JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome, everyone, to the 13th Plenary of the CCT Review Team. And we have a good turnout in the observers' Adobe Connect as well. So welcome our guest observers. We have attendees. Is there anybody that's not listed in the attendees list that's on the phone or that we need to be aware of? And I guess has anyone made an update to their Statement of Interest?

Alright. Great. Let's just roll right into the agenda. We'll start off with the Competition and Consumer Choice Sub-Team progress report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Jonathan. A relatively quick update since, with the ICANN meeting last week and other travels and so on, I think really just focused in on trying to finalize the project list that we've put together to be completed. We had some good news over the past couple of weeks in that we've made significant progress in identifying data sources for both ccTLD registrations and potentially to get parked site data or sites other than the new gTLDs that we've been using nTLD stats for.

On the ccTLD data front, staff was able to reach out to the folks behind Zooknic – not related to ZookNic as far as I know – but the Zooknic folks have put together a map that Dejan had distributed to the group earlier which seemed to have pretty comprehensive coverage for ccTLD registrations as of about – I think it was March, 2016. But in any case, quite recently – and we were able to ask them if they had historical data as well so we could use some sort of baseline to see how ccTLD has grown during the course of the New gTLD Program.

The good news is that they do have quite a bit of historical data, and we were able to agree as a Sub-Team that we will be using the end of 2013 – so essentially December, 2013 – as what we're calling the inception of the New gTLD Program for data baselining purposes. In reality, [Chabaca] started accepting registrations the following month, in January, but the Zooknic folks indicated that they thought that they had the best data set from the end of 2013 as opposed to from January, 2014. So given it's a relatively short period of time difference, we thought we would go with the stronger quality data. They also have data from December, 2015 and some data more recently from June, 2016. But it seemed to indicate that the end of year data is the best data, and so for now we'll use the December, 2015 data in our ongoing efforts with the expectation that since the report won't be released until after December, 2016, we'll do a quick revision to the final data charts as we get to the end of the year and get that data updated.

The one problem with the Zooknic data is it's not completely comprehensive. There's some ccTLDs that it's missing, and so we're currently just investigating how do we patch those gaps. Nominet is the organization that actually released the map that Dejan had circulated, and we're going to be reaching out to them to see where they got that data from. Alternatively, we may just try to use contacts at individual ccTLDs and/or try to discover if we think that the ccTLDs that are significant would really meaningfully affect the total registration numbers that we're looking at.

The one big outlier we know about is Zooknic doesn't have recent data on .tk, which we believe to be the largest ccTLDs by quite a ways. I think it's a couple times larger than .de which is the next largest one. So at the very least we'd like to get data on that. But in any case, we've made significant progress there which should allow Analysis Group to do some side-by-side comparisons of, for example, ccTLD growth along with legacy gTLD growth and new gTLD growth just to see what the overall market dynamics look like.

And in parallel, we've been trying to understand the differences between parked domains across various of the TLDs, and so far the best source of information on parked data that we've seen has come from nTLD stats. Unfortunately they only look at new gTLDs, so they don't have either legacy gTLDs or ccTLDs parked data stats. So staff reached out to them and they were willing to consider looking into trying to do similar analysis across other TLDs, but they had some concerns about the engineering and timeline required to do this. We're going to be meeting with them later this week in order to better understand the issues there. And in the meantime, I owe but haven't yet produced for the team due to travel just a quick summary of how the existing measures that they're using for parked data work so we have a better understanding of what they're doing going in based on some cursory explanation that they've provided to us so far.

Other than that, I think we've identified mechanisms to do most of our other projects that we've identified that we'd like to complete as part of the report. Some of them Analysis Group are doing. Some of them ICANN staff are capable of doing. The one other project ICANN staff is working on relates to trademarks and how they are represented across various TLDs. We agreed upon using the, I think, interbrands list of trademarks in addition to some other lists of trademarks that the

Analysis Group had already identified as part of their work in the TMCH Review.

So we've made, I think, pretty good progress on finalizing the types of data and the places that we're going to be getting them from. And meanwhile, I think some of the analysis is actually underway and we expect by the time we get together in August in a mystery location, that we will start to see data back from Analysis Group in terms of completing a number of the projects that we've completed. And that may be true for some of the staff projects as well. So we'll actually be talking about results in August as opposed to trying to figure out what we want, which I think will be a good reflection point in our overall effort.

I think that's the overall update. If folks have questions I'd be happy to answer them now.

DREW BAGLEY: I was just wondering, as far as pricing data – and you may have mentioned this – did you look by any chance at tld-list.com?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We haven't looked at tld-list. Could you elaborate on what information that provides?

DREW BAGLEY: Because I'm interested in pricing data, too, as it relates to DNS abuse because of a correlation there, and so I've been reaching out to various sources for data for our Sub-Team, and tld-list has pricing data going back to March of this year supposedly for all gTLDs, new and legacy.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: For the gTLDs, some combination of ICANN and Analysis Group has access to that data. We don't individually because that's protected by a Confidentiality Agreement with Analysis Group. Stan and I think a couple others on our subgroup are going to be working with Analysis Group in making sure that there's a good protocol and expected result for the number crunching that they're doing. But we actually, on the pricing side for gTLDs – well, we don't, but Analysis Group has good access to all of the data that we need – but I'm sure Stan, at least, is probably intrigued to hear that he can get direct access to some of this data if it's on that site. So that's a helpful find, Drew.

STAN BESEN: A quick question, Drew. Are you referring to wholesale or retail prices?

DREW BAGLEY: Supposedly they have both. This is just based on e-mail correspondence.

STAN BESEN: Okay. Because I've seen retail prices but I've not seen wholesale prices.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, and with that said, I haven't actually accessed the data to see what's there. This has been just e-mails back and forth.

STAN BESEN: Okay, thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: No problem Just one more question, Jordyn, sorry. I was wondering if you had given any more thought to our brief conversation in D.C. about adding on any analysis you might want that might make sense with the DNS Abuse study – considering that we're going to be asking a vendor to analyze years' worth of zone files and WHOIS data – If there's anything that might make sense to add on to that for your purposes?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think the only thing that might be related to this is the question of parked domains, and so I think we'll have a better answer for that after we talk with nTLD staff later this week.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, great. Thanks.

STAN BESEN: Drew, could you give us the name of the source again?

JONATHAN ZUCK: TLD lists.

STAN BESEN: nTLD lists. Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY: TLD-list.com

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, if there's no more questions I think that's the end of my update. So I'll turn it back to Jonathan for the next agenda item.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. Thanks for the update, Jordyn. That's great. Any other questions for Jordyn before we move on to Drew? Jordyn, how are the projects coming that people are working on on their own with data that we already have?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We haven't. I don't think such a project exists at this time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. [inaudible] I have one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There are a couple places where we have asked folks to fill in gaps. For example, I think Dejan volunteered to try to look and see on the ccTLD data side, for example, to see if we could fill in gaps or identify if there were significant TLDs missing. But I don't think any of them constitute stand-alone projects in the sense that we're generally referring to stuff here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. It's your chance to prod people. So you prodded yourself on the description of the methodology. I'll prod you on the [SIDO] contact, just trying to get data out of them for one of the projects. But otherwise, we'll move on. And, Drew, can you give us an update on what's going on in the Safeguards and Trust Sub-Team.

