
LAUREEN KAPIN:

We are having a meeting of the leads for our discussion papers, safeguards and trust topics. And we have some of the leads with us today, which is good. Not all, which is not as optimal, but will move on with what we have.

So over the past week, we have sent several e-mails to make sure that people are organized and focused on what needs to be done, including sample discussion paper templates, and also information about where the data that relates to specific discussion paper topics is on the Consumer Trust Safeguards wiki. And I think that's been helpful. I personally have reached out to almost every person on the Safeguards team, to check in with them and make sure they know what needs to be done, going forward, which I think has been helpful for the folks that I've chatted with. And then I've also advised all the leads to connect with their teammates, which I'm hoping has been done.

So what I thought we could spend this call on is basically a check-in with folks about how things are going and where there are challenges. So I'm happy to start. I am currently focusing on the consumer end user behavior discussion paper. That's what I generated, actually, a sample on. And I have gotten through the phase 1 study. And my focus goes forward, besides reviewing what other folks doing, is going to be to integrate the phase 2 results, which are updated and also contain additional data for my discussion paper.

For the effectiveness of procedures to enforce safeguards, we have actually had a switch in that topic. Carlton has agreed to take on that topic and switch with David, who is now going to be focusing on how

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.

the RPM, the new gTLDs differ from the legacy gTLDs. And he's going to be building on some of the work that Carlton has already done.

For "Have the safeguards been fully implemented?", Carlos, I know you're going to speak to that for a portion of it. But I've also managed to speak with Calvin, which was very productive, since Calvin hasn't been always able to make our subteam phone calls. And Calvin is going to be focusing on the technical safeguards. And, Carlos, I think you were going to be focusing on the GAC safeguards. So maybe it would be a good time, Carlos, to turn to you, to speak to that issue. And then also, Carlos, I know you're on several other groups, as well.

So, Carlos, why don't you fill us in on how things are going with the safeguard implementation? But I can't hear you, so I'm wondering if you're on mute. Carlos, are you with us?

Okay, it sounds like – or it doesn't sound like, since we're not hearing from Carlos, I'm wondering if he is having some microphone issues. So maybe we will hear from Carlos a little later on, when those issues are resolved.

Carlton, since you had so graciously agreed to make the switch, first of all, I want to express how much I appreciate that, because I know you're knowledgeable on both issues. I didn't realize exactly how much, and I appreciate you filling me in. But why don't I give you a chance to talk about effectiveness of procedures to enforce safeguards, and particularly to see if you have any questions, since this is a relatively new assignment for you.

It looks like, “Getting into the house in two minutes.” Okay. So let’s not move to Carlton quite yet. Fabro, how about checking in with you to check in and see how the discussion paper [inaudible]?

FABRO STEIBEL: Hi, all. Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Yes.

FABRO STEIBEL: Yeah? Okay. So my paper is number 4, “Have new gTLD registry operators complied with the safeguards?” What we did yesterday was to fill in a proposal for Carlton and David to comment on that. So I suggested [parts] in three high-level questions. And as soon as we agree on that, I’ll make the proposal on the findings and the other parts. And then we’ll circulate that, with free to comment.

So hypothesis that we di is that the gTLD registry operators have complied most of the safeguards, but not all. As far as I remember, we have to [make sure the] safeguards, and then [inaudible].

High-level questions are, number 1, what is the advantage of safeguards that gTLD registry operators have complied with? [The fact that is] interesting, maybe not. So the follow-up question is, what part of safeguards are [most effectful] to see what kind of areas they are complying the most.

Question number 2 is, what circumstances explain the lack of compliance? This can be like a [data], like just complying with that, or maybe a postponed decision so that is out of control. And then here, we are challenging to understand who is responsible and what circumstances explain the lack of compliance.

Any question on the three? [inaudible] compliance with [noncompliant] safeguards. This is the follow-up actions that ICANN took on addressing these issues. And then maybe there was no action because there is a context that avoids that. But maybe there is accountability check here on the role of ICANN [inaudible] the role of others, as well.

