
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, this is Laureen Kapin, and we're convening at our sub-team meeting on consumer trust and safeguards, and for this first session, I thought it would be productive to do a little bit of stepping back and looking at our scope and mandate, and then moving on to the discussion paper, to really take a hard look at ensuring that our discussion paper, high-level questions, and sub-questions fit within that mandate. I'm appreciative of everyone's work that they've done thus far, and I just want to make sure that the work we are doing subsequent to this is as focused and as precise as it needs to be, so that no one's spinning their wheels. So can we make that much bigger, so everyone can see it more clearly, including those with older eyes? There we go. Love that. That's a great function.

What I've done to help facilitate that is just basically put together a document that we can provide, but pulled some key language from both the Affirmation of Commitments, and our own Terms of Reference to keep in mind. So, starting with the Affirmation of Commitments. They're very specific about the role for this review. And that's to ensure that as the new gTLD space is contemplating being expanded, that a bunch of various issues are going to be looked at. And for our purposes, i.e. the sub-team, that includes consumer protection, security, stability, resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection. It's safe for our purposes, actually, I misspoke. That's a general statement. Our issues are subsumed within that, so if you look

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.

at the second highlight, ICANN will organize the review. So that review, for our purposes, is the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted consumer choice – that’s what we’re about here in this room now – and safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it’s consumer trust, is what we’re involved in [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I’m sorry; did I say consumer choice? I misspoke. Thank you. Consumer – I should know this – consumer trust. So you’ll see in some of our further discussion about topic papers and sub-questions, that I’m going to have some feedback about being very precise about fitting within this particular concept of whether the expansion has promoted consumer trust, and the safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the expansion.

And then, we have our own Terms of Reference, which picks this up and expands upon it a little bit. We can scroll down. So the other thing that is being looked at is effectiveness of the safeguards enacted to mitigate issues involved in the introduction of new gTLDs. I see that’s not highlighted, but it should have been. But this question of effectiveness is very important, also – the effectiveness of the safeguards. And then we have a definition of effectiveness – to what degree the process was successful in producing desired results and achieving objectives. The reason I’m repeating that is, many times we’re using the word

“effective,” and I wanted people to keep in mind that “effectiveness” is actually defined in our Terms of Reference.

Moving down, there’s some more information under “Scope.” In the second paragraph, you can see that as a last statement, we say the review will also consider the effectiveness of safeguards enacted to mitigate abuse, and it’s understood to include a review of rights protection mechanisms – I’m paraphrasing here – as well as other efforts to mitigate DNS abuse, such as public interest commitment. And then, finally, there are definitions. We have a definition of “consumer,” we have a definition of “consumer trust.” And then, finally, I thought it was projected to include – if we scroll down, Alice, to “Goals of New gTLD Programs” – because this is somewhat through the lens of the goals of the new gTLD program, I thought it was also useful to look at the goals, at least as expressed in 2011, when the Board of Directors authorized the launch of the new gTLD program, and it said the goals include enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs.

So I’ve said a lot of words, and I’ve quoted a lot of things. But my intent here is to have us keep these principles in mind as we’re formulating our sub-questions. Because if our sub-questions and our high-level questions don’t sync up with these primary tasks, our mandate, then we’re not heading in the right direction. So I wanted to introduce this session by reminding everyone of those things, and I apologize in advance if this is all things you know already. I’m sure you’ve heard it already, but at least I, myself, found it useful to go back to the Affirmation of Commitments and the Terms of Reference, instead of looking at the entire thing and memorizing everything, to pluck out

what I thought was most pertinent for our consumer trust and safeguard focus. So I'll have this posted, and I think it may actually be posted on the Wiki now, as a reference for people, so that you can, at any time you want to, go back and say, "Okay. I'm really interested in this, and I identified this, this, and this as sub-questions," or "I'm branching off into this discussion," and to just look at this as a check and say, "Okay. This is fascinating, but does it fit within our mandate?"

So that said, I thought we could move on to a discussion of our paper topics through the lens of our mandate, as expressed in the Affirmation of Commitments and our Terms of Reference. But before we move on to that next session, does anyone have any questions or comments? Is this useful? Okay.

So, let's move on to discussion paper topics. Alice, if you can – actually, I think it may be in the same – is it in that same document, or no? Actually, if we can do the paper with the sub-questions on it. Is that what you were already going to?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I actually have a document that I've prepared that has everyone's high-level and sub-questions, and I'll apologize in advance for any formatting quirks. And if we just scroll down, I think it starts on page 4. Okay, right.

So, this is what I thought we could start with discussing. And can you make it a tiny bit bigger? Yeah. Great. Can everyone see that? Since I've asked you in this very firm way, shut your computers, I want to make sure everyone can actually see that. Can everyone see that? Yes? If anyone's having trouble seeing it, we can make it even bigger. Yeah? [CROSSTALK] I can do that, too. So, is that big enough for everyone? Yeah?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good. Woo-hoo! Great. So if we can scroll up. So, what I want people to – I'm sorry, if we can get to the top of the paper. Thank you. There we go. I know that the discussion papers have been ordered, and they number eleven, and people may be remembering their paper numbers – so forget your paper numbers for now, because I've actually re-ordered this in a way that seems more intuitive. Don't get confused by the fact that these numbers are not the same numbers as your papers. What I've tried to do is separate this into the two buckets of our mandate. And that is, "Have the new gTLDs promoted consumer trust?" and the effectiveness of safeguards enacted to mitigate issues involved in expanding gTLDs. So there's a "consumer trust" bucket, and there's a "safeguards" bucket, basically. And then I tried to fit everyone's papers within those two buckets. And I wanted to start off by talking about people's high-level questions, and these are the discussion paper topics. Those are the highest-level questions we have,

other than these mandate issues that the Affirmation of Commitments and Terms of Reference already provided to us. I wanted to start off by having us make sure that the discussion paper questions have actually captured what we needed to be. So, I started off with the consumer trust issues.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Yes.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Carlos, for the record. Can I assume that these questions are high-level in terms of the LA meeting? Or – yes, that’s the question. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] Alice corrected me. We came up with an initial set of high-level questions in LA, and we’ve since refined them. So it’s sort of like a dynamic list, but these are the questions we refer to as “high-level questions” at this point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And also, just to further clarify, Carlos, as Jonathan pointed out, this has been evolving, so I think there are probably some differences between these particular questions that Drew helped identify with the group for discussion papers, and that evolved from our LA discussion. So I don’t

want people to get hung up on looking at the LA questions and thinking, “Okay, that’s definitive.” I think, actually, the whole LA question issue was in the context of the application and evaluation process, and that was the context for that discussion. I don’t want our sub-team to be confused and go back to a list of questions in LA, because our work has continued since LA, and we have refined those questions for our discussion paper topics. Where we are now is, I am asking the question, “These are the discussion paper topics we chose; I want to make sure that this fits within our mandate, and I want to have an opportunity to further refine that, if needed.” Does that make sense?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. If, by “refining,” we mean clarification, or bringing our input, yes. For me, it’s very important to see that we have some leeway to discuss the top-level questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: And that’s the reason I was asking. It’s not that I want to have a list; it’s just to make sure that when we discuss these questions, we are at that level. That’s what I want.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We’re exactly on the same page, Carlos. That’s the whole purpose of this first session.

