
RECORDED VOICE: -- meeting is now being recorded.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hey, it's Jamie.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Hi there.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Good morning.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Good morning.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: And to you as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Speaking? [AUDIO BREAK] And I am going on mute folks so you don't have to listen to me type.

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.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Laureen, for the record, I already have the recoding started and paused, so if you will tell me when you're ready, I will unpause it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so we'll give people a few more minutes. Did we hear from Jonathan whether he is able to participate in any of the call today?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think we know as much as you do, that he was going to try to be part initially, and then he might have to [inaudible], and so I guess the proof will be in the pudding.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Wise words. So I'll give people two more minutes and then we'll start.

[AUDIO BREAK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so I think we should get started. So, this is Laureen Kapin, and I'm going to be chairing the call today, as Jonathan has a different commitment. It is our 28th Plenary Call, and I will start with asking if anyone has any updates to their statements of interest. Okay, not hearing anything, we'll move on to our first topic, and also, thanks everyone for joining us.

We have a revised work plan which I thought, Jean-Baptiste, it would be good if we can get up on the screen for people to look at. What generated this was a call by some members of the review team expressing concern that things were a little too abbreviated at this rather critical point of our effort. We have drafts in varying degrees of readiness, but because of the time of year, and a lot of people being stretched a bit thin, we felt that there should be more time for people to contribute their comments, there should be more time for the penholders to engage in further revisions.

Also, I know that there are certain papers that also are still coming down the pike. So, in light of that recognition, we decided that it would make more sense to get our preliminary draft report out by the third week in February, and basically this revised work plan reflects that additional time for both the process for input to remain open, and also for the review team itself to have a more extended and meaningful period to make sure that we are all comfortable with the content of the preliminary report.

So, what you see on the screen is basically this revised schedule. I wanted to give folks a chance to take a look at this and also answer any questions that folks may have. I wanted, before I give folks a few minutes to take at that, so I did want to highlight something. So, we still do have one more Plenary Call next week, and although some people go away for the holidays and take time off, for others it's actually a really quiet productive time. So, for those who have the luxury of that really quiet, productive time, this would be a great time to really think about the contents of the report, especially the recommendations. So, I urge

people to look closely at the recommendations and raise any comments, concerns, enthusiasm that they have.

Here are some key deadlines. This draft report is going to be chosen for public comment by the third week in January, either Friday the 20th or Monday the 23rd. So, that is a hard deadline, so we only have a few more weeks and plenary calls to go through any topic that people feel are controversial, and I'll highlight January 3rd, because that's going to be the next iteration of drafts for the review team, and I'll also highlight January 11th, because that's the deadline for input on that second draft. And just a word about logistics, for the penholders who are using Word, which would be Stan and myself, what is very helpful is for you to get your comments to us back in a Word document.

But, you still need to CC Jean-Baptiste, so that he can incorporate all the changes, because we are working both with Google docs and Word docs and if things just get sent to Stan or I, or Drew, or Megan, or David, or Jordyn, or Dejan, all the other people who are actually working on discrete sections of this, then only they get it, but it doesn't make it into the final consolidated version. So, please make sure, when you're providing comments, that you provide them to Jean-Baptiste, as well. And I see from the notes that I misspoke, so I intended to say third week of January, I'm not sure what exactly I did say, the third week of January is what I meant. Okay. So, that is one comment. I also see we have an additional person with just a phone number, and I'm not sure I know who that is.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, this is Jamie Hedlund, I just rejoined after being dropped.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it, okay, good, good. Thanks, Jamie. Okay. So that is some highlighted dates here. And you'll note that this drives us to a March 1st closing date for public comments. So, that will give us a little bit of time before ICANN58 in Copenhagen to at least get a sense of what our public comments are, and basically we wanted to make sure that even if we gave ourselves more time to generate the preliminary report, we still had a closing date for the public comments that took place before ICANN58. And the other thing I want to emphasize is that at this point these are hard deadlines, because we want to make sure that the public comment period closes before ICANN58. So, with that said, I'll let folks digest this for a minute or two, and take any questions that people might have, questions or concerns. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, and I'm not hearing any questions or concerns, so this will be -- Jean-Baptiste, just remind me, has this already been sent out to our review team, or is this the first time everyone at the plenary is seeing it?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The work plan, it's the first time.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so then what I would ask is send it out to the review team, just so they have a convenient copy for themselves and know these deadlines, I'm sure we'll be reminding them as well, but I just want to make sure

everyone has this at hand. And perhaps just with a highlighting note for those who are not on the call, that we have a little more time to finalize our preliminary report, which means we really want to hear from folks. Happy Holidays, more time for your input.

So, with that, what I want to do is move on to comments received on different sections of the draft report. And Jordyn, I wasn't sure if you now have a microphone and wanted to deal with any of the competition topics, or if you prefer me to start off with the consumer trust paper, which is what I had intended to discuss for my part of the time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, I do have a mic now, but I see Stan is not on the call, and I think there's a large number of comments related to his section of the doc, so maybe if you start with your, I can scan through the comments on Stan's section, and see if there are significant issues that are worthy of discussing today.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, that's fine, yeah. I don't think Stan is intending to join the call today. Okay. So, then I think what I'd like to do is, I know that you, Jean-Baptiste, have a partially consolidated version of my document. I will tell folks that I'll be discussing things in addition to this, because I received comments from several different sources, not all of which made it to the consolidated document, because folks were emailing me directly, but not CC'ing Jean-Baptiste, and I didn't catch that until late in the process. So I have the benefit of all the comments, and what I'm

going to do is try and move through this in a consolidated way to the extent I can, while I'm looking at three different pieces of paper.