DREW BAGLEY: Sure. Similar to the other team, we're trying to organize ourselves before August to make sure we're showing up in August discussing some sort of results whatever's available to us. What we did on yesterday's call was do the final stretch of organization for the month of July so that we are ensuring that we either have completed our chart which analyzes all the ICANN safeguards that are applicable to Consumer Trust and looks at whether or not they've been triggered, what their intention was, and what the actual outcome was, and whether they achieved their intended result. So a little work to do to finalize that. And then we're starting to – we've already shaped our discussion paper teams – and so we will have discussion papers by the August meeting and those discussion papers will serve as, depending on the topic, either a literature review if we're waiting for additional data, or as the initial analysis of the issues we're looking at with regards to DNS abuse, the impact of safeguards, consumer and end user behavior, and the effectiveness of safeguards and their procedures. That's the main part of about what we did.

And then we also have a data call out to ICANN Contractual Compliance that Laureen submitted before she went on vacation. And then I have some outstanding questions to them as well as Registry Services that Brian's helping me with, and I think Alice is helping me with as well, maybe even Eleeza, too. I think it might be an all hands effort from ICANN staff getting some questions answered there with regards to the safeguards and trying to better understand statistics that we may not know about as far as, for example, how many times maybe a registry applicant [if you must] that they actually could not pass the background screening and therefore could not be an applicant and whatnot. That's the main gist of what we did in yesterday's call.

And then the other thing to report on would be that Brian and I are finalizing a Request for Proposal for the DNS Abuse study, and so we hope to circulate that perhaps today or it may be tomorrow, that Brian has one more meeting before we could circulate that to everyone and get additional feedback so that we can get that out and get a vendor selected. But basically what we're looking at doing is likely doing a twofold study where we would have a vendor look a couple years back but only have maybe six months that they could actually apply pricing data and do an analysis of DNS abuse going backwards, and then do a day forward analysis that would include any pricing data that we could get from this year – as I was mentioning before – from that website as well as however many months going forward that make sense. Therefore, we would have two deliverables from this vendor that would help us understand the impact of new gTLDs on consumer trust by way of DNS abuse.

And so that is the update for our team. Are there any questions? And I yield [inaudible] to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Drew. Thanks for the update. Anything interesting come out of the meeting in Helsinki? Not everybody on the team was at the meeting. Was there anything at this process that's worthy of note?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, so we didn't have an actual group sub-team meeting in Helsinki, but Laureen and I were basically strategizing what we needed done during her vacation. And so basically everything we discussed came out yesterday in the call, that we were basically deciding that July really needs to be a month of lots of action so that we can be really productive in August and ensure that, like Jordyn mentioned for his team, that we're actually discussing results.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, sounds good. And as far as the DNS Abuse study, I guess I have two questions. One is about timeframe – six months back, six months forward – at one point you were trying to propose going six months forward from today but we think we can find sufficient pricing that you can do some of that analysis from within the time that's gone by. What do you think the timeframes would be on that study now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We would have the historical timeframe going back to January, 2014. That way we would show the introduction of the new gTLDs. The vendor would have to take into account when the new gTLDs actually were introduced rather than assuming all of them were available during a Sunrise period or what not.

That will be one part of it. And then the ability to add the pricing data looks like we could go back to March of this year. But depending on when the vendor was chosen, it might even be that they could actually produce one deliverable but assuming that we got a vendor chosen in August, that's why there would be perhaps two deliverables. And so, yes, per what I discovered with the availability of pricing data and per your suggestion and emphasis on our need to stay with our timeline, I think that's the way it's going to work. It's the one part of the analysis that would probably go from March of this year to September of this year.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. And then I guess my last question – you mentioned a Ceridian RFP, which is a term of art inside of ICANN, but presumably we're hoping that that's a informal Request for Proposal rather than a formal Request for Proposal, right? That we think the budget for this will fall under the need to do a formal – Brian's hand went up. Brian?

DREW BAGLEY: I'm not sure yet because we were [saying] Statement of Work, but Brian in this morning's instant messages used RFP so he will fill the [time] in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Brian, you can go ahead and chime in. Thank you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Can you can hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay, great. Good morning everyone. The "RFP" has been expanding and contracting a bit over the past months as different people have looked at it and got their hands on it. The vagaries of going through an RFP process can be quite time-consuming, and generally there's a price threshold in which an RFP is triggered within ICANN and we're trying to keep it below that threshold just because things move a lot faster. There's also the potential that we may have some data sources available and even some research into DNS abuse ongoing, and I've been talking with our Security Team – this was just on Friday before the holiday – that they may be doing some research that could tick some of our boxes.

So there are a few variables in play right now. I'm going to sit down with Eleeza and Karen tomorrow and we're going to just pin down what we can do and what our timeline would look like. The timeline I put in the draft RFP that we're going to go over puts a vendor having a report out by January or February, and that's incorporating these different kinds of studies that Drew has talked about. Now, that's not final or anything. That's just a timeline we're playing with to just shorten things up.

I hope that answers your questions, but let me know if you have any more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Brian. In terms of timeline, do you think that you might have some preliminary results out of folks so that this issue could be part of a draft report that went out by the end of the year, or do you think this portion of the report's going to have to wait until the new year?

BRIAN AITCHISON: I think there's going to be some preliminary results, depending on how fast – especially if we can do the more historical aspects of the study – I would imagine there would be some preliminary results out before the end of the year.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright great, Brian. Thank you. Any other questions for Drew or Brian? I have another question that I guess I'm going to put him on the spot, for David Taylor because I confess I don't recall what sub-team it was meant to live under, but one of the things we're looking at is a defensive actions survey of INTA members and trying to figure out where that survey sits. In D.C. we had talked about just picking up the tab for it, and

I wanted to figure out where that was and what next steps were and what we needed to do to pursue it. I think you circulated some sample questions. I don't know if you got the feedback you needed, but let's figure out how to maintain momentum on that. So, David, if you would, please share with us where things stand and who needs to be doing what.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sure. Thanks, Jonathan. I always like to be put on the spot.

Absolutely right, where it sits is a good question. It's obviously sitting in our plenary the entire group, whether it's the Safeguards or whether it's the Competition also I think that's what is the fact of the matter is it sits a little bit between two. So we're certainly looking at it in the Safeguards Subgroup, and that's going to tie into the RPMs and that protection side of things. But I know Jordyn's keen as well to get that right so we're going to be also looking into Competition so it's going to be a little bit of everywhere, I think.

