
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Pamela.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi Pamela, it's Margie.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [Inaudible]

PAMELA SMITH: Bonjour Jean-Baptiste. Good morning everybody else. Sorry, it took me a moment to unmute. What do you say in the afternoon? What is the greeting?

JEAN—BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Bonjour is fine. Perfect.

PAMELA SMITH: Bonjour and something.

MARGIE MILAM: We're having a nice day here in Brussels.

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.

PAMELA SMITH: That sounds wonderful. Margie, did Mark finally catch up with you?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes he did. He showed up on Sunday. So we had some time, and he's here in Brussels. So all is well.

PAMELA SMITH: He got to see [inaudible]...

MARGIE MILAM: He did. He was so happy. They actually have Game of Thrones tours, and so we didn't pay for one, but we followed around a lady who was talking about all of the different scenes they filmed everywhere.

PAMELA SMITH: Very nice. I'm sure he was thrilled beyond all possible comprehension.

MARGIE MILAM: He was. He was pretty happy. I posted pictures on Facebook and all of his friends were jealous.

PAMELA SMITH: Oh gosh. Wow.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Carlos [inaudible], hello Carlos.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Margie, I am hearing you just fine, but do you want me to enable your mic...

MARGIE MILAM: No, no. I mean, I'll raise my hand if I want to say something. But we're on a phone bridge in the Brussels office, so.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Perfect.

And the cat says good morning. [Inaudible]

She's either 16 or 17 years old, and she's blind now. And so when she cries out, she's sounding so she doesn't run into things. And she does sound grumpy. She's always been grumpy. That's her way, but that's okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good morning.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning Laureen.

MULTIPLE PEOPLE: Hi Lauren.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hello one and all. I don't, I guess I don't need a mic pan, because I have my screen on, but I'm talking through the phone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. All right. I just know occasionally we have, there are phone issues though. I'll disable it, and if we need it again, then we'll re-enable it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect.

ALICE JANSEN: Lauren, this is Alice. Drew will be 10 minutes late into the call, just so that you know.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

ALICE JANSEN: He'll be joining though.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good. And I've got a note from David Taylor, who is a maybe.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

PAMELA SMITH: Also, Laureen, I already have the recording queued, so just let me know when you want me to un-pause it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Thank you, thank you Pam.

Does anyone know how Antonietta is doing? If her leg is doing better?

[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: She's doing better. She's resting.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good.

David, I see you've joined. I'm giving you a special welcome because I know you're just traveling and now it's very, very early in the morning for you. So thank you.

So will give a few more minutes for folks to join, and then we'll get started.

So I see there is a name that I don't know, which is Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. Is that an observer or is that a staff person? I'm just...

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Laureen, this is Alice. Jean-Baptiste started with us yesterday. So he is our new [inaudible] recruit, and will be helping on the CCT project. So Jean-Baptiste, do you want to say a few words?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure. Hello, good afternoon. I'm Jean-Baptiste. It's okay if you can't pronounce my name. It's always an issue. [Inaudible] I'm really [inaudible] join the ICANN family yesterday, and I'll do my best to help the team

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's great. Welcome aboard, Jean-Baptiste. Maybe you can pronounce your last name for me so that I know the right way to pronounce it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, it's Deroulez.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Deroulez.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's not bad...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, that's really good. [LAUGHTER]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hopefully I will not massacre it too much.

Great, welcome Calvin, and Carl, and Carlos, who I know is also traveling.

Looks like Carlos is having some sound problems.

Okay, we'll give it one more minute.

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi everybody. David here. I made it onto voice.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Okay. Well that is...

DAVID TAYLOR: I was just trying to avoid using my French mobile from America, because even a dial back, I think, I got the bill, about \$80, or \$100 for the call. I just need to figure out how to dial in and speak without going via the telecoms and paying French and US charges. [Inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think there is a way to do it via your computer. But [CROSSTALK]...

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm in the computer, but I can't, yeah. I've got my, I've got my voice on the speaker, but it's not...

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's not working that well. Maybe connect with... Who would be the best person for David to connect with regarding these technical issues so that it's easier for him to join without undue expense? Would that be Pam?

PAMELA SMITH: Yes. If you could send an email to Brenda and Pam.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So David, connect with Brenda and Pam, because we should be able to figure out a way for you to do that, without making it more difficult or expensive.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah. I'm just trying to figure out just... I'm on Adobe, so I'm fine, both green, the microphone and the sound is green, but I don't know why I can't speak. It doesn't give me an option to speak via Adobe, only connector. It says, do you want to be dialed back or do you want to dial

in? But you can't have an option, you just want to go via Adobe. Pamela is helping me here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Brenda and Pam will walk you through it. Okay.

DAVID TAYLOR: I'll give you the hotel number and then they'll call me back. That would be good. Carry on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We can start the tape, Pam.