So, Stan, in absentia, I will still laud Stan, because he was first out of the gate with many helpful comments. I think Stan raised two clarity issues, predominantly, one is the terminology issue, in that we have these two studies, one of consumers and one of registrants, and the terminology may be a little bit confusing, especially given that in our terms of reference, we define consumers to mean both end users and registrants, and I think Stan's suggestion was to use the word "end user," but it's a question of clarity.

And one of the reasons I'm loathe to use the word "end user" is because the Nielsen study itself talks about consumers and registrants, and I'm loathe to start using different terminology. But I do take the point that we need to be clear in how we're defining things. So I don't know if people have thoughts on that, but to me, the comment is that we need to be very precise in our terminology, and I think maybe having some introductory language about the way we're using those terms would be helpful.

And I see Megan's comment about being careful about changing terminology, that's my concern, also. I think we need to mirror the terms actually used in the study, and to the extent we're using them in any more general way. For example, again, in our terms reference, the review team itself defines "consumer" to include end users and registrants, we need to be explicit.

And Margie is saying we have a glossary, too. So I think this just points to the need for everyone who is using the Nielsen study, and a large number of us are in our papers, to make sure you're using the same terminology as Nielsen does, but if you are referring to any words in a broader sense, perhaps because the review team thinks of it in a broader sense, then you need to be explicit. I raise this as kind of an illustrative point. So, that's my suggested approach to this general topic which I think will not only impact me, but anyone else on the team who is using these terms. Any questions or comments just on that point? Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, I'm just trying to think through whether it makes sense to normalize what the surveys are saying, so Nielsen uses a particular vocabulary, if we're generally using another vocabulary in our report to refer to the same thing, wouldn't it make more sense to use the terminology that we're using throughout the report?

So for example, if Nielsen says "consumer," when what they mean by our vocabulary is really "end user," because they also use the word "registrant" which is just a subcategory of "consumer," I think, by our definition. And so I think if we just fall back to their terminology, it can be confusing because they're using the word slightly differently than we will use throughout the rest of the report.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

This is Jamie, and I apologize I can't raise my hand, so I'm not allowed to talk, but "registrant" obviously has a specific meaning, and it's a specific

category of users in both the Nielsen report and throughout our report. The registrant can be a consumer, but I think more generally when people say "consumers," they mean "end users."

So, my recommendation would be either to clarify that "consumers" does not include "registrants," or use "end users" instead of "consumers." But I think we have to maintain the integrity of the term "registrants," but I think it would, perhaps, be helpful to clarify the distinction between "end user" and "consumer." I don't think it's helpful to leave "consumer" out there as a possible "registrant."

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Right, I agree with you Jamie, that we don't want to muck up the word "registrant." So what I'm hearing is the suggestion that at least in the papers that really dive into the Nielsen consumer study and the Nielsen registrant study, to replace the word "consumer" with "end user."

The other thing that I guess I would want some weigh-in from staff, particularly Eleeza and Brian, is whether the Nielsen consumer survey was using "end user," if that's the right term for it, so to speak, you know, based on the people they actually surveyed, if that would be the right term to use. From a plain language standpoint it strikes me that way, but I wouldn't want to substitute a word that isn't precise.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

This is Eleeza. I am looking at the Wave II Consumer Report and how they refer to it in there. So, on Side 3, they refer to it as including "global online consumer end user," and then the other survey which

included "global online registrants" who were interviewed were reported separate.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I recall when we were talking about how we distinguish between them we had talked about, well, what if we get "end users," because some of those people who will qualify for the survey obviously may also be domain name registrants, and I believe we actually filtered them out and put them aside, and we're going to contact them against the registrant, the survey said these would feed certainly surely just "users," so to speak, and not registrants. I'm going to double check the actual survey language right now and see what we did with those folks, but I'm pretty sure that is how we treated them.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So then I take it you think it would be accurate to use the word "end user?"

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I do, yeah, I think it just might be important to caveat it whenever we are talking about the survey, like you said, Laureen, and make it clear who you are talking about when you're referring to survey results.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, what I'm hearing then is the preference to be fact checked, so to speak, when we're describing the survey results, to use the word "end user," when we're referring to the results of the consumer research study. This what I'm hearing from Jamie, and that's what I'm hearing from Jordyn, and I'm also seeing some cautionary notes just about precision from Megan, and I share that, we're going to need to be very, very precise about that.

Any other thoughts, concerns about this terminology issue? In terms of action items, I think this is also a communication we want to put out to the penholders, if we are going to be using this as a convention, i.e. whenever you're referring to the results of the Nielsen consumer study, use the word "end user," that something we should communicate to the team, after we have the green flag from Eleeza, Brian, et al, and the rest. Okay. I'm continuing to scroll down, Jordyn, and I'm looking at your comment. I'm not going to go over what I see as stylistic changes, I'm really focusing on substantive issues.

The next issue that Stan had raised, that I actually brought up with Brian, was the issue of statistical significance between the Wave I and Wave II Nielsen studies. Specifically, in a lot of this paper, I am making some comparisons between the Wave I and Wave II, and Stan's caution was there may be big changes in numbers, but are they statistically significant? And not being a statistician or an economist, naturally I did the wise thing and went to Brian, who has a lot of more substantive expertise on this issue.

And Brian actually did a very helpful review of the paper and suggested some changes where we can make some slight adjustments to the

language, but actually much of the language he suggested leaving as is, but did make some changes where he thought that the language needed to be more precise, so as not to imply a statistical significance where was not. So, Brian can you just say a few words on this concept? Because I, for one, found it to be a bit confusing and when I'm confused I always think there's a possibility that others may be confused as well.

