LAUREEN KAPIN:	So I'm going to follow the agenda that we set. This is Laureen Kapin just stepping in temporarily for Jonathan and starting our Plenary Call.
	So, first of all, welcome everyone and I want to ask if anyone has any changes to their Statements of Interest.
	I am not hearing any changes. I'm not seeing any hands. So I will take that as a "no changes" and I see for our first agenda item that we are going to be seeking to reach final agreement on several papers by Stan and one paper by Megan. And I think we have 15 minutes for that.
	What I'm going to propose to do is turn it over to the paper writers who are most familiar with any outstanding issues and allow for that discussion to take place. I'm assuming that Stan is on the call with us. I see him listed. So maybe we can get Stan's first listed paper up on the screen. That's Basic Market Share Consultation.
	Stan, can I rely on you to guide us through this discussion?
STAN BESEN:	Yeah, I'm not sure what we want to do here. This has been through some iterations. Comments are still coming in and I'm incorporating them as I get them. There's one suggestion for this one that Jamie made and in the spirit that no good deed goes unpunished, I have asked Jamie to take a crack at answering his own question that appears in the comment on the right by drafting a paragraph or two there.

There are several other changes that are small relative to what existed before and you have the current, latest version on the screen. I think the main gap here – and we would not resolve this on this call – is the absence of the parking data. So all of these calculations, obviously, do not take that into account and I regard that as a major gap in what we've done thus far.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do you have a sense, Stan, of whether and when you're going to get the parking data? I know we've discussed this and I'm sorry if I don't recall the answer to that question.

STAN BESEN: I think there are two parts to the answer. Eleeza knows the first one much better than I. There are still apparently some issues of contracting involving acquiring the data. I inquired of the Analysis Group how long it would take them once they had the data to redo all of the calculations taking that into account and they said a week or two.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so a week or two from whenever these difficulties are resolved. Do we have an optimistic sense that they're going to be resolved?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Laureen. I'm really not sure if they are or not at this point. I wouldn't want to overpromise anything at this point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure.

STAN BESEN: There's something that actually – I'm not proposing this – but something that actually would be doable. It's limited because NTLD stats reports on a real-time basis parking by several measures for all new gTLDs, all the calculations that are limited to new gTLDs could be done with parking data from them. I'm not suggesting that, but that's actually doable.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, maybe that's a plan B then if things don't go according to optimal plans.

                                            Did we want to give a high level summary of what, Jamie, your concern and proposed fast forward is on the paper?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So we're talking about the addition to the beginning of historical context?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, that's the comment that your now "no good deed goes unpunished" going to be tackling.

JAMIE HEDLUND:	Yeah, I will do that. I will come up with a paragraph from Genesis that talks about the creation of ICANN.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Okay. My sense, and I'm asking ICANN staff here, my sense is that the purpose of this particular phone call is to try to come to a final agreement on these papers. As you all know, competition has not been my area of focus and I'm just stepping in for Jonathan here, but other than the lack of parking data which is a necessary absence here as we've heard from Eleeza, at least for the time being, and the addition of some context about ICANN and its formation. Are there any other outstanding issues regarding this paper that still needs to be discussed?

And staff, if I'm misunderstanding what is the purpose of what we're supposed to be doing, I'm going to rely on you to jump in and give me more complete information. But that's my sense. |
| STAN BESEN: | Can I ask a question, what it means to have complete agreement or whatever your term is here? I picture these as still works in progress and if new good ideas come along, either from me or somebody else, I think we should get to put them in. What's the purpose of finalizing this other than preparing for the meeting in India? |
| LAUREEN KAPIN: | Again – and Stan, I'm sort of stepping in here on the fly and giving you my best judgment. Here's Laureen Kapin's sense, not speaking as Chair, speaking as herself. As myself, my sensible good judgment, hopefully, |

self, I see that the papers are going to continue to evolve as we get better information and sometimes as we get feedback from our colleagues. And we certainly will have feedback from the community. So these are works in progress.

What I see as the purpose of this phone call is to get things teed up for Hyderabad, so to try and put things in a set of form as we can so that when we're presenting something in Hyderabad, it is with the understanding that our team members have had an opportunity to comment and it's fresh, their perspectives, and that these papers are the best and final expression as of now of that. So I basically see this as teeing us up for Hyderabad, not as setting it in stone forevermore. Does that make sense?

STAN BESEN: It does, except, of course, that the presentations there are going to be much more abbreviated than we have here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely. Absolutely. And again, my understanding, just from our leadership call, Stan, this morning, is that, really, the next step for everyone is going to be to extract a high-level narrative so that we can make a presentation in Hyderabad that gives a summary of these much more detailed papers.

You know, and it strikes me as along those lines, Stan, and maybe you have already been working with that with Jordyn that it's going to be helpful to have some sort of high-level executive summary of each

paper to feed to Jordyn so that he's able to make this presentation in Hyderabad. But I don't want to step into the workings of your group too much. That's just my [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: I think Jordyn is already in the process of drafting such a document himself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

STAN BESEN: So that's quite correct there. Actually, while I have the line, I did make some suggestions in an e-mail that I sent this morning because I think we also have to preface everything we're doing by an overall discussion of some of the limitations under which we are working. I think that's just also important for stage setting.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, and I was going to reply to your e-mail but since we're on the phone, I'm going to do that now. I heartily agree with your preface in that e-mail and I think you're right. We need to set the stage, which is that these are early times, there are certain situations where data is missing so this is very much a work in progress and an interim report. And I think that is absolutely something that should be said at the outset to align this as to the place and time where we are which is very early. So I heartily agree with that.

STAN BESEN: Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. That being said, does anyone have any other comments that they feel need to be aired before we come to our, what I'll say is the interim finalization of this paper?

Okay, I am not seeing any hands.

Okay, then that said, let's move on to the next paper which is also yours, Stan, on industry structure.

STAN BESEN: The main missing thing here is a table that Analysis Group said they would have by the end of the week, which is the Project 6 table, which is basically, think of it as the size distribution. I'm sorry. Think of how many registries have between one and ten registrars, have between 10 and 25, etc. And they'll produce that table. I think that's important.

I actually went back and looked at some NTLD stats data. Some of these new gTLDs have well over 100 registrars. It's an interesting statistic to me.

The other thing that's sort of been added in the last little while, I had an exchange with Kylie yesterday, and this issue of what about these really little guys. And I think the way to say it is the way I try to say it here now, which is that the cost of the availability of these inputs through

the market that is registrar back in services, the way I would put it is the minimum viable scale of a gTLD has been reduced. That is a gTLD could survive with smaller numbers of registrations because of this, that it could, if, in fact, it had to produce all those inputs internally. And so, the phrase "minimum viable scale" appears in here and the period before.