Okay. So first of all, thanks everyone the very productive session in Vienna. I thought we made a lot of progress both to organizing our discussion paper topics and something that is more of a narrative, or more supportive of a narrative, a logical narrative, and also making sure that our topics and sub-questions, really fit squarely within our mandate.

And following the meeting, I have taking a stab with the document on the screen, which I think we all have an independent scroll rights to. To thinking about where our current discussion papers fit within those topics. So I thought that we could spend the first part of our call making sure we know where things fit in, and also making sure that, if there is additional gaps that need to be filled in regarding this new organization that we're aware of, who is going to be doing what.

So I thought we can start off that way. And what I did is, it struck me that the teams of three were not working especially well, although folks could jump in if they disagree with my observation. But it struck me that the teams of three were not working especially well in that people were finding it challenging to communicate with each other.

And I thought that one way we could address that is to pair up instead of having teams of three. So I took a stab at trying to do that, based on the existing work that's already been done. I'm not wanting to have people not be attached to the work they've already done.

So maybe if folks could scroll down, I thought we could have a discussion, at least with the people who are on the call, I know we have some people who are absent, but for the people who are on the call, a discussion of where existing work fits in within this narrative. So if folks scroll down to page four, you'll see that there is a refined discussion paper topic.

This reflects the work we did in Vienna, and then I expanded on it a little bit to start to incorporate our existing discussion paper topics.

So on page four, hopefully everyone is there... Okay, good. Carlton, I see you've joined us, welcome. Welcome temporary, at least. So, you'll see on page, we're on page four of the paper on the screen. You'll see our first topic is, has the new gTLD program put mechanisms to improve trustworthiness in the DNS.

And this really draws from elements of almost all of our discussion papers. So, what I envision, ultimately, is that everyone's discussion paper that introduces these mechanisms, so that would be technical

safeguards, GAC safeguards, and voluntary public interest commitments, as well as rights protection mechanisms, I see those papers including some sort of background description of what it is we're talking about, i.e. what are the technical safeguards? What are the GAC safeguards?

What are the rights protection mechanisms? And I think a lot, I think most of that work actually has already been done, but I just flagged that so to the extent your discussion paper doesn't include sort of a description, a foundation for the issues discussed, you should include that.

That actually should be one of the easier things to include. So in terms of responsibilities, Calvin has taken on the technical safeguards. I've taken on the safeguards applicable to all gTLDs and sensitive highly regulated gTLDs. And we haven't... Although we flagged the voluntary public interest commitments as an issue, we haven't developed that in detail yet.

And that's going to be the subject of an updated request that I think the sub-team is going to work on, perhaps with the assistance of staff, regarding the voluntary picks. Jamie isn't on the call, but I have volunteered him to work with me on the voluntary public interest commitment.

And Antonietta, where are we on including the voluntary public interest commitments on our chart?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Hi Laureen. So I'm working on that, and I should come back to you by tomorrow.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, that's terrific. That's terrific. I think that will... Once we have that chart, I think that will help us formulate the industry topics that we want to delve into to try and chat with people about the public interest commitments, and then also at a first level, it will help us identify who we may need to chat with in terms of the public interest commitments themselves.

Do you have a sense, Antonietta, now of how many different registries included voluntary public interest commitments?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: So, I have... Not much has changed on the part I've been working on. I've included the top 30 registries that included the voluntary public interest commitments, and with regard to the ones that were category one safeguards, all of those that were dedicated included the [inaudible] commitments, the voluntary ones.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So in terms of that chart, we're just doing the top 30. We're not doing a comprehensive?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Correct. As far as I know.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have a sense, though, if we were to try and capture all of the public interest commitments, what the volume would be of that?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Yes. They're about 500.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh okay. So they're quite a number. Okay, so the top

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Correct. As far as I know.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have a sense, though, if we were to try and capture all of the public interest commitments, what the volume would be of that?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Yes. They're about 500.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh okay. So they're quite a number. Okay, so the top 30 seems like a sensible way to go. Okay. So that's good that we'll have that tomorrow. In terms of rights protection mechanisms, David you had taken the lead on that, and I know Carlton had also done some existing

work on that, which is why I've paired you up for the background description.

Because I know Carlton had actually done a draft discussion paper that included a lot of information on that. So in terms of refining, incorporating that, I thought it would be good for you both to get together to make sure that Carlton's existing work describing those mechanisms, that that's something, David, you can review and incorporate into your discussion paper. Does that make sense?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yup, that makes perfect sense. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Great. So I think in terms of the... In terms of question one, I think actually it's pretty clear how our discussion papers fit in. For discussion paper two, I'm sorry, for topic two, that's when things get a little more interwoven. So for our topic two, we had how is the new gTLD program put sufficient mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the trustworthiness of the DNS?

So our first topic there would be, have the safeguards and right protection mechanisms been fully implemented? So that's going to divide up into two topics: safeguards and again, Calvin and I have taken the lead on the implementation issues regarding safeguards, dividing up into GAC safeguards and technical safeguards.