So this is we thoughts as the high-level questions. I'm waiting for Carlton and David. But remembering that I submitted to them yesterday. And once we agree on that, I'm going to make other suggestions on the [inaudible] of the template. That's it.

Hi, Lauren?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Fabro. Are you [inaudible]?

FABRO STEIBEL: Sorry?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Are you facing [inaudible]?

FABRO STEIBEL: There is some feedback. Maybe if you're not speaking, I guess put your phone on mute. Because for some reason, there is a feedback with Laureen.

Would you like me – wait. I [inaudible] the phones, just in case.

Hi. Is the feedback still on?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Let's see. Okay. It sounds like it's not. So what I'm asking you, are you experiencing any difficulties that you want to... Are there any challenges that we should be discussing to the discussion paper?

FABRO STEIBEL: No. So far, none.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good.

FABRO STEIBEL: Sorry for the connection [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's okay. And I'm just looking. Okay. And what your approach reminded me is that maybe it would be helpful to share – although I've shared this electronically, but maybe it would also be helpful to share some of the subquestions for my high-level discussion paper, as well. So thank you for providing that good model report, Fabro.

For my high-level question, the issue was, do consumers trust new gTLDs? So some of the subquestions that I formulated to grapple with that topic are the following: Why do consumers visit TLDs? And as a subquestion to that, do consumers visit new gTLDs as much as legacy gTLDs? And the reasoning behind that was because the Nielsen survey study found that actually trust is related to familiarity. So the issue of visiting gTLDs becomes a relevant issue to the topic of trust.

Also as a subquestion, do consumers provide sensitive information to new gTLDs? And the a subquestion compared to legacy gTLDs. And I think, although I need to refresh my recollection on this, although the phase 1 Nielsen survey doesn't speak to this, I think we have more information on that in phase 2. So I'm going to be focusing on that.

Then another sublevel question, do consumers trust new gTLDs that offer domains too? And then there's subquestions based on the data that we have. Take precautions regarding who gets a domain name, give consumers what they think they're getting. And this relates to discussions that actually David had brought up about how if you're going to a .photo, are you actually going to a website that deals with photography, as opposed to something else? And do consumers trust new gTLDs that offer domains to screen individuals or companies who register for certain special domain names? And this relates to the verification/validation procedures.

And then finally, do restrictions on who can purchase domain names contribute to consumer trust? [inaudible]

Hello? You are not on mute. So we [inaudible] a lot conversations. Okay, good. Much better.

And then basically, for my discussion paper, then I am amassing the findings to these questions. And what I had shown in my model discussion paper, that I'm hoping everyone else does as well, is that you need to map your findings to your subquestion so that it's not just a [inaudible] list of findings, but it's findings that relate to your subquestions. So if a subquestion [inaudible], it should match the findings [inaudible].

And so that's by way of example. Okay. Let's then move on to Drew. Drew, I know you're back from vacation, so it may be a very short update. But I thought it would at least be productive to hear from you.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yes. Yeah, I'm definitely – I'll provide more of an update with some of the documents over others, because of the vacation. So for the first one, for, "Is there more or less DNS abuse in the new gTLDs?" I applied the modified template that you created, Laureen, which I think was perfect, because it combined the best of all worlds, because it didn't make sense for me to create hypotheses when what I really have is research questions. And then I think filling in the subquestions that let you answer the big question was really important.

And going back to actually Fabro's presentation, I think that might even work better for his, because it seems like he did a great job creating subquestions for the high-level question. And maybe he could use your modified format and that might work.

But, yeah, so for mine, I can just go over the subquestions that I have created so far. And then I have not begun to expand beyond that yet. But for this one, the subquestions are: What is the rate of abuse in legacy gTLDs? What is the rate of abuse in new gTLDs? And for those questions, that should be answered by that DNS abuse study. It would be more of a present-tense answers as to what the rates of abuse are between the two. So you could see if legacy gTLDs have more or new gTLDs have more, and whatnot.