So I thought maybe, Brian, you can explain this concept briefly, because many members of the review team are looking at these reports and relying on them, and I thought that would be helpful to discuss. [AUDIO BREAK] You're having trouble coming off mute. Is there any technical assistance? Are you off mute now? You're typing. Okay, so Brian has to dial back in. We can put a place holder there to come back to Brian when he is connected.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Laureen, while he's dialing back in, just a quick answer on the question of "end user" versus "consumer." I'm looking at the survey and we actually took out all the questions that had to do with whether someone had registered a domain name, and they had fallen into the "consumer"...

BRIAN AITCHISON:

Can you hear me?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

We can hear you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Brian, yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Oh, sorry, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm just hearing from Eleeza for a minute, and then we'll get back to you. Great, I'm glad we can hear you, Brian. Go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, what I was going to suggest is perhaps when you start getting into the survey results, what you lay out is the qualifying criteria that Nielsen included for who they defined as a consumer, which were those who were 18 and up, spent at least 5 or more hours per week on the internet, and say that this is who qualified and this is how they defined a "consumer end user," which is the terminology they used in the report. And I can email that to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and I know where that it is in the survey because I've been looking at the survey so much.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, it's the main methodology page.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right, which is right in the beginning. I'm wondering then, as you're mentioning it, so it sounds like, just for clarity, registrants weren't necessarily screened out, it's just we eliminated questions that we wanted to save for the registrant survey, is that right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's correct, so there may have been registrants in there, but we don't know how many they represented or really anything about that group and who was actually in the sample.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, I'm wondering if it might be a fix to use the phrase "consumer end users," I know that's a little cumbersome, but at least it would match the terminology that Nielsen seems to use.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I think that would be fair, and I think I would do so, again, with saying here is how they defined it, and here is who is qualified to join the survey.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, Jordyn, in your comment I think maybe you mistyped, do you mean, I don't think in our definition of "end user," we imply they can't also be registrants? You typed end users.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I meant in the definition of registrants that they have the end users, or the end users can't be registrants. So I guess we could say consumer end user, but it's definitely clumsy, and elsewhere, especially in the glossary, if we use in the same roughly as Nielsen, which is people that use the internet, then it seems consistent with our vocabulary to just call them end users. Because Nielsen seems to be intending to target the exact set of people who we defined as end users.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right. Okay. Well, I think, as long as we're precise in the beginning, and I can certainly make that edit and add that as sort of background, how Nielsen included the people they were going to survey, and what they actually consisted of, and then as a definition here and after, "end user," as long as we're consistent about that, I think that will work. So, good. Let's move back to Brian about the issue of statistical significance.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yes, can you all hear me okay? Okay, great. I don't know what the problem was, I was frantically hitting *6. So, it's early in the morning to talk about statistical significance, Lauren, but I think it's an important question. So basically my understanding of what Nielsen did, is they had one set of responses from 2015, one set of responses from 2016, from a particular region, and they ran statistical significance testing between each set of numbers, just to give us the little arrows you will see on the report, and you will see on the report, as a little footnote on each page, where they're reporting the results, that the arrows indicate

whether the change, whether it's an increase or decrease, was within a 95% confidence, in that they were 95% sure that the change in the two sets of responses were not due to some kind of random variation or random error.

So, when we are reporting our results in the paper, you really have got to go to the body of the report and look for those little arrows next to each individual outcome or result to see if you want to put "statistically significant change" next to what you're reporting in the CCT report. What else to say about that? There are some questions in my mind about how meaningful that statistical significance testing is, in terms of just comparing two sets of survey responses from different sets of respondents over different years, is that saying there is some kind of toggle connection underlying the variable they're testing?

I think if you delve a little deeper into what they're testing, it may not necessarily be meaningful to have a statistical significance test, but it's not also un-meaningful, if that's a word. So if you don't see the little arrow, you can't really point to statistical significance, and I know there was some confusion, it's quite difficult when you look at the report, Lauren. I think I saw where we were both having difficulties is in a lot of executive summary type parts of the report or overview type parts of the report, they were reporting average figures over all the regions, so you couldn't really point to statistical significance for the sort of entire globe, but you can point to it for the individual figures.

So, I hope that helps out in terms of reporting, just look for the arrows, and don't necessarily worry about the sort of deeper meaningfulness of the statistical significance between the reports. So, I'm happy to answer

any questions if I can. I also warn, I'm not a statistician, but I've worked with them before, so that's my reading of it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, what I think I want to draw out, Brian, is what I don't want people to take away is thinking that percentage increases or decreases year to year that typically would be seen as meaningful, and I'll just choose a number, say, more than 5%, for example, that they are not now considered meaningful, because for technical reasons, it's not statistically significant.

I want to make sure people don't take that away, because as I understood it, you're really talking about an issue of being able to compare apple to apple in terms of samples year to year, and I may be misunderstanding, and just jump in if I'm wrong, but I don't want people to be left with the impression towards concluding, oh, I can't even report these year to year changes, because they're not statistically significant. Because I don't think that's what you are saying.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

No, no it's not.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So I want to make sure there is real clarity there.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yes. The only place to be cautious is in using the exact phrase "statistically significant," because when the Stan's and the economists of the world will read that, they will think it's a very specific thing. If there is a big change, if there is some, big, 5, 10, larger percent change between the 2 years, certainly I think it's important to report that, you're absolutely right.

