EN

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. Sorry, I jumped the gun and now the recording is officially beginning. But no one missed anything. So we'll make a note to catch up on David's pending articles. It doesn't look like Carlos and Carlton are with us this morning yet. And it also doesn't look like Jonathan is with us. So I will present on my additional articles.

But before we get to my additional articles, I will note just in looking at the chart that I'm scrolling down, that I see very, very little green on it. And that is making me think that folks haven't gotten the opportunity to go back to this chart and do two things: one, highlight what article will be useful for our effort, and two, also in terms of articles that are useful, fill out the chart in a more helpful way as Jonathan has advised us.

And before I go into my presentation, because I'm not seeing green on the chart, and therefore, I'm concluding that people haven't had the opportunity to go back and perhaps, revise their findings, I want to open it up to questions to make sure that people understand the thrust of Jonathan's guidance and maybe go through that a little bit more.

So let me start with that question. I had sent out an e-mail last week and then resent it this week to talk a little more about how we can fill up the chart in an even more useful fashion. Do folks understand the guidance that was sent out because now would be the opportunity, at least for those of us on the phone and hopefully for the review team members that are going to listen to this recording afterwards to discuss this issue? I'm hearing – say it again.

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.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. So basically, as we understand it, we got these various [regimes] at the top, article observations, hypothesis, research, findings, possible recommendations and [inaudible]. I was wondering if it may be useful to just spend five minutes quickly going through what kind of thing each one is meant to signify. I mean, I've gone through it myself and I've started filling in the charts. And I have my own ideas, but I would welcome some guidance on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Thanks for asking that, Calvin. And while I'm thinking about it, because I was also going through this exercise myself, this is an action item for a question to Alice just about the Google Doc or anyone else who has control over the Google Doc. Is there a way to have the headers repeat on every page? Because what I found myself doing even though I'm at the top is I kept going back just to make sure what column I was under and I think it would be helpful if we could do that to have the headers repeat.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen. I will look into it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And then what I'm also having trouble with the copy and paste functions. For some reason, I can highlight it and press copy but it will not copy and it will not paste. And I don't know if that's a Google Doc thing or it's a Laureen thing. But if I'm having trouble with it, I suspect I may not be the only one. So that's one other question that you can just

get back to us on via e-mail or offline. But having said that, let me launch into a short discussion of the columns.

So the first column is observation and this would be our own observation. And for example, we may have an observation that lower prices for domain names may result in those domain names being used for more abusive activity. We may have that observation. So it's an observation made by the review team, not an observation made by the article. So it's our own observation. I think that's the key thing to keep in mind. That would be the first column.

For the second column, hypothesis, it would be a hypothesis posed by the review team to explain the observations. So for example, for the low cost observation, the hypothesis might be that because it's so cheap, those wishing to engage in abusive activities can spend less to do so, that the low cost is actually a factor that can encourage abusive activities. Or the converse may be true, that high cost may deter bad [actors] from using the domain names because they don't want to spend so much. So that would be the hypothesis.

The research I actually think is fairly intuitive. It's just what sources the article is using, what's the data source.

The finding is what finding we are concluding about the hypothesis. So for example, we may find that the data supports this hypothesis that low prices encourage, may lead to more of a prevalence of domain abuse. And that would be the finding.

And then a recommendation may flow from that. And I think that that's something that not every, we're not going to have a recommendation

that flows from every article or every hypothesis. But there may be some. So in this case, you can consider whether a recommendation should flow from that regarding pricing of gTLDs or whether it's just an observation that entity selling gTLDs should keep in mind, that no cost or low cost gTLDs, there seems to be a correlation with higher incidences of abuse.

So that is how I understand Jonathan's further guidance on this. Jonathan's not on the call to help with further amplification. But that is how I understand it.

So questions based on that description? Does that make sense? Do people have further questions about it?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, thanks. That's very useful. It's given me a little bit more direction.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. Good. I'm glad. Because I think I, myself, misunderstood the intent here, I can certainly understand that things were not as clear as they could have been. So I appreciate everyone's patience here in asking questions, A, and then I'll thank you all in advance for going back to the chart and for the useful articles. If you can make sure that the chart actually reflects this type of information and analysis, that's what's going to be most helpful.

Any other questions? Questions? Comments?

Okay. I mean, we do have a smaller participant base for this call so hopefully folks will go back and listen.

