this question about whether we can simplify the process by eliminating rounds. So this is an ongoing question that's almost become an assumption by virtue of the fact that we're trying really hard not to talk about rounds. But we are going to have to address this head on, and try to document what the deficiencies a round may have been, because right now, we're sort of operating on that assumption.

Because it does feel, seem to be a lot of feeling that the implementation of the application process as a round, led to many of the challenges that have come up. And so we're going to want to try and address that directly. So if you scroll down to slide number four, since everybody has their own scroll control… I had some questions that I wanted to kind of put out for discussion, and we may, we probably won't get through all of this today, but just starting to start to flesh out some of the questions

that we need to try and answer to get to reviewing these larger questions that we raised.

So the, one is the notion of a quality versus the developing world. So one of the things that we need to kind of outline is what we think are the distinctions between these two, because there is obviously large sort of economic implications to a discussion about the availability of the program to the developing world, but I think that there are still those on the review team that are interested in trying to figure out whether or not, even in the developed, quote/unquote developed world, there was kind of an inequality in the accessibility of the program.

That if you had less money, you had more difficulty getting in, or if you weren't an ICANN insider to begin with, it was difficult to get into the program. So I think those are the distinctions people were trying to draw, but what I want to do is raise this for discussion on the group to kind of put meat on the bones about this distinction that got drawn during the brainstorming discussion, so that we have a better understanding of it.

So we can figure out what, if any, research we want to do them separate from the research we're proposing about the developing world. I hope that makes sense, and I invite some comments and discussion about what people believe to be the distinction in the questions, and what they think appropriate research might be to address the question of equality.

Don't everybody raise your hand at once because it can really overwhelm Adobe Connect, so I appreciate everybody, you know, taking it slow.

Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWN: Yes, I just wanted to point out that if we're going to go further than the education process, to give you an example of where I'm going with this, a whole bunch of African TLDs were not renewed on the first anniversary, and I'm wondering if that's a concern and that's somewhere where we need to go to or not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Calvin, you're talking about successful applications for new gTLDs that now, a year later, are being dropped?

CALVIN BROWN: That's exactly what I'm talking about, yes. Do we want to [inaudible] or not?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's very interesting. I feel like that's a little bit outside of our remit, but I don't want to be dogmatic about that. We were asked to kind of evaluate the application and evaluation process for its quote/unquote effectiveness, and so I guess the degree, my personal response that I'm interested in everybody else's, is the degree to which those dropouts

speak to the effectiveness of the application evaluation process, we should look at them.

In other words, if we let things through that shouldn't have made it through because there wasn't sufficient economic stability or something like that, I feel like that's the context in which we might want to look at those, at those dropouts, but I welcome hearing from other folks as well. Carlos, go ahead. Or Calvin, if you've got more, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWN: Yes, I just wanted to, you know, a couple of brand TLDs from dot [inaudible] dropped out said, it's almost hard, the number of [inaudible] Africans in Africa, to give you an idea.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I missed almost half of what you were saying, you're dropping out.

CALVIN BROWN: Well, then maybe it's a third of them, or something like that. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, I certainly think it's interesting. I certainly think it's interesting, so let's figure out how to reach out to the… These release people, we know who they are and who the right contact is probably, to ask them directly what's going on and see how it informs our findings and recommendations.

David, you seem to be… I'm going to skip you, Carlos, because you might be talking about something new, but David, did you want to speak to this particular issue?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes I did. I just put it in the chat anyway, but I agree completely. I think that the reason why these dropped out would be interesting to know, most certainly on the contact details on question 18. So if it's not public, I'm sure we can ask that, and I think that also goes to the outreach issues, because this is where you have outreach potentially and it's interesting that they've withdrawn, having gone through the process, obviously lost some money, the applicant fee.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So these, but these were strings that were delegated, right? That we're talking about.

CALVIN BROWN: Right, [inaudible], yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And Carlton is saying that it was, ICANN is claiming there is a violation of the registry agreement. So, how do we imagine that this relates to outreach on the application process? I guess I'm confused about the connection to outreach. David, do you have a sense of where you're coming from on that?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, I was just thinking, obviously, we're saying that the outreach didn't work or we're considering whether or not it didn't work as well as it could, and here we've got people who have taken the time and the expense to apply. And so just the reason why they then dropped out, I think, is valid data for us to have to understand whether the same thing would happen, because again, what we don't want to do is have 50 applicants apply, because we've done wonderful outreach and then they find for some reason, they've failed for the same reasons that we've seen here, that there wasn't enough ongoing support, or there wasn't enough financial support, or whatever.

