DREW BAGLEY:

I'm not sure if all of you had the time to read my e-mail from yesterday, but I was just reminding everyone that today we're going to do a status report so all the group leads can tell me where we are in each of the subtopics. Then we'll plan out what we're going to do in the next couple of weeks. That will include coming up with specific discussion paper topics now that we have the template from Jonathan to move forward with.

Going around for each person who needs to give a status update, I guess I'll go ahead and start with myself. I've been working with Fabro and Gao and Calvin to get our chart completed on the DNS abuse readings. We have some [data calls out], and Brian has gotten back to me on some of that.

Where we are now is we have pretty much almost everything complete with ours if you look at the chart, except for the [bottom] section. We're still trying to fill in some data about the expedited registry security requests process and also the draft framework for the high security zone verification. If anyone has any input on that, that would be much appreciated.

Then for the other chart, looking at the impact of the safeguards – sorry. That was the one I just went over. For the other thing, looking at all of our reading, I think that we are in good shape there with having everything related to DNS abuse that's relevant highlighted.

I see, Jonathan, your name is under a couple, so I don't know if you have an opinion on the "Typosquatting" article or the "Measuring the Global

---

DNS" article. I haven't had a chance to look at those yet, but if you think those should be part of whatever eventual discussion papers we write, then definitely chime in and let me know.

That's my update for our stuff. Who would like to go next for their update? Who do we have on the line? Jamie, even though you're not the head, do you want to talk about the rights protection mechanisms? Are you there, Jamie?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry. Yeah, I'm here.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, no problem.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I don't have much of an update to provide. I think David sent some e-mails on some things that he's doing, but in terms of the chart, we're behind.

DREW BAGLEY: From what you've gathered from David, does it sound like he's working on it?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I think he is. As he said I think on the last call, he has budgeted a certain amount of time to work on this, and he is working on it within those constraints.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, got it. At this point, we need to take it to the next level and start shaping it into discussion papers.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yep.

DREW BAGLEY: So maybe you, David, and I can set up a brief call and figure out the best way forward. Do you know how much time he has budgeted, out of curiosity?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I don't. I just heard what everyone else heard the last time he showed up.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. Okay, yep. I remember him saying that as well.

JAMIE HEDLUND: But we will get it done and it will be in good shape. We're just behind.

DREW BAGLEY: Alright, well, thanks for the update. And then we don't have Fabro or Carlton, do we, on the line? No. Alright, well then, hopefully I can send an e-mail today to get some e-mail updates on where we are with the other topics so that way we can move forward.

Along those same lines, and Jamie at least for rights protection mechanisms, hopefully we can figure out some topics. I've been trying to figure out a list of individual discussion papers that will fit into these four big categories of DNS abuse, the impact of safeguards and PICs, consumer/end user behavior, and the effectiveness of procedures to enforce safeguards.

Within those big headings there are, of course, three subheadings from before that we have from the Washington, DC meeting. Under impact of safeguards and PICs, we have the technical category which also includes DNS abuse kind of as a catchall, Specification 11, and rights protection mechanisms. But for discussion paper purposes, we can, of course, break that down even more.

Something I was thinking about was if we can get this done in the next day or so, that would be ideal, where we could have a working list that could always expand but at least a working list of papers we know we need to write and that way we can actually just start writing them, fitting them into Jonathan's template.

So for DNS abuse, some research questions that I thought would make distinct papers based on the research we've done and the outstanding research we'll eventually get data for, I thought of three questions. I'd love to hear your feedback.

The first one was: Is there more or less DNS abuse in the new gTLDs? That's just based on the question we've had for months going back to some of our initial discussions. Did the safeguards help prevent DNS abuse? Have the safeguards been fully implemented?

Based on all the research we've done, I think there's enough data to fit those into three separate categories. Can you think of anything else that might fall into that DNS abuse category? Brian's typing something. Okay, Brian's cool with that. Gao, are you on the line?