Okay. So, the first mandate issued concerns consumer trust, and right now, we have two papers on that, and you'll see I've added a possible third. This isn't something we've had a sub-paper on; it's something that occurs to me. Before we get to that, one of our papers is "Are Consumers Aware of New gTLDs?" Carlton has taken the lead on that paper. My question is, are folks comfortable with that as one of our high-level questions for the consumer trust issues? "Are consumers aware of new gTLDs?" Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

I want to make clear that we are departing from the accumulated definition of consumers, and from the Nielsen Report, we had seen some difference between the two types of consumers – between the registrants and end users – and I would agree to the question, acknowledging that this seems to be, to me personally, more driven by the registrants than by the final users. Is this – [CROSSTALK]

Awareness. Okay. Awareness.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

This is Carlton, for the record. The approach in this case, Carlos, was from the opposite end. I was looking at consumers – end users – that's where we focused on the research. End users, not registrants. End users.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, that would have suggested a refinement of the question, to say "end users," right? And to specify that. And so, getting back to the idea of

whether or not new gTLDs have promoted consumer trust, I think it has to do with whether or not their trust in the overall system has improved as a result of the program, as well. So I think the awareness is there, but also, when we look at end users for question 2, it's not just trust in new gTLDs, but probably whatever it is, the DNS or something like that [CROSSTALK]

Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I want to unpack that a little bit. There are two separate issues being raised here. One is, I hear Carlos asking about registrants, which at this point, have not been a focus of our consumer trust topic papers. So that raises the question of, "Should we be adding a discussion paper on trust from the registrant perspective?" Especially now that we have updated information from the registrant. So, feedback on that?

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew, for the record. I think we should – for sure for this question – I think we should ask that, I guess, with each subsequent question – ask whether or not we can better craft the question to address both end users and registrants with the same question, or whether we should make distinct questions for each. And so, I think for awareness and for trust, we should definitely have distinct questions between end users and registrants, because it's important to describe –

the data's going to be different – but it's important to describe those communities in different ways. And I think we're going to – we'll go through the questions – but I think we're going to need to think about this exact topic, too, as we get to safeguards, as well.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: This is Carlos, and for the record, I'm agreeing with Drew that we should address them as two separate, and I think going through the [inaudible] should be in both groups. I can tell you from the ALAC perspective, we've always held that a consumer, as two segments, is the end user, and then there is the registrant. So, that's all.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Fabro.

FABRO STEIBEL: Fabro, for the record, and adding to that, I think if we defend consumer trust as that, we should abide by a definition that has two different ones, and we should discuss if you want also to compare them or not. So Nielsen results present one, the other, and how they compare. So it might be that the questions are okay, but if you talk about consumers aware of new gTLDs – end users, registrants, and how they compare.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So I think this is very, very useful because although I swept over it, as folks recall, our definition of “consumers” is not just end users; it's registrants, as well. And I know people have given me – people have

commented on that in terms of feedback, that we need to be very precise with that. So this is why I think this exercise is so useful – and I’m wondering, Alice, since I’m taking notes in my Stone Age system, but can we edit this document so that we can capture some of these refinements, or have I hobbled us in doing that by making it a Word document?

And I see you, Carlos, I just want to – are we able to do that Alice? Okay, yes, good. I just wanted to make sure we had a “yes” there. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, I still want to comment on the previous –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: – on the one we just commented, I have the following problem. I don’t only need a list, I need a hierarchy and the way I understood Jonathan’s comment before was that trust is a very top-level concept, very well-adapted to the whole DNS. And on a second level, we have this awareness that we have there, and we’re applying it to consumers. And then on a very specific level, where we have data points and so on, we have safeguards and abuse – those are rather measurable. And one of the big problems I have is the jump from trust at a very high level to safeguards. Okay? Or to abuse.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. [CROSSTALK]

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I know. But we tend to say, “Okay, did the safeguards include trust? Did we reduce abuse with the safeguards?” It is a jump that for people probably who don’t speak English as their language but are used to thinking in German, the hierarchy is really important.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That is an important question, and I want to get to that a little later in our conversation, because I absolutely agree with you. But I don’t want to get into that discussion right now, because it’s too soon, in terms of these questions. But in terms of the leap from trust to safeguards, yes. We need to talk about that, we need to figure out how we’re going to grapple with that, but not right now. So –

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: It’s very important to me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. It’s crucial for all of us, so it’s not just important to you, Carlos – I think everyone feels that that’s crucial. So – just wait one second – I want to make sure we’re capturing this, so before I move on to the other part that I wanted to unpack, which was Jonathan’s observation about overall trust in the DNS in general, let’s just make sure our notes

reflect this prior conversation. So – “Are consumers aware of new gTLDs?” – underneath that, can we add as an “A,” end users, and then as a “B,” registrants?

Okay. And then, David, did your comment – yeah, go ahead. Relate to this.

DAVID TAYLOR:

David Taylor. So my question is – which, we might already have this, so just remind me – is, when does an end user become a registrant? Is it a registrant of any domain name, anywhere in the world, or is it of a new gTLD?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Any domain name.

DAVID TAYLOR:

So, just one domain name – immediately an end user becomes a registrant?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. Then our higher – then, the other issue that Jonathan raised, and this echoes back to our discussion just this morning, and I think Jordyn has been the person that’s most consistently reminded us of, perhaps, the biggest universe that we’re dealing with, which is overall trust in the DNS system. My question is, is that a question for a separate discussion paper, or is it a sub-question that we ask within, perhaps, discussion

paper #2, of whether – well, it’s not discussion paper #2, because that’s “Do Consumers Trust New gTLDs?” I’m wondering where we put it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. One possible solution is to make question 2 a sub-question under that question about whether or not we’ve increased trust in the DNS, and so one of those questions is, “Do people trust new gTLDs?” etcetera. So it could just become a sub-question underneath a question that’s more generally about, “Do consumers trust –

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, would it be, “Has –

JONATHAN ZUCK: “Has trust in the DNS improved?” or something –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, it has to be more for the – it has to relate to the expansion of the new gTLDs though, doesn’t it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, it –

LAUREEN KAPIN: [CROSSTALK] Has expansion of the new gTLDs –

CARLTON SAMUELS: enhanced trust. The June 20 – enhanced trust. Enhance trust by assuming that there is a trust factor in the DNS, in that system. So I go with what Jonathan is saying – that we ask that question, and then we say, “Has the new gTLD actually –

JONATHAN ZUCK: But in reality, we’re back to the top question, though, right? I mean, that’s what just transpired.

CARLTON SAMUELS: But that’s okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So then, the question is, “What is the sub – ” So, “Are they aware of new gTLDs?” and then down here, it’s somehow – I think that the [CROSSTALK] new gTLDs is a –

CARLTON SAMUELS: This – is it enhanced?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Has trust in new gTLDs –

CARLTON SAMUELS: – new gTLDs enhanced overall trust. They want to enhance trust. That’s what they said.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. So, has the expansion of new gTLDs enhanced trust in the –

CARLTON SAMUELS: Domain Name System?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Domain Name System.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which, unfortunately, has gotten us back to the top question, though.
So we've now turned this into the mandate issue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: So the question is, how did you break this into smaller projects, right?
So maybe mentioning trust is the wrong way to do it for question 2.
Instead, it's "Are consumers aware of new gTLDs? Have – " And so

maybe, this is one of the sub-questions about – it’s just that we need to tie it back to the mandate issue, so maybe we don’t need to roll it up in a sub-question. I feel like I’m adding more confusion than clarity right now, but the – so, “Have safeguards helped to promote trust in the DNS?” “Has [inaudible] helped to promote trust in the overall DNS?” Things like that, those are the sub-questions, I think, associated with whether or not – so, whether or not they trust new gTLDs could be a sub-question, in itself, which would roll things back up to the mandate question.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, I’m seeing a lot of hands, so let me give people a chance to –

So, David, I saw you, then Fabro, then Carlos, then Drew.