But if it's a breach of the RAA, then it might be another thing, but still, I think we need to find out why, if we can. Then make use of that, if we can, for the future.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So if there is general agreement on this, let's make it a research effort to reach out to the applicants that dropped at the one year mark, to try and gain an understanding of why that is, and draw a connection back to, you know, some of the underlying problems associated with outreach and the application process.

But I mean, let's just find a way to make sure that we keep it within a remit to the extent possible. So let's… I guess, Calvin, are you in a position to maybe write this up as a little bit of a research proposal? Like how we might go about what questions we might be trying to ask,

and how we might go about getting the answers? Just a paragraph on this so that we have a strawman to work from?

CALVIN BROWN: I guess I can, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks Calvin. I appreciate it. Carlos, you've had your hand up a long time. I'm sorry [CROSSTALK]…

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, no problem. This is the Carlos for the record. Thank you very much Jonathan, no problem that I had to wait. I'm trying to draft a question around this, and I just wrote a draft and shared with some people on the list that have been, they're discussing it. I hope to have a clearer position by the time we meet next week, but I have to agree with you that we have to remain on our remit.

This is really the application process. We have to think a little bit more about what we mean about underserved areas. And for me, I'm working around an elephant in the room, you know? And the elephant for me, or for the Latin American region, I don't know about the Caribbean, but for me, is the ccTLDs.

I mean, I know this is outside of our remit and so on, but we have to ask ourselves, is a country or a community served by its original ccTLD? Is the ccTLD cheap enough? Is the ccTLD flexible enough? Is…? I mean, we have to tackle this somehow, because I see that ICANN's outreach in

Latin America, and please don't quote me, I hope it doesn't remain in the record, has a very cozy relationship with the regional ccTLDs.

And you want to be friends with them, and you don't want to threaten them, and they have been very weak compared with other ALS of the world in terms of pursing new gTLDs. So that's my explanation, that's my personal opinion. I don't have the numbers. This is my personal opinion. Why? Outreach or the application process in Latin America was basically an effective outside of Brazil.

There is a cozy relationship between ICANN and the ccTLDs, and there is not enough drive in most smaller Latin American economies to pay $185,000, and I think we can tackle that. I mean, we should ask ourselves, if the ccTLD is proactive and came with new ideas, or if the ccTLD was just protecting their home terf, and they were not interested in having a lot of activity there.

But I'm thinking how to try to get some numbers on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay Carlos, thank you. I mean, that's interesting. I think we aren't trying to avoid the issues ccTLDs altogether in that, as Stan may be about to raise here, we are looking at them as part of the market, in many instances, for competition. And so they play a role in the competitive landscapes, you know, for TLDs and gTLDs, because they are a kind of ccTLD in many ways, even the ones that are marketed in [CROSSTALK] TLDs, like… I'm sorry. Go ahead Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: No, no, no. There really is a substitute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, okay. That's right. So, there is a substitute. And then the question you ask about a role that they played in the outreach and the interest level in the developing world around, you know, interest in new gTLDs, I think again, is valid. That what we can't do is make recommendations for ccTLDs… I understand. Hang on, we just have to make sure that we stay within our remit, that what we come out with our recommendations for subsequent procedures for new gTLDs, and they can take into consideration the dynamics created by ccTLDs.

That's the only thing I'm saying. We don't need to avoid them altogether. We just, we can have them as context, but our recommendations just have to be specific to any further new gTLD program. That's all.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sure. I fully agree and thank you, and I'm trying to concentrate and trying to get some numbers on the dynamics, as you just said. So I hope to get some reaction from Carlton and Stan, and why I wrote the note on that for next week. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So again, try to form a hypothesis, and then we'll look at what kind of resources we might bring to bear, that are either existing or that we need to get to try and document that hypothesis. Because

obviously, we're going to avoid just putting people's feelings and opinions into our findings. Stan, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Great. Thank you very much.

STAN BESEN: I actually feel uncomfortable seconding the chairman's suggestion, but that's what I'm going to do here. These are all very interesting questions. I think we have to drill down at least one level down below them to make any progress. And I think that basically the same thing is true on the competition side, we need to identify projects with great specificity.

And that's going to require us to identify the data we need to test those hypothesis, and then we have to figure out who is actually going to do the calculations. At this point, seems to me, these are at a level, for the most part, are a level of generality that don't meet those requirements. And if this is going to be, our report is going to be based on data, we have to drill down at least to the next level below these.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I certainly agree with you Stan. So, I mean, that's why I welcome people throwing these things out, and I know Jamie is another vanguard of undocumented aspersions being cast, but we're going to, I think for any of these things to make it into the report, they need to be turned into very specific research questions, you know, based on hypothesis and then documented for us to include them.