And as far as a status of that is, yes, we were trying because the two aspects we'd got was funding for the survey and also getting the questions for the survey and getting them in the right format and then getting them out to a suitable audience. So we've been pursuing with INTA as being the suitable audience. I'd certainly like it to go wider than INTA if we can. And also on the audience the question of whether we limit it to specific brands as opposed to the law firms as well just on the basis that… My concern there is if we were to send it to every member of INTA and you send it out to the law firms and you have each of the law firms also potentially contacting the same clients who have already received it directly – or the same entities have already received it directly as being members of INTA – so we don't want to overload people with too many questionnaires.

As far as the questions go, the good news is we were looking and we'd started preparing some short questions on that, and then I had a call with INTA and the Sub-Team that's been looking into this area within INTA anyway, and that's the set of questions I've circulated. So that was primarily to the Safeguards Team but then I know that's also gone to Jordyn and the wider team.

I've put a deadline on it the 5th of July for comments to that, which obviously was yesterday, and I don't think I've had that many. So I don't mind extending that, but I'm just being mindful of the summer period approaching and obviously I goal of trying to get some meaningful data back in end of September/early October and not have something which comes in next March which would be too late for us.

So obviously it's quite a tight time schedule, but we need to get it right so then once we've got a – the goal with the questions, by the way, was we've got these INTA drafted questions, we've got some additions to make, and obviously any additions here that people look at those questions and think we could add this or this in – to try and get a set which we then agree is worthwhile pursuing and then in parallel we've got who the provider will be. So I'm not sure who can update from ICANN side on that. I think Eleeza was looking into that, but I'm not sure who because we were going to obviously do an RFP and see whether it's Nielsen or another that do this, and then the stage would be for them to refine the questions into a meaningful format as per other questions which have gone out and then we can try and get that out with a goal – I'd like it to go out the very beginning of September, which I think is realistic as long as we keep going through the summer. That's my update. I'm happy to answer any additional questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza, I see your hand up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to add – so as David mentioned, INTA reached out to us to help us put them in touch with Nielsen as the potential vendor for this. So I [inaudible] was in a conversation with Nielsen and we actually received a proposal back from Nielsen yesterday in terms of costs and timeline. They're estimating approximately nine weeks from start to finish to get our survey out and done.

That's where things stand. I'm not sure what INTA's reaction is. I haven't spoken with Lori over there yet [about] the proposal received or what the next steps might be. But that conversation is happening.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eleeza. I spoke to Lori very briefly in Helsinki, and I guess I don't know definitively whether or not we need to just do this ourselves and try to get the lists out that or if we're able to split the costs with them or something like that. Structurally, I think they're concerned about being themselves somehow under contract with ICANN as a conflict of interest and so I don't know where that stands and that's maybe more detailed than we need to go to on this call, but I will… The next thing I want to cover is the fact that we need to figure out what research efforts we're trying to get completed and do that within the next couple of weeks here.

I've got a lot of hands up. So I'll take that and then get into the budget issue. Stan?

STAN BESEN: I just did a little bit of research on the site that Drew recommended and unfortunately those look like retail prices. I'm concerned about access to wholesale prices.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Stan. So that's still an open issue about trying to get access to wholesale prices.

STAN BESEN: I believe so.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright, well let's continue to figure out how we're going to get them. Can you put a pin in that for just a second, Stan, and we'll just finish this conversation and then maybe give the microphone back to Jordyn to figure out what the next steps on that might be.

I see David's hand is up. Is that new?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, it is, Jonathan. I was just going to pick up with your point that I also spoke with Lori and we had quite a detailed call with ICANN staff, Lori and myself, I think it was two weeks ago. That would have been where we discussed about the funding, etc. and I think it's clear that it's not going to be a co-funded proposal. INTA seem quite happy to pay for it, but they don't want to be receiving funds from ICANN although we did discuss that point is that we would not actually be receiving any funds from ICANN because it would go straight to Nielsen.

So that point still needs to be finalized, shall we say, because at the moment it seems an interesting scenario that we've got two sources for payment – so that's always good news, better than having no source for payment – but it really is a question for my mind if we want the questionnaire to go out sooner than later. And that's my only worry, that we end up getting delayed by things.

And I've just got a question which is why I raised my hand originally, for Eleeza on that was, the nine weeks which Nielsen mentioned, is that for them to create a questionnaire through to analyzing results? Because I'm just looking at the timing here – if we provide them with a questionnaire that they need to refine to make it a proper questionnaire in the proper questionnaire format that these things need to be, whereabouts is that in the timeline? Because obviously nine weeks is a little over two months, so we're starting to mean that we'd be already into mid-September from the place we're at now which we signed.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, there. Yes, they've allotted two weeks at the very beginning for survey development. That's presuming is effectively refining the questionnaire that they've already been presented with.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay. So time-wise, that comes back to my 5th of July. Maybe I should say if anybody has got any further comments on it, then if they get them to me by the end of the week or Monday next week at the latest so we can try and finalize that questionnaire next week and get that off to Nielsen, if we're using Nielsen. I suppose we need to have another call probably offline from this one to decide whether that's who we're going with or not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yes, so shall we take as an action item to do a sub sub-team call on this survey to talk vendors and pricing? It's your sense, David – I'm sorry, I don't mean to belabor the point because we're in the middle of a budgeting issue and so I want to – are you confident that INTA, that the budget is not going to be an issue for the survey?

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm fairly confident that it's not an issue. I think my concern with that is just if it's inter-paid for whether that may mean it's delayed for some reason because they may have to get some sort of approval. I need to work with Lori on that. It's control over the questionnaire at the end of the day. It's going to INTA members, which is absolutely fine, but I just want to see this go through. And if we've got the money, I'd like to get an A-okay and an approval and move on it. So we need to move before that. I think it's the 18th of July is now the budget deadline for anything like this.

I'll try and liaise with Lori or Eleeza, if you're already liaising, or we can always have a call. But we'll liaise by e-mail and just try and get that point rushed out for sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. Any other questions for David? Okay. Do we need to [spec], Jordyn, or do you want to pick this up in your sub-team call for the search for wholesale data?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, I think we can pick this up in the wholesale call, unless Stan thinks it's pressing. And as I mentioned, Analysis Group does have access to data. It's mostly a question of whether we get to play with it ourselves versus – and it's not a question of whether we'll have access to it for the purposes of doing analysis in a report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That's right, and I guess we had talked about making Stan a kind of data ninja that had signed an NDA or something like that. I don't know where that stands. Stan's latest suggestion was to just have Analysis Group participate on the Competition and Choice Sub-Team calls, but that might limit his access to data. So that might be worth giving some thought to on the next sub-team call as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We did agree on our last sub-team call that we were going to have a few folks, including Stan, work directly with Analysis Group to supervise the work that they were doing so that we have a confidence that they're doing it in a manner consistent with our expectations for the report. That's slightly different from having Analysis Group participate in the sub-team calls, particularly because at least I and anyone else with potential conflicts won't be directly engaged in those conversations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Okay, thank you.