GAO MOSWEU: Hello. I'm on the line. I'm not sure if you can hear me because I'm actually driving right now.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. We hear you loud and clear.

GAO MOSWEU: Oh, okay.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, we can hear you loud and clear. Do you have any thoughts about discussion paper topics under DNS abuse since that's one of the categories you've been working on?

GAO MOSWEU: Sorry?

DREW BAGLEY: Do you have any thoughts about what I just said about potential questions for discussion papers under the DNS abuse heading?

GAO MOSWEU: I actually missed all of that that you said.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, okay. Well, real quick recap…

GAO MOSWEU: The sound and the audio are really bad, so I if I have anything, I'll just type on the chat. Is that okay?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, that's fine. I'll also paste the questions on the chat. Then we'll move on to the next category.

GAO MOSWEU: Alright, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a disaster. No one has done their work.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Then the next category for impact of safeguards and PICs, for the first category with this catchall technical category, there are definitely a lot of questions we'll need to break out of there. But one big one would be: Did the use of PICs help prevent DNS abuse? I'm saying that just because that category includes some of the things we were looking at with DNS abuse and moves beyond some of the other topics that would fall under what we put under that DNS abuse chart. Does anybody have any feedback on that?

Then Specification 11, I'm thinking we need to come up with a research question about it, but that could be its own paper just on Specification 11. Then for rights protection mechanisms, I imagine we could have several. Jamie, I'd love to hear your feedback chiming in. I was thinking one basic one just based on our past meetings would be: Have the new dispute resolution processes reduced trademark infringement.

I'd love for you to weigh in on whether that's something that you think we can measure with data that we've looked at and will be looking at or something that we could not measure and, therefore, should be reframed. Are you still there, Jamie?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry. Can you hear me now?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

JAMIE HEDLUND: The question is whether there's data to measure trademark abuse?

DREW BAGLEY: Well, to measure whether or not the new dispute resolution processes actually reduce trademark infringement. There could be other things we measure with them, but if we're looking at the fact the new gTLDs have this unique feature to them, I was trying to think of research questions and based on what I'm guessing your safeguards chart will show with the intention of the safeguards. What do you think of that research question? Have the new dispute resolution processes reduced trademark infringement?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I think it's an excellent and legitimate question. The issue is going to be, as we discussed before, whether there's enough data to make anything conclusive because there are still gTLDs that are launching. As far as I know, there have not been that many instances in which the dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly the PDDRP, have been invoked. So we'll look at it, but I don't know if we're going to have enough data to say anything conclusive.

DREW BAGLEY: Do you think that exact question is worth exploring for a discussion paper even if you come to that conclusion and you highlight that?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I can't speak for David, obviously, but I do if for no other reason than to set it up for the next review.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Then what else so far from what you've looked at with rights protections mechanisms would you say we'd want a specific discussion paper on?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Ideally, there would be enough data that you could make a comparison between the RPMs for new gTLDs and what's available for [Gs], which is [specifically] just the UDRP. But, again, I don't know if there's going to be enough data to say anything conclusive. But I do think if not for this review, of the next one, honing in on the added value, if any, of the URS and PDDRP.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay, I think we should set that up then as a discussion paper because it sounds like it would be worth at least synthesizing what's out there. Because you are describing unknowns, then it's going to be worth exploring that topic whether or not that discussion paper in the end stands as its own chapter or becomes merged with a broader rights protection mechanisms section of the report.

I guess then so far we'll have the two. So it's this impact one we're looking at: Have the new dispute resolution processes reduced trademark infringement? In terms of measuring that, that's where you can incorporate any data you have about complaints. It might be: Has it

reduced trademark infringement complaints or has it reduced something else related to trademark infringement in terms of just alternative dispute resolution mechanisms being used?