So I think Carlton and Carlos, you get this. Carlos, I'm going to task you with trying to come up with a set of hypothesis, you know, based on your thoughts, and then let's work together to boil them down to very specific research questions. All right?

So, that was all great. What I was trying to get at for this question though, is that we end up having a separate set of questions related to equal accessibility of the program. And so, if you go back up to slide number two, if everyone would do that for a second, you can see that the orange box here was this other set of questions, providing equal opportunity for participation in the program.

So one of the things that came up in the brainstorming process in Los Angeles, was a kind of generic economic and status based bias about which people had some concerns. Risk of unfair advantage to those with more money, and insider knowledge, linguistic barriers, etc. So there is a lot of relationship between this and the first one about the developing world, and developing emerging economies.

The question is, is there is still a feeling within the review team about making asking a separate question about an economic or insider bias associated with the program, so that even in the global north there were issues of concern with respect to the accessibility of the new gTLD program.

So this feeling did come out of the brainstorming session, but I want to make sure there are still sufficient feelings about this distinction that we should pursue it separately. I don't know if anybody remembers if they were the one to pose these questions, or if they really meant for them

to be part of the underserved markets question, or if it was meant to be something separate. So that was what I was trying to get a discussion about, because I want to really boil this down to a set of questions we're trying to answer.

Does that make sense? Does anybody have questions about the question? David, go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, thanks. I can't remember now exactly the brainstorming in LA and where we got to… I do remember. I think it was on the last call, the call before, when we looked at this, I think it was me suggesting we put in the insider knowledge addition into the orange bit. So that was at that point when I put it in. I don't think it was something we had on the brainstorming back in LA, but I may well stand corrected because it was such a long time ago, I can't remember what we were storming in our brains back then.

But the point [inaudible] after there, was the insider knowledge, was just really, which again ties into the outreach in many ways, because the only people who really, really know about it, and I would say in many ways care, are the insiders who are looking to make considerable money from the process. And it's as the new spread, so the people realize there is an opportunity, and that's where you then get onto outreach that you want people to know.

But you look at the attendees at an ICANN meeting today compared to two years, four years, and six years ago, and it's completely changed. And I think there is an inside advantage, as there is in anything, I'm not

saying it's a bad thing I just think it's something which we have to accept, and it is there, and I'm just trying to think, I wanted to put it in so we can figure out how we, or if we can capture it and consider it. And then the best way, that's it really.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan, you may be on mute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just figured my voice was loud enough you could hear me even if I had my microphone muted.   But so, since Waudo appreciates my microphone. The… David, do you have a sense of how to boil this down to a hypothesis that can be turned into a research question? You know, it's about outreach, but in this case, it's not necessarily emerging markets outreach. It's about general outreach about the program.

And so, do you want to…? Can I pass to you with coming up with a couple of hypothesis associated with this question of equal access to the program? And then we can kind of brainstorm about how we might find the answers to the…? You know, how we might document those hypothesis?

DAVID TAYLOR: I can try. I think it's something we need to discuss when we're face to face. I mean, it's a difficult one. I'm trying to figure out how we do get data points out to that. And you can't go and ask every [CROSSTALK]… And…

JONATHAN ZUCK: And let's discuss that face to face, but if you could boil this down to a couple of hypothesis in the structure that we're talking about, in the template, then that can be the basis of the discussion face to face. So I'm not asking you to go research it, just to think about it, if that makes sense.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks. Stan, is that an old hand or a new hand?

STAN BESEN: It's a new one. This goes back to a little version of [inaudible] earlier. We have a very practical question, who is going to in fact do these calculations? I assume it's not the committee. Presumably it's going to be either the staff or outside consultant, and that means that we have to define these projects, I call them projects, with sufficient specificity, so that if we ask somebody to do it, they know what we're asking them to do.

                      And we, and I think, here in this conversation, some specific things have come up. I think there is a lot of work to be done to identify these projects with sufficient specificity, so that we can hand them off to somebody who is going to do our calculations. I just think we're a long way from being able to do that.

So Stan, that is similar to your previous remark. What is it that you think we should be doing differently then we're doing to get to that point?