But I would suggest only reporting that it was statistically significant in the very specific cases in the body of the report where it is, in fact, statistically significant, and be careful to say if there is a change in one particularly area that doesn't have the little arrow, we can't report that it's statistically significant, we could say it's a "significant jump," but maybe leave out "statistically." I don't know what you think about that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's actually very helpful. So what I want people to people to take away from this is two things, and maybe we can just put this as another thing to communicate to the team. When we're dealing with the Nielsen studies, do not use the term, "statistically significant," and I would put that in quotes, unless Nielsen has characterized it that way, and the convention I believe Nielsen has used is to designate that with an arrow.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Precisely, yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And it is okay, though, to point out, I will say meaningful changes between the Wave I and Wave II, and you can even call that

"significant," or "a big jump," or "a large decrease," however you want to put it, that's precise, but do NOT use the term, "statistically significant," because that has a special meaning, and it's only going to accurate if there's an arrow there. Is that a fair admonition?

BRIAN AITCHISON: That's fair, Laureen, that's fair. Just to be extra cautious and make sure we don't get flak from Stan. Stan's not on the call, is he?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, Stan's not on the call.

BRIAN AITCHISON: You know, the Stan's of the world.

LAUREEN KAPIN: But his point is accurate.

BRIAN AITCHISON: It is.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just don't want us to draw the wrong conclusion from it, which is that, oh, we can't report these changes if they're not statistically significant, because that's not at all what we're saying.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: What we're saying is we need to make sure we're using that only in the precise situation that it applies to.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Right, and again, just to reiterate, I don't know how meaningful the statistical significance testing in the reports is, in and of itself, like I said, it's not un-meaningful, it tells you there is probably some relationship there, but given the sort of diversity of respondents over different years, I think it's hard to infer too much from the statistical significance. So I just wouldn't make a big issue of it, other than to be precise with our usage.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, great. Thanks for giving us some more insight. So, I want to move on, then, to different topics. I'm just scrolling through to make sure I capture the more substantive things. Okay. So I think I'd like to jump to recommendations, because this is where Jordyn had some comments, and also there is a comment and I don't know who the author is, but there is also another comment there.

So, moving on to the recommendations. There's a recommendation that flows from the Nielsen findings about the relationship between trust and familiarity with a recommendation that the PDP Working Group and ICANN staff assess how to select detail these that are relevant to what the public seeks information about, with the

recognition that would likely require further research. Both Jordyn and whoever authored comment 59 are concerned about that, and I thought I would let at least Jordyn speak to his concerns and if the person who authored the comment about the recommendation of being inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendation, if they're on the phone, they could also talk to that. But why don't we start with Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure, so my comment here is in two parts, I guess. The first is just sort of about how the sentence is composed, which is that I agree that the recommendation follow on the notion that the reason that the public visits websites associated with research does seem to indicate that they are looking for some particular type of content, and so therefore it might make sense to say that we would want to have PLDs related to content that the public is seeking out. That at least is sort of a logical matter that makes sense to me.

The relationship between trust and familiarity is less obvious to me, because the familiarity component seems to be primarily with whether the user is familiar with that particular field, even, obviously if it doesn't exist yet, they wouldn't be familiar with it in any case. So anyways, that's the first comment, I think it's less significant, because it just gets to how we form the sentence, as opposed to what the recommendation is.

I agree with the other comment that the GNSO policy, and it could be part of the point of the review team is to look and see how the program

is working, so it's possible that we can make recommendations that, you know, ask the GNSO to go back and look at the policy, but I think we would want a relatively high threshold to do that, and I'm not sure we quite get there with this. I think there are two problems that are practical problems with the recommendation.

The first is, it seems hard for ICANN to really be able to conduct a set of research that would allow them to determine in advance what sorts of TLDs would match the information that people were searching for, and I think just as importantly, that would always be sort of a trailing indicator. So we would only add TLDs once it was obvious that there was a certain categorization existing, and it wouldn't necessarily allow emergence categorizations of information.

One of the sort of interesting things about the program as it stands right now is that, I guess in my mind, at least, there has been some surprising results. TLDs like dot guru, which I wouldn't have expected we would have seen a lot of survey -- if we did a survey we wouldn't have said, oh, lots of people are looking for gurus necessarily, but that has actually been quite a popular TLD, and so it's hard for us to anticipate what the market demand for some of the stuff might be. So I guess logistically it seems very hard.

I think secondly, just as a point of principle, I think the GNSO has been shying away from the notion that ICANN sort of does like a beauty contest and makes evaluative judgments about what people are applying for, instead of just acting as a technical gatekeeper to make sure that the registry operator is not going to put users at risk, or not be capable of operating technically or financially, and this sort of shifts

ICANN into a mode where instead of doing that, they're also sort of saying, well, is your idea good enough. And I think what we learned in some of the previous rounds is that is pretty fraught.

And I guess the last point I'll make is I think this recommendation makes sense if we believe that the addition of TLDs don't match what consumers are looking for, are somehow harmful, as opposed to just sort of a waste of time. And I guess I don't think we have any evidence to say that they're harmful, we're just saying that they wouldn't necessarily match what consumers are looking for, but that's okay, because that just means that the business model of the registry operator won't be as successful, and it's not obvious that consumers are particularly harmed by that, it just means that certain businesses will be successful and others won't. And that's, I think, not necessarily from a consumer trust perspective, but from a competition perspective, it seems like something that is a reasonable expectation of a functioning marketplace.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, this is Agent 59. This is Jamie. I don't know why it said Comment 59, but I'm happy to talk to it, if that's helpful.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Jamie, that is helpful.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Jordyn has touched on some of it. So, a few points, as Jordyn said, the policy recommendations explicitly wanted ICANN out of the role that it

had played in previous rounds of determining which might be most attractive to end users, and instead, I think the decision was to allow a relatively open application process, subject to certain conditions, but they did not have ICANN prejudging whether or not consumers would be attracted, find useful certain domains and not others.