And then other subquestions were: What was the rate of abuse of legacy gTLDs upon the introduction of new gTLDs? Because we're not commissioning a study to do a historical analysis of the whole era before. But during the initial introduction of new gTLD, how do we know that didn't mean that all these new gTLDs were actually live and people were registering them, and whatnot. So I think that question really captures the reality of a realistic baseline.

And then the next subquestion is: What has happened to the rate of abuse in legacy gTLDs since the introduction of the gTLDs? And the intention of that question would be to capture the sort of trend, since we are looking for the impact. And so that way, assuming we get a good vendor and they do a great job with that DNS abuse study, we'd be able to answer all those questions and actually be able to show its impact one way or another. So maybe right now we would see there's a higher rate of abuse in new gTLDs than legacy gTLDs. But perhaps we would see that the trend of abuse in gTLDs actually hasn't changed. Or maybe we would see that it has and people have migrated to the new gTLDs. So I think those questions should capture all of that. And certainly, what we're looking for, in terms of impact and how that will really tie into

some of the consumer trust questions that will be explored in other discussion papers, such as yours.

So definitely open to any feedback or any additional questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Drew. That [crosstalk] –

DREW BAGLEY: And then I can go over the other ones, too. But just if there are any feedback on that one.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm not seeing anyone or hearing questions, Drew.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So then the next one, it's discussion paper 3, "Did the safeguards help to prevent DNS abuse?" And for this, the subquestions I've come up with are: What were the new gTLD safeguards? How are the safeguards – whoops, that one's worded improperly. But how do the safeguards attempt to prevent DNS abuse? And so that would be more descriptive about the safeguards.

And the final one: What instances of DNS abuse did the safeguards prevent? That question might be a bit leading and more like a hypothesis-driven question that's making the assumption that they did actually prevent some sort of DNS abuse. So maybe I should reword that one. But basically, this one would allow me to go and take the list of

safeguards that we now know exist, and once we have more data, line those up with DNS abuse. But even before that, we could perhaps see if there's some DNS abuse we know may have been prevented by DNSSEC or something else, and so really be able to incorporate some examples of the safeguards. And then my hope is that then I can lead us to recommendations, where we would see any gaps and maybe make recommendations about how safeguards could be improved.

Does anybody have any feedback or questions about that one?

Okay. And then the final one is one that I have not contributed to yet, but Carlos has. So I don't know if Carlos wants to say what he put in for discussion paper 6, which is dealing with – well, the question for that is, "Did the use of PICs help prevent DNS abuse?" And so Carlos, you want to take that away, with Specification 11?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I'm sorry, I am in listening mode. I thought we had the call two hours earlier. And right now, I am able only to listen. I am sorry about that.

Can you hear me?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. Yeah, okay, so I'll just go over then what you put in the paper.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sorry about that.

DREW BAGLEY: So for this, we have not come up with questions yet, but this paper will deal with the use of PICs. And so some of the questions we've already come up with for the applicant survey about the use of PICs, I think, will help answer this, perhaps. And also, what you're exploring, Laureen, when we're talking about the restricted registration, I think once we're able to correlate abuse data with all of those other things, we might be able to draw some conclusions. But in the interim, we might be able to use the worksheet that Antonietta put together for us. And I will see what we can find for existing [register] on abuse rates and domain names, and the top-level domains that use PIC. And so, yeah, they're just something that we need to develop, subquestions and what not.

But I see Carlos has put in here, "Do we have a clear relationship between ICANN policies and national laws, in terms of the PICs established? Who is responsible for the compliance function in specific cases?"

So, Carlos, do you want to speak to maybe those questions?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I really can't talk now. I'm sorry. I missed the change of times.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So, yeah, I guess that's my update then.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Drew. And with the research paper that Antonietta has put together, I want to – might a brief update on that. First of all, it's very

useful for the work, especially focusing on the information that applicants put in their gTLD applications regarding what public interest commitments they would make. But we are [inaudible] of adding another very important piece of information, which is a review of what public interest commitments actually are in the registry agreements for the successful applicants. That was something that was missing from the table but is now going to be added. So I think that will also be a very useful piece of information, because that's basically what's going to be the rules of [inaudible] anyway, what's actually in these registry agreements. So I'm very [inaudible] of Antonietta, of the people who are working with her to provide that information to the [inaudible]. So I wanted to [inaudible] where [inaudible].