Other than that, this is pretty much what you had earlier and it's still waiting for the tape from the Project 6 table.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So I see Jonathan has now joined us. Jonathan, we're at Stan's second paper. The first paper, Stan informed us of some missing data and what the Plan A and Plan B is to deal with that. But there weren't any comments.

We also clarified that when we talk about finalization of the papers, it's really as final as it's going to be for Hyderabad, but things still may shift as we get feedback from the community, and we get more data, and we even may get some straggler feedback from our colleagues. So Stan had asked for clarification of what we mean by "final".

But that's where we are and Stan just presented where the second paper is. And what I would ask is if folks have any comments or concerns about that paper and then turn over the chair back to Jonathan to take it from here.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Laureen. Sorry I was late. So yes, do people have questions or comments for Stan? Otherwise, is this paper minus the Project 6 table ready for inclusion into a graphic for community feedback?

Okay. Seeing no comments, let's move on. We're going to assume that it is, so we're going to call that semi-final, Stan, to answer your earlier question that I missed. Thank you for your work on this presentation.

We have Megan on the call. I don't see her name. She might be on the phone. Does anyone know if Megan's on the call or not? It looks like she's not, so let's move on to concentration ratios. I'll reach out to Megan. Does somebody want to e-mail Megan to see if she can join the call? [Inaudible] apologies. Okay, thanks, Alice.

Sorry, Stan. You thought you were getting a break, but you're back up.

STAN BESEN: This doesn't change much, but I've actually been thinking a bit more about this apropos of the thing I circulated this morning. There's something I said very early when we started to talk about measuring industry concentration and I think what I had in my mind then, I still believe, which is that we cannot be definitive about how to define the market yet. And we ought to say that we're going to provide concentration measures for a variety of alternative market definitions. And at some point, I think I'll want to add language to that effect here.

The other thing I want to say here is this is. I'll talk to Jamie about this later, but it was provoked by the comments he sent me yesterday. I know some people have said, "Well, concentration isn't competition."

And so I try to say two things here. One, often, it's a good proxy for it and there's a lot of literature on that. But the other point I would make is that if we had had better data, most importantly, the legacy registry price data, we could have conducted this analysis in a very different way. We could have analyzed the effect of entry by looking at those prices and see whether they had changed in response to entry.

I'm thinking of, actually, a very useful paper on another subject in which people very interestingly calculated the effect on prices of wireless service in the U.S. of the entry of two or three wireless carriers in the 1990s. And that's the sort of thing I would have liked to be able to do here and maybe in the future, when we have better data, we can do that. It would also require us, by the way, to go back and get the data that would have existed before the New gTLD Program.

So this thing says two things. One, we're looking at concentration. That's a quite reasonable thing to do. We would have done something in addition to that had we had better data and I think that's actually related to a suggestion I think we all agree to now, is that these are data that ICANN should be trying to collect in the future so that it can better analyze competition.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, Stan. That's a great point and I think we definitely need to make that a hard core part of our recommendations and really suggest that ICANN is front and center, collecting that data, whether they [inaudible] represent updates to contracts to get it or if there are other ways to

gather it along the way and archive it so that better study can be done in the future.

STAN BESEN: And I would even argue we ought to go back to answer the question, "What was the effect of the program?" it would really be useful to have data as of 2013. And the registries have it. For historical purposes, that would be very useful to have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It would, indeed. And then on your first point, Stan, about market definition, I almost feel like that's its own little section on the competitions on marketing.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, I'm going to write something up. One of the problems of writing modules is I want a good, clear picture of how the flow among these sections works. But in part, in response to suggestions, I realize I should have included a paragraph or two on that. I don't know whether I should try to do that between now and tomorrow so you have it for Hyderabad or just put it in a later version. It's on my list of things to do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I'll definitely spitball it. So the key is I'll try to coordinate with you about the high-level way to represent that question because it's even where we want to make some kind of passing reference, at least, to the alternative online identities thing that the ALAC folks brought into the

picture as well that we got partially addressed in the survey but have zero data for, but that we can sort of say that it's one possible market definition that could be studied by others or something like that to make sure that we incorporate what little data we have about user behavior on that.

STAN BESEN: Yeah. Actually, let me tell you one other thing. This issue has come up a number of times about substitutability. I think it's a real important question. We have a little bit of stuff about that from the project that Jordyn has had us do, which is how many people chose a new gTLD name rather than, even though it was available in dot-com. And I think that gives you a little bit of picture of the substitutability.

But as I think back about it, that's the sort of thing would be nice to have had through the Nielsen surveys. And unfortunately, I don't think we got that. But that's an important gap in our knowledge. That's one of the reasons we're doing multiple market definitions is because we don't understand substitutability all that well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good point. Do folks have any other comments? Like Calvin, you asked a question about making an interim recommendation. Do you mean about the data or do you… Was that something else that you were suggesting? Do you want us to –

CALVIN BROWNE:	I never questioned [Stan]. Okay, can I go first? You know, I was just thinking that if we made an Internet recommendation to them to start collecting this data before it's too late and it's passed us by, it will [cost] the community by in the future.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah. So, I mean, obviously, we did go through an effort to try and get some data collected as he went along and we're going to be making a new set of recommendations for data that ICANN should be collecting. So if you look at the original metrics document, it had data sources that ICANN did begin and I think what we're going to be doing is putting a little bit more nuance behind the theories behind those things so that different types of calculations could be done by the next review team.
	I don't know if there's anything interim to do, but I can certainly, in front of the Board, make a point, the point about the data right off the bat and see if there's anything they want to do about it right away. But I think we need to just focus on completing our review rather than taking a branch off then making some recommendations.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	I have a question for Stan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Go ahead, Carlos. Thank you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'm sorry. I'm on a phone line. Stan, just for clarification, when you talk about substitutability which is really very important issue, you mentioned surveys. That would be surveys of registrants, I guess, and I wanted to have it clear, separate from the previous recommendation of parking, if that wouldn't conflict.

I mean, if we chased the registrants and start asking them why have you reserved three or four, or why did you take a new generic being dot-com, [three], are we going to ask them, why did you [park] them and didn't activate them as well or this is a separate suggestion? I mean, we should really discuss what kind of service we want from registrants because that would be a very valuable source of data for the future.

STAN BESEN: Actually, I hadn't thought about that but what I had in mind was asking about which domain to register in. But your point is well taken. We could ask them, to the extent that you're parking, why are you parking? I think, sort of generally, I think if we were doing, if ICANN were fielding a registrant survey today, I think we could ask a number of questions that, in fact, would fit very nicely into the set of questions we're trying to answer here.