And David has taken the lead on the rights protection mechanisms, and I know Carlton was also interested in that. So, and I know also that

basically we don't have much data for that yet. So, what I would ask David and Carlton to do, is... And what I would like the group to do, actually, if we have time, at the end of this call, is to take a look at David's questions that have been identified, that we didn't get a chance to go through in Vienna, and make sure that those fit within our mandate, and also if we have any comments or questions.

So once we get through with this, I think we will turn to David's sub-questions, which are also in this document. Actually they should... Yeah, which are also at the end of this document, so we can take a look at that. And then, after we have implementation, we go to, which is the process, we go to compliance.

Fabro, who is not on the call, has a discussion paper in progress on whether there has been compliance with the safeguards. And this, I believe, this is very ICANN compliance focused in terms of data. So this is going to be one of the issues that needs to be identified as something to work on with staff to communicate with ICANN compliance, to get the information that's needed there.

With the rights protection mechanisms, David, I know you're going to be expecting data from [inaudible], in that study. And David and Carlton, are there any other data sources that you think that you can turn to within ICANN or someplace else, where you think you're going to need data about compliance with the rights protection mechanisms?

I think we had started to touch a little bit on that in Vienna, but I wanted to flesh that out a little bit.

DAVID TAYLOR: David here. Yeah, and I do. The question is, I don't know whether compliance has got data on whether any registries haven't implemented a clearinghouse or the URS or any complaints about any of them not being able to use it or something like that. I'm not aware of any data, there could well be some data.

But [inaudible] actually been looking at that or whether it has been reported.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So could we put that as an action [CROSSTALK]? Yeah. Could we put that as an action item for staff to identify whether there is ICANN compliance data on rights protection mechanisms? And to communicate with David about that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Lauren, this is Eleeza. We need something a little bit more specific than that. There is data on rights protection mechanisms, and we report on our CCT metrics page, complaints about UDRPs, and URSs that are made to ICANN. I'm just wondering, what else specifically would you be interested in?

Because some broad topics like that, it's really difficult for the team to nail down on what you're interested in.

LAUREEN KAPIN; Well, staff...

DAVID TAYLOR: Eleeza...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Go ahead David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry. I was just going to say... Yeah, thanks. I was going to say, obviously there is data about the number of URS complaints that have been filed, etc. That we can find, but I was thinking more, is the data, whether the URS has failed, or people have complained about it to ICANN, or it hasn't been...

I don't know whether there is that sort of data anywhere.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We do have that. We have that published on the stage, I'll point as a chat right now. We have the number of complaints about UDRP and your decisions that are made to ICANN.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And Eleeza, is it possible also to... And you may have done this already, but if we don't have this on our Wiki page in terms of data that relates to the rights protection mechanisms, can we put it there? Can we put a

link there so that when David is looking at the data sources, he knows that that's an easy place to find it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Absolutely. I'm pretty sure it's there, but we'll double check.
[CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine, that's fine. I just want to make sure that it's clear where everything is living.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And I just put in a second link that's all of the data that we have on some compliance that we're tracking for the recommended CCT metrics, so hopefully that will be useful to you as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's great.

DAVID TAYLOR: That is great, Eleeza. I'm just looking at the data there, which you've posted in the, for instance, on the page 1.9 B combined UDRP and USR complaints to ICANN. So for instance, I see that there is 19 URS complaints to ICANN in 2014, and 27 URS complaints to ICANN in 2015. How do we find out what those are? What were they complaining about?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, I'm not sure that we can work on the specifics of the complaints themselves, the individual complaints. I'm fairly certain I can't share that. I can double check on that.

[CROSSTALK]

DAVID TAYLOR: ...what we do with that data?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I'm wondering, Eleeza, I realize that you can't reveal identities, but maybe we could find out what would be most useful for David in terms of what can be revealed. So even if it's not identity, if there is a general subject matter of the complaint, that still might be useful to know. I'm not well versed enough in what types of disputes typically come up in these proceedings, but I would speculate that it might fall within three or four typical buckets, then it might be useful for David to know the number of complaints that fell into which particular bucket, what type of information do you think would be useful to know, David?

Realizing that confidentiality....

DAVID TAYLOR: Right. Yeah. Obviously, the data would consider the number of complaints filed, got that absolutely fine, because we know what's filed and what's replied to, etc. and then we've got decisions at the end of it.

But I suppose for me those, and I'm picking those a little bit at random going in now, where we see the URS complaints. So somebody has complained about the URS to ICANN, so it's really what's the complaint?

Are they saying, it doesn't work, it's too fast, it's too slow. Is it an attempt at appeal? Saying I've been, you know, a bad decision against me, and I want to appeal to you, ICANN? Is that counted as a complaint to ICANN? Because that, to me, give us some sort of an idea of the issues which it might have, which have been raised with ICANN, so I think it's quite pertinent to have that.