So, I also agree with Jordyn that it would be difficult for ICANN to know in advance which TLDs might be successful and during the launch of the program, there was discussion, there was a time in the early 2000s, there were 4 or 5, maybe more, search engines out there. Neither ICANN nor anybody else would have been able to predict at that point that Google would be by far one of the more successful of them. Similarly, I don't think there is any expertise that ICANN has that would allow it to predict that dot guru would be really successful.

The final thing is you really are asking questions about content, and that is beyond ICANN, and ICANN is a technical coordinator, as Jordyn pointed out, and I think putting ICANN in the position of determining which content is more salient for which user, I think is not only a bad use of ICANN's resources, but it exceeds the mission statement and ICANN's scope and bylaws. I'm off my soapbox now, Agent 59 signing off.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Agent 59. Thank you both Jordyn and Jamie. That's part of why this process is so important, to get these perspectives and concerns. Other comments or questions on this? Jordyn I still see your hand up, I

don't know if that is an old hand or if you have more comments that you want to share.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, it's a new hand. I just had a thought while Jamie was talking, which is this is somewhat near my comment for the next recommendation, maybe one way to think about this, we can take a couple lessons from the findings. One is that somehow we would want to limit the set of things that could be applied for, based on what consumers are looking for.

Another is they will use this information to help inform future applicants, and make it more of an incentive scheme. They could do a survey or put together data on what people are searching for, and then make that information available to the world prior to the application process, and that could be used to inform applicants, they could use that information to figure out what sorts of TLDs to apply for.

It's also possible that ICANN doesn't even need to do that research, they could call out this finding as part of the application materials and leave it up to the applicants to sort of work out, okay, we know that end user consumers consider this to be a reason why they would look at a particular TLD, so you'll have to consider that as you formulate what TLD to apply for and what people did their own market research, or you could take it a step further and actually have ICANN do the market research up front to inform future applicants.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry, Jordyn, this is Jamie again. We're not a market research organization. We're a technical coordination body. We can use search just like anybody else, but I can see us coming up with some things that later applicant relies on and says, you know, ICANN lied to us. So I think getting into that, that might be a good thing for the DNA to do, or some other, one of the consulting bodies to do, to consult with potential applicants, but I don't think that's really within ICANN's bailiwick.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't disagree with the general sentiment that this is probably something that is something like, hey applicants, are you aware of this thing that we figured out in the past, and you may want to do your own research. I will say it is a little bit of a stretch to say ICANN doesn't need markers in the face of talking about this consumer study. It's very much an example of what I would consider to be market research.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Are you talking about the analysis of the survey?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, no, the exact Nielsen survey, I'm talking about.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Right, and that's being done by the review team, but we wouldn't do that as part of policy development, right? We wouldn't do that on a routine basis. If there is a review team that asks for a survey that they think will help them complete their work and publish a report, assuming

it doesn't cost two billion dollars, we will facilitate that. But that is different than doing that as part of our daily work.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks to both of you for raising those issues. And I certainly think you raised valid points and concerns. What I'm struggling with, and I think Jordyn has offered some possible creative roads to consider, is how to apply what I think is a fairly rich set of findings from survey to actual concrete recommendation. And I am mindful of not being inconsistent with prior policy recommendations unless there is a good reason, and also asking ICANN to do things that are totally outside it's agreement.

So, I think that further thought needs to be given about how to use these findings to drive a recommendation. And what I heard you talking about, Jordyn, gives me some food for thought in terms of how to broadcast this information to future applicants, perhaps as part of the application process, or to encourage stakeholders or consulting bodies to consider doing this research to guide future efforts.

So, I think that's something for me to consider in terms of working with my sub-team, about how to basically generate a recommendation that reflects this finding, but isn't, and I'm hearing these concerns, too prescriptive, i.e. having ICANN be in the mission of saying, you know, we found this study and this is what the second round of the TLDs details are going to be, who wants to apply for them, and making those recommendations about content, which clearly ICANN doesn't want to be in the position of saying.

But still, let this finding be reflected in a recommendation that helps. Because I think when we look at the big picture in terms of the relative lack of familiarity that the public has with the new gTLDs, and that's separate and apart from any evaluations of how "successful" the new gTLD program has been just as a business enterprise, it seems to me that this reflection about what the public wants in gTLDs is actually a useful fact, and further more useful information could be generated to take advantage of it.

So, that's kind of where my thoughts are now. But I certainly take these comments seriously, and I think they reflect valid concerns. Does anyone else on the phone have thoughts about how we can use this finding to shape a recommendation that wouldn't unduly infringe on both ICANN's remits or get us too involved in dictating, so to speak, what our next round would be? Thoughts, comments?

DREW BAGLEY: This is Drew.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, Drew, and just before Drew speaks, it's actually Recommendation 1 for whatever kind person is typing the action items, yeah, there we go, I just want to make sure, and then we'll move on to Recommendation 2. Go ahead, Drew.

DREW BAGLEY: I was just thinking that if going with what ICANN's agreement actually is versus going too far, to where it's doing proactive market research,

something that seems to me within this remit, and along the lines of what we're starting here, is an in depth analysis of the existing new gTLD zones where somehow they were able, and we struggled to get the data ourselves, but this is just the hypothetical to the remit thing, able to tell which TLDs seem to be the most successful or at least solvent.

Because I know we've talked about, hey, maybe certain TLDs are intended to be boutique TLDs, and that's why even like a future market analysis would be kind of skewed it was determined everybody searches for this, very few people search for this other thing, but maybe this other thing, you could sell those at a premium, so I think that would be complicated. But I think the key that would be within the ICANN agreement is to kind of help maybe prevent obvious or preventable failure. But we haven't seen anything, we haven't seen TLD patterns.