I'm scrolling up. I think everyone has individual control over their chart. I'm going to scroll up and talk about the articles that I read, that we hadn't discussed before. And I'm going to talk more about the articles that were useful than the ones that I feel are more backgroundish. And I'll open it up for questions after each article.

So I'm going to my first article which was potential for phishing and sensitive-string top-level domains. And here, this is something that I've gone back and done, here were my observations. And I'm doing this just to illustrate use of the chart again. So if it's repetitive, pardon me. But if it's useful, it's worth repeating as we say in the infomercial world.

So the observation would be new gTLD policies impose more safeguards than [inaudible] gTLDs. That's my observation. And then another observation is that certain practices – for example, safeguards prohibiting domain name abuse, restrictive registration policies, pricing – may decrease phishing. So I have two observations here about this general topic of phishing and sensitive-string top-level domains. Those are observations.

The hypotheses are really going to be tied to the observation, so more protective practices may reduce the incidents of phishing in new gTLDs. That's my hypothesis. The more protective practices you have, the less phishing you're going to have. And then another hypothesis is that sensitive-string gTLDs have a lower incidence of phishing due to restrictive registration policies. So that would be the second hypothesis.

So then moving on – and this is a good article just for my own personal review. The research, it primarily relies on the Anti-Phishing Working Group global phishing surveys and they also, in addition to that, they listed the 300 most recent domains. And then I give the reference for that.

What I liked about this article, just for people wanting to learn more about phishing, is it really talks about what needs to happen for phishing to occur. So it really takes you through the steps of what happens and what are the conditions that need to be in place before phishing can occur. And it does it in plain language, which I'm a great fan of.

So one of the interesting findings that it takes place on compromised domains. It usually occurs at the web posting level. So in that regard, registration restrictions don't matter when that happens. It doesn't matter how good your registration restrictions are if the vulnerability is taking place at the web hosting level. But there are other methods and those would be malicious registrations. There's an interesting finding about this mostly happening to Chinese targets. Sub-domain resellers, and the observation here is registries often provide free privacy and proxy services. And also IP addresses, these are other places where the phishing vulnerability can take place.

Whoops, I just scrolled all the way. The screen is jumping around here, so I'm going back to my –

Another interesting fact pointed out by this article is that phishing, those folks behind phishing, can pretend to be a sensitive domain by

shortening a URL string that appears to be in a sensitive domain. They often try and hide their real destinations. But another big picture thing to keep in mind is that if we look at the big picture, phishing is a very small percentage. It's very small compared to the number of domains in the world. Not surprisingly, .com is the big domain for phishing. And the article predicts that the expansion of gTLDs won't affect the total amount of phishing but it will create new places for phishing to take place.

At the end of the article, there's a specific analysis of new gTLDs and it talks about registration restrictions and typing strategies as well as active mitigation deterred phishing. So those are two separate things, one of which wasn't an observation that I had made but the article certainly emphasizes, is it's not only prices – prices may have a place – but active mitigation and quick takedowns are what can really have an impact on phishing.

So as far as conclusions, they don't conclude that phishing is any more or less prevalent in new gTLDs. But they do conclude that pricing is a factor and also that controlling assets to domain registrations with more stringent requirements and higher pricing is a factor and that gTLD operators should enforce their terms of service to allow for suspension of domain names engaging in phishing.

So that's kind of the big picture. I think it's a useful article because it does look at new gTLDs even though it doesn't really have a conclusion that it's more or less prevalent. But it does zero down on this issue of pricing and this issue of stringent registration requirements and active monitoring and mitigation.

So that's the phishing article. Does anyone have any questions about that? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing, I'm not hearing questions. So I'm going to move on to my next one.

The next one, I didn't think was useful for our endeavor, although I would [inaudible] what has fascinated this topic of data breaches. This is the Verizon 2015 Data Breach Investigations Report. I will commend this to everyone because I thought it was one of the most entertaining and well-organized articles that I've read on this topic. And it also was hilarious in its EG references to all [inaudible] sci-fi things like Star Trek, Star Wars and other fun references. And I would commend it for that alone, being geeky in that way myself. But I thought it was more of a background piece.