DAVID TAYLOR: David. I think I remembered my question until Jonathan confused me. That’s alright. I was just thinking – if the goal is to enhance trust, to me it seems that there is a difference between enhancing trust in the DNS generally and enhancing trust in the new gTLDs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible], hoping to enhance, though, in the new gTLDs.

DAVID TAYLOR: I exactly am. If you end up with a domain name – a TLD called “.trust”, and everyone trusts it, that doesn’t enhance the trust in “.com”. In fact,

it probably goes the other way. So you could arguably say you've enhanced in one end, and you've taken it away in the other. So I don't know how we capture that. I was kind of throwing a spanner in the works, but I think we do need to be looking at "Do new gTLDs enhance trust of themselves? Do people trust that when you compare to the legacy?" And if we go down that route, I think we're okay. Because the other way, I was getting a bit confused. So I'm just throwing that out, really.

FABRO STEIBEL:

Yeah, Fabro. I think the two main questions here are [inaudible] trust gTLDs. So the first question is, "Do people trust it?" And then the second one is, "Compared to what?" So, compared to the legacy today, or compared to the legacy before, or compared to before the implementation period? But they're two different questions. Not high-level. Sub-level. To a different sub-level.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Jonathan, for the record. Given the fact that there weren't previously new gTLDs, we can't enhance trust in new gTLDs. We can say that we've created trustworthy new gTLDs, but the question we then ask is, "Have we in that process improved consumer trust in the overall DNS?" Because now – so, for example, people are concerned about phishing scams. So the introduction of .bank, for example, made people feel better about the Internet. Because now, there's something that's a place for .bank, and I'm less likely to be phished in .com because of the presence of .bank. I think that's what they were trying to get at, is

whether or not the innovations of the new program lead to a greater overall trust in the DNS. That's what I think [inaudible] was asking.

FABRO STEIBEL:

So in comparison to .com, .trust – I think the first thing is, do people trust gTLDs? And we do have good data to provide an answer. But if people trust, and they trust more in .com, it's an issue; if they trust less, it's an issue. But maybe then, we have a problem with the verb "enhance," because we don't have the previous. So we can maybe just focus on documenting [inaudible] first.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

But a change in – sorry, Jonathan again – a change in relative trust I don't think matters. In other words, I think it's a red herring for David to say that trust in .com went down. Because what that really means is, I now have a greater feeling of security overall, because I know where I want to go to do my banking. That means my trust in the system as a whole has improved. So it isn't about trusting .com less, it's about – when I go and I open up my laptop and I start typing in, do I feel better about what I'm doing? Do I trust the system I'm entering into? And has the new program helped to promote that overall trust? I think that is the high-level question.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, I read this morning David Taylor's paper, and I was very attracted by a question he put under some of the sub-questions. Does it change anything compared to before? And Fabro just brought in onto this

concept of before and after, and I speak to my preliminary bias, that I prefer to leave trust at the highest level. Because for me, the issue that the Board put that forward is because there was some perceived risk – that by expanding the DNS there was a risk there. And for me, it's very simple to see the risk. We had a thick system. And we had 22, up to 30, but a very slow, thick system of TLDs. And now we've jumped into a very dynamic system, greatly expanded and purely arithmetically, the risk increases. We just have more places to abuse, phish, spam, and so on, so I think this is a kind of a very high-level, objective warning. Don't spoil it! We're going to move to a new system, and we have to be careful that the new system is good enough so as not to erode trust, and trust is very hard to measure. That's why I keep saying trust, we'll leave it at the higher level and then we can compare. Do we have more abuse before or after; or do we have more safeguards before or after; or do we get more confusion because we don't have .org anymore, we have .org, .ngo, and .ong? These are the kinds of issues that we can feel at the lower level.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, I don't mean to drag this out, but I think what you're saying almost suggests two high-level sub-questions. One is, "Did we put sufficient measures in to mitigate erosions of trust as a result of the program?" And, "Were there innovations associated with the program that, in fact, enhanced trust?" If I can channel Jamie Hedlund, I think this was his point that he made before, is that – just the absence of erosion isn't the only thing. The other thing is potentially the promotion of trust through something like .bank. Right? So in theory, there are things that the new program put in place that were designed to improve

trust, and then there were other things that were put in place in the program designed to mitigate the risks of distrust. And so both of those are components to whether or not it promoted trust.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jamie couldn't join us because of some hot button issues that cropped up in DC that conflicted, so we all miss Jamie; I'm putting that on the record.

DAVID TAYLOR: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, that was exactly what I wanted to do. So this would be a side conversation, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so share – no, share it with us. That's exactly what I wanted to ask Jonathan to do, because I'm thinking that could be our sub-question or, to get this concept, instead of having what factors contribute to distrust, talking about this in terms of the positive, what enhanced – what factors led to an enhancement of trust, and did we put factors in place sufficiently to mitigate distrust? I'm paraphrasing, but that's

exactly what I want to get to now. So, can we put those – David, let's hear from you.

DAVID TAYLOR: David Taylor.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Could we replace that, actually, for question 3?

DREW BAGLEY: [inaudible]

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, yeah, go.

DREW BAGLEY: So what I was going to say is, why don't we summarize everybody's points right now as a bunch of mini-questions, and then start grouping those together, and create whatever questions. I've been taking notes as people have been speaking. So it seems like something we want to figure out with this is, we want to figure out – going back to our mandate – how the introduction of new gTLDs affected trust in the DNS systems, going to your point, Jonathan. And so, as part of that, I think – part of that, we can easily answer with the Nielsen data. So I don't know if this would be a sub-question that would help form the big question, but something is just – did the trust in the overall system change at all since the introduction? And you don't have to necessarily

tie it directly to the new gTLD, but just since the introduction. There's got to be something there with a timeline. And then, there were separate questions, which I'm thinking these might come to a different category that people were bringing up about the safeguards – did the safeguards encourage trust, not encourage trust, things like that. I think that's completely separate, because you could have no change in trust in the DNS system; and yet, people have faith in the safeguards or something, but maybe that didn't actually play a role in whether or not they trust in the DNS, because they just see the DNS as a big system. Whether that includes thousands more gTLDs or five more, they don't distinguish. And then I was going to say, too, the way that you guys craft the question, or we all craft that question, we need to pay attention to this awareness thing that Laureen brought up previously. Because it might be something where we're actually trying to measure – creating a Venn diagram of those people, or wherever the new gTLD program – and this would then be different from what I just said about the system as a whole, right? All those people answering whether they had trust in the DNS system may not have necessarily been aware of the new gTLD programs.

So you'd be looking at the subset of the people aware of the new gTLD programs, and to Fabro's point, did they have more or less trust in the new gTLDs than in, I guess, [inaudible], or something. That's where we could get that comparison component. Sorry, I just wanted to share that as you guys were brainstorming.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Drew. Fabro, and then let's get back to David and Jonathan.