Maybe a suggestion would be that once that data is available, there's more data available, I guess, that ICANN getting all the pricing data, or at least the profitability, or something, like I said, just the solvency, of all the existing new gTLDs, that could be indicative and helpful for the future, but also within the remit of ICANN looking at its existing zones. Because ICANN, at the end of the day, has to deal with this stuff, when the TLD fails.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Drew. That certainly gets at the solvency question or the success question. I guess the question then it would raise for me is that how then does that get used to inform the next round, so to speak.

What would be the next step there? And you don't have to answer that now. [CROSSTALK] Okay, first Drew, then, I think, Jamie. Go ahead, Drew. [AUDIO BREAK]

DREW BAGLEY:

[Inaudible] if that is the case, and if I'm going to spend this much money, maybe it's good that I invest in my own market research, or, oh, I see a correlation between these unsuccessful ones, and, I don't know, at least there is data available, even if it's only within a snapshot of time, so that people would know that the actual TLD itself might matter, what the word is, in addition to how it's run and everything else. And so maybe you would be matching that up with the existing repository with some market research.

But the distinction I'm drawing is, I guess, like ICANN just going out and exploring all these other things to try to see what is fertile for new gTLDs, and the difference this is retroactive, I'm suggesting just looking at the existing zone, but in a market research way, where you're also telling them the reality of the possibility of these TLDs, the size of them, and then their solvency. I think that is within ICANN's agreement to the extent that, like I said, if a TLD failed, ICANN needs to take charge and pick it up. So ICANN definitely has an interest.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, thank you Drew. I couldn't tell if Jamie had a comment, then I also see David is in the queue. Did you have another comment, Jamie?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I do, but if David wants to go first, that's fine, too.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so David, you have the floor.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Laureen, can you hear me okay?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, good. So just looking at it, it's a valid point which Agent 59, aka Jamie raises. I dropped off for 4 minutes on the hour there, so I might have missed something, because I was supposed to be on another call, but I came back on this one, so I'm just going to do my bit for 4 minutes and come back. So you might have covered this point.

But I was just looking at that recommendation, listening to what you were saying there, and I'm just wondering if maybe we can just use some previous terminology and the sponsored TLDs, sTLDs, because those exist. You've got dot arrow, I'm thinking of dot museum, dot coop, dot cat, those ones, so I'm thinking there you've got a TLD and it's relevant for the information that the public seeks. So that side of things, they exist, there is precedent, so maybe we can rephrase this or bring something in like that and pointing it out that way, shall we say.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Although those aren't new TLDs, those are preexisting gTLDs.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, well, they used to be new gTLDs, like these ones are new gTLDs, and the definitions will have to be interesting, how we define future new gTLDs, et cetera, but we've got to learn from looking back. A lot of those, the point is that if you go to dot post, what to you expect, it comes back to one of the first points I made at one of our first meetings, what do you expect to see. And if it's run by the Universal Postal Union, there's not going to porn sites there. So you get what you think you're going to get, and that's what consumers are looking at, and that's the point that you're making here, so I'm just thinking it's another way of looking at it in a slightly different language in the existing language of the sTLDs.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and actually I think the issue that you're getting at, in terms of expectations about a relationship between name and content is a subject of the second recommendation. But thanks for that, David, looking to examples of gTLDs in the last wave of new gTLDs. Jamie, you had another comment you wanted to make.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, just a couple of things. One on the studying of sponsored TLDs, there are already some studies on there that field the policy recommendations for the current round, and there was a lot of criticism about the restrictions that ICANN put on some of those in the past, in

terms of either being sponsored or the subject of a beauty contest. So I'm sure there is more to learn there, but I don't know how much would be directly relevant to the current gTLD program, and David is absolutely right, those are previous rounds, and the latest round of new gTLDs is the same from the legacy gTLDs.

But one thing ICANN could easily do and would within our agreement, is to commission a third party study on success and failures and gaps in the new gTLD market. It would not be ICANN actually doing it, but ICANN could commission it. Tying in, however, to the launch into the next round, I guess since Jonathan is not on the call, I can say that, then is going to be tricky, because again, there may not be enough data before the next round launches. If you're going to wait until there is enough experience out there, that may unnecessarily delay the next round.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jamie. David is that a new hand or that your existing hand?

DAVID TAYLOR: Sorry, it's my stuck hand, I'll unstick myself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear you, so did you have more to say?

DAVID TAYLOR: My hand is stuck up, so I'll unstick myself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Your hand is stuck up, but you're not stuck up, we all know that. Other thoughts or comments on this? One thing that just strikes me, and again, I think it's something that requires further thought, but this may be a recommendation that goes out that is directed towards the community, that the community of future applicants may want to consider engaging in this effort to think about what new gTLDs might be particularly appealing to the public in terms of what they want information about as they consider making their decisions. So it may be that his recommendation could be directed to the community, which I think would avoid the concerns that Jamie has identified and Jordyn has also touched on. So that may be a way to think about it, also. But thanks for that.

I wanted to also talk about the second recommendation, but also, Jordyn I'm mindful of not snarfing up all the time here. So, I'm going to make the offer to you to pivot and take this up in our next phone call, or continue on, but as I said, I don't want to snarf up all your time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think the discussion on the competition and consumer choices is going to be pretty brief. There are only a few unresolved comments at the moment, so why don't we go ahead and try to get through this?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, great, thanks. So let's move on then to the second recommendation which really flows out of the public's expectation

about registration restrictions, that the public, one, expects these restrictions. And I think, Jordyn, you made the point that sometimes they think these restrictions exist when actually they don't, and that may be.

But of course sometimes they also think that new gTLDs that have been delegated, when in fact they haven't, so there are all sorts of accuracy issues about the difference between public perception and the objective reality.