Obviously, no name basis, but it still that's the sort of data which I think would be good to get out.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I can certainly ask about that and I can get back to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah. That, I think, would be useful because it seems to me that it would be a generic way to get that information out, that would put some meat on the bones of any analysis and recommendations we make. And that sort of thing, knowing how many people complained, that it was too slow, or how many people complained that it didn't work.

That doesn't strike me as something that would infringe on confidentiality. That is sort of generic to me. So if you and David can work through the best way to get that information, that would be great.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good. Okay. So again, we're at the, have the new gTLD operators complied with safeguards and rights protection mechanisms. I think that Eleeza, Fabro is going to probably to want to have a discussion with compliance about information he may need, or he also just may need some guidance on where this information lives. So can I make it an action item, Eleeza, for you to connect with Fabro to make sure he knows where the information is, and to chat with him about whether there is anything further that he needs?

I just want to make sure that he is aware of the data source for a lot of this information, and that if there are additional information needs that he has, that we can develop those as soon as possible.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. Okay.

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew. I just wanted to chime in real quick. I sent Fabro an email when we were in Vienna, that hopefully will give him a little insight into that because it was from a request I put in much earlier in the summer,

maybe in June or something. And so, there is at least some responses. I think Brian ultimately had me kind of hunt down some of the answers and we've been getting replies.

But there is some information in there about which statistic may exist and not exist, so I did some of that last week. So have a little start for that conversation with you, Eleeza, you and Fabro.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And maybe you can forward that to Eleeza also, just so she has a common starting point, so to speak.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I'll do that right now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect. Can we help...? Is there any help we can give to Gao so that she's not having trouble hearing us? I don't know if that's a technical issue or not, but I see her comment in the chat.

Okay. And also, okay. So, then we move into the topic that, then we move into Drew's topic, the impact of the new safeguards on DNS abuse. And I know Calvin has also focused on the technical safeguards. And Calvin, jump in any time if you have any questions or comments.

So, I think the big issue here, Drew, is going to be making sure we can move forward with getting the information we need. Do you have any updates that you want to give? I know a lot of time hasn't gone by since

the Vienna, but now would be the time just to give us a sense, give the group a sense of where our plan is to move forward.

DREW BAGLEY:

My top priority right now, when I started working on last week, that I'm not going to share, is trying to come up with a definition of DNS abuse for purposes of this review, but then also figure out how to incorporate some of these other topics that might not fall into the definition of DNS abuse, because I want to say the definition of DNS abuse into something that is quantifiable and being measurable for the purposes of our study, but then there is so many of the other things that we've talked about in terms of brand infringement and what not, that I think Carlos will bring it up, but I want to make sure that we're covering those topics too, even if we're coming up with maybe, I don't know, two separate definitions or something.

So to that, I think step one is defining it. And then a lot of this. A lot of the data for this question will come from that abuse study, we were seeing correlation, and then you can start looking at the correlation between safeguards, and registries, and abuse. And so, I guess prior to that, I don't know if, Eleeza, you might be able to chime in, if there is any other data you can think of that might be interesting for me that I may have forgotten about.

From ICANN, on this topic.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: On the abuse topic, I think you've covered everything [inaudible], you know, you need to have it all covered by whatever comes out of this RFP.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Then Calvin, yeah, what are your thoughts on this?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, I'm... My thoughts are, that we need to confront us into the ecosystem of which we're on topic, and that's the registry, registrar environment, rather than the whole internet environment. So mainly, I guess what I'm saying is, we want to look at these fine registrants, registrars, and registries rather than just general DNS abuse, because [inaudible] DNS abuse, then we are heading down a slippery slope, I think.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. Very good point. I'll try to [CROSSTALK] this week.

CLAVIN BROWNE: Yeah, so my thinking is if you better write something up and having, you know, keeping it to registrants, registries, and registrars, because I mean, that's really what [inaudible], I think.

DREW BAGLEY: I agree. I think that's a great point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And just to tie this to the request for proposals that I know is going to be reconfigured a little bit, but in terms of the data we're seeking to get with the zone files, does that focus on the players, Drew, that Calvin is identifying, i.e., is that going to tell you about abuse at the registry, registrar, and registrant level?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. That will. And then the outstanding question will be then, or just another factor that I'm hoping that the vendor will identify, and we'll know more as we go forward, will be also that the reseller factor, just because hopefully our data will be indicative of all of these things, but then there could be the potential that, you know, there is a bunch of Visa domains, and resellers are actually in charge of registering the registrants.

Those are domain names, and so we would need that reflected in our analysis, even if we're not going to, you know, say much more than that about the resellers. Just probably want to be able to have these analytically separate that from the registrars in certain situations, otherwise we'd be, I guess, giving, putting everything under the umbrella of a registrar.