But you could lump all that there and then have this other one. I don't know if you want to frame it: How are the rights protection mechanisms for new gTLDs different from those for gTLDs. Would that, you think, be a good use of existing and new data?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah, absolutely. We can, at the minimum, note raw data on the amount of time that the URS was invoked and then seeing whether that was followed up by subsequent UDRP filings or whether it was effective and what happened. And same with the PDDRP, although I don't know of any that have been filed yet. I know a couple have been threatened, but I don't know if any of them actually filed. But again, setting up for the next review.

We've talked about this in other contexts as well, which is just that this is in [competition] also, that there are disadvantages to having the review so close to general availability.

DREW BAGLEY: Right, and that's fine too in the paper to discuss what's in general availability and what's not and those considerations, but at least then we move forward with something.

Okay, then if there's anything else you can think of, let me know. Otherwise, for consumer/end user behavior, I was thinking about

questions going back to when we were first brainstorming ideas months ago. We'll probably want one paper just on – and this is something that the Nielsen data will help inform – but: Are consumers aware of the new gTLDs? And then a separate paper: Do consumers trust the new gTLDs.

Then eventually perhaps as chapter depending on how each of those pan out, maybe that would become one big chapter in the report. But as far as the distinct discussion papers, I think that would be good with the existing literature and with the Nielsen data. What's everybody's thoughts on that? ICANN staff can chime in on that too.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi, Drew. Can you all hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Just as an overall comment, I think it's probably time to start getting a lot of this on paper. We've been talking about this, pinging each other, but I think doing some literature [reviews], doing some kind of strawman paper, something we can critique and see where the white spaces and what the research is saying will be good. That should be a next step. My two cents. Thanks.

DREW BAGLEY: Thanks, Brian. Exactly. That's my [thought] as well is that's what this next month will be is just all of us writing these distinct, discrete discussion papers, even if they do have holes in them because then we'll be able to plug that in with data or we'll end up maybe we need to go a different route with writing things as we're analyzing more of the data and seeing where that leads us.

Jamie, did you see the rights protection mechanisms link? I'm sure you've looked at this, but that was just pasted in the chat. I'm trying to think if there's any other paper that then would come out of it looking at this data. Eleeza just pasted it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Drew, if I could jump in quickly.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, yes. Please do.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I just was pointing out that link because those were the metrics that were recommended by the Implementation Advisory Group for the review. So that's one way of looking at some of the RPM data that we have access to and that we've compiled from various providers into single, really big sheets. That's one set of data you might want to [inaudible] looking at.

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Drew, can I come in for a second?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. As a general rule, and I think this is my fault, the work group and the Implementation Advisory Group came up with these metrics. The original Board resolution [on] the metrics was that the GNSO and ALAC recommend some metrics and also some downstream targets for them as well. I think we did just a brainstorm exercise in L.A., and it didn't do a – I don't know what the right word is – a metric-centric analysis of these problems.

So we should make sure that we go back through the relevant metrics that were collected by staff as a result of the work group and IAG efforts and see which ones are applicable to each of the questions that we identify as important and make sure that we make use of them because one of the things that's good about them is that they are structured. That original report is really structured to be a part of a continuous improvement exercise in that the degree to which we can say, "This is our finding, and this is the data we used [in the] finding and this is the data you should look at next time to see if there's been a change here."

So even if we're saying there hasn't been a change yet, we're identifying for the future where to look for a change on the particular questions that we're asking. So I guess I would ask that we make a concerted effort to go to the metrics in each of the sub-teams and see what's there and what can be applied to the questions that we're asking.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, thanks for making that point, Jonathan. Absolutely, all those metrics should be incorporated into all of these discussion papers and, obviously, into the final report. I like your suggestion of, even before writing the discussion papers, going back and looking at them now to see if they actually inform any other topics for discussion papers rather than just fitting into these existing areas we're coming up with.

Thank you, again, Eleeza, for sharing part of those metrics. I've been looking at some this week as I've been trying to piece together what we should do as far as individual discussion papers. But I'll definitely go back and look at all those metrics again today, and I encourage anyone else on the call – Carlton, Jamie, it looks like we lost Gao – but that would be great if you guys could as well so that we can make sure we are covering everything.