STAN BESEN: Well, I pretty much see the project as a model, but what I try to do when… We had exactly the same, a similar issue arose in connection with the competition discussion. I looked at the questions and I said, gee, those are not research projects. And Jordyn volunteered me to come up with some projects, which is why that [inaudible] that I try in doing so, to be as specific as I could about the question we were asking, as specific as I could be about the data we were going to be using.

And it seems to me that we have to do exactly the same thing here, because we can't just hand these off to somebody and say, you figure out what we have in mind. I hate to sound so harsh about this, but I just think we're just not very close to being able to do that. And if that's the…

I would be disappointed if we left Washington next week without, in fact, being at the stage where we can hand these projects off to someone else to do the work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Stan. So I mean, I'm certainly inclined to agree with you. And that's why I'm sort of trying to push people to get things, to begin to get to at least the hypothesis stage, and then maybe what we can do in DC is get them to one level below that, to turn them into specific research

projects, either for the group, or for staff, or for an outside consultant. So it's identifying data sources, as you say, and also identifying what questions we want to ask of that data.

So I think we're on the same page.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, and we have the same issue. The competition group has the same problem. I think we're closer to that stage, but we're certainly not at that stage either.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. No, I mean, I think that's got to be the objective to all of the groups, is to get to that, whatever degree possible. I mean, there might be some areas where we're going to be doing a narrative, but wherever we can do any kind of quantitative documentation, we need to boil it down to what resources we're going to look at, and what we're going to employ to get those questions answered.

So I appreciate your comments on that Stan.

So, David again, to that line, I'm hoping that you get to the first stage of that, which is getting down to some more specific types of questions, that we're going to try to ask about the equality of the application process. And some hypothesis that you have, for example, less availability for outsiders, and then we'll try to boil down from there when we're in DC to turn this into specific research questions.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you David, I appreciate it. So, I know that the… Do we…? I'm sorry. We're coming up to the end of the call I think, is that right? Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes. Two minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, is there anything else that we need to do? Do we need to talk about with respect…? I guess we'll stop here. I'll pick up on the next, you know, talk a little bit about these surveys that we are working on to get at some of these questions related to the developing world. And so I guess Alice circulated the slides.

So you can see here on these other slide, the applicants surveys are both looking at people that either withdrew their applications, or applications, applicants, potential applicants who never applied, right? Which is a trickier question. And so we… I have the beginning of some methodology associated with both of those to conduct some surveys to gain an understanding about why people withdrew or why they didn't apply in the first place.

I will circulate to the whole group the research proposal on number two, and you can see sort of the phase one and phase two of that. And we can get some feedback there, so there is more detail in that proposal

than there is in this slide, but that's what we're doing there. But if you look at the slides here, you can see some of the existing questions again, that we have about some of the areas of work.

So please look at these slides, and Alice has uploaded the link to them, and look at these questions, and then we'll be diving into them into some detail and trying to boil them down to hypothesis and research questions when we are together next week. Alice, do you want to go ahead and talk briefly about September?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, sure, very briefly. You may have noticed there is no [inaudible] for the September meeting dates. So what we'll be doing is we'll be issuing a new Doodle poll with new dates, and we'll be looking into early October. So please keep an eye open for this new Doodle poll, that will be circulated in the list, and thinking about that input.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Alice, I guess separately, are we planning to do a face to face surrounding the meeting in [Hyderabad?]?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Jonathan. I think that's the plan, yes.

MARGIE MILAM: This is Margie. I think one of the things that we were talking about in the past was trying to get closer to where Rob might be able to join us.

And so, it strikes me that that's a great place to do that. The question for you all is, we had this question in Marrakech, is when would be the appropriate timing for it? During the week, before the week, after the week, if we were to go down that path?

So we'll need to explore with our meetings team.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right. There seems to be consensus in Marrakech that during the meeting was very difficult for people, because they all wanted to actively participate in the meeting, so I think there is a preference for before or after the meeting, before, for our face to face. I guess we can try to do a little quick poll here, if people are up for it.

I know that GNSO Council has its meetings on the weekend before the ICANN meeting. To what extent is that something a significant draw to people on this team? I know that I usually go and make a presentation, and people go and make presentations, but can we maybe see a show of green ticks versus red X's if you would be okay with us scheduling our face to face the Saturday and Sunday prior to the ICANN meeting?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. This meeting in India is very strange. It goes from Wednesday to Wednesday.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh right, sorry. So not Saturday and Sunday. The two days, I just mean the two days prior to the meeting, the same time as the GNSO Council

meeting, I guess is what I'm really suggesting. Or do people feel like that's too much of a conflict?