Obviously, those surveys were fielded before we even existed, but I take your point and one thing we might want to do is say, "Here's what we'd like another survey, the kind of information we'd like another survey to obtain." So I take your point very much.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think it's a very good idea and that's a very specific recommendation we should prepare very nicely. Thank you, Stan.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, by the way, we did have, there was a series of four, I think, five questions that I originally posed to ask the question, was this a duplicate, was this a substitute, etc.? There were five of them. I think they didn't get asked very crisply in the second survey, but maybe the next survey, they will be.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Great. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Stan. Jamie, go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Stan, I just had, you and I will talk later on about [inaudible], but your basic market share calculations, the last cause, and I don't understand that terminology but I know that's what we're using, but it says, "ICANN's requirements may make it difficult for new backend providers to enter the market." Do you elaborate on what that is in another paper?

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. Where are we? I'm sorry.

JAMIE HEDLUND: This is the last point on your basic market share calculations paper. It's a two-page paper at the bottom.

STAN BESEN: I'm just shuffling stuff here.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure. This is a research discussion worksheet.

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. Is this the one that's on the screen?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Well, no. It was one that was linked to in the agenda. So…

STAN BESEN: Jamie, I'm not sure it's mine. I don't recognize it, but tell me where it is.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I can put the link in the chat.

STAN BESEN: This is not mine. This is Jordyn's. So tell me where we're looking.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay, never mind then. Sorry. I thought…

STAN BESEN: Where are we looking?

JAMIE HEDLUND: At the very end.

STAN BESEN: Oh, I don't recognize that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. Well, I'm disappointed you don't have an answer for that, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I can make one up.

JAMIE HEDLUND: No, that's my job. Okay, I'm sorry.

STAN BESEN: Sorry. Yeah.

JAMIE HEDLUND: No further questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Any other questions on the paper that we're actually discussing?

Okay, that's great. Let's move on to Dejan's paper on registry policies, an amendment for that paper.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Actually, there is no particular update on this paper. But the thing with this paper is that I have a question we should reconsider. So when we discussed about this project a few months ago, at that moment, we thought that high-level question was quite good for that project and reflecting the purpose, what we're looking for. But after we got data and finished some analysis and conclusions, we discovered, many people from subteam raised that issue that this high-level question is not so perfect for these findings and projects. So I think that we should reconsider that with the whole team and maybe to find some better place for this data. So the same question is applied for another project that I'm presenting later [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think the high-level question doesn't apply. [inaudible] and it was just because of the problem that Stan raised on the last call, that we don't know whether users know our policies.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Stan write that question also, Jordyn, and generally, it's very hard to prove that registrants are making some analysis of policies before they decide which string to choose. Probably some of them are doing this,

but it's not so usual. And if it is, this product is under that question. The purpose of that would be to answer on that question. Are the registrants choosing [strength] and registries based on their policies?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So part of what we want to do is keep a running tally of questions we want to ask registrants because they're going to be coming from all sides. So that's probably something that, as one of our recommendations, will have a fairly developed set of questions that, given the ability to start all over again, that we might ask registrants. So let's have everybody keep that in mind as we're working on this and set aside questions that you'd like to ask registrants. And then maybe the next time there's a survey, we can get those questions on the list.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yeah. That would be one of the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, that makes sense.

Are there other questions? This paper isn't new. Are there other questions or comments for Dejan? This is just a check-in to see if there are any updates on the last time it was presented, [conflict] [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: I actually think, although it doesn't fit under non-price competition, it's actually quite interesting stuff. I hope we can find a place for it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I think definitely and the other thing that's interesting is that it sort of fits under Laureen's narrative about trustworthiness as well when it comes to privacy policies and things like that. So I think there will definitely be a place for the analysis so I'm not about that because the narrative that Laureen is developing, I think it would slide well into that.

Any other questions or comments?

Okay. Let's move on to Waudo and discuss the brand TLDs.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, Jonathan. Waudo is [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: He's on the phone or not on at all? What did you say?

ALICE JANSEN: He sent an e-mail and said he couldn't join, so I'm afraid he's not on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. Okay. Thank you. Let's keep going then. That's Waudo again. We're down to price analysis with Stan.

STAN BESEN: This actually has been changed a bit in response to very good comments from Megan and Carlton, so if people have a chance to sort of go look at

it, basically, it's because of the absence of data and the presence of the caps, it just makes it hard to draw inferences. And so what I try to do here is to speculate about what might be happening, but we can't be very definitive about it.

Actually, I was thinking about this, about inferences we could draw from the little bit of data that we have here and I guess I would say if it had turned out that the prices for the new guys had been way, way higher than the average of the price caps, that would have been some information that you would say they couldn't possibly be providing any constraint at all. Given the fact that they don't seem all that far apart, it's really hard to draw any inferences and I basically try to say as much as I could here without hanging myself.

And so I think people should go back and look at this carefully and look at the exact wording. A lot of the wording changed in response to Megan and Carlton and the nuances here are important. I want to make sure I'm not overstating the case. Hello? Hello?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I can hear you, Stan, but I don't hear the rest.

STAN BESEN: Okay, good. Fine, I'm sorry. So please, I mean, this is a trickier thing to write for all of the reasons I've suggested already and so people should look at it and make sure we're not overstating the case.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, so we'll definitely do that. Carlton, have you had a chance to look at this new document yet because it would be important for you to see if it captured the comments that were submitted. Do you have microphone ability, Carlton?

Okay. We're not hearing you, Carlton, if you're speaking. Oh, I see that you're typing. Yes, but muted. Can you unmute? Oh. Staff, did we mute Carlton because of a noisy line or something like that?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm here now. They just unmated me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, there you go.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I did read Stan's update, then I think it pretty much captures what I was trying to say. I also looked at what Megan was suggesting and in my opinion, the changes captured what I think we were putting [to Stan.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great, thanks, Carlton, and thanks Stan for incorporating these comments. Everyone, please take it as a takeaway to take a look at this, since Stan has flagged that this is a little bit more nuanced language, and that's where everyone's going to want to be signed off before that's trotted out to the public, so please [inaudible].

Staff, we may want to re-mute Carlton, since he's apparently got [inaudible] noise [inaudible]. Thank you, whoever was responsible for that.

Then, Dejan, you have another paper to discuss.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, great.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, as I mentioned before, the high-level question has the same problem here with this project, like the previous one on registry policies. This researching is based on CCT metrics reporting and Rights Protection Mechanism review.