Alright, so the next thing is the application and evaluation – I may just squish that down because we're going to bring this up as our next topic here in the call. So what I'd like to do is just skip ahead and talk about research and data requests. This is important because we have, as you know, moneys that were budgeted for us for last year that we didn't spend, and there are some budgets that's allocated to us for this year that may or may not be sufficient to cover all the things that we want to do. And so there's a good chance that we'll be making some kind of a proposal to expand the moneys available to us this year, and so in order to do that in a timely fashion, we're setting a deadline of the 18th of this month to finalize proposals for budget for research. That means that they need to be discussed long before the 18th, because the 18th is the deadline to have them ready so that we can roll them into a proposal for expanded budget if necessary with Theresa and ultimately Xavier.

So I just wanted to make sure that everyone, we made that decision about the deadline on the Competition and Choice Sub-Team call while in Helsinki so not everybody was there, and I just wanted to make sure that everyone's aware of that deadline of the 18th because that's the point at which we'll go in with a final proposal to ICANN for moneys needed for research.

So all these little projects that we're talking about trying to purchase data, a survey, whether we're using INTA's money or our money, and things like that, all need to be determined so that we can go in and make a case for them. Does anybody have any questions about that? Okay. You all know who you are. If you have a pet project that requires the acquisition of data or outside research, that's the timeframe we're working in in order to make a budget request.

Then the next topic is I guess the Application and Evaluation progress report, which I'll give. Our [last] meeting of this team, if you will, it's almost like a Work Stream rather than a sub-team because it's everybody, was in Washington D.C. We have a number of different action items.

By way of progress, I'll let you know that Eleeza and I had a call yesterday with AMGlobal, Andrew Mack's firm, to talk about the progress of the research on the cohorts, and they are ready with Africa and Latin America lists of entities and what they hope to be the appropriate contacts within those entities, and we gave them the go-ahead to go ahead and do Southeast Asia and the Middle East. But further, we had a conversation about what's going to be done with those names now that they have compiled them. So part of the question was whether to farm that out to Nielsen where they've got a lot of bodies to throw at it and a lot of global reach in terms of people in the field to get surveys done, but not necessarily a lot of expertise in the issue or in those regions. And so we're expecting some kind of proposal back in the next couple of days from AMGlobal for them to do a kind of a pilot outreach in a couple of the different regions to see what kind of responses they're getting back from folks so that we can make a good assessment about whether or not it makes sense to treat this like a survey or to just let AMGlobal continue and reach as many people as they can and get more detailed perhaps less quantitative data out of them. Because even at the 200 names or the 280 that AMGlobal set as a goal, Nielsen are very concerned that the statistical sample isn't big enough and that they'll get at best like a 10% return and so it will be difficult for us to say things definitively quantitatively, and so more in depth questioning or a more focused group like approach may be the way to get at and tease out some of the issues associated with why there weren't more applications from the developing world.

So that is proceeding at pace and may find its way into a further research budget request as well if Nielsen is the way to go or if there's some hybrid. But that's one of the things that's ongoing and is at the core of a number of the questions that we're asking in that sub-team about the developing world.

As far as the action items, I'm trying to look back and forth to see who's on the call versus who have different ownership of these different action items from Washington D.C. I don't see Carlton on the call. So as far as obtaining input from Nielsen on how to structure a survey – this is the other applicant survey, this is the one of the people that did apply and we had a number of – is there, maybe Eleeza, you'd like to speak to how conversations are going with Nielsen on this issue of the actual applicants as opposed to the Unicorn applicants.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, I'm happy to. Sorry, you might hear my daughter crying in the background.

We've spoken to Nielsen and they've come up with a proposal for us of varying degrees because they don't know how many responses they get from applicants. So that is ready to go pending our approval of how we want to spend our budget. I just wanted to note that on the applicant survey that the Subsequent Procedures [inaudible] was considering undertaking, as far as I know they still haven't gotten anywhere on that survey or set of interviews. They're still discussing how they want to approach that or if they're going to approach that. At least that's what I've gathered from my colleagues [who] work on that PDP.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay great, Eleeza. Thank you. There was some notion of [form] questions for the survey. It was Eleeza, Jordyn, Laureen, and David – have you guys had a chance to meet or [inaudible] a call to begin forming the questions for that survey?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes we have and we shared those with Nielsen. And that was kind of what led to the proposal that they had sent to us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, great. I don't know who this was assigned to look at the Applicant Guidebook and sections on it that relate to GAC advice, compare how the GAC advice provided advice during the application process, catalogue GAC correspondences related to advice, acceptance of advice, implementation of advice, and so on. Was this a staff project? I need to be reminding.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think this was actually assigned to Carlos, if I'm not mistaken. But he doesn't seem to be on this call. But as I'm looking back at my notes I'm pretty sure this was something for him, and I actually may owe him something [inaudible] this. I have to go back and look through my notes on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And then Laureen, David, Jordyn to look at a table compiling reconsideration requests and the intention set, etc. Has that process begun?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't believe so. So let me sync up with David after this call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. Identify a list of the same words and their own plurals – who owns this action item? Do we know, Alice? I'm not sure I even completely understand the action item.

ALICE JANSEN: I don't think this was assigned to anyone. It's like a general action item.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And is this among the applications? Is that the idea?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, I think that was for adopting the applications conversation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Is this something that staff can take on, since it's not evaluative?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, but I'm not sure I know what… Is this a list of those that were same words and plurals that were applied for? I'm not sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. I don't either. I apologize. I don't remember exactly what it was we were talking about either. But presumably it is just a list of words and plurals that were within the application pool.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Yes, that's certainly [doable].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. And then Megan and David were going to [examine] objections and inconsistency [of] results and string confusion, singular, plural, etc. So staff was going to get a list of data. David and Megan, do we know where that stands?

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm not sure. I haven't seen the list of data, but I might have missed an e-mail on that. If I have, my apologies.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I believe Karen sent an e-mail on that to Megan and David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, I'll have a look for that then. So no, it hasn't advanced yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. We're going to try to put people on the spot a little bit more, so that's our first shot at that on this issue is to try and check in on each of these things every time we have a call so that we can just keep the ball rolling on them.

Are there any questions on any of these action items that people have or who's doing what? David, you have your hand up. Is that an old hand, since we just spoke?

DAVID TAYLOR: I just put that up now. It's just a question with Adobe on this. I think you might be just doing this directly into the CCT notes. Okay, that's fine. It must be Alice doing that. I was just going to say, because when we're in Adobe and I'm looking at the Application and Evaluation process in action items, I was trying to copy that straight into my Evernote to remind me so I've got my work stream, and I can't copy and paste. So I was going to say, are we putting those into the CCT notes or can we actually copy and paste from Adobe when things come up? Because for some reason, I don't have access to that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. But you do now from the notes down below?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, perfect. Thank you, Alice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Any other questions?