But that aside, there were findings about the public's expectation about registration restrictions, and that such restrictions contribute to consumer trust. So the recommendation here is for the PDP to consider whether additional restrictions both on the types of entities or people who can register in certain gTLDs and restrictions on the relationship between content of the gTLD and the name of the gTLD, whether that is something that the PDP Working Group should explore, if they are considering what policies should come into play for future rounds.

So, the comments here, I think this is Jordyn's comment, he accurately points out that the most trusted legacy gTLDs are unrestricted, and we can look at dot com for that, as that is one of the most trusted and is generally unrestricted. So, Jordyn suggests configuring this to talk in terms of incentive to encourage them, rather than being proscriptive. That's the comment there. So I open this up for discussion, because I think, I read Jordyn's comment not as a discomfort with the concept, but a discomfort with any implications this would result in mandatory prohibitions or requirements, and Jordyn's tweet would be did they just think about this in terms of what incentives can be offered. Jordyn,

your hand is up, so you can amplify my characterization of your comments.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, I think there's probably two ways to think about this. The first is I agree the data seems to show that consumers will to some degree, both types of consumers, believe that there should be some restrictions on these. General registry operators have been very reluctant to do so, mostly because it's very hard. I know, having worked on some of these myself, it's extremely challenging, especially if you want to think about a worldwide launch, to think about how to adequately implement restrictions in a meaningful way that work globally.

And I think if we were to have these things exist, and my personal opinion is that it would probably be beneficial if we had more TLDs with some sort of restrictions. It would be helpful to think about how can we encourage that. And the other caveat is like there are some TLDs that seem obvious that they probably shouldn't be restricted, like XYZ, it's hard for me to imagine what a useful restriction on XYZ would be, and probably most consumers wouldn't expect that in that case, whereas maybe for something that wasn't applied for. I don't know, dot some sort of MSC, master of science, or something like, I don't think anyone applied for that.

You know, maybe people would expect that is very specific. It could be that we just do roughly where they back landed and tried to identify particular strings that are worthy of restrictions, and somehow build that into the ICANN process so it's predictable. That seems challenging,

so instead, I guess I would argue how do we somehow make it so that there is an incentive for registries to take of restrictions where appropriate?

Today it seems like if you have two applicants for the same screen and one wants to impose restrictions and one doesn't, in general the TLD is probably going to look more valuable at first blush to the one without restrictions, because they can sell more domain names than the one with restrictions, though it's possible that the other would be more successful, but it's a little bit of an uphill battle.

So somehow you would want to provide some incentive to the one that wants to impose restrictions, they're going to be able to maybe acquire the domain for so much money, or ICANN fees are so low that changing the ICANN fee structure probably doesn't do it, so there's probably somehow in the acquisition cost is lower if we get behaviors that we want to encourage, or something like that. So I'm open to other ideas, but that seems like the general direction I would like to see this recommendation take. I do agree it would be good to see the program encourage those type of applications.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Other thoughts, discussion about this? David did you have any thoughts about your issue which would be restrictions about the relationship of the content to the name of the gTLD? Is this something that you view as a recommendation we should be making in terms of restrictions?

DAVID TAYLOR: Well, it's a difficult one, because I certainly do think that, yes, I'm trying to take on board Jamie's point about ICANN regulating content, and it's just trying to find that balance of how we go around doing something like that, but, I think that's one of the issues which consumers face, and I think we've seen that coming through. We didn't put that specific question, that Nielsen question at the beginning, because I know it was one of the ones I wanted added in. So, it's a difficult one, to get it right. We need to figure out how we can get it right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: What I'm really hearing in terms of discussion is the difference between asking the PDP to consider, I'll say a prescriptive approach, i.e. consider whether there should be contract restrictions versus a suggestion or recommendation that says consider how we can incentivize this sort of behavior. That's really where I'm hearing the difference between the recommendation that's currently formed and Jordyn's concern.

DAVID TAYLOR: Just on the wording that's in there, talking about additional restrictions, I think it's more, the wording I prefer is the relationship and expectations, rather than saying restrictions. But, it's a tough one, anyways, I'm just talking out loud here while I'm reading it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I was going to say, there's two ways to think about this. One is if all we're doing is booting it to the PDP, we have quite a bit more flexibility, because we're really not trying to solve the problem ourselves, so we don't have to get into the fine details. And therefore it could be something like, consider how to encourage the use, you know, we don't need to get into incentives versus mandates, we can just say consider how to encourage the adoption of appropriate restrictions, or something like that, and the PDP has to figure out what the right basis is for that.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right. Okay, that actually sounds like a way to thread the needle here. Megan, we will miss you, thank you for being here. Okay, the rest of the comments on the recommendations, particularly a few of you are asking for more precision, which makes sense. So I'll take that. David, we'll miss you too, thank you for participating. So I think at this point it would make sense to pivot to you, Jordyn, to talk about whatever competition and consumer choice issues you would like to discuss with the remaining time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure thing, so why don't we start with consumer choice, which is the document that I have been the penholder for. I went through and have resolved most of the comments here, there's just one that I think deserves discussion this morning, and that's how do we characterize the prevalence, this version of the doc that is being projected doesn't yet reflect all the comments I've resolved, but if we look at page 2, there's a

sentence that says, "Most of the peers of defensive registration is not an insignificant phenomenon."

We actually have two different comments on this, one pushing in one direction and one pushing in the other, so it's probably worth some discussion. I think Carlton says why not just say what the numbers... whereas Jamie says this statement is directly contradicted by the conclusion that defensive registrations represent a significant component of the registration of the new gTLD, which is later contradicted by the finding that the median registration for trademark owners was 3. What are we trying to say?