FABRO STEIBEL: Yeah, I'm looking for the 2 in 2A. Actually, I think that I agree with the argument that they are inverted. The main question here is about the Domain Name System. So, what's the role of gTLDs in the Domain Name System, and the secondary question is, do they trust new gTLDs, or do they distrust gTLDs, and why? I'm not sure this is easy for us to talk about the whole Domain Name System, [inaudible], but I would say that 2 and 2A are inverted. And just a question that came to my mind – I might be wrong – but trust is pretty important for all groups. Is awareness also important? Should we drop the question of awareness, or should we keep it? I don't have an answer for that, but just compared to trust.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Carlton, why don't you repeat your comment, and then Carlos.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Carlton, for the record. I was saying that the first thing is, you have to be aware of, so you've got to know what's going on in the space before you can even begin to measure anything. So I don't think you can dismiss it at all. [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

I feel very good in terms of awareness as an output of the Nielsen survey, so I wouldn't say put it aside. I mean, we have hard data of awareness, both for users and registrants. A year ago and today. So it's not that I would put it away; it's just that it seems to be fixed as one of these areas where we have data.

DREW BAGLEY:

So one possible – and you're going into a kind of taxonomy – I'm just wondering if there's – I almost want to go up to this whiteboard here, even though I'll write and people still won't be able to read my handwriting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

[inaudible]

DAVID TAYLOR:

[inaudible], to others, as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So the big question is about promoting trust. I think the reality is that the [inaudible] I think that the high-level questioning [inaudible] promoting trust in the DNS. I think that there are two factors there. One is trust, which is a perception issue, and the other is trustworthiness, [inaudible] which is a more fact-based [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: So trust and trustworthiness, right? So, promoting it is both of those things. One of the tentative cause and effects. But these are the two aspects of promoting trust. And then I would suggest that, within trustworthiness, there are two sub-questions. One has to do with, let's call it innovation; and the other has to do with risk mitigation. Right? So, in one case, in trustworthiness, there are innovations, whose intent is to promote trust, which is things like .bank and other types of thick [inaudible] related to pharmaceuticals and things like that. And those are things that we're doing that are designed to actually make the system more trustworthy than it was previously. So by bringing this new program in, we're trying to make the system as a whole more trustworthy. And then the other thing that Carlos mentioned is, we're trying to address concerns that were raised about the rapid expansion of – and we put safeguards in place, specifically to mitigate the risk of decreasing trust. And so that's sort of the – and then this is the perception issue that we're getting via the Nielsen survey, is about people's perceptions, and to the extent possible, trying to tie that perception back to something specific – trustworthiness initiatives – that we have in place.

So we asked questions like, "Are you more likely to trust that there are restrictions or validation in place?" for example, as an attempt to achieve some level of causation between the numbers that we're seeing here, and the facts that we're establishing here. So to what extent the trustworthiness effort have they reflected to date on the public? What

is the extent to which they have had an impact on actual trust, I think is the purpose of the Nielsen survey. And I think what I've heard from David earlier, was that this largely worked, because there wasn't an overall sense of erosion of trust among the public, and that in fact there was some increased feeling of trust and some belief in the value of some of these innovations, such as [inaudible] and things like that. That's in very broad terms, the taxonomy of this question of trust.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what he said. So you may disagree with what he said, but I feel like what he said was that we can't point to his survey as the source of – to suggest that there's been an erosion of trust in the DNS as a result of the expansion of the new gTLDs. We can say that factually. We might still disagree with the survey, but he was saying that by looking at my survey, you cannot use it as a way to suggest that trust has eroded.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, but he in the same sentence, he said that in some areas of the world, they didn't believe that these mitigations would work. I'm relating –

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the improvement side.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: As opposed to the mitigation side.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So all I'm saying is that on the mitigation side, we seem to have gotten some validation that whatever it is we did – or despite what we did – we didn't cause custom to lapse as a result of the expansion. And then there was disagreement – there was a belief that there's potential to be had from the innovation, but there was some cynicism about whether we would realize that potential. Right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, I hope – could that all be picked up by the recording? Do we know? Good. No, I think that was very, very helpful. So I'm not sure what we're seeing on the piece of paper. Is that you? Oh, it's David. We never got back to you, so let's get back to you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thank you very much. David, for the record. So this is the little doodle I was just doing with Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I love the phone shadow.

DAVID TAYLOR: No, it wasn't a phone shadow. It wasn't a phone shadow. I didn't use my phone for this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I will attest that David did not use his phone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, it's just a picture of it.

DAVID TAYLOR: No, it's just – this discussion about the trust – I was looking at if that circle, your top circle's your .com. The world with .com, the Wild West. There are no safeguards. Anyone can register; anything can happen. That makes sense; that's the way we were. If we put safeguards on .com, we'd have complete trust. But that's not what we're doing; hence we've got the new detailed lease. And I was just imagining as we were talking there, trying to amalgamate the two. There's your .com, and then we're getting these little turrets, or these little castles, appearing, which are all the new gTLDs, through it. So you've got the .web, the .services. The .web – anyone can register in .web – it's just like a .com, so that doesn't affect anything, so that's why it's staying clear. And then you've got the .bank or the .farmer, which are blacker. Those you

can see; there's more trust there because you've got safeguards which are effective and enforced.

So I was just doodling, trying to make it – how do we look at that so we're measuring trust? Because I've struggled to figure out trust, enhancing trust, and what we're talking about. And I think a lot of the questions which are posed to the consumers and the registrant, people will look at that question and answer it differently, depending on how they're looking at that. So if I'm looking at a .bank, and I've used .bank, etcetera, I'm going to give a very different reply to "Do you trust new gTLDs? Do you trust this?" Because it depends which ones you've come across and you've seen. So really, that was just where I'd got to, and hence talking to Jonathan and wondering if there's any usefulness in looking at it that way.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So – and I see you, Carlos – what I want to turn our conversation to, and then I will definitely hear your question, Carlos – is how we incorporate this discussion that we've been having, which I think is very useful, into tweaking our high-level question so we capture both the issue of promoting trust within the DNS as a whole, and this concept of the impact on trust of innovations and measures to mitigate risk. So I just want to put that out there, because that's where I want this conversation to feed into – to improving our questions. That's the task. So whether you agree or disagree with the last speaker, that's fine; but what I really want us focusing our comments on are to how we can refine these questions to make sure they're in the best possible sync

with our mandate. So with that said, Carlos, do you have a comment on
- ? Okay.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Just to comment on David's, because I read his paper in a lucid moment at two in the morning – of course there is a dominance of .com, and that created some trouble, but your second statement is, "We could put safeguards on .com." I wouldn't say we could put safeguards on .com; I would say that under the dominance of .com, safeguards came about in a very slow, exposed manner by fixing right protection mechanisms, by bringing new mechanisms, by revising WHOIS, and so on. I think the DNS has been engaged in fixing this issue on an ongoing basis after the fact, so to speak. And the big difference – and that's where I have a problem with my – no, I don't have a problem, but I have a difficulty expressing it on the safeguards on the new safeguards – on the Spec 11 safeguards – is that we changed gears. We said, "Okay, there is an expansion because x, y, z reasons. Demand, [inaudible], whatever. Now we're going to try it the other way around. Now we're going to go forward and let the specific group that he doesn't like come up with a lot of preventive measures, the second [CROSSTALK]. Yes, but we change gears before we delegate all these – how do you – you have a very nice word. Not categorization. Taxonomy.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So [inaudible]

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I'm sorry; I have to finish this.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Finish.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Okay. Because it's very important to answer your questions and explain where I am with my paper, so please – I am very slow in English. I can try to write it beforehand, but it is difficult to discuss it. We have changed gears, and we have gone into a process, and that's what we're evaluating – if this process was effective. Of defining risks beforehand and spelling out conditions – yes, programmatic, we call it [inaudible] regulation in Europe. That's my bias; I come from Telecom, and we make the difference between the US system as an exposed system, and the European system as an ex [inaudible] system of regulation. Excuse me for using the word. So if you would put exposed in the old system and [inaudible], then you would be talking the same language I speak.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, drawing these threads together, how should we refine these questions? How can we refine these questions? It strikes me – at least, as a threshold matter – we perhaps want to define our mandate issue as, “Have new gTLDs promoted consumer trust in the DNS?” That would be at least a top-level – can we have that incorporated there? To just our mandate issue. “Have new gTLDs promoted consumer trust in the DNS?”