Exact dates. I don't remember them. Does somebody on staff remember what the dates of the GNSO Council meeting will be in [Hyderabad], the two days prior to the ICANN meeting?

I forgotten what the new dates are.

So the 3rd to the 9th of November, are the new dates for the ICANN 57, so this would be the 1st and 2nd of November, I think. So my question to you, and maybe this is too quick for people, but consider the possibility of us having our face to face in [Hyderabad] on the 1st and 2nd of November.

Or the 10th and the 11th.

CALVIN BROWN: I would prefer before. Sorry, I'm in my car so I can't do a check.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So 1st and 2nd works for Calvin, is anybody else okay with the 1st and 2nd? I mean, we can do a Doodle poll as well, but I just wanted to get a sense.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, Jonathan, just one thing. The 1st is a public holiday for me, but I can get around that, if need be. But I was just going to say, maybe for other people as well, I don't know, for the 1st of November. But I was

also going to say we can switch over, instead of actually matching whatever the Council is doing, we could do the 2nd and the 3rd, so we use the first day of the ICANN meeting and the first day beforehand.

Because I don't know about you, that first day generally is the easier day. You don't have any constituencies, you don't have other things like that, but obviously, other people may be affected, but for me, I could certainly dropout of the first day of the ICANN meeting to spend the day with the CCT review team.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So this is a lot of variation, so thanks David. Thanks for the input. I guess we're going to need to do a Doodle on it, to try and figure out [Hyderabad], and I didn't mean to derail the conversation about a prior meeting. It's just when Alice mentioned October, we may end up having two meetings in a row, that's all.

So I guess the other question is whether we should try and slip into late August for our face to face. Because I would, sooner rather than later myself, but I don't know if that works for other people as well. Alice, is there a reason why we're not considering going earlier than September, rather than pushing it later?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Jonathan. I think, well August is usually a vacation time for a lot of people. So we can potentially look into late August, if that works?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.   I mean, that's…   It might end up over my birthday, but I'll happily… I'll happily give up my birthday for the CCT [CROSSTALK] bakes me a cake. [CROSSTALK]

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, on the Doodle poll there was an early September, was there a reason for it not being in early September?   Because obviously then, we're out of holidays. That seemed potentially a good time, no?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Speak for yourself, it's Labor Day in the United States.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Alice, I guess in addition to adding some dates in early October, maybe add some in very late August as a possibility? And we'll circulate a new Doodle poll, folks, and just do your best. So be as aggressive as you can about dates that you can make, because the reason why we're having this conversation is that we, in the Doodle poll we circulated, we didn't get a very large number for any particular date. Everybody was all over the map.

So think harder, if you would, about your availability for the dates on the Doodle poll, but we'll also add some dates in late August and early October. Okay?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I just advise, [inaudible]…

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlton, you've got to speak up.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was [inaudible] Jonathan, there are too many choices, that's not good. [Inaudible] we try to [inaudible] choices, it would easier to get [people?] to focus that way.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, Alice I guess the best way to execute on that is to maybe look where there was the most support from the old Doodle poll, and include those, and where there was the least support, we'll just drop them out of the Doodle poll, and then we'll add a couple of choices. We'll add a choice in late August and one in early October. Does that make sense to everyone?

ALICE JANSEN: Okay.

DAVID TAYLOR: And maybe September, as you can see on the chat there, Jonathan. I don't know if that works for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I thought there were dates in September already in the Doodle poll, but I don't even remember it now, so…

DAVID TAYLOR:
…I might be wrong, I have to go to it, but I thought we were starting sort of mid-September or something, so I assumed there was something on in the first two weeks of September, but I might just be muddling my Doodles.

JONATHAN ZUCK:
Yeah, early September would be fine with me as well. So Alice, if you want to, we can do a separate conversation trying to go through the results we got, and…

ALICE JANSEN:
Sure, okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK:
If that's helpful. Okay folks… Yes?

ALICE JANSEN:
The poll was designed not to include weekends. The one in September that we all, you all looked at, would you like to consider some weekend dates in September? Because that's the other thing we can expand the poll to cover.

JONATHAN ZUCK: How do folks feel about weekends? It's difficult to have everybody talk. Can you just use the ticks quickly and put a green tick if you're willing to have our face to face happen over a weekend?

CALVIN BROWN: I'm okay with weekends. Can't do ticks, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks Calvin.

Okay, it looks like about half of the folks seem to be okay with the weekend. So maybe we'll through a couple in.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Great, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, folks. Thank you. We'll see you all in DC, and I'll figure out something for Sunday evening and send out some kind of an invite. Okay? Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]