I guess those are the action items that came out of D.C. for the Application and Evaluation discussion. We began a process of looking at the remaining questions, if you will, in D.C. But where we didn't get to was the question of rounds. And so one of the things I just wanted to get some brainstorming on – and David, is that a new hand, or is that old?

DAVID TAYLOR: Old. Sorry, going down.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So we did some brainstorming and got through a number of these different things and came up with action items associated with each of them, but the one we didn't get to is one that gets sort of bandied around a lot and nowhere was this more true than in Helsinki, which was this notion of rounds and the notion that most of what went wrong with the New gTLD Program had to do with the fact that it was a round. I know this is something on which Jordyn has some strong feelings that he expressed in Helsinki as well. But I guess the question is, how do we get to the logic of this, and how do we go about thinking about it in a rigorous way for purposes of the review.

So Jordyn, I may as the champion of this issue, put you on the spot right now to just ping you to brainstorm on how you think we might look at this question since we've raised it in Los Angeles.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that's a good question, Jonathan, and admittedly one that I'm relying on intuition more than data. I would say, we're already doing a few of the right things to try to answer this question. The first is if we do some sort of or if there is some sort of applicant survey where we try to discover the pain points for the applicants, that may shed some light on whether the contention process is… The reconsideration request [inaudible] as well, I think may also be insightful to see what fraction of the disputes that were escalated up [inaudible].

I think in a number of ways it'll be quite easy to quantify the costs associated with doing the rounds, and then the obvious ones of doing rounds necessitates a de-contention process and the process of last resort is the ICANN auctions which is its own community Work Stream going on right now. So there's also this question of, "Okay, we've agreed that if you're going to have a de-contention process, auctions are probably the right way to resolve them after the community process."

The question I think that we need to answer is more on the, what are the benefits of doing things in rounds side. I think in Helsinki a couple of people were trying to say that there were some benefits. I didn't particularly understand the arguments being made other than the fact that first come first served was somehow unfair to slow movers, but it wasn't obvious to me how that was more true for a continuous process than for just a series of rounds that happened on a frequent basis, since obviously once someone gets a TLD, no one else can reclaim it later on.

But trying to maybe get at the benefits of rounds would be helpful. And I think also the other thing that we would have to do is give some more thought onto what the transition process we might suggest would look like. Obviously, there's some pent up demand that we couldn't just switch directly to a continuous process because that would just create a log jam of everyone trying to click as fast as possible on the first day of the application window.

So I think those are the components we need to look at. I think there's already some work underway that will help with the costs. Somehow we'll need to try to quantify the benefits – I have a harder time with this because I'm skeptical that there are any – but maybe we could look back at the transcripts from Helsinki and try to understand the arguments there. And then lastly to think about what a model for transition would look like.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Now my question, I guess, just drilling into that, Jordyn – you mentioned, for example, the applicant survey that we're doing. When you guys did your sub-team meeting about what we might want to ask applicants, do you feel like the questions are already in there that we need to address this issue of rounds, or does thinking about this afresh mean revisiting that effort?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's a good question, Jonathan. We should go back and take a look at that. I don't recall off the top of my head.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Stan, I see there… Go ahead, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I just wanted to point out that this is not a totally unique question. The one I'm most familiar with is the process by which the Federal Communications Commission allocates new licenses to spectrum use.

So I'm wondering whether we might learn something from the way in which that was done in other contexts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which, Stan, I guess is more analogous to rounds though, right?

STAN BESEN: Well, sometimes they do rounds, sometimes it's been historically on demand, and sometimes it's what they call comparative hearings, and sometimes it's auctions. So there may be something to be learned from that experience.

JONATHAN ZUCK: How would you imagine next steps of learning from that experience, Stan? What do you think we should look at that won't blow our bandwidth out of the water? Is there a way to investigate whether that's relevant in a quick fashion to see whether or not more research there would be useful?

STAN BESEN: Why don't I volunteer? I hate to think of doing this – why don't I volunteer to maybe call on something, write a short memorandum? [inaudible] channel may have some footnotes, but it could perhaps survey some of that literature briefly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I saw Jordyn's hand go up and then Jamie's. So Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan, if you're taking a look at that I guess my initial reaction was this isn't quite like spectrum in that spectrum often becomes available in rounds or in chunks because the government's decided to [inaudible] available or freed it up from some other purpose so that means that there's an event that predicates the availability of the spectrum, whereas the gTLDs name spaces, especially unlimited, I mean it's not unlimited in that there's only some words that people would probably actually care about so there's only parts of it that are good, but if the actual name space is 36 to the 63rd – which I think is more than all the atoms in the universe or something like that sort of size of available name space – and so from that perspective, the scarcity of rounds is somewhat artificially imposed by ICANN.

My inclination was that a better – an analog might be something more like mineral rights or drilling rights or something like that where it's not quite as finite, and in a place where the government may impose scarcity rules but it's not necessarily because there's such a finite amount of it and it's more based on the interests of the companies that want to get into… There might be a million acres available but only 500 of them are good or something like that, and so most of the scarcity comes from the quality of the resource more than the total availability, sort of see how government allocates there.

Mostly just to say I think there's probably better analogs than spectrum, and it's worth looking at those as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. Could I task you with just creating bullet points – it's just I know since you're not as comfortable with the positive on rounds – if you were doing a PowerPoint on this, what you think the drawbacks of doing this in rounds were – a few hypotheses basically?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, I'm happy to do that and then for each of those I could point out at possible data sources [associated to them] as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'd be great. And then we can use that also as a tool to reach out to some of the folks that are bigger fans of rounds, I guess. Some of this I guess also may come under the category of transition, as you mentioned, because as you say there's some pent up demand, for example, for brands and so there has been this notion that we may be more ready for certain types of applications than other types of applications, and so doing a brand round or a particular round of communities, etc., something like that is one of the conversations that I hear coming up in the PDP. And so I guess that's another angle on this is it's not rounds in general but these rounds that are specific to types of applications for which there's less controversy and maybe an ability to proceed sooner. I don't know how you feel about that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess I would argue that that's not necessarily… It's only round based because we're used to thinking about it in terms of rounds. You could just as easily imagine this as saying, "Oh, brands aren't controversial for some reason. We'll just allow them to start applying continuously from now on."

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good point. I guess it's a round and it's being called a round because it's kind of exclusive as to who can do it, but it's not necessarily exclusive in the same way in terms of a deadline and things like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Makes sense. Jamie, go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: A lot of what I was going to say has already been touched on, but one thing I was wondering was, if we're going to look at rounds versus continuous or something else, shouldn't for the purposes of this group that analysis be pegged to the effect on Competition and Trust and Consumer Choice? It seems we could spend a lot coming up with reasons why one might be better than the other, but not having any nexus to what this group is supposed to be looking at, which would be… I can see in the PDP they would look at things about like were you mentioning about brands going… but that would also mean looking at and formally recognizing types in a more rigorous way, types of TLDs which would seem to be something more appropriate for a PDP rather than our group.