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] new gTLD program [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, not there. "Mandate issue." [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] at the end [inaudible] the DNS.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and we can say, "Has the new gTLD program" for the sake of precision.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. It is the system. It is a program. Right. So I think that's a good refinement. So, again, would we add something to our – would we replace this third question, which I just put out as a trial balloon, because we have all this information about distrust – but would we reformulate that in a way to capture these improvements and innovations? And then also – a question to capture our mitigation, which would be the safeguards, which to get to your issue, Carlos – that, to me, is the place where we connect up the trust issues to the abuse issues, which are worthy steps that we put in place to mitigate risks. Were they successful?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I don't think we're in disagreement, there. So that's my question on the table. How can we reformulate – how can we come up with a question that captures the improvements and mitigation? And I think where we started, Jonathan, was your comments echoing, channeling Jamie about improving –

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, "don't forget improvement."

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, "don't forget improvement."

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was Jamie's comment. So, in a way, the thing that might make sense – sorry.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sorry, I should be monitoring that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan, for the record. So it may make sense to invert this and say, "Has the program put mechanisms in place to improve the trustworthiness of the DNS?" And the second is, "Has the new program put sufficient mechanisms in place to mitigate the risks of the downside consequences of the huge expansion of gTLDs?" And then the third question is, "What is the level of consumer awareness of both of these, and are these efforts yet reflected in overall perceived trust in the DNS?" So that sounds like a bit of a narrative, in that sense. Rather than starting with the observed behavior, end with it, and say, "Have we put a good set of mechanisms in to improve the trustworthiness of the DNS? Have we put a good set of safeguards in place that mitigate the risks to the trustworthiness of the DNS?" And then, "What is consumer perception of both of those?"

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. It's natural that it'll take consumers a while to catch up, and to actually gain awareness. And so, under that, there are sub-questions. Are they aware, and of those that are aware, do they perceive value in these things, and we've gotten some answers like that from Nielsen. Does that make sense to folks?

LAUREEN KAPIN: When you say "mechanisms to improve DNS," I think that needs to be more specific. Because when I hear "mechanisms to improve," that's not precise enough for me to think about trust issues. Do you just mean improve trust?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, to improve trustworthiness.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. To improve trustworthiness.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Both 1 and 2 were about trustworthiness, because trust is the observed behavior, right?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, both 1 and 2 – “Have we put improvements in place to improve trustworthiness of the DNS?” “Have we put safeguards in place to prevent the erosion of trustworthiness?” And then, “What is the observed behavior of users?”

LAUREEN KAPIN: The safeguards in place to mitigate risk – I’m just trying to track the specific language. “To mitigate the risk –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. “To mitigate the risk of erosion of trustworthiness.”

So then, the third is, “What is the degree to which these efforts are reflected in public perception?” And then there are sub-questions under that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Over time, that’s right. So we start strong with, “Are the efforts good?” And then, “Have the public picked up on them? Have they actually identified them as – ” And we have some beginnings of some feelings that they’re happy with the efforts that are being made, right? That was some of the results that were coming through.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] tracking [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we can mention that there is, in fact, some cynicism about the public that this will actually be enforced. We can mention that, and therefore, recommend that – we’ve created an opportunity for ourselves to improve trust, that is ours to fail – which is what David’s point was, as well. That the public has validated that what we’re attempting to do is worthwhile, but that they’re still watching us to see whether we follow through.

FABRO STEIBEL: The reason I made a note about that, and I think it’s very important, is because when I did my homework that I did right, I read that cracking of the compliance with the GAC mechanism – also, the GAC people said, “What we proposed was much stronger. They have watered it down. That’s not enough,” and so on. So it was very funny to hear the opposite side, that the people in North America don’t think that it’s worth a penny, what they wrote in the contract – and on the other side, having the GAC track recording that that’s not what they expected. They expected more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I think “not worth a penny” is an exaggeration, too, because I think – what I took from the survey summary this morning was guarded optimism, right? That yeah, that sound like a good idea. I don’t really believe that you’ll follow through on it, but it sounds like a good idea.

So it's less than, say – it's not saying that "Even if you do it, it won't be good enough." It's saying that "The thing you're saying you're going to do is good, but we're reserving judgment about whether you actually do it." Right? And I think that that's an important distinction there, about whether or not the effort is perceived as worthwhile. And it seems as though it is, but there's some cynicism about whether or not we will follow through to realize the benefits of that effort.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So, I think that the challenge here is, if we want to fit the work we've done already into this construct, we need to have a clear idea of what would go where. So – say it again?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll sneak out the back door.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. No, it is, but – well, let me ask the threshold question. Do people feel that Jonathan's proposal is something that is a good refinement?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. [inaudible] I'm sorry. I think that the suggestion of Jonathan, the way he's re-ordered it, follows a certain narrative that I think people can follow easily.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, say it one more time.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: We're all awake; we're all engaged. The computers are down – I'm thrilled.

[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] Domain Name System [inaudible] how the [inaudible] look at the [inaudible] but I think [inaudible] to improve the efforts we have done [inaudible] somehow [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: I mean, this isn't throwing the baby out with the bathwater. I feel all our work that's been done is perfectly relevant to this. This, I think, is

more of an analytical approach of what makes sense in what order, and – [CROSSTALK] yeah. So I don't think think anyone need worry that all our work won't be used. I think this all fits in very comfortably; it just doesn't quite fit in in the same order, and we need to figure out the [inaudible]. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I want to comment on your question. I think they are useful – we don't have to throw them away – as long as we can tweak a little bit the main hypothesis and the questions, and so on. And what I was asking for in my case, which I have a prepared statement on that written, but I cannot read it because it's closed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: When you need to read it, Carlos, you may open it and read it.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: To restate a little bit the issue, and I do think we have to finish the templates with just a little bit more flexibility on revising the questions in the language that we agreed. I think it's useful. And my purpose for this was, "Okay, how much do I have to restate the Spec 11 group?" And I'm ready to do it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Yeah. And again, I want to emphasize – nothing is set in stone. And I think for me, the best results at the end of the meeting, would be if we go through the discussion and analytical process together to come

up with the best refinements we can. I don't want to leave things set in stone when they're not the right things. That's the whole benefit of us all getting together and thinking together. So nothing's set in stone.

Okay. So, let's link this back up, then. If we start with "Has the program put mechanisms in place to improve trustworthiness in the DNS?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] question 1 –

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think these would be the new questions – let's put those on top.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you want me just to put my template up?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. The other part of ground rules, folks, is whenever you need to duck out, duck out. There are no handcuffs and chains here. If you need to duck out, duck out.