Generally, you will see improved Rights Protection Mechanisms and it's more effective in order to take down a website which infringes intellectual property as well as to fight cybersquatting. If we're comparing fees, it's lower than [inaudible] four times cheaper if you compare it with the single panel at [inaudible] for example.

In general, you'll see this measure is more effective, but it has only limited purpose, and it's only dedicated to suspend a domain name. domain name after this process can't be transferred or deleted, so that's the main concern of trademark owners, that they don't have

possibility to transfer in their property that domain name, or to delete it or to forbid it.

After that domain name which is suspended expires, it's available to be registered by another infringer or cybersquatter, so that's the limitation of this process. That will be it in short.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, thank you, Dejan. Other people had a chance to take a look at this. Do you have questions based on the overview? Obviously, the opinions vary wildly as to whether or not there have been sufficient improvements for trademark owners, but [inaudible]. Are there other comments or questions?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Before questions –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead.

DEJAN DJUKIC: For me or someone else? I didn't hear you well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Dejan, you, go ahead.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay. We had discussion yesterday on the subteam call, and Waudo and Jordyn I remember asked about how many [inaudible] processes held in last few years, and to compare that with European. I'll do that in the next few days and make that addition. It's available in the CCT metrics, so just to add that before any question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Dejan. Are there any questions or comments on this? Did David Taylor say that he couldn't make [inaudible]? Yes, okay. Dejan, if you could do me a favor and send a non-group e-mail just directly to David Taylor with this document, then that might go to a different place in his inbox and get his feedback on this, because I think he's best equipped.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, I'll do it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And it's possible that he has a rule that all the group e-mails go into a folder that he checks periodically, so just send it directly.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thank you, Dejan. Thanks for your presentation.

DEJAN DJUKIC: You're welcome.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn is not yet on, so he's not available in the first hour or so, so I guess Laureen, it looks like it's back to you, and then we'll double back to Jordyn when he joins the call.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and I'm actually going to subdelegate to the people who are most involved in the papers. What I'd like to do is just to have people give a very brief, high-level summary of their papers, and then discuss any topics that still need further input, of there are topics that need further airing to deal with those on this call, and then proceed that way, if that sounds alright with you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good. I'm not sure whether we have Gao on the call, but I know we have Carlton, so Carlton, can you give a very short summary of the Consumer Awareness paper? And my sense with this paper is that you have reformulated some of the focus on the sub-questions to make sure it relates to awareness and trust, and perhaps the place for input may be on recommendations, but I'm going to leave it to you to define this as you think is most helpful.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, so we had a discussion about the paper originally, so we kind of refashioned the paper to focus more on trust and relationship with awareness and trust. We changed the sub-questions and found data that we could support the sub-questions from the Nielsen surveys, and Gao and I just kind of combined the two groups that we were looking at: consumers and registrants, and we asked some questions.

Awareness increase year on year, greater awareness leading to increased trust, what attributes and practices of new gTLDs have led to increased trust? We were trying to see what was it that made them more trustworthy. We asked the question because it came up quite often [inaudible] in terms of where registrants were going, and we asked where alternative identities more trustworthy, and we're [throwing] the question there because it came up, and this is for everybody to weigh in on this.

Is the [inaudible] promoting increase awareness by consumers of the new gTLDs? What we have found, trust has increased year on year on the consumer side, but it seems to have decreased on the registrant side. One of those anomalies that may take some digging to figure out what it really means.

If you look at the data, and this is mostly from the phase two research of both registrant and survey, you would see total awareness on the consumer side increase by almost 20% from 46% to 62% between 2015 and 2016, and then there's the question of – because the two waves are the different sets of new gTLDs which the questions were asked, you

see in the report a distinction between what they call consistent new gTLDs, which is the set that was in play from 2015-2016, and then ones that were introduced additionally.

But suffice to say that in the consumer segment, trust and awareness increased year on year. In the registrant survey, it decreased year on year. It seems that, from the data, it was not even across regions. Trust on the consumer side was highest across Europe, increased across Europe, and followed by North America and Asia Pacific, and in the registrant survey, the decreases were highest in Africa, followed by North America and Europe. Asia Pacific kind of remained steady.

If you look down at the detail of what was learned in Africa, the South African numbers, so what the Africa area was producing, awareness seems to be highest for geographically targeted gTLDs by customers, regardless of where they are. The consumer awareness was independent of the time that the gTLD was in play, that is it was delegated and live, available for registration, and that is so regardless of the first set or the second set.

In contrast, consumer awareness remained higher for legacy gTLDs, and that continues to grow. Consumer awareness is independent of the number of domain names sold in each gTLD, and that is for the new gTLD segment. Then, in response to the awareness and trust in TLDs, trust seems to have a slight decrease in the consumer segment. The registrants was a mixed bag, because they are showing that less than half of the new gTLDs, including the geotargeted gTLDs, were seen as trustworthy by registrants, and registrants [do] generally have higher trust levels than consumers.

There are some numbers there that show you what the average trust was. If you look at trustworthiness with consumers versus registrants, it is clear between 2015 and 2016 overall that registrants had less trust, and that when you ask what attributes and practices led to increased trust, the answer came back registration restrictions seem to increase trust in the registrant group.

Purchase restrictions in those new gTLDs also increase trust. Then, there is the reputation of the gTLD, and perceived safety, security in usage, and it is something that goes all through the registrants as well as the consumer surveys. [inaudible] extension seems to have a lot to do with trust.

If you look at the details of trust restrictions, registrants have become more opposed to registration restrictions overall than consumers, and that is looking at 2015 data versus the 2016 data. Opposition to restriction seems to be trending down in the registrant sector.

The increase though – there is an increase – the increases seem mostly for those new gTLDs with implied purpose, which is something that we can look at more closely, I think, in the next wave. Alternative identities more trustworthy, a mixed bag here.

If you look at the registrants, they tend to have more alternative identities at use for new gTLD registrants versus the legacy gTLD registrants. What is interesting, one in four of them say that they're using alternative identity in lieu of registering alternative domain names, and this seems to be more prevalent in South America and Europe.

One in six say that they did not renew a domain name in favor of using an alternative identity. More than half of them, 54% said they would be less likely to register a new domain name or renew an existing one, which is probably more interesting for us to continue to look at, and if you look at doubling down and why they would be less likely to renew new domain names or renew existing ones, cost and ease of use seems to be top of mind for them.

The rest of the report just gives you some details of whether something in select TLDs, especially those that are implied purposes. So all in all, the recommendations with registry owners [inaudible] trustworthiness? Registry operators might look at that.

There's the note here that says recommendation requires high level of trust. The idea also because restrictions are related to trust and trustworthiness, the suggestion was that we consider announcing those attributes that would improve trustworthiness in the new gTLDs.