And this really was more an explanation of how data breaches occur and where they occur and the many different ways that that address can compromise credentials. So it was more of a how-to. It certainly [inaudible] is focused on new gTLDs but it is a good background piece for how and where data breaches are occurring in the amount, in the time period that's covered in the support. They're done every year.

Moving on to the next article sources which are ICANN compliant pieces, the next two – actually, the next three sources all relate to ICANN compliance. And here, the observations are similar, that the new gTLDs impose more restricted policies in the registry and registrar agreement. And the hypothesis would be that the more restricted policies could result in fewer compliance.

EN

Now here, I have a question because at least the resources that I was looking at didn't do a straight comparison between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs. They just report the numbers in total that contract compliance is seeing for the year. So I would like to set up a meeting with contract compliance. And we can put this as an action item to meet with them to figure out if we actually can use the data they've already collected and do a comparison if that's something that they can do themselves or if that's something we can easily get from them because they have all the data and it's just a matter of splicing it and there's different ways to do a comparison.

I will point out particularly for the ICANN contract compliance annual report in 2015 and also the contract compliance dashboard for January 2016, that you can see exactly what complaint category contains the most number of issues from contract compliance. So for example, for the 2015 Annual Report, contract compliance did not an increase of 20% in overall compliance from the prior year. And that was likely due to the new gTLDs because there was such a huge increase in the number of gTLDs they were getting complaints about.

So the complaint abuse categories, which scrolling down, are at the bottom of the page, you'll see the biggest complaint category for registrars is who is inaccurate. You see over 75% abuse complaints are actually proportionately rather small, 1%. And for registries, the big category is, it looks like the big category actually is zone file access. And abuse reports, again, are rather small. Here from the registry, it would be an abuse, a failure to identify a point of contact to report abuse.

And the dashboard for 2016 has similar findings. WHOIS is the top complaint category. Abuse complaints are relatively low and this is for registrars. For registries, again, it's zone file access and it's registry data escrow issues, complaints related to abuse and serious abuse points of contact, very small.

So here, the big ask is to see if we can get data that compares the new gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs. And I guess I also would note that the fact that WHOIS inaccuracy is a large complaint category is something for us to consider. How that impacts consumer trust if that's something that we want to reflect on as we're thinking about consumer trust issues just because that's the highest complaint category that contract compliance has seen.

And then finally, we get to the rather packed category of GAC safeguard advice and communicating. And for this, I went through the communiqués starting with Beijing, moving forward. Here, the observation would be that unlike the legacy gTLDs, the new gTLDs were actually subject to a lot of GAC safeguard advice. And they issue safeguard advice on a variety of issues.

And the hypothesis would be, the question would be, has the GAC safeguard advice [inaudible] consumer trust then had an impact on abuse. But this actually is hard. This actually is something that's going to be hard to measure. One, because not all of the advice was implemented and not necessarily implemented in the way that it was advised. And two, it's hard to draw a causal connection between the exact advice and any differences in domain name of [inaudible]. So this

is something we're probably going to have to do some further brainstorming on.

But in terms of the advice, I highlighted some of the key points of the device that we may want to focus on. And the Beijing communiqué is really the mother load for much of the GAC safeguard advice. So there was advice given on to reconsider the decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same string because of the risk of consumer confusion. There was a requirement for registry operators to conduct WHOIS verification and checks.

There was requirements, there was basically a prohibition on registries. There was a prohibition on abuse of activity and this flows from the registry operators to ensure that abusive activity is prohibited. So the registrars would prohibit the registrants from engaging in this sort of activity.

There's a requirement of conducting an analysis to make sure domains aren't being used to perpetuate securities in threats, a mechanism for making and handling complaints, real consequences for false WHOIS information. And the thread here that relates back to contract compliance results is that we see inaccurate WHOIS information being the most common category of complaint to ICANN contract compliance.

And then there's a whole separate category of safeguard advice for strings in sensitive or highly regulated areas. These are your banks, your pharmacies, your charities, your gambling institutions, mortgage brokers, etc. And for that, we have additional safeguard advice: follow the law, including privacy and consumer protection laws, implement

reasonable security measures if you're gathering sensitive data like financial and health information, how to single point a contact to report complaints and abuse.

And then there's further targeted safeguards for domains with clear and regulated entry requirements. And I guess I misspoke before because I was describing this. These are the more sensitive categories: financial gambling, professional services. The prior category, Sensitive Regulated Strings, that was a broader category that included children, medical issues, I think there were also perhaps environmental. It was a broader category and there's precise information about what strings are in what category. We have a chart of that.