Okay. No, I do, too. So, further refined questions 1, 2, and 3. And what I want to do is figure out where our existing papers fit within that, because as I've observed, they do fit in, but I just want to make sure we're clear on where.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: You were [inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] if you have the [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's good.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I know that it's difficult, and I appreciate everyone putting up with my suggestions. Put it that way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I know, I'm [CROSSTALK]. And Carlos, you will get to open your computer and read that. I will not surprise you with that.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, no, I know. So if I basically have deprived everyone of a break – is that what I've basically done? Am I depriving people of our scheduled break? When do we have our scheduled break?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In half an hour.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In half an hour.

LAUREEN KAPIN: In half an hour. Okay, good. That's fine.

So let's take a quick look at this for just five minutes, and then let's turn to David – to answer all these questions for us! – let's turn to David for insights on whether the data we have goes to these questions. Does that make sense? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And I think that question 3 [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: 3 and 4.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. So 4 is meant to be B, and those A's need to go [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh. There are three, not four. There, okay. Okay, so it's really question 3 [CROSSTALK] Right.

So let's take a look at this reconfiguration briefly to see if folks feel this makes sense, and if this is what we want to adopt. Carlos? You're raising your hand. Or are you just – you're raising your hand. Okay. Yes, Carlos. Use the mic, Carlos, or get to a mic.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I agree with you. And what Carlos just did is asterisk that to a certain extent, there is some linkage between that particular trust question and the safeguards question.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: And particularly, that this group of the trust question is not the data or survey-based, but number 3 is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The other thing it doesn't capture – sorry, this is Jonathan – is whether or not everyone's concerns were unfounded to begin with. There's improvement, and then there are risk mitigation factors; but if the risks were unfounded, that's another thing that could be captured by the survey data, which is that we were too worried about an erosion of trust. And it's not related to the safeguards if there's not an erosion of trust, but the risks weren't that high to begin with. [CROSSTALK].

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Drew?

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew, for the record. For the large question for number 3, I think we need to add something to the end. “Have these efforts had an impact on public perception in the DNS?” Or perception of [CROSSTALK] – well, it could be implied, which goes back to the discussion we just had about whether we’re focused on new gTLDs [CROSSTALK]. Okay. This is one of the prepositional phrases.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Prepositional phrases are our friend. So for folks who are on the phone and don’t have the benefit of this, I just thought I’d briefly read it out loud, and then I think, we’ll turn our attention to David, who’s here to talk about what data relates to this. But this reformulation is on the high-level question of, “Has the new gTLD program promoted consumer trust in the DNS?” The primary discussion paper topic would now be reconfigured to, “Has the program put mechanisms in place to improve trustworthiness in the DNS? Two, “Has the program put sufficient mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the trustworthiness of the DNS?” And as a side note – the trustworthiness is our objective component: Is the DNS trustworthy? And now we’re moving to a subjective: What’s the perception of trust? So the third question would be, “Have these efforts had an impact on the public perception of the

DNS?” And then we have sub-questions: “What is the level of consumer awareness of these efforts?” – divided into end user awareness and registrant awareness, and that goes to our definition of “consumer.” B, “Has consumer trust in the DNS improved?” – again, both users and registrants. And then under B, we have four sub-sub-issues: “Do consumers perceive value in the new innovation?” “Do consumers perceive value in the risk mitigation initiative?” Three, “Do consumers have confidence in the implementation of the innovation and initiative?” And four, “Has consumer trust in the DNS improved overall since the introduction of the new gTLDs?” And like any wonderful story, we are ending where we began, which is the whole DNS system. So, I just wanted to make sure for folks on the phone, that they knew what our discussion was going to be based on.

So with that, I thought it would be useful, then, to take advantage of David being here with us to focus on this third question, about how the consumer and registrant surveys can help us address the issues. And if folks have specific questions, especially the folks who have been working on this about information in the surveys, this would be a good time to ask David those questions. Or David, you may have a take in general about this topic, which I’m delighted to have you to address. You can grab this mic, or any mic that you’re near.

DAVID:

[inaudible] Like that? Alright. The magic button. So at the high level, I’ll say that in the surveys, you have two types of trust information. Trust in the groups of gTLDs, or the individual gTLDs that we tested themselves, and then trust in the Domain Name industry as a whole. So

if we look at it from both sides, in neither situation – on neither topic track – do we see large-scale evidence of distrust, fear, concern, on those levels. Regarding the gTLDs, what drives it more than anything else is, again, the hypothesis we've had and continues to seem to bear out is, if they look interpretable, if they look meaningful, then I tend to trust them. And in fact, the new ones that we've added to the survey this year debuted at some of the highest levels of trust of any of the new gTLDs we've tested. If they haven't been in the market that long, there's a huge proliferation of them. Earlier today, you asked why is the number in general of new gTLDs lower, and I said, time and market familiarity. The thing I didn't think to mention earlier today is that we started out with a much smaller set, so it's easy to get to know them; whereas now, we have this huge proliferation – hard for any one gTLD to get as much familiarity. And yet, in the face of that proliferation, we're not seeing any erosion in general trust. People tend to – what they report is that they tend to drive mostly off of indicators that they experience on the web, a security badge, a virus warning, certificate warning, those sorts of things – or apparent validity; that it looks meaningful, it looks like it's a legitimate site. It passes the sniff test, so to speak. And all of those things continue to pass.

Additionally, when we shift to look at the industry, there's a perception that – there are some people who have a negative perception. That's not to say that there isn't any distrust. A lot of that tends to be based off of perception of the general reputation. I've experienced positive things or I've heard positive things; I've experienced negative things or I've heard negative things. But there's also a general perception that you're motivated by – or that the industry is motivated by – self-

interest, and that the industry knows the space and the demands better than anyone else, so that's a reason for me to instill it with some trust. You look at – we just asked people to associate words with the new gTLDs. Overwhelmingly positive associations. There are some negative associations – confusing, extreme – but still, overwhelmingly very strong associations with the positive things. So that isn't suggesting that you're turning people off or causing people to run away by the introduction of new gTLDs.

So those are a few data points, and I think that this is one area where we do have lots of different ways to look at it, because we added a substantial number of questions to the survey, took out questions. If you want to look at – what was it up here – I can't remember what I was reading – I know we took out some questions this year; but they were in the last wave, so we can always go back and look at that data about what causes you to distrust a specific website, or those sorts of things.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, [inaudible].

DAVID: It may have been, as a – yeah. But it wasn't in the registrant survey, where it was last year. And they were similar. But even then, we've got that data available. So that would be my high-level, off-the-cuff sort of thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is Jonathan, for the record. Is there a distinction between what kind of trust we're looking at between end users and registrants? In other words, what they are looking to trust is potentially different between the two of them. Or else, you're just looking at registrants as a different type of end user. Are you looking at them as educated end users, or are you talking to them in their role as registrants? Because in their role as registrants, the things that they care about from a [inaudible] perspective are going to be different. So what makes me trust or not trust a website feels like a less relevant question to be asking a registrant than it does an end user, unless we're just treating registrants as educated end users. If we're treating them as wearing a hat of "registrant," then it feels like a different set of issues.