And for those registries that were judged to be low on trust, the idea is that they might do something to improve trustworthiness going forward in their own right by having some campaign to make them more known or more aware. Awareness seems to attract trustworthiness, and they might also want to look at what attributes they might assign to the registry that would improve trust. So that's about what we have here.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlton. I want to pick just on some comments in the chat, and one of them really relates to sort of how the lens through which we view these shifts in numbers between the wave one and the wave two

studies, and I think that's an issue we've talked a little bit about in our group, but I think bears emphasizing is that I believe there's a 5% margin of error that Nielsen states the survey results are susceptible to, so that when we see a decrease or an increase in numbers, whether it's an increase or a decrease in trust or some other percentage, if it falls within that margin of error, it's not necessary statistically significant, so we wouldn't want to say something has increased or decreased if it's only within 5%, because it's within the margin of error. That's just something we need to keep in mind when we're reporting on these results, so that if it's less than 5% threshold, we can't really rely on that as something definitive.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Precisely. That is why we always say it's a mixed bag, because if you look – and why you go down to the regional level, Laureen – because if you look at the regional reports, they tend to differ in quantity, and that's why it's important to look at the regional and see where the numbers are coming from. In some areas in the world, it's more important. In other areas of the world, it's not, so that's why it is a mixed bag and we have to be mindful that it's not even across the world.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, so I think we're on the same page there. So I'll open it up for questions, if folks have questions or comments for Carlton.

DREW BAGLEY: Hi, Carlton. I think it would be great if, maybe along the lines of what you and Laureen just discussed, you'd keep all the parts where you're emphasizing the statistically significant differences in all the different parts of the world and the variations from one year to the other, but then change the way you [word] average consumer – the overall reflection that average consumer trust in new gTLDs reflected a slight decrease, because that one is not statistically significant, whereas the breakdown you're talking about is.

So I think that sentence perhaps should instead reflect the fact that average consumer trust did not reflect a statistically significant change, whereas individual metrics measuring consumer trust did, and then lead in that way.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, sure, Andrew, that is perfectly reasonable.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Any other comments or questions for Carlton? And thank you, Carlton, and Gao in absentia for putting this together.

STAN BESEN: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I'm not sure they're always the [inaudible] margin of error is always 5%. I just don't remember. I remember when the guy from Nielsen presented stuff to us, he actually would say, "This difference is not significant." Perhaps we could just run these differences by him and have him confirm which are and which are not significant. And by the way, this significance also depends on the confidence level that one uses, so it's a complicated concept, but maybe at least we could rely on him for at least vetting the numbers so that when we say something is different, he agrees that it's [inaudible] different.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and that is actually a question we had posed to Eleeza, our excellent resource on a lot of Nielsen data matters. And unless I'm misunderstanding what Eleeza had conveyed, it was that for this particular survey, 5% was the margin of error. But Eleeza, jump in if I've misunderstood that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks, Laureen. Nielsen states in the methodology section of their reports that they're reporting findings that are 95% confidence interval level, so yes, as far as I understood, it was a plus minus 5% margin of error, but that being said, I think Stan has a good point, and I [inaudible] to share this with Nielsen and make sure that the conclusions we're drawing are in line with what they reported. I'm happy to do that.

STAN BESEN: Eleeza, I think that's actually very important. I think using the words 95% confidence interval level in the footnote would be useful to the reader so that they know what we're saying, what we mean.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, I will share this paper with Nielsen. Thank you.

STAN BESEN: That's great.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think in general, as we're considering these narratives, we need to be mindful in both the competition and the consumer trust arenas that some of this stuff is technical and not intuitive, and we need to be able to translate this in a way that average Joe and Jane can actually figure it out, because when I hear 95% confidence in interval levels – and I'm sure I just gargled up that phrase horribly, but – what I need to know before a translation is that it could be plus or minus and not be meaningful. We can't just rely on it, so I think we need to have the precise technical language there, Stan, but then I think we also need to have a real world translation so that someone actually can understand what's being said.

STAN BESEN: I'll try to help with the translation.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Oh, good. Thank you. Okay, any more questions or comments for Carlton?
	Okay, then I think unless Jordyn has joined – do we want to go back to Jordyn's high-level findings now, Jonathan, or do you want to continue on the consumer trust track?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	I guess I might not think about that. We may as well have you continue and pick up with Jordyn – unless he has a schedule [inaudible] pick up with Jordyn as you get through it.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Sure, that's fine. Okay, then the other J, Jamie, is the next person up to talk about consumer trust in the DNS, whether that's improved overall.
JAMIE HEDLUND:	Sure, thanks Laureen. I will be brief. This paper looked at two Nielsen consumer surveys and two Nielsen global registrant surveys, specifically at the question of trust in the DNS, and at a high level, what both of those series of surveys found was that for both registrants and consumers, trust in the DNS was high in 2015, and remained high and actually started to increase in 2016.
	They gauged that primarily by looking at trust in the DNS compared to trust in other technology industries like ISPs and application providers, service providers, online service, ecommerce, and what they found was

that in most cases, it was actually higher than it was for other tech industries, but it was at least as high.

As I mentioned, it was an increase from 2015 to 2016, but there's not enough data to see whether that's sustained increase, let alone causality, whether it's because of the New gTLD Program. Trust was highest in Asia and Africa, and there was more skepticism in Europe and North America.

There were some really interesting findings on the issue of validation [inaudible] or what registry operators might do for certain strings, and a lot of the respondents did not like the idea of any restrictions. In other words, they like open TLDs, but they also expected that strings associated with a regulated sector would be subject to – even if it's more self-regulation in terms of making sure that they don't go to anyone perpetrating fraud or other illegal activity.

So that's what this paper reviews, I'm happy to take any questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, questions for Jamie? Jamie, I'm not seeing or hearing any questions, so thank you. Thanks for also being responsive to various feedback and your quick turnaround with that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Absolutely.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, then moving on, we are now moving from awareness and consumer trust issues, and I'll just remind people that we have – on the prior plenary call, there was a discussion of consumer trust more explicitly, so that is the third paper that would be added to this, but it's already been discussed.

So there's the awareness component, there's consumer trust in the New gTLD Program, vis-à-vis legacy gTLDs, and then this consumer trust overall in the DNS. Those are the three segments. Now, we're moving on to a separate but related segment, which is, has the New gTLD Program mechanisms in [safe] to improve trustworthiness?

So we move from this subjective viewpoint, what are people's perceptions of trustworthiness, to something at least in theory more objective: what mechanisms have been put in place to improve trustworthiness, and here we get to the safeguards.