But here's where there was advice given about verification and validation of entities who wish to do business in these domains, that if you were a .bank, that there should be some obligation to actually verify that it is a bona fide bank doing business in that area. This particular advice was not implemented in the way that the GAC advised. And so this is one good example where the GAC advised one thing and the Board implemented this in a different way. Registry da, da, da, and then there are additional restrictions on registration policies.

The rest of the chart goes into other GAC safeguard advice that were issued in the communiqués. Although many of the communiqués really reiterated prior GAC safeguard advice. But some of the other issues that arose were concerns about the outcomes of community applications and general concerns about whether the Beijing advice had been implemented as advised. But I go through the specifics in the chart.

So here, really, our task is – and this is actually part of our upcoming work – to figure out how we're going to measure the impact of GAC safeguard advice and figure out what data sources we have and if there's something more that we can get in a timely manner.

The other thing we can do – and I know that Brian has already started thinking about this – is looking at the public interest commitment for the strings that relate to the highly regulated sectors to see how they have actually included in their voluntary public interest commitment some of the safeguards that were advised. So that might be an interesting comparison to see if there [are] domains that voluntarily provided additional protections that weren't required under the registry and registrar. I guess it's just registry agreements.

Anyway, that is the highlight/summary of the GAC advice. So questions on that?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I've got my hand up.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry, Jamie. I'm just trying listening/talking at the same time. Go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So a couple of things. One, I think we've discussed this before, but as you know, any written views on GAC advice and how it's been implemented is likely to be sensitive with the GAC itself. From my

understanding, the GAC is already, the Secretariat's already undertaken one review. I think it's an ongoing project but I'm not sure. But I do know that depending on how we characterize the advice itself as well as whether or not it's effective or was appropriate or tied to the Applicant Guidebook or not is right foot's opportunity to alienate members of the GAC. So that's the first thing.

The second is when you were talking about the GAC advice, a lot of times you were talking about requirements and prohibitions. And I think it's important to point out that it was, there were no requirements or prohibitions. There was advice to require or advice to prohibit. And the Board considered that advice and in many instances, came up with ways to implement that advice in ways that they thought was in the spirit of the advice that was given. But also done in a way that was implementable.

And then finally, in terms of whether or not the Board actually implemented the advice, the only advice I'm aware where the GAC, where the Board did not implement the advice nor did it reject the advice was on validation and verification. And the Board later said that the GAC was right, that it in fact had rejected and did not implement.

So I think we could probably spend a whole lot of time arguing about whether or not the advice that was adopted and implemented was the same as what the GAC intended, but I'm not sure that it would be a good use of the CCT's time as opposed to looking at things like the last thing you mentioned on validation and verification, the voluntary efforts of .bank and others and see whether that has made a difference. So –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jamie. I appreciate all those points. Am I interrupting you?

JAMIE HEDLUND: No. I'm done.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I appreciate all those points. As to the first point, you are absolutely correct. The GAC is engaging in an ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of GAC advice. And your general point that this is going to be a sensitive area and we should proceed prudently and carefully, I am in total agreement on.

The second point about being precise in how we're characterizing this in terms of the GAC issue and advice, not restrictions and prohibitions, also correct and I appreciate the precision there which I lacked. It is only advice. The way this was actually implemented was through the registry and registrar agreement, mostly through the registry agreement as it's implemented through the public interest commitment primarily. So that's also a very good refinement of the language.

And then as the areas we choose to tackle here, that's something that I'm really going to want the input of our group to figure out as you point, what's going to be the most productive way for us to tackle these issues. So that's something I really am seeking everyone's input on and I appreciate yours, Jamie. And I see your hand is up again, so I'll turn it back to you.

JAMIE HEDLUND: No, I just didn't take it down. I apologize. Thank you for that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Other questions or comments on this?

Okay. So we're still going to have a to-do list of presentations, I think, for our next phone call. And because everyone has not gotten an opportunity to refine this chart and color code it, we're not going to be able to engage in our number two agenda item which is to run through the findings and agree on a list of useful articles.