But yes, we could [inaudible] everything to that, and so then the question would be, you know, which types of abuse data the vendor can get a hold of? Is it going to be phishing sites, bot nets? What's that going to be? So that's where defining the scope in advance will be helpful for that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, just to make sure I have my brain around this. What I hear you saying is that resellers is also a separate but related category, but I'm not clear whether that is something you'll be able to get data on.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. So, it's definitely technically possible in terms of, once we better understand the vendor, they should be able to do that. And that is something in the RFP. But just in terms of talking about this framework we're looking at registries, registrars, and registrants. That would be another R word that would fit into that that would also be tied to a bunch of these registrations.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And that would fall in the registrar bucket? So it would be a sub-bucket, so to speak?

DREW BAGLEY: It would be a sub-bucket of that, and so the resellers have no direct contractual relationship with ICANN, but they would have a relationship with the registrars. And so that would be just be definitely a dynamic that would be important enough for us to, of each reference as we're looking at the data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Calvin, I think I cut you off. Go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, no that's fine. Sorry, I, just, you know, a step on the resellers as well, because if they can be looked at, they should be looked at.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So I think for your purposes, Calvin and Drew, since a lot of the data that you're looking at isn't going to be ready by Hyderabad, what I would also encourage you both to look at, is to make sure that you've looked at what's available on the ICANN compliance data that does exist. Because I know that there are, there is data there that you can use for some finding that relate to your questions in terms of the number of complaints, the complaint categories.

So I just want to make sure that even though you don't have what is probably going to be your most crucial body of data that you are looking at the ICANN compliance data that exists now, because you can certainly use that as some pertinent findings, because at the very least, you'll have certain complaint categories.

And similar to the discussion that Eleeza is having with ICANN compliance and David, if you both, after looking at the ICANN compliance data, feel it would be useful to have any further information, realizing the confidentiality issues, you'll probably only will be able to get generic information, but if you have a need for further information, we are wanting to get that identified no later than next week on the 14th.

So, what I would encourage you to do is look at the ICANN compliance data now, so that if you need to formulate any other requests, that's done as soon as possible. Does that make sense?

DAVID TAYLOR: That makes sense, definitely. I'll look at that.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And Calvin, does that make sense to you also, for the technical safeguards. I know actually there is data on that in ICANN compliance about complaints regarding some of those safeguards.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. Certainly makes sense to me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So again, if you're having trouble figuring out where this information is, please reach out to Eleeza, who is our valued and indispensable guide here. And I know Antonietta is also working on these issues.

Okay, so I see that David has to drop off shortly. So should we take a little bit of a detour then, to look at David's rights protection mechanisms questions? Those [CROSSTALK]...

How much longer...? So we have you for 15 more minutes, David?

DAVID TAYLOR: You've got me for about two minutes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

DAVID TAYLOR: I mean, I'll start sweating, because I've got to be somewhere else, but I could probably hang on for about four minutes after that, but go on.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Let's take a quick look at page 10. Page 10 and 11 are the questions that David has identified as his questions that relate to the lead topics, should the RPMs mitigate the risks involved with the expansion of the gTLD program? And that's including whether the dispute resolution processes reduced trademark infringement. So let's just take a quick look at this, and now is the time for feedback for David. And I'll open this up to the group.

And Calvin, I see you have a hand up. I don't know. Is that a present hand or an old hand?

CALVIN BROWNE: That's an old hand. I'll take it down now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

I'm wondering, David, on 6H, what other enforcement measures were taken. Is that the source of data that you would expect to find through your [inaudible] work, through your [inaudible] study work?

I'm wondering...

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, absolutely. It's something which we hoped to get in the [inter?] study, certainly to see what else people are doing. And then it's not something that is centrally located, because when you look at an UDRP, being far and wide doesn't ask the number of UDRPs that are appealed. So they don't actually know unless they've been given notification of an appeal.

So some of these things do go off and things do progress, so it's actually trying to get that sort of data which is going to be anecdotal to a large extent, because the ITA is going to be sort of asking all the members, have you done this? And how many times have you done this? So we have hoped some day on that. But it's hard to get it precise, I think.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And it's the same thing true for I, that your [inter] study would hope to get an answer to that specific question about increased enforcement costs? Or the potential for increased enforcement costs?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah. That's a specific question in there to try and get the brand owners to come out with that. So yeah.

And that, so you've got a question there, question J, what type of abuse is prevalent? That is something again which is a question in there. So they're being asked that, but it's interested in touching of other areas of ours, but whether the brand owners are looking and seeing those sort of things as well for the brands.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And is the [inaudible]... What does that stand for? You're not talking about the [picture?], you're talking about something else.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, that's the potentially the trademark PDPRP which hasn't been used. So that should be an easy answer.

LAUREEN KAPIN: There you go. So is it fair to say...

DAVID TAYLOR: I was going to let you know, I have some good feedback from Jamie on this, because he was querying whether, what if anything, should be changed? And the questions I put in there, moving more into the implementation of something we shouldn't necessary be looking at, which I'd agree with him on that. It's not for [inaudible] saying what should be changed, but it is more of me trying to get some of these questions out, as well trying to get...