For example, did the deadline have a negative impact on competition or eventual consumer choice because it kept some groups out? I remember before when the program launched being in one [hill] meeting where the staffer said at the same time we should launch a limited round and how quickly will we launch the next round, which was keep it small but make sure that everyone can get in if they decide to later.

I guess it's a little rambling, but I just wonder if it's incumbent on us to tie the analysis of rounds versus something else to the impact on Competition, Consumer Choice and Trust.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jamie. This is obviously a question that comes up with some frequency, and it may just be a matter of interpretation. I feel as though the team, when noodling this particular question about whether or not the components of the review that were specific to the application and evaluation process and the safeguards process, whether those are meant to be bound by Competition, Choice, and Trust, or they were really just a separate part of the review. And I feel as though the team has kind of rested on the notion that they were a separate part of the review and that we weren't necessarily creating a boundary around our evaluation of the application and evaluation process, we weren't necessarily bounding it with the CCT parameters. It sort of finds its way there sometimes, but I don't know if that's an artificial constraint. I think it's got raised to something of which there was some interest and the difference might be that the findings are sort of bigger picture and that the recommendations are kind of bigger picture that then go to the PDP for implementation.

But it feels as though the team has not fallen on the side of [UDCT] is a bounding around the other aspects of our review.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Maybe I was unclear. I wasn't suggesting that something is within or outside of our remit so much as how do you discipline the analysis such that it doesn't go on a wild tangent? I think you even mentioned earlier about reigning in the discussion, and so just pegging into competition, consumer choice, consumer trust, was a way of imposing that sort of discipline so this or any other topic doesn't go down a wild goose chase.

The other thing I think may be important ultimately is when we do range beyond consumer choice, consumer trust, and competition, that we call out somewhere in the final report that these issues are issues that the group felt were important but did not necessarily tie to those elements.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jamie. Again, I think these are valid points so it's really just up to the group about whether we want to constrain in that way. As Jordyn mentioned in the comments, we've already sort of said that typing of TLDs, we just decided outside of our prioritization it's not our remit, and passed that back to the PDP so that they might pursue brands or something like that independently if they so chose. I guess I don't get the sense – and Jordyn help me out here – that the list of issues that

Jordyn may come up with as a straw man for reviewing the round concept will be out of control, but I don't know. Jordyn, do you feel like that's a risk that's easily managed, or maybe we can table this particular conversation until we're looking at Jordyn's list. I don't know. Jordyn, what's your thought on that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, as I said, I think it ought to be, as I said in the chat, I think it ought to be focused in the application process which I think is part of our charter. So not necessarily through a competition and consumer choice lens – although it probably has some effect on that – it might be worth thinking through that lens as well. But certainly I think we're chartered to look at the application process and safeguards and I'd want to understand the effects of the round on the application process. I think one of the disadvantages that I didn't mention is I think there's a general sentiment that the artificial scarcity caused by the rounds caused people to apply that didn't really want to because they thought they needed to do it now in order to get in. And that may be something else that we bear out through the applicant surveys. That would certainly be an indicator I think of a flaw in the application process if people are entering it because they feel like they have to as opposed to they want to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I think that makes sense and then we look back at how many haven't done anything with the TLDs that they have applied for, etc. that may be some indicator of that as well.

Eleeza, I'm assuming that buried in these notes is an action item to reconvene your survey team to make sure that we've covered the questions that are related to the rounds question?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Are you referring to the applicant survey?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am, yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We can certainly add that. I don't think we have much in there right now in relation to rounds.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Jamie, is that an old hand or new hand?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry, old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And thanks, Jamie. And obviously we are all stretched bandwidth-wise and so finding ways to constrain our scope is always a good idea. So thanks for that input and let's just figure out – maybe after we've looked at Jordyn's list – whether that scope seems realistic or if it's, as you say, falls into, "We thought this was important but chose not to evaluate it, etc." We'll look at that once we've looked at his list and potentially run it by some of the people that in Helsinki were sort of speaking in favor of more of a round based approach, like Geoff was doing suggesting a three month thing I guess, Jordyn, right? Where it was every three months there'd be a mini rounds or something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can sort of just get at some of these level questions and just see how big a bite we've taken out of the apple and then constrain it as needs be. So thanks, Jamie, for your feedback on that.

I think that that is, for the application, the end of our exercises of designing action items. So really this is a good example of where it's going to boil back down to homework that folks have agreed to and taken on in order to bring about progress on these issues. Because we've now gone through the brainstorming process and reduced it to a set of projects that now need to be executed, and so rounds was the last thing in that brainstorming process, so I hope everybody can look back at the action items to which they're assigned and I will reach out to the folks that weren't on the call – like Carlos and Carlton – that have action items and try to ping them for the status of those things as well.

The next thing I wanted to discuss was, as we begin to get data back and we begin to think about how we are going to formalize our research into written form, we've had some discussions – formal and informal –

about how we might standardize the look and feel, if you will, of the discussion papers that we create, and ultimately the document that we're trying to create.

And so I've taken a stab at creating a couple of templates that I wanted to present and open up for comments and criticism and modification, but the idea is I'd like to adopt a couple of standardized templates that folks use to look at the research and the questions that we've been asking and put them into a certain kind of structure so that, as we try to translate that into the written word, there's some uniformity in terms of what we're doing.

Alice, if you would, the first one is related to the research product worksheet.

ALICE JANSEN: [inaudible] Pamela and Brenda are bringing the documents up on the screen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thank you.

There's sort of two different vectors, if you will, in terms of our research. Some of it is hypothesis-driven and some of it is research question-driven from which hypotheses actually fall. And so we're trying to accommodate both of those scenarios and find our way to a hypothesis-driven worksheet eventually so that we can use that as the structure for the paper that we ultimately produce.

The sort of the straw men that I came up with, the first one being kind of inspired by the work that's going on currently in the Safeguards and Trust Sub-Team, but as we begin to do the projects in the Competition and Choice and Application and Evaluation Sub-Teams, we want to fit to the same template if we can.

This is the basic structure – the title, the owner, a description of the product, if you will – if it's an article, a survey, some number crunching, a report, etc. and what the underlying methodology of it was. And this is to deal with the fact that a particular piece of research might cross multiple questions and multiple hypotheses within those questions, and finding a way to just get to listing them.

The first part of this then would be the top-level questions addressed. So the idea here is to list the questions that this research product touches upon, and these are the top-level questions that we came up in Los Angeles that have sort of become the guiding structure of our report. I mean, it's my anticipation that when we put this report out what we will do is structure it around the questions that we asked in Los Angeles.

So the first question to ask of any research project, lit review, etc. is what questions it applies to. And obviously, if it doesn't apply to any of them, then we need to really look askance at that product and see if we need to go further with it because if many of the things that we might be reading in terms of lit review as I was saying in the Trust and Safeguards Team, is that some of the stuff on the reading list turns out to be very interesting but not at all related to the questions. And I think we want to remain guided by the questions that we created in Los Angeles.