So even though this is organized in a way that talks about background and description, and in particular the safeguards applicable to all gTLDs, and sensitive and highly regulated gTLDs – in fact, a lot – and the technical safeguards – really, most of this information is contained in two different papers: Calvin's paper on the technical safeguards and the implementation of those, and then my paper, which provides some backgrounds and descriptions of the new gTLD safeguards, and how that has been implemented.

Those are, at least in my part, it's a rather lengthy paper that already actually has quite a bit of narrative already in it, but if I were going to put things at a very high level, what I would say for an overview is that

many of the safeguards implemented as part of the New gTLD Program arose in the context of ICANN's decision to implement GAC safeguards advice as a result of the Beijing communiqué, and much of the intended goal of that safeguard advice was to mitigate increased risks that might come about as a result of extending the New gTLD Program, particularly risks of abuse in the domain names, and that was particularly defined – and this is a technical safeguards paper that's up, but right now, I'm talking about the paper that I have about whether the safeguards have been implemented effectively, so if we can get that up, after that I'm going to turn the floor over to Calvin.

So is it possible to switch papers? Yes? I'll wait for that to happen, but again, much of that advice was targeted to trying to mitigate those risks, whether it was a risk of abuse like farming, phishing, malware or other deceptive conduct – and I see your upload is in progress, so that's good. Great.

Or trying to implement safeguards that lets the public have a dedicated place to complain, that lets law enforcement have a place to complain, those are some very targeted goals of the safeguards overall. So my papers go through this in detail, and I welcome people's feedback or comments, but what my papers do is go through the safeguards applicable to all gTLDs. Those include WHOIS safeguards. I think everybody has independent scrolling. It includes mitigating abusive activity. It includes security checks, so registries can detect abusive activity. And just as a high-level note, many if not most of the safeguards really aim at responsibilities for the registry, but it's important to know that sometimes, the responsibility of the registry is to require a registrar to do something. So sometimes these safeguards

have downstream requirements; i.e., it runs from the registry to the registrar to the registrant. In certain cases, it can be a system of obligations.

The next set of safeguards focused on those particular new gTLDs that were felt to raise particular concerns. For shorthand, I call those regulated gTLDs. Again, certain safeguards applicable to those were implemented. My papers really go through an assessment of whether the implementation was done in a way that would promote effective enforcement.

I would say, overall, for all the categories of safeguards – all safeguards applicable to all gTLD safeguards, applicable to regulated to TLDs, and safeguards applicable to highly regulated gTLDs – there was certainly implementation of the safeguards. In a few places, there are some concerns listed where the language is perhaps mushy or imprecise, which makes it necessarily hard for ICANN Compliance to enforce.

Or, there's simply concerns that the implementation left room a higher risk of abusive behavior than was intended. I think that they gave the example there that it's generated a lot of community input, particularly from the ALAC and the Business Constituency and the GAC, filled with the safeguards applicable to highly regulated gTLDs, where there was advice to have a proactive verification and validation of credentials for highly regulated gTLDs, like charities, banks, or pharmacies, before a registrant would be able to have a domain in that highly regulated area.

There were concerns raised about the practicality of how that would be implemented. It was ultimately implemented in a manner that requires

EN

a representation; i.e., whoever wants to buy the [inaudible] in that area, who would basically represent that they have the appropriate credentials. If there were complaints, there would be a duty to investigate, etc. As I said, that's one that has generated a lot of input from the community.

With that said, I don't want to take more time on reading a paper to people. Really, the best way is for people to read this paper and just give me any feedback.

I know Carlos has some comments about basically how far back we need to go in terms of looking at the safeguards because, although there were safeguards applicable to the New gTLD Program, that wasn't necessarily the beginning of safeguards conceptually. Conceptually there were improvements made to the registrar agreement in the past as well.

However, this paper really does focus more exclusively on the New gTLD Program, so I see that as a question for discussion about how far back we should be reaching in terms of comparing things.

But I do note that it's our hope with the DNS abuse study to be able to draw a correlation to the rates of abuse between what's happening in the new gTLD domains and what's happening in legacy gTLD domains because there are these additional safeguards where there were none before. It'll be very interesting to see if abuse levels are different between new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs, to see if there are correlations there.

So that's my high-level summary. I'm putting the floor open now for questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for that, Laureen. This is Jonathan. I guess, as far as answering your general question about how far to go back, I think it's all going to be about being able to make the defensible argument about there being some relationship between changes in behavior and the New gTLD Program. So I think it's as much about having an answer to that question as it is about some absolute going back.

I think this is going to be problematic in some measure because strings are being delegated during the whole study period, so there was, for different things, a different start date [inaudible] take into consideration.

Anyways, I'll go back to the queue. Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Jonathan. Laureen, I guess one thing I'm curious about whether, if we're looking at what was suggested by the GAC, for example, versus what was actually implemented in terms of safeguards – I totally lost the ability to see the paper, so maybe this was addressed already – you're also tempted to look at the results of the safeguard that was implemented and I ask the question of "If the GAC articulated that we need a safeguard that looks like this, like the pre-verification on the sensitive strings, presumably that's to mitigate fraud or something like that," and then look to see what was actually implemented and say,

"Did it actually achieve the goal that the GAC was trying to get at anyways?" – or maybe it didn't; but in any case, trying to understand what extent the safeguards that were adopted actually met the goal where the [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I think that's exactly the right question, Jordyn. Actually, I reformulated this paper from its initial version, which had really focused on: what did the GAC advise, and what was actually implemented in response to feedback from the team, which was, "Well, shouldn't we really be focusing on what was implemented because that's what's on the table?"?

So what I really tried to do with this next iteration, which I'd love to get your feedback on, is: what was implemented? The only time where I really reached back, as in the case of the verification and validation, was if it was a particular hot button topic.

With the WHOIS safeguard, one of the issues there was how ICANN decided to implement its own WHOIS Accuracy Review project, and that project looked at accuracy of syntax and operability but has not moved to accuracy of identity. So that's an example where we looked back to see the bigger context, and verification/validation is another issue.

But primarily the focus is on: what was it intended to do, and did it do it? But in terms of the answer – well, did it in fact do that? – we don't know. We don't know because we don't yet have data from what we're hoping is going to be the DNS Abuse study.

Even then, we will only be able to draw a correlation because these safeguards basically created a whole synergy of the changes. It would be very hard to figure out if one particular change had an impact on abuse overall.

I think the best we might be able to say is that all of these taken together changed the playing field, and when we look at the playing field, we see a correlation in the levels of abuse between gTLDs that had all these safeguards and gTLDs that didn't. I don't know that we would be able to get at anything more specifically than that.