You know, if we get suggestions in from various sources, we can at least report on these are suggestions being made, as opposed to what's coming through and suggesting what should be changed.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And yeah. I think that's an excellent comment to take that as feedback. But not... Yeah. I think that's the right balance. That it's useful information to gather, and then that may go into a recommendation, but yeah, I agree with Jamie's comment.

Okay. And I see that this is mostly focused on trademark, which is, I assume, the focus on the rights protection mechanism. Was there anything on any other types of IP protections in these rights protection mechanisms? For instance...

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, the copyright. Well, that's one of the questions which I think I was raised at Vienna, as to how far we go, and how we look at it. Because I mean, copyrighting goes into content. That is quite a bit of discussion as to whether or not that should be included.

And obviously, we've heard Steve Crocker and others say that, it's outside of the remit of ICANN. But essentially, we trademark disputes, the trademark going out is all trademark focus. So I think probably having to stick with that, but we'll try and raise it in some sort of question, hopefully in the NITA one at least.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. And I guess for looking down the road, we probably want to anticipate saying why we do... If we determine that copyright is outside scope, because it has been such a heated issue from time to time, we probably want to be able to have thought through how we, what the thinking is for it being out of scope, other than Steve Crocker saying it's out of scope.

We probably... We want to have a logical reasoned position for whatever conclusion we reach about it being in or out of scope. So I put that to you as someone who has thought about these issues, that we need a placeholder for that.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, we'll cover that, yeah, yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN; Okay. Well, I know that you have to go, David. What I'm going to ask people is that, if they have any other feedback for David on these questions, to please communicate directly with him by email. And if anyone has any questions or comments now, now is the time, the voice you can give them, although I'm not seeing any hands. Anyone?

Okay. So David, thanks for joining us.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Thanks. Just one thing before I do run. I pinged an item around trust in the domain name system by email to everybody, which I thought was a research paper. It's by the IDSG. So I've circulated that on Friday. [CROSSTALK] data in it, if you do look at it from the 7th of March this year, and apparently they surveyed some 10,000 people.

So it's trust in the internet, so it's right up our street. So I was quite pleased spotting that. But that was one of my questions, whether or not we shouldn't be considering doing something similar or follow-up to that, and I wondered whether the 14th of September deadline is something we should be looking at for that, or whether we should reach out to the IDS research to see if they're going to do another one, because it sounds like it's a useful paper.

But I mean, have a look at it. I don't know if anybody has had a chance to look at it and see whether the findings are helpful to us, but it seemed quite good to me.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That sounds good. So we have a group... That actually is a great segue to getting back to our list, because there are several of us who are focused on the trust issues. So I will make that an action item for us. Thanks for reminding us.

So let's scroll back, thanks David. Let's scroll back to, we were on page five. We had just finished with [inaudible] as the new rights protection mechanisms to mitigate the risks.

Now for subtopic three, have these efforts had an impact on public perception of the DNS? Carlton and Gao were focused on awareness. So, to the extent that there needs to be any further refinements on the discussion paper on awareness, which I know Carlton has submitted, and I'm not sure to what extent Gao had a chance to provide feedback on that.

But Carlton and Gao, you should be working together for that topic. For the express trust in the new gTLD program, I will work with Carlos on that topic, and I'm going to look at this paper, and Carlos, perhaps you can look at the paper also so that we can schedule a time to chat with that.

And maybe under the action item that you just focused on, Alice, can you add, as an action item, Lauren and Carlos to discuss? You can put it under the prior action item, because it's all related to that trust in the domain name system paper. But Carlos, you and I, perhaps, can set up a time to discuss that, and see if there is any follow-up that might be useful regarding that.

The validation issues, I thought that Fabro and I can focus on that, and I think that will also connect with the voluntary picks. But I think the data for that is going to be in the Neilson studies, and it's something that I need to pluck out and add to my discussion paper. Maybe we can add that as an action item, Alice, just for my organization, for LK and Fabro to focus on perceive the value in the new innovations.

And I would put in parenthesis, validation and registration restrictions.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Lauren. Could you repeat that for me please?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Lauren and Fabro to add to consumer trust discussion paper, perceived value. And I would just do colon, add consumer trust paper, colon, perceived value in new innovations, e.g., registration restrictions, validation. And then I would add voluntary picks.

And Drew, I thought you and I can focus, and again, this is on the same discussion paper, whether consumers perceive value in the risk mitigation initiative that we can discuss that. And again, I think the Neilson study, and perhaps this new discussion paper may have data on that.

I think that's the other side of all of the work that you're doing, after collecting the data, is to see whether the objective data matches the subjective assessment by the public.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I agree. That sounds good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And then, Gao, I thought that you can be, since you're looking at the Neilson survey data already, that you can also look to see if there is data on this issue of confidence in implementation of the innovations and initiatives. I think this is really looking at the Neilson survey, confidence in the implementation of the innovations and initiatives.