So the first thing here is just a list – one to n, however many there are – which questions this particular article, survey, research, etc. were meant to address. And then the idea below that is to look at the hypotheses within each of those that's addressed to see what sort of theories, if you will, were addressed by that bit of research, to look at the research to see if it supports that theory, and then also what the findings were for that research that were particular to that hypothesis.

This is just a basic structure I just did last night based on the conversation with Jordyn yesterday. And I welcome some feedback on it or other sections that we might want to include as far as how to write up the things that we study in a standardized way.

I open this up for discussion if possible. Maybe I'll put Jordyn on the spot again and see if this is getting close to what you had in mind in our conversation yesterday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think just having the first chance to digest this new document now obviously. But yes, I think this would be helpful. Did you imagine in this top-level questions addressed that it would include not only the question but then the inferences we're drawing out from this particular bit of research?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was the idea behind this sort of hypotheses addressed, right? What are the subquestions or theories, if you will, that fall out of that research and what other findings on those hypotheses. That was my intent at that concept.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The top-level questions addressed is just purely categorization and then the hypotheses addressed is more of a description of the relationship between the data and the findings and the hypothesis, is that the idea?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Part of the reason the top-level questions… Go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was just going to say, I think in general this is probably fine. I think for both this, you've done a little bit more in the other documents, but I think it would be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. That's what I was going to show next.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] actually have a more concrete example just to stress test how it actually works, like how we would expect the layout to be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I did this quickly and it's a sort of random set of things that it's filled in with as examples, but I'll try to take a single example of [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It may even be useful – so one example that we could use is… We may just choose something we already have some sort of data on and just try to fill it out for one of those and see what it looks like once we're [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have an [example]? Do we have anything like that on your team? I know they've done lit reviews so far in Trust and Safeguards.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, maybe we should try one each, but one example – a really high level one – is Stan crunched the numbers just to look at the overall share of growth in the gTLD marketplace that new gTLDs represent. So that might be a very small finding that we could just try to plug in to this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Maybe, Stan, I might ask you to try and fill this out and I know it'll be frustrating because it won't quite fit but that'll hopefully allow this document to morph into something a more useful, as Jordyn suggests, by actually trying it out with a particular piece of analysis.

STAN BESEN: I actually thought that what we were going to do – [and so] most of the projects that we have in mind are basically descriptive statistics, that is what happened. I'm not sure they're exactly hypotheses. I guess I suppose they could be. But I think we've agreed that we have a whole series of descriptive statistics of exactly what happened and I think those projects are in the works and we're collecting the data to do them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that's exactly right, Stan. And this isn't an attempt to change any of that, it's really boils down to the fact that we're looking at all of these questions, be it different types of research and projects, and trying to find a way to funnel them back into a format that's consistent across our efforts and questions so that when we go to try to write it up, it doesn't seem like it's completely different with each area that we go to, so that we can come up with a kind of a consistent structure with which to write the document.

So that's this exercise, is to get some uniformity. I don't mean to create [make] work for you. It's more a question of how to figure out how we might present the things that you're talking about that aren't just sort of what happened, but then place them back into the context of the questions that we're asking. Does that make sense?

STAN BESEN: Yes. I think it'll be easier to do once we get some results and we start to write them up. It'll be easier to see. Sometimes you can't exactly tell what something's going to look like until you write it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I was asking you potentially to take the project on growth that Jordyn is talking about and maybe you two could talk offline and see if you can get through this worksheet and if it works as a format for translation.

STAN BESEN: Not to put too fine a point on it, but I actually wrote something like this back in February but someone told me to relax.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Excellent. So it could be that you've already done this exercise and so revisit that document and gold star for you for having done something like this in February, but again, we're trying to get to something that's consistent if we can. It may mean that you've already done this exercise and we should all follow that, but if it doesn't match across types of projects then we might not be able to do it. More in worksheet form if we can, so appreciate it.

STAN BESEN: Good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Brian, you have your hand up.

BRIAN AITCHISON: I was just looking at the overall structure, Jonathan, and that's what I'll comment on. I'm sort of thinking in terms of standard academic paper structure, which tends to fall along the lines of an introduction where you have your research questions and potential hypothesis that's typically followed by some form of literature review which, in this case for this particular worksheet might be a few lines depending on how much research is out there, then you move into methods. And as you know, some of the things we're testing might be more amenable to just simple description, and the literature review essentially might cover us and give us a result. In some cases, we might have to describe more extensive methods if we're doing some kind of survey if those research questions that we pose in the introduction aren't addressed. Then moving into methods, describe your testing and results, and conclusion.

So that's the structure I tend to think in terms in for whatever it's worth for this exercise and this worksheet. That's my two cents on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And thanks, Brian. There's another document that I want to share that heads more in that direction. And this is meant to be a – I don't know – research-centric. We're just doing some things and out of it will fall some information across a number of different questions and hypotheses. As opposed to a hypothesis-centric analysis which is the next document. I might be getting closer to what you're describing in the next template.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It was sort of trying to provide a space for work that's not hypothesis-driven to still get recorded in a consistent way that then could feed into a hypothesis-driven analysis, if that makes sense.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Great. Okay. Yes, that makes sense. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUK: So this is the other hypothesis-based worksheet. And the idea here was to look at an individual hypothesis, have an owner for that, and then look at the high level question that the hypothesis came under, and then look at the findings associated with that, and so the relevant findings and supporting data. So this is sort of what you were getting at, Brian, in terms of a lit review combined with whatever analysis or studies or research that we're doing.

The example I did here was more specific than what I was doing on the other one. So this is all made up, FYI, so nobody raise their hand if they disagree with these findings because they're not findings yet.

"With the new gTLD program, the average program failed to reach potential applicants in the developing world" is one potential hypothesis that has been thrown out by the group. And if you recall, several people have come up with alternative hypotheses to explain the fact that there was an underrepresentation of the developing world in the applicant pool. But this is one hypothesis.

And so the findings: "Applicants from developing worlds were disproportionately low," and then, "Potential applicants from the developing world did not know about the New gTLD Program." So for example if the applicant cohort survey found that most of the people that they reached out to were unaware or vaguely aware of there even being a New gTLD Program, that would support the hypothesis that the outreach program was at least partially to blame for the lack of applications from the developing world.

And then the next thing was looking at causes, is again: "The outreach program was begun too late in the process," and that's a sort of separate hypothesis, "And the outreach program was using the wrong media." If you recall that was Carlton's hypothesis in Washington D.C. And one of these worksheets would be filled out for that hypothesis.

And then the next question that ICANN's very interested in from us – obviously the community's interested in – is the priority to address this issue. And the three categories they came up with was prior to Subsequent Procedures a mid-term or long-term priority. And this might be an area where we put [that] out there that we'll get some feedback from the community in terms of a prioritization that's a good area for community input.