And the other piece of information that probably people are aware of, but I also want to make sure, is that Karen Lentz has also put together another detailed list of all the safeguards. And [inaudible] people are wanting to access that list, it is on the wiki. And also, it was sent via e-mail to the Safeguards Team on March [inaudible] from Karen Lentz, where she actually lists all the safeguards. So it's a useful item if people are ever wanting more detailed information about the universal safeguards. I just wanted to point that out to people.

Right. And, Carlton, in the chat, I see, is picking up on that, that they're broken up into classes. And he's exactly right, that we can't just be speaking of the safeguards [in general]. We need to be speaking of them specifically. There are rights protections safeguards. There are DNS abuse safeguards. And then there are the safeguards that are in Specification 11. So [inaudible] make sure people are aware of this very

useful list that Karen has put together so that we are precise in the way we are [inaudible].

Carlton, did you want to – I'm not sure you have a microphone, although it looks like you do. Did you want to provide us with a quick update on issues you're working on?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I hope you can hear me now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I can hear you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. I am looking at [inaudible] discussion, Lauren. I have kind of refocused to look at the implementation of safeguards, and I'm looking at the Spec 11 safeguards especially. The reason for it is that I probably have more long-term relationship with the Spec 11 safeguards because, in the At-Large, those are the ones that took a lot of time and effort on some of the working groups.

I'm kind of just listing them. I take Karen's list, and I'm listing them out. Then I look at the ones that I think would require a little bit more explanation than others. Some of them are very clear and straightforward, and we have data, including compliance data, to match where they are now and where they should be. What is not so clear is some of the baseline data. I'm still trying to figure out how I make that

very clear, where the work is start of the program and where they are now. But I'm working on it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That sounds like a good start, Carlton. And I'm glad this is building on all the work you've done in the At-Large committee and the issues that they've grappled with. I'm wondering what would be most helpful for you, in terms of discussions, if it might be helpful to talk with any of the Compliance folks, perhaps. I know Maguy's group is very, very cooperative and willing to chat, if that would be helpful. In terms of the effectiveness of procedures and enforcing safeguards, my general observation is that a lot of that information does live with the Compliance folks. And perhaps some industry groups may also have views on that. I'm not sure how much data they would have on it. But certainly, Compliance will have data.

We won't really have a comparison to something, because this is all so new. But certainly, we would have information on statistics that Compliance puts together, in terms of the complaints they get and those resolutions. So that is certainly something that I know that they're happy to share with us and chat about.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes, Laureen, you're absolutely right. Most of it [inaudible] with Compliance. Let me give you one example. The PIC DRP, you know that's a procedure that's going out. And if you look at the reports, [inaudible] there have been talk about PIC enforcement. The procedure, the items [that have booked] the procedures, they're still not sure how

to [tap] that down, because some report says that there have not been any. Another report says there are two or three. I am just kind of working through with some of my colleagues, to look at what it is that we've been watching, to see if there are any gaps. And then maybe we can go back to Compliance when we have specific questions to ask. Right now, we don't have – we want to tie down the questions before we go asking Compliance.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That makes sense. And the other place I would suggest looking, Carlton, is that I know some of the GAC communiques have commented specifically on the PIC DRP, particularly how complex and lengthy the procedure is, as written. So that also might be something to look at, because it's comments specifically on concerns regarding the PIC DRP.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Absolutely. That's one area that we look at, because quite frankly, most of what the GAC says, [we have endorsed]. So that is something we have. And we are looking at the PIC DRP. For example, if you look at some of the GAC specs, specifically on PIC DRP, there is a contention whereas that the enforcement mechanism is really very light and there was not enough to even impact behavior. But again, a lot of that is from the GAC communiques, when you look at that. We're still looking to see what does "light" mean in context, just an example.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thank you, Carlton. I think we have now heard from all the leads on the call. So I want to open the call up then for questions, comments from anyone on the call regarding these issues so that we can meet our deadline of passing draft discussion papers around by the 22nd. Any questions, comments, obstacles, calls for help?