So this is just a very isolated sub-question, but what will be good is to develop findings on that. And that can be added to the discussion paper that I've already drafted. This is just a separate sub-question, but you can add the sub-question and the findings. And once you have something in place, we could then put that into the existing consumer trust discussion paper that I have, that is already on the Wiki that I've developed.

RECORDED VOICE: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support, and will rejoin soon.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Can everyone still hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good.

Okay. Gao, so you and I can connect on that. Maybe we can setup, maybe as an action item, you and I can connect on how to assess and incorporate that.

And then finally, thought that Gao and Jamie can address this big picture topic about consumer trust in the DNS overall. And I believe

that there is data on that in the Neilson study, and perhaps this other survey that David has circulated.

And could we add, as an action item, for Jamie and I to connect to make sure he understands what I'm asking him to work on?

So, these are my thoughts on how we go forward. But I'm very open to questions, comments, especially if people feel that they've been placed in something that doesn't build on their prior work. I really tried to make sure that I've placed people on issues they've already worked on, and issues that they've expressed interest on. But I am not perfect. I'm flawed like everyone else, so if I've gotten it wrong, or there is something that you want to be working on that you're not, now would be the time to chime in and let me know.

So that we can make sure that these people know exactly what they need to do going forward. Any questions or comments?

Okay. I see that Alice has the question, well [inaudible] being using Google Docs as a basis or they will exchange documents using traditional email? For folks working with me, I need you to use traditional email because I don't have access to Google. I cannot access Google Docs easily at work.

I also have to change locations and go to the computer that is someplace else and away from everything that I normally work with. So it's not easy for me. So I will ask people to, for me, to use traditional email.

For everything else, I think it's okay to use the Google Docs, but I think you need to make sure you communicate with your partners about what you're doing, so that you're not duplicating efforts, or creating unexpected confusion.

So, I'll ask people to communicate clearly with their partners. It's my hope that by streamlining the number of people you have to work with for finalizing these discussion papers, that that makes things easier. Does this seem like a sensible way to proceed? To have streamlined these groups to pairs rather than larger groups?

Thoughts, comments, agreements, disagreements?

DREW BAGLEY:

This is Drew. Yeah, I think this should work out well. So that then there are two people, they know who the other one is, and what they're depending on each other to get work done.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That is my intent, that this should streamline it, and let people communicate and depend on each other, and put each other on the spot if need be. Okay.

So, what I want to do now is make sure that people have the opportunity to ask any questions they may have about this. I see Carlos, we don't work on the master documents for the time being. I'm not sure I know what you mean by master documents.

If you mean master documents, i.e. whatever document we're going to be producing for the public in Hyderabad, yes. You're correct. We are not working on that right now. What we are working on is the building blocks for that document which are the discussion papers.

So, okay, good. I just wanted to make sure that I understood your question, and now it looks like I've understood and answered it. So yes. Other questions or comments?

So I think what I want to emphasize to folks, is that as I understand from Jonathan's comment, decide these questions, I think a lot of the focus in Hyderabad is going to be presenting our findings. So that's what I really want folks to focus on in their discussion papers. We are all at different states in terms of the data that's available.

So data is already in, in particular the Nielson study. There is a lot of compliance data. Those are things that are already at the ready for us to use. So it's going to be really important in your discussion papers to make sure that you have looked at the data that's available, and actually presented that as a finding.

And please make sure that those findings map to a specific question, one of your specific questions, and that you are referencing the source of your data specifically. So if it's the Neilson study, which is hundreds of pages long, you should pinpoint the site to the page of that study that you're getting your finding from.

If it's ICANN compliance data, you should be specific about where you are finding that data. Often, ICANN compliance has it organized by date. It's off and on a specific page. Just be very specific about where

you are finding that data so you don't have to figure out where you got it from at the backend, which will be a lot more difficult.

Other questions and comments about this? I set September 15th as the deadline for final discussion papers. And I say I set, but actually that is the same date that the competition sub-team has as its deadline. So we're trying to harmonize there. So that is next week, that is next Thursday, I believe.

So we've had a chance for a lot of discussion and questions. We've also had a chance to make sure people know where to find the data. So, folks need to make sure that they have these discussion papers ready to circulate by the 15th, because that's going to be the time where we are circulating these papers for discussion.

So, that's the deadline that we need to meet, because we have to produce something for Hyderabad and this really is the key foundational step in that process.

If you are not the lead drafter, and as we spoke in Vienna, everyone has different superpowers, sometimes your superpower is to comment, and ask questions, and edit, and refine. So if you're not the lead drafter, you still need to make sure you have the opportunity to improve the discussion papers.

So please, please connect with your partners. Okay, so that's the discussion papers. The other topic that we've touched on, that I want to make sure that is very clear, is to finalize all data requests by Wednesday, that's next Wednesday. So for those action items that involve any compliance related issues, that needs to be articulated and

communicated to ICANN staff, preferably in writing, not just over the phone, but if you have a conversation, then use a confirming email. That needs to be articulated by September 14th. So we have these things in place.

Any questions about data requests?

Questions or comments?

Okay.