Does that answer your question, Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think that makes sense, I guess. It sounds like you're already doing this, but it's having a taxonomy of types of… What's the safeguard trying to prevent for each safeguard and then [inaudible] –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. I do have the –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Exactly. Then, as we look at the follow-on data – or maybe this is something future review teams will have to look at and say – for example, imagine some of these safeguards are going to have to be targeted in very different ways than the pre-verification on the sensitive strings. So maybe that's a specific area where we could look and see if that type of [inaudible] is actually happening or not.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's exactly right. In fact, that's the recommendation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Great. [inaudible] one I can actually – I'll look at your paper on the [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Terrific. Those are all good points. So, other good questions or comments? What I really found is that it's actually very, very complicated. It's complicated to figure out where the safeguards live in certain cases and what the intent was. We just don't have the data in many cases to figure out whether the intended goal was met.

I'm not seeing more questions, so –

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: This is Carlos. If you'll allow me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much. I really recommend this paper. It's really wonderful work. I want to comment on two issues that you raised.

One is that the implementation was not according to what the GAC expected. There were many comments in that direction. I don't know if we want to go into this, but just to be prepared for comments when we go to the public. It's a very weird situation because what the GAC says in some areas is, "This is an area where we have a lot regulation, so the registries should put a telephone number to call Laureen at the Federal Trade Commission." [It's a review].

But then what happens if you are not in the U.S. or if you are in a jurisdiction where there is no such agency, or the agency doesn't have the power that they have in different countries?

So this is a probable discussion that might come up again. The issue that we have the [local] jurisdictions in the mind of the GAC, and we have ICANN trying to please everybody around the world, and that's fair.

The other comment I wanted to make on the data is that we might go follow the arguments of the top-level recommendations that Stan has been promoting and ask ourselves, "If a highly regulated sector – let's say finance – had a lot of abuse before the new gTLDs, how did it happen? How is it now with all these banks?" Because we recognize a lot of banks were taking their brand and using it heavily.

So we might want to discuss these types of recommendations for future discussion of these issues because, if they stay on the same general level of data that we have been doing, they won't find anything next year or the year after or afterwards. We have to be very specific and try to consider if we want to go into [inaudible] of regulation and suggest that they should be checked by this specific [inaudible].

But I really recommend everybody – when I mentioned, Laureen, not to go through the whole story of WHOIS and so on, I only raise it from the document. The document is very valuable. By comment was geared only for the document of the CCT Review. I don't want to see overlaps with their WHOIS exercise, but they have already called the second one [inaudible].

But don't revise anything else. I think it's a great piece of legal research. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlos. I really appreciate your support. Also, I think you raised really excellent points about being specific with our recommendations. It would be very interesting if, when we get the abuse data, we see that there's abuse in certain gTLDs with particular subject matter, perhaps highly regulated, perhaps not. That would be something to look at closely for generating recommendations. We just have to see where the data guides us.

The other thing is we also do know already high areas that have generated a lot of concern, and that's something that even at this point

we can be sensitive to with our recommendations. So I appreciate that feedback.

Any other questions or comments on this topic?

Okay. I'm not seeing hands and I'm not hearing anyone, so, Calvin, could we go to your paper on the technical safeguards?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah –

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. I just was muted inadvertently. Can I raise a point quickly?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, absolutely, Stan. Go ahead.

STAN BESEN: This is actually not specific to this paper, but I just came from a meeting this morning, in which an FTC report was discussed. It was the one on entities that sue patent infringers – patent enforcement entities.

One of the points made by all the discussions – the concern was that it was great piece of work but the recommendations went well beyond what could be supported by the research. I guess I'm particularly sensitive at having just sat through this for about two hours this morning.

So I think we should be careful that we don't reach recommendations that can't directly be supported by the outcome of research. It's all right to say more research is needed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think that's a fair point. I think here we're [inaudible]. I think here we get into this qualitative versus quantitative issue that has been a theme. We do know objectively that highly regulated industries have certain risks associated with them because the public will give more sensitive information to those entities in order to have those entities do what they do, such as a medical establishment or an accountant or something like that. So that is objective.

Now, whether there's actually more abuse going on in those sectors, we don't know. That's something that we need further research for. But I do think there are some objective facts that can lead to recommendations, and there objective data that can lead to others.

I would just say, in an effort to be mindful of your point, Stan, we shouldn't forget that those are both sets of information that can feed into our recommendations, that studies and data from those studies aren't the only sources of information we have.

STAN BESEN: I just think we just have to be careful.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I agree. I think we're generally on the same page. If we have to disagree at the margins, we'll be able to hammer that out.

STAN BESEN: Every discussant at the session this morning said, "Great research. The recommendations were not supported by the research."

LAUREEN KAPIN: So that's a cautionary tale for us. I don't dispute that.

Other questions or comments?

Okay. Can we move on to Calvin and the Technical Safeguards paper, which is already up? Thank you, kind ICANN magicians.

CALVIN BROWNE: Hi. Good evening, everyone. Just very briefly, [inaudible] but as short as possible. Basically, I was tasked with verifying whether the technical [inaudible] was applicable to the new gTLDs implemented. I am just going to quickly run through them.

I have registry operators who have been technically vetted. DNS [inaudible] one point been prevented or has often been viewed as appropriately managed. Thick WHOIS has been implemented and has centralized [inaudible] have been implemented, as well as the [inaudible] registry security request process and the voluntary framework for high security zones and top-end domain [inaudible] programs [inaudible].

Basically, the brief rundown is the ones from [inaudible] are the ones that have been contracted and implemented in the Registry ICANN Agreement.

So the short answer is yes. As I've indicated before, it appears that this was the low-hanging fruit on which ICANN could actually do these things via the registry contract.

I haven't [inaudible] on that. I'm going to expand that and say [inaudible] low-hanging fruit. But if you think about it, ICANN's core mission is the technical stability of the DNS. It is also imperative that it [has] anything to do with stability right. That's probably one of the reason why this has been so [inaudible].

These last two points, the expedited registry security request and the voluntary framework for high security zones, those two will be [inaudible].

Very briefly, yes, it has been implemented. Just because something has been implemented – for instance, in the case of Thick WHOIS – doesn't actually mean that the accuracy, for instance, of a Thick WHOIS has improved. There are different processes, for instance, on that to actually go and have a – by which those measurements I've been trying to achieve.

Brian gave an extensive e-mail comment back on this, and I've made a couple of redline changes in reaction to the [many] changes to his e-mail. He has also sent a nice, 50-page paper, which I haven't been able to just go into my paper as of yet. I'm hoping to get to that real soon now.