DAVID:

Or not necessarily totally different, but they would have a unique set of issues that the non-registrants wouldn't care about – as an example, "I trust you to expedite my registration quickly." Those sorts of things. You can frame a lot of specific issues for the registrants, but for the most part, the trust issues are more general. They're about your perception of the gTLDs and your perception of the industry, in general – and that way, we could contrast between the two. With the hypothesis that the registrants might have substantially different viewpoints about the industry – if anything, they tend to be a little bit lower on some measures, a little bit higher on others, but very close.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

This is Lauren. I have a question, and this also may be a question for Jonathan. When [inaudible] question and [inaudible] this is the result of our recent discussion, Dave. Do consumers perceive value in the new innovations? Specifically, I'm wondering how to connect that up to the information we already have. So when you say "new innovation," are you talking about registration restrictions? That's something we have data on. Or are you talking just about the new abundance of new gTLDs, which I see as a choice issue?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I've never considered that to be an innovation. [inaudible] innovation at a lot of ICANN meetings. No, I just [inaudible] tug in the microphone. So, these are high-level questions, at some level, and so sub-questions about them are going to be registration restrictions, or validation mechanisms, etcetera. I don't know what other innovations we've put in place to improve the system, versus mitigate risks. So maybe that's the only one, and I just need to think about that more. But I was trying to come up with a high-level term that would be a basket that would include those, right? So I think that's to be determined what falls into that category. Certainly, I meant the validations, or restricted use. And I partly came up with it because I know it's in the survey, and I know that there's already an answer to that question; so that's partly why I put it in there as part of the sub-question there, because it's something I think people have already expressed some interest in, in the survey. The thing that I keep coming back to is, we keep wanting to throw registrants in there in addition to end users, but registrants are end users. They're a subset. So unless we're looking at unique characteristics of them, then I don't know how, in fact, it's any different.

If we're only looking at end user concerns, then the distinction with registrants and end users is a specious one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, but we do have these two separate buckets of –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Answers.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Which I have to say, confused me when I was looking at it, because at first I thought, "Am I looking at the same survey I was looking at before?" And I think that just reinforces that, conceptually, the points you're making, which is, "Is this really different?" I mean, we've got probably a little bit of different – I don't think the results are that inconsistent from each other. I think that we probably have different numbers because we have different data. It's different people responding, so you're going to have different numbers because you have a different set of people who are responding.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But what it really is, is a characteristic –

LAUREEN KAPIN: But conceptually, I don't think it's different. I agree with you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well what it is, is a characteristic of an end user. That's what it really boils down to. In theory, we could've done one survey and asked people if they had registered a domain name and used that as a [inaudible] to suggest whether or not more active engagement in the system led you to have greater trust, or something like that. But the concerns, themselves, we're talking about are the same. That's what I'm hearing now.

DAVID: Yeah, and it was even more that way last year. That's why we cut some stuff out of the registrant survey and added stuff in, to push it to be more targeted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

DAVID 2: Yeah, but they're not the trust questions, by and large.

FABRO STEIBEL: But if I remember well in terms of awareness, these two behave differently. Registrants were way more aware of the program than end users. So they might be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] end user concerns.

FABRO STEIBEL: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: – is characteristic of that particular type of end users, to make them more aware. That’s all. But it wasn’t – the concern itself is not the specific to the fact that they are registrants; it’s just that that is a coincidental characteristic that leads to greater awareness as end users.

DAVID: It does give us an opportunity – and it’s already on my to-do list – because registrants were more aware of the new gTLDs – they’re leading the curve, which makes sense for who they are – it gives us a larger sub-sample to look at, to see, is there any correlation between awareness and the trust questions? Which does steer us in the direction of potentially identifying some things that could be causal. We can’t prove it, but we can identify potential things. So that’s on my to-do list, and we’ll be coming back to you with a specific take on that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Laureen. Other questions to David, either about the data you’ve encountered in your own efforts in grasping with the discussion papers, or with this list, specifically? Fabro? No? Okay. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: David, I would actually just quickly look at what we've written up as question 3 there, and give your sense of whether or not you have the answers to those questions – and, are there other interesting sub-questions we've left out of question 3, to which we do have the answer?

DAVID: So, 3-sub-A: "What is the level of consumer awareness of these efforts?" We don't really have awareness of restrictions. We have expectations about them, but we don't have – we didn't ask a question, "Are you aware that ICANN enforces restrictions?" or something like that. We didn't ask that type of question. We just asked what they would expect, basically. So, slight difference in what you've got there, versus what we can deliver.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You asked something about things like .bank, though, which was separate from the expectations question.

DAVID: Yeah, it was still – it wasn't phrased in a way of saying, "Are you aware that this is a restriction?" We were asking, what is their expectation about those sorts of restrictions. So slightly different question. I could say, "Boy, I don't have any specific knowledge of what the policies are," but yeah, I expect that they do. So it's a semantic difference, but –

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I see the distinction you're drawing, and I want to draw a different one, if I can – this is Jonathan still – in the one case, you have expectations based on taxonomy, right, which is somewhere in your surveys. And I like the fact that there's now a .photography, because I'll know that there are photographers in it. But separate from that, you also asked about restrictions and whether or not you thought they were a good idea, or would lead to consumer trust, so that's what I meant. The presence of restrictions, not the specifics of them, but – can we be asking whether or not they have awareness that things like .bank are happening, or is it just a flow from a general expectation that the taxonomy is going to lead to restrictions? Is there an awareness among consumers that there are restricted and non-restricted TLDs?

DAVID:

So again, we didn't ask them for awareness. What I can tell you is, they clearly react favorably to the concept of restrictions. And again, they have differing levels of confidence that those are going to be enforced, but we didn't ask them, specifically, "Are you aware of these new efforts?" We've asked them if they're aware of new gTLDs, but not restriction efforts on those. We asked them specifically, should there be restrictions on each specific new gTLD that we tested, but we didn't ask them, "Are you aware that this one is – " We didn't try and test them on their perception of the policy, or presence of the policy.

So I can't definitively answer what the level of awareness is. I can answer the level of perception about the value of those things, and clearly that those things do, if they exist, people feel they improve their sense of trust. We can answer self-reported trust levels, we can answer

that – that has trended over the waves, at least on a few measures, and we’ve seen that – and as I said earlier, what I would say is, definitively you can say you have not eroded confidence or trust. It appears that that has increased. Is it causal? We can’t say for sure. We’re going to do a little more investigation to see if we can put a stronger correlation there.

Do they perceive value in the new innovations? And again here, you’re saying that the new innovations are the restrictions, as opposed to the gTLDs. They clearly perceive value in the new gTLDs, and they would like to see some restrictions.

The other thing – I’m not sure exactly where it fits in here, though, but it relates to the general discussion – is, we’ve asked them, “When there’s bad behavior on the Internet, whose responsibility is it?” And they tend to look at law enforcement and government regulatory-type agencies. It’s their responsibility. ICANN gets mentioned 12% - it’s a low number; don’t quote me on that number, but it’s a low percentage. It’s mostly, though, you look across – it’s overwhelmingly law enforcement regulatory agencies, that’s their job. So that’s who they think has responsibility for that, so it’s easier to maintain a level of trust when you’re not the policeman walking the beat.

I think we’ve talked about all of those. There’s a little bit more work to do to see if we can strengthen the correlations. But if I had to make a wager today – being somebody grounded in statistics, wagers are good things, generally – but if I had to make a wager today, the overall effect of the program has been net positive.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That’s very helpful. So I want to just ask the group, since we clearly will want to tweak this 3A question, because I think previously, it was “Are consumers aware of new gTLDs?” and that morphed into, “Are consumers aware of – ” [CROSSTALK] Right. So I think maybe, as the 3A, “Are consumers aware of the new gTLDs?” and then perhaps have something – I don’t know if we keep this, or we have something a little different. But if we can at least add to this document under 3A, “Are consumers aware of new gTLDs?” – because we have data on that, and I want to keep that – and then think about how we can tweak –

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could be that 3A we just don’t have data for.