So what I'm going to exhort people to do in my next e-mail and those on the phone – I'm preaching to the choir here – is to make sure you go back to the chart and code it for what is useful. And for those articles that are useful, to go back and make sure that your findings are discussed in a way – and I think, "findings," I'm using that generically to refer to the entire chart, not just the findings column – but to make sure that the columns in the chart are discussed in the way that we talked about. And if you need to refresh or go back to the last e-mail that I sent which has Jonathan's detailed explanation included as an attachment.

So we're going to have to come back to this item two in our next phone call.

Which brings us to item three, which is something that is due by the end of the day but when I was looking at the Google Doc on this, I'm not seeing that anyone has gotten a chance to do this yet. So I wanted to

open up the task of the impact of the safeguards and the public interest commitments. I wanted to open up this task for questions.

Does everyone understand what they've been asked to do, which I had tried to clarify in my last e-mail? But I want to make sure that everyone understands what they've been asked to do. And is it possible, Alice or Brenda, to get that Google document up which has that chart? It's now a blank spot. [Inaudible] to go over it.

Okay. There's our blank chart. Basically, we have divided up into subgroups and the subgroups were listed in the last e-mail but as a reminder, that technical category is DNS abuse. That's through Fabro, Calvin and Carl. Spec 11 GAC advice is myself, and Carlton, and Carlos. And then right to protection mechanisms are David and Jamie.

And basically, what we agreed on is that each sub-team would decide how they will divide the work. But that the sub-teams are in charge of filling out these categories based on the safeguard identifying it – for example, the public interest commitments and GAC advice contain a variety of safeguards – what the intent was, whether it's been triggered because, for example, some of the things that we're talking about may not actually have come to be. So that's an important part. And then a result if we know a result.

So we see this as an effort to kind of get very granular about all of the different safeguards, what the intent was, and then if we can measure whether the intent has been achieved.

So does everyone understand what the task is?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hey, Calvin.

CALVIN BROWNE: I think I'm missing something somewhere. I'm not sure why. Maybe I wasn't paying attention properly. And did we try and verbalize? Does this go back to our reading list or not?

LAUREEN KAPIN: It doesn't really go back to the reading list. What it goes back to is the chart that Brian had created that we worked on in Los Angeles where we listed, we broke out, all the different safeguards. And this, as you recall, was the session we had on the second day where we had moved rooms and the safeguards broke out into these general categories.

Is it possible, Brenda or Alice, to get Brian's chart listing all of the safeguards? In fact, I think he even has a new version of this that he had sent around. Am I describing it clearly enough to be able to put it up on the screen?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen. Yes, one moment. We'll get it up for you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. I just think it would be useful for the team to see that because if Calvin is bravely asking the question, I suspect Calvin is not the only one who has the question. So let's put it up for everyone.

CALVIN BROWNE: You've got to remember that Calvin wasn't actually physically present in L.A.

ALICE JANSEN: This was actually in Washington.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, you were present there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Body] present.

LAUREEN KAPIN: You know, I mean, I'm sorry. You know, I misspoke. I said L.A. but what I meant was D.C. So yes, you weren't present in L.A. Yes, sorry about that. I'm being confusing.

CALVIN BROWNE: Good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: But I saw you across the table in D.C. So this, yeah. This is –

CALVIN BROWNE: [It wasn't me].

LAUREEN KAPIN: So this, Calvin team, this is Brian's chart. And this is really the underlying document. And we all have control of this. This is the underlying document that ties to our next task. You'll see that Brian not only has populated just based on our discussion but he's taken initiative and also done additional work so we have a pretty well populated chart here.

So these are the actual list of safeguards that you will be using to populate the chart that had been up just a few moments before. Does that make sense?

CALVIN BROWNE: I'm starting to get it now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Yeah, so for example, Calvin, for your category, let's see. So get registry [operated] because that's the first one. So you would take that and identify first and talk about the intent. What was the intent for this requirement? Is that registry operators, whether it's been triggered, and then for that, certainly, it has been triggered. And then has it achieved the result that was intended? So that would be sort of the application.

So any other questions, comments about this? And when I say questions or comments, I'm certainly always open to refinements or reflections on our approaches here. I think all of these activities are really aimed at getting us to a smaller universe of what we're going to focus on based on things we can measure and things we have useful information on.

So other questions or comments?

DREW BAGLEY: Hey, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hey. Yes, now I see your hand. Sorry about that.