Does anybody else have anything else as far as other discussion paper topics? If not, then what I'm going to do is later today circulate the list I've come up with, and that will serve as the basis for first assignments. I'll just assign them out and then set deadlines so that way we're keeping ourselves to task and getting the work accomplished. But I definitely appreciate any feedback on other topics we should write on

or other research questions that will fit into the template we now have to work on.

Does anybody else have any more thoughts about that? If not, I'll move on to the next topic. I see you typing something, Eleeza, so I'll wait a second.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Drew, the report I just put in there is the original advice.

DREW BAGLEY: Yes, that's what I was reading earlier this week.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, exactly. The original advice from the GNSO and ALAC that Jonathan was just referencing but with the revisions from the Implementation Advisory Group included in there so you can see how they changed over time.

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you. That's something I think I'll put in the e-mail after today because this is something all of us read months ago but I think everyone should go back and reread this now that we have a lot more knowledge about the areas we're looking at and a lot more data to look at. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure.

DREW BAGLEY: Definitely look at that. Okay, well, if nobody else has anymore feedback on that topic, then expect an e-mail from me later on today with this draft list of research paper topics. Basically, we need to begin writing this week, so we need to either expand this list or modify this list in the next day or so and then start writing. Then we can always add more research discussion paper topics, but we need to at least get started with what we have so that way we're going into the August meeting with a lot of stuff already written and we'll have a lot to discuss then. Then we'll also have a framework to plug in data as more data becomes available.

Making on to the next topic about voluntary PICs, yesterday Jonathan, Eleeza, Alice, and I had a call with Ron Andruff, who is an observer and listening in right now, about what we're doing to look at PICs. I know that we've discussed PICs a bit on our calls.

Eleeza is going to give an update on where we're at with that, but just for a reminder, a couple weeks ago, Laureen tasked the ICANN staff with coming up with a list of voluntary PICs and categorizing them so that we could look at them and understand what the universe of PICs was, what promises they made.

From there, we could start looking at them more closely by interviewing registries that came up with these voluntary PICs and find out what goal they set out to achieve with the PICs and then also in matching that interview, an interested party from the relevant industry. So if it was .bank, we would look at the .bank registry and then we would look at

the banking association to see what their view was of what the PICs accomplished, whether they accomplished their purported goal and whatnot.

Yesterday, we all received a spreadsheet. Special thanks to Antonietta for sending that out. I'm not sure if everyone had a chance to look at that yet, but it does a terrific job categorizing the PICs for the top 30 new gTLDs. I'm not sure if you wanted to chime in or, Eleeza, if you wanted to chime in and explain this data.

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Can you hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Hi. As you mentioned, the [big stockpile] that I sent out yesterday [inaudible] there's one tab on the [inaudible] these that have the highest registration numbers. Then the other one that we looked at was the GAC category strings, the highly-regulated sectors. For those two areas, there were two parts to the PICs, well actually three [inaudible] pretty much the same for all of them.

Section two of the PICs, they basically [inaudible] part of their application that they want to incorporate as a binding commitment. Then for [section two], which is also optional, they indicate if there is anything additional that they want to commit to.

For [inaudible] what I tried to do was organize them according to the applicant. I don't know if you guys have had a chance to look at it, but most of them are Donut TLDs, so those groups are sort of the same box. Then there are two major areas [in section two, the PICs, and section three] [inaudible] within those. It's broken down into a few categories: registrant eligibility, name selection, RPMs, acceptable use policy. They all [inaudible] commitments that they made.

I think that's pretty much [inaudible] any questions [inaudible].

DREW BAGLEY: Thank you so much. This is extremely helpful. This will allow us to go through and categorically look at each of these, compare what each registry or group of registries committed to and then ask them why they did that and then find out for the relevant party whether or not this was how this worked out for them for these different industries.