Basically, that's the high-level summary of that. I'm prepared to take any questions or [inaudible] today further, as may be required.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Calvin. Does anyone have any questions or comments for Calvin?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hi. It's Brian. Can you hear me? Hello?

LAUREEN KAPIN: We can hear you.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Great. Calvin, I just want to encourage you to go through the new gTLD safeguards against DNS abuse report. It will be helpful in adding a lot of levels of detail to what you've written here; for example, that Compliance does monitor wildcarding and Orphan Glue, but we just don't receive any complaints on them. So that could be one sort of proxy measure for effectiveness.

So, yeah, I'm just encouraging you to look at it. I think it'll be very helpful for you. Thanks.

CALVIN BROWNE: Agreed. From what I've seen in several points I've [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thank you, Brian. That's an excellent point and one, Calvin, that I was very mindful of when I was doing my paper, which was trying to figure out if there were actual complaints that were being generated that related to specific safeguards. Sometimes I could figure that out, and sometimes I couldn't.
	In fact, some of the recommendations that I've generated relate to suggestions for how ICANN Compliance reports on complaints because right now there are many times when you can't tell if a certain safeguard has been complained about because it's not reported in that way. It's reported under a more general category, like abuse, for example. Or in WHOIS, you may have complaints, but you don't know if it's an identity verification issue or if it's something else.
	So that's a good reason for looking at the ICANN Compliance data because it may be that some of recommendations go to how things are being reported and transparency issue as a stepping stone to be able to get better data in the future.
CALVIN BROWNE:	Yeah. Agreed. I've seen on the registry side of things that they can have a – I'm not sure what the right wording is – relationship with ICANN Compliance, which sometimes can be [testy].
LAUREEN KAPIN:	I found that everyone has been helpful on staff with getting us the information we need or finding out if that information exists. So it's a great resource.

Any other questions or comments for Calvin? Go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: I have one further comment quickly to make. Another thing that I need to add on is your suggestion of giving some footnotes or definitions to certain terms, such as an explanation of wildcarding. I intend doing that as well. That might feed into a larger definition section that you might need to put together for our reports as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you for reminding me about that. That is one of the things we had discussed that may be a general issue for the final or preliminary report that the review team does as a whole. We're dealing with some very precise and, in certain cases, rather technical things that we may know the definition of, or some of us may know, but the community as a whole may not know; again, particularly Joe and Jane Public.

So that's one of the things we discussed in my subteam that may be useful for the review team as a whole; that perhaps we want to come up with a glossary of a definitions document so that, when we're using these very precise terms, like wildcarding or your economic index [specs] that you refer to so often, Stan – I'm not going to massacre it – like the H1; that we define what that is.

I see Carlton has a hand up. Carlton, I see your hand up but I'm not hearing you.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: The staff may have muted his line, so if you could unmute him, then he'll be able to talk.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi. Okay. Thank you, Laureen. I just want to say – I'm sure you know this – that there was an original assignment to me about whether our new procedures are effective in enforcing safeguards, emphasis on the new procedures.

What I did was go through all the procedures that were largely implemented in the New gTLD Program, starting at the Board level, and then coming through to show what it is that they were intended to do and how it impacts [inaudible] systems.

So in that paper I sent you earlier on, what I was looking at was all the procedures. [I balanced] the PICs. What has happened in terms of this levels and so on – I got some information through Brian and Eleeza, from staff, and from Compliance about the PICs and what has come up with PICs.

I started from the position of looking at results and backing my way into it. I used that information that was provided from Compliance, and I looked again at the reports that were generated from various kinds of abuses from outside factors, like APWG and Stanhouse and so on. I looked at what they're saying as opposed to what the PICs are saying.

If you recall, these kinds of abuse now are within the envelope for Compliance reporting by virtue of Spec 11 requirements. Previously,

they were in the RAA, and the dependency was on the RAA. The [RARAA] combinations take care of them.

With the new procedures now part of Spec 11, they rise one level up to the registry level, so you have a sense now about what can happen if there is [inaudible] response to the abuses have been tracked by Compliance.

Generally, what you see is that maybe they are tracking them, but the reporting on the various factors are so different. Then you don't have a leveling of what really is happening.

So if you look at that paper, I got some information, specifically [on that one], on specific abuses, and you can see where there might be some kind of delta between what Compliance is reporting and [what they enacted in the area [inaudible].

I just thought I might mention it there because this is not evidence collection, and reporting has come up so often in the conversation. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Carlton. I will definitely look back at that. I recall looking at it when I was drafting the implementation paper, but it's absolutely a good idea to go back to that.

Can we mute the background just so we don't get –

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's Carlton's line.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Thank you. We haven't gotten to a discussion on the PICs yet, and I fear we're not going to be able to get to it since our time is up now. But I did look at the information about complaints regarding the PICs, and it's very sparse information because it doesn't seem like there is a lot information about complaints about PICs and enforcement activities. But I will definitely look back at that.

I did the read that paper. I think we have general information about abuse levels in general, but it doesn't really reflect on the new gTLDs specifically, and it certainly doesn't compare abuse levels in the new gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs, which is what we really would like to get information on and what we're hoping to still get information on.

Jonathan, I don't know how you want to proceed here; if we want to go back to Jordyn and have a longer call, or table this and schedule some time in addition [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I don't know what people are going to do about extending or not. So we should probably just wrap up since people are being [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. [inaudible] be able to [inaudible]. Based on the feedback we had on our own call earlier in the week, we're going to revamp the

[probable] findings doc. I'll recirculate that. So if people have comments at that point, it will be helpful to go over them online.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thanks, Jordyn. We just need to underscore that, if stuff is getting circulated, the importance of providing feedback off the call is only going up. So let's make sure and get feedback back to folks so that you're not hearing things for the first time on these calls.

We'll move on, and things we didn't get to with the PICs or whatever we'll move to the next call.

I don't know if it was housekeeping that we needed to do, but I'll be reaching out. We've shared AM Global's paper. I'm hoping to get Carlos, Carlton, and Waudo, maybe, to combine forces to look at the applicant survey results and the AM Global survey results and begin to answer some of the questions about the effectiveness of the application evaluation process in the global south. But I will put that out over e-mail as well.

All right, folks. Thanks a lot for the call. Let's be vigilant about things when they're circulated about getting back to people. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Also, I just wanted to note that Carlos recommended a discussion on the PICs, and, yes, I definitely think we need to do that in whatever next call we have.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	All right. Sounds good. Thanks, Laureen. Thanks, everyone, who presented. Thanks, Stan. You have [created] in lot of ways this call. Thanks a lot. We'll see you all soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]