DREW BAGLEY: I just wanted to take advantage of the fact that a couple of my sub sub-team members are on the line to see if they got my e-mail from a little over a week ago about this so we could get started on that. Calvin and Fabro, did you get my e-mail?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go right ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: If you're asking if I got an e-mail, the answer is yes, I did.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Awesome. Great. And I guess I just want to chime in for what Laureen was talking about. For our topic, [but it would] apply to the other topics, for some of these, we're going to have to call registry services. We're going to have to call ICANN compliance and ask questions to find out whether or not a safeguard was triggered perhaps. But I've been working to get contacts on the various departments so that we could get answers to fill out this chart even though, of course, we might alternately need to do a survey or something [inaudible] completely fill out the chart and determine the effectiveness and impact of the safeguards.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. So good, I'm happy to hear that. Other questions or comments?

It sounds like, certainly for some things, you may not have all the answers you need to complete every column. But what I am asking for people to do, hopefully by close of business today, is complete as much as they can so we can move forward with this because as you'll see when I circulate, which I will today, the next version of our work plan, we are going to need to move on to discussion papers. And really, these charts, the readings and the charts and the thinking that is required to fill in the chart really is going to serve as the foundation for our discussion papers. So if we don't have the foundation in place, it's going to be hard to move on to the discussion papers. So I am strongly encouraging folks to move on to completing the chart on the safeguards.

Okay. So now we're in the any other… David, I see your hand. Go ahead.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks. All right, thanks, Laureen. Jamie and I were just chatting on these and looking at it as well and we just wondered, question of both of us, how will the trademark registry restrictions in the table, what is that, I'm not sure how that ties into the RPMs? You're the ones that can certainly see the trademark registry restrictions. I was wondering exactly what that is. And the picks are also under there, which I can see them being, obviously, a safeguard. They're not an RPM per se, so it's something probably in its own right in there. But I just wanted to check those two with you or Brian.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Actually, [inaudible], I'm going to turn that over to Brian if he wouldn't mind.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Sorry. What was the question? I was being pinged by several other people.

DAVID TAYLOR: Not a problem, Brian. Yeah, it's in the table under the RPMs, we've got the bottom two trademark registry restrictions and picks and I was just checking that. I mean, picks I can see they're a safeguard; they're not an RPM. So I was thinking that probably should sit in the other safeguards. But I was just wondering what your trademark registry restrictions were and what you were thinking on that just to know. I mean, we can try and take it. But I'm just wondering what exactly you're asking.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah. That was actually, we were talking about that last week. You'll see that it both says undetermined there. So let's put a pin on that, David, and probably see what that means because this was populated from a list that was made a while ago. So I will get back to you on that. But we're looking into it. Actually, we had the same question.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, good. Well, we'll concentrate on the other ones, then, when we get through to concentrating.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah. That sounds like a good plan.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Because I think the public interest commitments probably do belong up in the… the public interest commitments [of] Spec 11. So I think that's just in the wrong spot and that could just be moved unless there are rights to protection mechanisms in the picks that I'm not focusing on.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Not that I'm aware of but there's lots of stuff on the picks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So we'll have Brian take a look at that. I think it's probably just, at least for that one, that's just moving it.

Other questions? David, do you still have a question? I'm not hearing you. I'm wondering if you're on mute, but I am seeing your hand go up. David, are you still with us?

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry. I am.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do you still have a question?

DAVID TAYLOR: No. Sorry, I meant to put it down. I was actually trying to put it down as you were saying that. My [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine. Because I don't want to ignore you, David.

Okay. So let me open it up then for Any Other Business. Any other issues, concerns, observations, questions?

CALVIN BROWNE: I was just wondering if, I know nothing's really planned for next week in Helsinki but I was wondering who's going to be there and if anybody is doing anything there aside from our usual stuff.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Excellent question. So Jonathan will be there. I will be there. I know Megan will be there. So who else will be there? Chime in so that we all know.

CALVIN BROWNE: I will be there myself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: David, you have a question.

DAVID TAYLOR: I was just raising my hand to say I'll be there. Sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh good. And I saw you had the cool smiley face. I need to figure out how to do that.

DAVID TAYLOR: That was just because it was so funny about me being ignored that I couldn't stop laughing, you see.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Drew will be there, I'm assuming, from his raised hand. Are you going to be there, Jamie? I would have expected you to be there.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I'm sorry. Am I going to be where?