And speaking of calls for help, I want to make sure that everyone knows they can reach out to me, and also our great staff, if they're experiencing challenges about trying to find a data source, a template, anything. Our staff is super-responsive, and I just want to make sure that people don't hesitate to ask for any assistance, if they need it.

DREW BAGLEY:

I just wanted to chime in just to echo again, I think, using that modified template that you created, with the subquestions, is probably the most helpful approach for any of these questions, for us to generate discussion papers this next week.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Drew. And that's on our wiki. I also sent it to people via e-mail. So if anyone has any questions about that, definitely come to me, because I'm happy to walk people through my thinking process. What I really just did is build upon Jonathan's good example, and then refined it when I couldn't understand it myself, to make it a little more user friendly. So this is just my attempt to make things even easier to understand, basically thinking of our high-level question and then asking ourselves, "Okay, if I'm going to answer that high-level question, what smaller questions do I need the answer to?"

And what I want to emphasize to everyone also is that my questions, besides being intuitively logical to me, were really linked to the data itself. I couldn't have asked the subquestion about how likely folks are to visit gTLDs for the consumer trust issue if I hadn't been aware of the data that links trust to how often consumers visit a particular gTLD. So I just want to make sure that people realize – which I'm sure you do already – just to emphasize that the subquestions really are based on your intuitive, logical sense of what you need to ask to answer the question, and the data. The data may surprise you. The data may contain linkages that you hadn't anticipated. So this really needs to be data driven, and then that should be added to your sense of how these questions need to be answered.

Okay. Is anyone having any challenges communicating with their team members? Because ideally, this is a team approach. And if you're having any particular challenge reaching a particular team member, you can let me know offline. You can also ask staff to help schedule a call with them. I know that Brenda has been very helpful in scheduling phone calls and working with all the different time zones we're working under. So if folks are having that challenge, please reach out to me or ICANN staff to try and work on a way to come up with scheduling a call to have necessary conversations. Or communicate via e-mail. That's fine too.

Are there other questions, comments? Okay. Then in terms of our deadlines, our next big deadline is August 22nd. That's when our drafts of discussion papers are going to be circulated. So what I want to emphasize is that those drafts ideally will have already gone through your internal review with your team members, and then it'll be a draft for our team to discuss. And at this point, really, the crucial parts of that

discussion paper are, in addition to the high-level question, the subquestions really need findings. Findings based on the data. And if you have those findings, you can start analyzing what the causes might be regarding your subquestions.

Recommendations, it would be great if people have recommendations down. At the end of the day, what our group is going to be providing are recommendations. But I also realize that that is probably part of the process that's going to be the most discussed, the most debated. So I want to let people know that the recommendations are really, at this point, they're going to be your first thoughts on this. So don't be afraid to get those first thoughts down and realize those are not going to be set in stone. So I don't want people to hesitate or be intimidated to give recommendations at this point. Those are all going to be discussed and debated and thought through. These are just your first thoughts based on the analysis and review that you've done. So I want to make sure that people have that field filled in too, regarding recommendations, and don't feel intimidated by that. And if you can get thoughts down about how you think this is going to be reviewed, all the better.

My big takeaway here is to do as much as you can with filling in the template. It will be refined. It will be debated. It will be discussed. But don't be intimidated by the template. We can only start discussing things when we have something down there. Yeah, and I agree with Jonathan's comment, that we'll also get community feedback on that.

Okay. Then if no one has further questions or comments, I'm going to thank everyone for joining us in the phone call. I know we're across a couple time zones that are more and less convenient for folks, so I

appreciate it. And also thank you for the work that's already been done. And I'm looking forward to seeing the draft papers on August 22nd. So thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]