That's the only thing I'm looking for. We know the applicant, but then do we know – I guess most of these, which says something about new gTLDs – most of these are pretty obvious as far as who the intended audience of registrants would be. Perhaps, actually, all of them are except for the businesses. That could be very broad as far as who that would be we would want to talk to.

By any chance, do you have any thoughts about that? For example, .llc and TLDs such as that, .ltd, as far as who we might want to talk to from the registrant community side? That question can go out to anyone to chime in.

Alright, well, from here, what we need to do is actually reach out to the registries themselves to ask them about the PICs. We should compare this to any existing interviews that are going to be undertaken, perhaps, by the competition team and see if this can be part of the same interviews and see what overlap we have with some of these new gTLDs.

Jonathan, by any chance, do you have insight into that? Because I know how we've talked about in the past that we don't want to be interviewing the same group over and over again with different questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. We're doing a survey of the applicants, and Eleeza and I have a plan to coordinate with the PDP on [some] procedures to see if there are questions they want to add or something in order to prevent that duplication from happening. So there is a little applicant questionnaire sub-team. I don't remember who all is no it. Maybe Eleeza remembers who is on it that are developing a questionnaire for those who applied for strings.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jonathan. I can't recall exactly who is on it, but we do have a pretty well-developed questionnaire so far. I'm going to look at it right now to see if there's anything on there about PICs, but that's certainly a topic we should probably cover in there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So either way, we should all plan on creating our questions. They will be really basic about the PICs today. That way, we can ensure those are added to that survey if it makes sense to go through that survey. Unless you think that will reach other parties than the ones on the spreadsheet, and then we can reach out individually to them.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I would say it's worthwhile to at least add it because there will be two [inaudible]: one for those who withdrew and one for those who either are still going through the contracting process or are delegated. I'm looking at it right now. We have 15 high-level questions. Maybe if we want to add a couple that are related to PICs like why they committed to them or what drove them to include PICs in their applications and so on and so forth, that might be a good way to capture this. But that being said, it's all entirely dependent on which applicants respond to the survey.

DREW BAGLEY: Right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: One other things I wanted to point out – I put another link in the page – the competition team is interested in PICs and other registry policies as a form of non-[inaudible] competition. One of my colleagues put

together a chart, which is on the page I put in the chat, that compares different registration use and privacy policies across the top 30 gTLDs. You can get a sense for how they are differentiated themselves in terms of those types of policies as well.

DREW BAGLEY: Great. Thank you. Yep, I'm pulling that up now. Oh, it's perfect. Okay, so then either way, we can begin writing the discussion paper on PICs, which will then utilize that existing analysis. Then we'll be able to plug in whatever responses we get from conducting a survey. That is something that we can begin writing this week and working on.

I'll circulate some questions about PICs later today. Then we can plug those into that existing survey, Eleeza, and then I guess figure out in the next week or so whether or not we'll want to solicit a survey to other registries that won't be included in that survey pool. Thank you for that.

Does anybody else have any other thoughts on PICs? Carlton or Jamie? Okay, then, moving on. One of the big that our sub-team is doing that will inform a lot of other things is the DNS abuse study that you've heard me reference many, many times. Brian and I have now finished a draft statement of work. That's something that I can circulate for feedback to see what people talk about it.

As Jonathan has mentioned many times, we'll have to act fast, of course, because of where we are in the budget process and even in our own timeline in terms of meeting to get data back for our actual report.

But basically, what that statement of work outlines is that we want a vendor to go ahead and utilize historical WHOIS data, historical zone file data, DNS abuse data, and to the extent possible historical pricing data, which from what we've learned there might be retail pricing data available going back to spring 2015.

With all that data combined, then what the vendor would do is look for whether or not DNS abuse is more or less prevalent in the new gTLDs and then look for correlations with registries, registrars, resellers, and even privacy and proxy services, as well as correlation with price.