And then finally recommendations for ICANN. And then for each recommendation there'd be a target of the recommendation – this is the staff, Board, or the PDP folks, what we're recommending, and then the implementation details associated with what kind of exceptional costs there might be, etc. And so two recommendations might be: "Begin outreach six months prior to accepting applications" – that's a recommendation aimed at staff. And because the total time the outreach program was longer, it would result in a 20% increase in outreach costs.

The second recommendation might be to use radio advertising for outreach. It's a staff recommendation, and it's likely to increase cost by x and such percent.

So those are examples of filling this out for that particular hypothesis, and to provide a rigor to what often just gets just thrown out as theories by people in the ICANN community and to try to support them and then the next step would be to wind this into a structure more like the one you described, Brian, that's question-driven and then has the relevant hypotheses under each question.

Brian, is that a new hand?

BRIAN AITCHISON: It looks good, Jonathan. The only thing that I suppose I would add or critique I suppose is every hypothesis ideally should have a test and a method. So I think maybe some kind of space for a method of answering the question or testing the hypothesis, and in the interest of perhaps identifying a kind of white space in terms of what is or is not being answered with what exists. I think for a lot of questions we ask, there's going to be existing sources that will sufficiently answer the questions we ask and that's something we would might want to indicate in a separate maybe methodology or hypothesis testing section on this paper. So that could be something as simple as, "I reviewed these three sources. That was all that was out there on this particular question. And these are the findings. And then findings are sufficient."

In the other cases where we're looking at surveys or something like the DNS Abuse study, I imagine there would be unanswered questions or we'd be unable to test these hypotheses with existing sources. So I think some space for methodology/testing, what we did to sort of arrive at the answers we came to or test our hypothesis would be a good section to add.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Brian. Thanks. I may ask you to actually just take a shot at doing that. In my mind, I see this as a document we end up with as a result of whatever that process was as opposed to a documentation of why we decided to do a survey rather than just use existing sources. In other words, the findings would list the existing sources if they were, and then additional work that we did to get to answering the hypothesis.

So I don't know if I've addressed your concern or not, but that's my intention. So maybe take a look at this and if you've got some recommendations for changes, I'm happy to hand the pen over to you, albeit briefly, since we want to try to get this standardized. But take a look at it from that perspective and see if you could, with this structure, without complicating it further record the things you really wanted to get recorded ultimately to find their way into a final report.

BRIAN AITCHISON: To me on this sheet, and maybe I'm misunderstanding, there seems to be a sort of jump from the sort of hypothesis high level questions to findings. And I guess the question is how did we get to those findings, which to me is a fundamental question. And again, that could be something as simple as, "I looked at these three papers and I arrived at these conclusions." But I will.

JONATHAN ZUCK; That's what the source is, Brian. If you look under each of these findings there's a reference then of what was used to get to that finding. So again, I may have flipped it from the way you're thinking about it and there may be a better way to represent it, so look at this and again, maybe take a sample of your own and see if you can fit it into this template and see if you can find a place for the things you want to convey. And if not, then we can add another section. In my mind, part of the finding was the methodology of that specific finding, and that's what the source was meant to be.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Okay. I'll take a closer look at it, Jonathan, and get back to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thanks a lot.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions about this document? Okay, great.

And then I think that's it for the substance. Is there Any Other Business that we need to bring up on the call? I know one of the things is people are champing at the bit about is where we might be meeting in the end of August. And there's a certain urgency there because of visas and things like that. But it's my understanding we don't have a specific update on that yet.

But are there other issues that people want to bring up before we finish the call? Staff, is there anything that you want to…? I have this vague recollection, Alice, that you were going to bring something up during [Any] Other Business but I don't remember what it was.

ALICE JANSEN: So [inaudible] on the August meeting we hope to have an update for you early next week and I apologize for the delays here. And then maybe, Jonathan, I'm not sure if you want to touch on the Helsinki sessions and give a brief update and overview of what the sessions were like and the input that you received?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I, together with Megan and Laureen, gave a update to the GAC about our work and what we were up to. And folks seemed genuinely interested and engaged, and obviously they're very interested in the GAC related portions of the review and Laureen handled those questions deftly. I don't think there was anything that fell out as a, "Why didn't you think of this?" I know that the represent Great Britain was very interested in this question of people who didn't apply and whether or not the application process was sufficiently open to smaller entities and things like that. And we talked a little bit about that question.

But for the most part, I think there was general appreciation for the work we were doing and how we were doing it. They're obviously anxious to hear some results and findings, and so I kind of confirmed that that would be closer to the end of the year until they would really have something to read substantively from us in terms of our findings.

Perhaps the most telling comment out of the GAC survey was Jamie afterwards saying, "Wow, I didn't realize we were doing all of that." So we'll interpret that however we can. But for the most part the GAC was pretty excited about what we were doing and I feel like they think that we're on the right track in terms of the questions that we're trying to ask.

There was also an interesting session in Helsinki that was led by the PDP on Subsequent Procedures just going through a number of different people very, very, quickly on a number of related issues, and so I got to give a five minute presentation there and I actually took my cue from – because it was such a short presentation – took my cue from Secretary

Strickling, the summary that he gave to us in Washington, which is kind of taking a step back and reminding us that what they were really asking us to do was kind of do a cost benefit analysis of the New gTLD Program. And when all is said and done, that's what we were tasked with doing is kind of looking at what the upside consequences were and what the downside consequences were to the program and trying to give the community the sense of how those balanced out. Of course, sort of [orange] comparisons that can be difficult some time, but there is some clarification associated with that way of thinking about the review that Larry gave us in a meeting.

And again, I think that was largely well-received as well. Cheryl Langdon-Orr from the ALAC actually led a little discussion on… She asked this question of the audience, "Is there anybody that doesn't think that we ought to be doing more to reach out to the developing world for applicants?" And just to be a troublemaker, I raised my hand as someone who didn't necessarily think so because we didn't have the data back on that yet and that we might want to focus more on removing barriers to entry for applicants and less about promoting types of applicants if they know better than we do about what their actual market demands are, as Drew and Dr. Crocker suggested that we may be making assumptions about the developing world and why they didn't apply and we need to test those assumptions.

So those were sort of the presentations that we made there. But I think, again, generally the feedback was positive in terms of the questions they were asking. There's a lot of anticipation to hear about our findings.

Any other questions, any other business?

Alright folks. I'm going to let you go early. Thanks [inaudible] the call. You all have action items. Let's do our best to stay on top of them. I think because we're doing such a research intensive type of review, more work is going to get done at home than on calls. So it's going to be really critical that everybody stay on top of their to-do lists, because we're not going to get this done through a series of calls. It's going to be people doing their work. So I implore you to stay on top of the lists of the things you've agreed to do.

Alright. Thanks a lot, everyone, and we'll see you on the next call.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Jonathan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[**END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**