DREW BAGLEY:

This is Drew. I was just going to say, what do you think the best way forward might be? Shouldn't we all maybe for our papers and our partners, should we all...? You're making sure we're checking in with each other? Just every Monday or something like that?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yes. I think we should be checking in with our partners at least once, I mean, at least... Because our discussion papers are going to be due by Thursday, I would advise everyone to, after this call, to set up at least two times to check in with your partner. And thereafter, probably on a weekly basis.

Just to set up a standing time to check in with your partner on these issues, so you make sure that you have the opportunity to discuss and transmit drafts.

So, can we add that as an action item for everyone to schedule two times to check in with your partners between now and the 15th?

And Alice, what is the best way to have accountability to you in terms of a final draft? Is it easier to send you a document? Is it easier for us to say, “I’ve changed it on Google Docs, now it’s final.”? What’s the best way to make sure there is clarity to you regarding discussion papers?

ALICE JANSEN:

I think on the onset, it would be very useful if all the pairs clarified with us what method they’ll be using, either traditional email or Google sheets. And then based on that, we’ll work with them to make sure we receive the copies by the 15th. I think it’s easier if everyone clarifies what their modus operandi is.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay. So, let’s add that as an action item, identify for Alice whether you are working via traditional email, or Google Docs for your discussion papers. And for that, only the lead drafter needs to do that.

Okay.

Does anyone have any questions, or any other topics that they want to bring up? Any other questions or topics?

So, I have a quick question, Alice, that I’m not sure can be answered. But I know in Vienna, it was announced that, actually, can you re-announce the dates for Hyderabad, for our...

ALICE JANSEN: Yes. So the face to face meeting will be held on November 2nd and November 3rd. And in addition that, we'll be scheduling an outreach session for, in order to get feedback from the community on the interim recommendations. And we're trying to schedule that as close as possible to your face to face meetings, so that you can leave Hyderabad within a reasonable timeframe.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. And I note some of the feedback that, at least our sub-team, has discussed was with the possibility for longer face to face meetings. Is that a possibility in Hyderabad? Or is this already pretty much firm?

ALICE JANSEN: So the face to face meeting dates in Hyderabad are firm, but I believe Jonathan's intent was to arrive in Hyderabad with some preliminary findings already. If I remember correctly, [inaudible] specifically asked in Vienna that these conclusions and findings be circulated to the different communities prior to Hyderabad...

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right...

ALICE JANSEN: ...so I think the expectation is to arrive in Hyderabad with preliminary findings and translate those into recommendations, and sort of confirm your findings and conclusions during the outreach session.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got you. Okay. So maybe that is the longer face to face meeting, is something that we can explore subsequent to Hyderabad. It sounds like we're going to have those two days coming in with findings, and then opportunity within the ICANN meeting to have this input from the community, and then perhaps have some sort of time within that framework to discuss that feedback.

I guess what I'm asking is, other than the feedback from community sessions, is there going to be another time for us to get together and process or not in Hyderabad?

ALICE JANSEN: So we'll try to schedule a debrief session during a, parts in the afternoon, morning, for the group to reconvene and debrief on the input they've received throughout their outreach event. But we'll make sure, yeah.

In addition, you can always meet with your sub-team informally as well. I'm sure we can locate if there is meeting space available for that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Any questions, any other business, comments about any other topic?

CALVIN BROWNE: Calvin here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Calvin.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. While we're mentioning Hyderabad, this is more of a logistical question. And I was wondering if anyone has actually tried to [inaudible] Indian visa, because that seems to be heading towards an [inaudible] where the plane tickets are necessary for the visa, and the visa is necessary for the plane tickets.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I can tell you that I did not need a visa to get a flight reservation, because I've done that already with ICANN travel. And now, I am going to apply for a visa.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. So that's not the actual plane tickets, that's just the flight reservation, then.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. And yeah, they've made the reservation. I don't have like tickets in hand, but that's the usual process that I follow when I've been

working with ICANN, is that you know, they will make the reservation and pay for that when the time comes. So, have you [CROSSTALK]...

CALVIN BROWNE: I've got a reservation, and it's the fact that they want the tickets [inaudible], and hopefully they'll accept the reservation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So if you run into problems, Alice, who should Calvin be chatting with if he runs into problems with obtaining a visa?

ALICE JANSEN: So constituency travel, [inaudible] will work, constituency travel are the best people to help Calvin on this.

CALVIN BROWNE: I'll just [inaudible]... if they have a problem, they [stop bringing in?] problems.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So let's see how it goes, and then if you run into obstacles, reach out to Joseph and Nicole in ICANN travel, and hopefully they will be able to shepherd that through any obstacles we may encounter.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. With that, any other questions? Any other questions or comments?

Okay. Then I will thank everyone for participating, and Alice if we can, if you can recap the action items in an email to me, I will send around the summary email.

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, happy to, Lauren.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Okay, thanks everyone. Have a good rest of your mornings, days, and evenings.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]