From there, we would be able to apply our existing knowledge of PICs, of safeguards, and of requirements within safeguards, such as the 2013 RAA and whatnot and DNSSEC, etc., and be able to see what we can deduce in terms of whether or not new gTLDs employing certain safeguards are less likely to have DNS abuse than others, whether it's the same. This will really help inform some of our recommendations going forward.

I'll circulate that today so that everyone can see the methodology, weigh in on the methodology. Then from there, we'll hopefully get that out pretty soon, unless we have reason not to, such as we find that there's existing research that would help us or whatnot. But as it stands now, it looks like this is probably the study that we're going to do and will help inform a lot of things.

I'll circulate that actually with the broader team rather than just our sub-team for feedback. If anyone can look at that, please look at it as

soon as possible and weigh in as soon as possible so we can make any modifications as needed.

Does anyone else have any other thoughts about anything we've discussed? Alright, so for a recap, we're now definitely in the writing stage for this review team. That's why today I'll be circulating a list of discussion paper topics that fit into Jonathan's template.

Then with each of these topics, I'll assign them to individuals so that way individuals will be held accountable. Then if an individual is unable to work on the topic, then that way they can at least let us all know so we're not surprised that a group of people didn't get something done. Then that topic can be reassigned, but we need to move forward on actually writing these things.

With individuals being assigned to these discussion papers, people can definitely seek out other sub-team members to contribute to them. But at least we have one owner that will be responsible for creating the outline and filling in the substance based on all the work we've done so far as a group with first consolidating a literature review list, analyzing these resources, and now we'll be synthesizing them, and then we'll be plugging in data we'll get eventually from our studies. This will be really helpful going forward. That will be the big thing.

In addition to that, I'll circulate a list – and this will be brief – of questions related to PICs that we'll want to append to the existing survey that will go out and that could be used for any individual phone calls or surveys we solicit to that registries that were identified in the spreadsheet that was circulated.

Then beyond that, I'll just once again give reminders because now we're past deadline on things that needed to be done with regard to analyzing some of these topics so that we could all have a comprehensive understanding through these spreadsheets of what the readings have said so far, what the safeguards look like for the different categories, whether or not they've been triggered and whatnot.

I like Jonathan's suggestion. Jonathan has suggested we come up with some sort of "Game of Thrones" punishment for those who don't do their work. For fans of the show, you now that's not going to be a really nice punishment, so that should be some motivation. I'll leave that to Jonathan though because I don't want to get in any sort of legal mess.

I saw, Carlton, you were typing something briefly until you got scared by Jonathan's "Game of Thrones" comment. Carlton, did you have something to say? We'll all wait in suspense as Carlton types. No pressure, Carlton. Yep, alright. It's a joke. Okay.

Anyway, I was hope attendance, of course, for this meeting would be much better than it was, but hopefully people will listen to the recording and participate accordingly. I'll send out those e-mails later today, and let's definitely get started writing this week on these discussion papers. Feel free to reach out to me if you have any difficulties whatsoever getting started on a discussion paper or finding any resources.

ICANN staff, as always, will be here to support us and be extremely helpful with reminding us of existing resources, resources we looked at

months ago but maybe have since forgotten, and any new resources, so make sure you're utilizing ICANN staff members as well.

I guess, does anybody have any other – are there any other acts of business I'm forgetting about? Eleeza, is there anything else that we should discuss? Or, Jonathan, did you want to chime in with anything else?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Nothing from me, Drew. Thanks. Just looking at those metrics, I think, would be very helpful as people start looking at their paper topics.

DREW BAGLEY: Great. Then, Brian, did you have anything to add on the DNS abuse paper as far as discussing that? Okay, and then, Jamie and Carlton, anything? Okay, then, we'll adjourn the call.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Thanks, Drew. Thanks for leading the call.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, yeah, of course. My pleasure. Alright, from here, expect some e-mails from me, and then expect to start getting to work writing. Alright, thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]