DAVID: [inaudible] I was just looking at their open-ended responses. This is a free-form response; so I could say anything I wanted, and then we would categorize it into these codes. But for why the new gTLDs were created, only one in ten said it had something to do with improving credibility, security, safety – the overwhelming responses were to meet demand and to provide new structure. And the structures make it easy to identify the type of business, that sort of thing. 22% said they didn’t know. So that is a suggestion – and this is among the registrants. That’s not a bad number, but there’s room for improvement.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Other questions for David, or comments on our list of questions?

The other David – our own David, now.

DAVID TAYLOR: This is the other David – David Taylor. I’m just looking at there, where we’ve got 3A 1 and 2, where you’ve split up “end user” and “registrant.” Can we not –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, but actually, I kind of prefer the way it’s done B – has “consumer” in brackets and then user, registrants. Because you look at the 1, 2 and start comparing it with the 1, 2 beneath. And there the confusion starts. So I think, what is the level of consumer, and put them in there. A suggestion, anyway.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Mm-hmm.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Jonathan, I have a problem separating restrictions as opposed to safeguards and [inaudible]. My question is, instead of “restrictions,” when we talk about consumers, can we use a positive word like “validation,” or “segmentation,” or something, and leave the restrictive ones? Is that right? Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I'm trying to make a distinction between things we're doing proactively that are new - .bank is the example that I'm using, where I've come up with this idea to make a safe space for people that do their online banking. To me, that's an innovation to improve trust, as opposed to some sort of risk mitigation factor, that was designed just to prevent the erosion of trust.

DAVID: And if I may comment on that, I just – if we had said to them, “What do you think about the creation of a gTLD specifically designed to create a safe space for online banking called .bank, and it would have these characteristics?” That's a much more detailed and specific question. I would be willing to bet my bottom dollar that that would have had even higher levels of acceptance. But we didn't pitch ideas to them; we just kind of said, what's your expectation? But everything I know about what people worry about on the Internet, something like that would have a high –

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that raises the other question, which I keep referring to as the David Taylor question, which is – expectation is, again, a different issue. Have we created an expectation of validation that goes beyond where we will actually be doing validation? And I guess your data suggested that perhaps we have. That they think the Internet will fall into this taxonomy that's being created.

DAVID: Yes, I think it's fair to say that they have an expectation that things will align with the structure that's implied. That's why they like it, and that's why they think it was created. Whether you've created the expectation, or that's something that's just come about, is not something I can specifically answer. Well, you can say whether you've created it or not. Whether customers perceive that you've created it, versus it's just the way things are, is different. There isn't, however – again, going back to those open-ended questions – there are some people who say, "They're not trustworthy. They don't do background checks. They don't do anything like that." But that's only 5% of the responses. There's no indication that there's an overwhelming perception that somebody's asleep at the switch.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Fabro, and then we're going to move on to our break time.

FABRO STEIBEL: Just a quick comment [inaudible] overall DNS. [inaudible] so A [inaudible]. Maybe B should [inaudible]. And then, we should have section C about [inaudible] question [inaudible]. So the question would be, "Do you [inaudible] has improved?" and maybe the first two questions about just the program, and not about the DNS as a whole. The 3B – only way to say it – is about the program. And the fourth one should be C. It makes sense.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

FABRO STEIBEL: The program.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible] consumer trust [inaudible]

FABRO STEIBEL: [inaudible] improved.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan, for the record. These will probably get refined as they're filled out, but I think the idea here was that as they were introduced to these concepts of restrictions, there was some guarded optimism about their value in consumer trust, right? And that trust was not in the program, but in the DNS. So that's the point. There was a belief that their trust in the DNS would be improved by these programmatic elements. But it's not about trust in the program; it's still trust in the DNS. So – this structure may go away, because each of these things can have its own sub-questions. These are still high-level questions, that underneath them, they could have greater specificity – individual [inaudible], individual restrictions, etcetera, that might feed into these.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So then, would C go away? I just want to make sure that what we're looking at is –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, the purpose of C, or what was B before, and it could be either way; I don't know that it matters – but to actually get back to the number that they had, which is, we have a baseline as a new number of overall perceived trust in the DNS. And we wanted to reflect that number. In other words, has any of this rolled up in such a way that the overall trust in the DNS has improved or decreased? And what we find is that it certainly hasn't decreased, and maybe has improved a little bit.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So what's the difference between B and C? I'm sorry, I'm just trying to get my brain around it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, the idea behind B was to try and get at some hopes associated with the initiatives that were listed above. In other words, there are some questions that suggest that these initiatives will have an impact on consumer trust – right? – that yeah, if you do this, I'll trust the Internet more. And C is about that baseline number, about whether or not trust itself has improved. So one was about getting at why trust might improve, and the other is, did it? They're both perception questions, but one is broader.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I understand how you explained it, but I don't see that reflected in the questions, themselves. To Joe or Jane Reader – to me, those questions look very similar. Your explanation makes sense, but it's not reflected in the questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I mean, one is more specific, and the other is more general. That's one way to put it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: "Has consumer trust in the DNS improved?" "Has consumer trust in the DNS improved overall since the introduction of new gTLDs?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: Overall. Which is the number that we have. That's why we're asking it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think the problem – in my mind, anyway – is with B. That that [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are specific things that we looked at. Do consumers – because those are individual questions we asked, these are somewhat circular. We asked, "Will these restrictions make you feel better about the Internet?" yes; but as we took a step back and said, "Do you feel better overall?" we have that as a separate number, that's all. So they're similar in a way, but these are more specific questions – "Do you think

validations will improve your trust in the Internet?” And the answer is “yes,” but also with the caveat that “I’m not sure they’ll be enforced.” So it’s a different kind of discussion about some of these efforts at trustworthiness and what we think the impact on trust will be from them. And the other is, “As of today, has trust improved since the baseline?”

DAVID: And if I may, to make sure I’m clear in my survey terms – B is about those questions that we’re asking them about specific gTLDs or gTLDs as a category. C is about those questions about the domain name industry, overall. Am I – ?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

DAVID: Yeah. Okay.

FABRO STEIBEL: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead, Fabro.

FABRO STEIBEL: My rationale was that the B has consumer trust in what we do, or what we did, or what we're measuring. Has consumer trust in the gTLD program. Because the three questions are about the program. And then, C –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so maybe can refine that, then, to "the gTLD program." That, to me, would be more precise.

FABRO STEIBEL: So, we introduce innovations. Do they trust it? Maybe [inaudible] we ask. We introduce risk mitigation initiatives. Do they trust it? We introduce innovation. Do they – well, I'm just looking at 3B. If they have [inaudible] implementation on how we did it, yes or no. But that would be insufficient, unless we ask question 3C, if they trust the overall DNS system.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great time. Thanks for your patience. Thanks for a really focused, useful discussion. So, it's five of four; so let's come back here in – we're next door.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh. I was all ready to continue this! We got some momentum going. Okay. So, when do we come back next door?

JONATHAN ZUCK: In fifteen minutes, I guess. Five minutes? Or we're just making [inaudible]. Let's be realistic. We tell them five; it's not going to be five.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so try and get back next door after you've had a – as soon as possible.

[CROSSTALK]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]