LAUREEN KAPIN: In Helsinki.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes. I will be there all week.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. And what about our fabulous staff? Who is going to be in Helsinki? So Eleeza, no. Fabro, no. Margie, yes. [Inaudible].

KAREN LENTZ: I'm on the phone, but I'll be there.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. Okay, so we're getting a list of folks who are there. So certainly, if anyone wants to get together, we can arrange that via e-mail. And also, there is going to be a formal presentation from Jonathan to the GAC if people are interested in attending that. And I'm also pretty sure that Jonathan is going to be presenting to the PDP on subsequent procedures. It's possible I'm mocking up the name. The PDP that we've been talking about, Jonathan is also going to give them an update on our work.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Laureen. Just to confirm that yourself, Megan and Jonathan will be giving a presentation to the GAC on Monday, the 30th, noon. And then Jonathan has been invited to the PDP working group's session on Tuesday afternoon and will be delivering a [inaudible] update there as well. So staff will be sending all these details to the full CCT mailing list with [inaudible] details as well, so you have that ready at-hand.

And we will also be compiling some of the sessions of interest that we think might be good to follow as well but we'll follow up on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Terrific. Good. Any other – David, you have your hand up.

DAVID TAYLOR: I do. Thanks, Laureen. [It's just an] AOB and to let you know on the survey, which we're looking to put together on the RPMs just so everyone on the call here knows it's progressing. Obviously, Eleeza or Alice, I think we had quite a few. Karen and Margie were on the call yesterday which we had with the INTA. So it's just basically trying to get the questions together and put out an RFP. But we're trying to have a timeframe so that we get answers back end of October, ideally, so we can try and get these into a draft report. And I just wanted to let you know as well that the questions, we got a set of questions which INTA prepared, we're having a quick look at those, as well in IPC. And then I thought I'd send them round this safeguards subgroup for any thoughts or questions or any additions because it's the RPMs and it's our remit. And then based on that, we'll try and get those out to Nielsen or

another provider. So just to give you an update on that so you know what's going on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's terrific. Thank you. And I also know that for our part on future studies that Drew and Brian and I are still working on the root zone file study to compare domain name abuse issues between the new gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs and I will update you further when we have more information on that. But if Drew or Brian want to jump in here, please feel free to do so.

Okay. David, do you still have a question or is that an old hand? Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: Sorry. I was speaking on mute. I just realized.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, okay. I was going to say. I just thought you didn't want to speak up.

DREW BAGLEY: I've done it a few times this meeting. I just wanted to quickly chime in and say that Brian and I have been working on that original draft statement at work and adding a lot more to it to expand the methodology and make it more specific so that way, the methodology will hopefully stand for itself regardless of who the vendor is and we can be vendor agnostic while hoping that we get, obviously, a terrific vendor

who will do the best work. But I expect we'd have something to share with the group pretty soon, definitely by the next meeting.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. That's terrific. Brian, I see that you were also speaking on mute. Did you want to add anything? Drew got it. Okay, good. Terrific.

So any other comments, questions about general topics? Okay.

So for the next e-mail you'll receive from me, it will be one, my strong encouragement of folks to one, complete the chart of useful articles for us including our newly improved analysis and then, two, to complete the safeguards chart.

The other thing you'll be hearing from me about is our revised work plan because we're going to want to discuss that and make sure that folks are comfortable with this work plan and the deadlines set because we're all going to need to pitch in for this. So look out for those three things.

Summer is coming. I'm changing topics. And some of us, including myself, will be taking vacations. So if you are going to be out of pocket for a while, it might be useful to let the sub-team know. I, myself, am going to be going to Japan for most of the month of July immediately after Helsinki and I may be reaching out to a few of you to ask you to take the helm for times when I won't be available. So I'm giving folks a heads up about that. And also, I'll be on a different time zone than I normally am in, so we'll have to take that into account when you're communicating. My communications back to you may be delayed. But I

think it would be useful for folks to share if they're going to be unavailable or difficult to reach because of vacation plans. That would be good to circulate to the group.

Any other questions or comments before we break a little bit early?

Okay. Then thanks, everyone for participating. I know this is an extra call. So I appreciate everyone joining in. Have a good morning, afternoon and evening. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]