This is why I think, Stan originally, and I echo this language, used the language "not insignificant," because I think neither of us believes it necessarily that there is not evidence to substantiate the significant phenomenon, while at the same time, with a cumulative 60% or registrants and new gTLDs saying that their motivation was either to protect their name or to stop other people from getting it, it's hard to completely discount the defensive registration phenomenon as well. Later on we get into some of the exact numbers. So, that's the motivation so far, I guess Jamie, you're on the call, Carlton is not.

Jamie, do you have another way that you would prefer to characterize this statement? We don't really see defensive registration happening, even if that number is 3 per trademark, we see over half the trademarks being registered in the new gTLDs by the same registrants, and we see that a majority of the registrants in the registrant survey attribute at least some of their rationale for doing so to reasons that can be characterized as defensive. So it seems incorrect to just say that it is

insignificant, while at the same time I agree it doesn't quite rise to the level of characterizing it as significant, either. So, I guess we're struggling for language to characterize it, so Jamie, if you have thoughts on that.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Yeah, so, I wasn't trying to suppress the data, it just seemed to me that we were kind of inconsistent in how we were describing it. So we say it's not a significant issue for trademark owners, it's 3, and then somewhere else I think it said, and I'm not at my laptop so I apologize, that it was in fact significant, a significant concern. So, I'm fine with not an insignificant issue, and it just seemed like it was kind of all over the place.

The other thing that was kind of confusing, and maybe this is probably just me, but, I don't think we really define what defensive registration is. I think if you ask most people in the ICANN world what defensive registration is, they will think about a trademark, but here it seems like it may be more than just a trademark or related to a trademark, it's just someone's personal name, and it might be, to the extent that we are drawing distinctions, it might be worth calling that out, especially since we do later say that for trademark owners it does not appear to be an issue. But for people who responded to that survey, it may be.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, you're right that we maybe should call out that different in particular. I think that we are characterizing a defensive registration here as anyone who is doing it primarily to protect the name, as opposed to having an intent to register, you know, there are other

intents that Nielsen characterizes which are roughly, oh, I couldn't guess the name in the dot com or in the legacy gTLD, which is obviously not a defensive intent. And then there is like, oh, I was trying to reach different users. Or there is even, I was trying to prevent other people from getting it, but I didn't necessarily have that name in the legacy gTLD, which I also wouldn't characterize, I would call it more speculative than defensive, I guess.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Right, right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

And we can't actually quite tell the difference based on the survey question between whether they have the name in the legacy gTLD or not, in the case of that last answer, but in any case, there is some amount of obviously sort of non defensive behavior as well, but when someone is registering a name, they already have legacy TLD, either to protect the name, or primarily to prevent other people from getting it. I would call that defensive regardless of whether or not there is a trademark involved.

That's just a little discussion that we've tried to have, to look at how much people are registering for purposes that are constructive and creative, as opposed to purposes that they just feel like they have to. So it probably makes sense to have a discussion of what we mean by defensive registration before we get to that, so that's definitely something we can take under advisement.

And I guess I would characterize the statement about trademarks in a slightly different way than yours, I would say the cost is relatively low, as opposed to it's not a problem. I think David has pointed out in the past that oh, this might double the cost for some trademark holders, even if it's a relatively low number, and I agree that might be true, but it's still not a very big cost, even if it doubles it, and so that's why later uses a relatively low cost, as opposed to not a problem.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay, well, I think David is wrong, but okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The other important finding from the trademark part is that it's a pretty bimodal distribution, that for most trademark holders the cost is low, but there is obviously a small number of trademark holders who are incurring a significant cost registering a large number of TLDs and I think one of the recommendations we may get to is to sort of think about other ways to mitigate the cost for the folks that, for whatever reason, are registering a large number of TLDs.

JAMIE HEDLUND: And again, I didn't have an issue with most of the substance in this section, I just thought that there could be more clarity on the definition and more consistency just in terms of how we either describe the problem or contrast it from different parts of the same problem.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, okay, sure. I'll do another pass and try to take those concerns into consideration. I guess we could pause here to see if anyone else has feedback on the consumer choice paper, otherwise I'm going to move to our perpetually favorite topic, although none of the relevant people are on the call, so it might be a very quick conversation. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, so moving on for a moment. The other comment that I want to reflect on is from Carlton again. This is in the master, where Carlton makes a comment about the executive summary, where he says that there is a figure from the report for park domains, why not spell that out in the executive summary. I think this gets in the general discussion of parking.

I think one thing that we're going to need to figure out as we get to the final first draft here is what the exact discussion about parking is going to look like. I do think it's helpful to include some reference to the data. We're not going to have the data by the time we get the draft report out, so it may be that we have to lean on the UCSD study which they have offered to share some of the raw data with us, and actually their methodology seems reasonably sound.

It might be worth trying to have a quick conversation with them over the next week or two, although academic schedules may not make that practical, but I'll loop back with Eleeza. I know what I don't want, and I guess it would be good to get the sense of folks here, is to publish a number about parking in the new gTLDs without any reference to legacy gTLDs, because I think one thing that the UCSD paper does demonstrate

is that the parking rate is very high, regardless of which type of gTLD you look at. They come to the conclusion that only slightly more, I think it's like 12 or 13% of registrations in new gTLDs have what they call primary registration intent, or something like that, but I think if you were to run the same analysis on legacy gTLDs, that number would be higher, but it would like 25% or something like that.

So the definition, the significant majority of legacy gTLD registrations is also not for primary registration intent. I think that's an important fact that we would have to include well outside of any discussion of what the parking rate for legacy gTLDs looks like. Otherwise we leave the reader with the impression that the behavior is markedly different in the new gTLDs from the legacy gTLDs, but I just don't think we have any data at this point to substantiate that concept.

So that's my high level discussion on parking, but I don't know if we have anyone on the call who has a view on that. So, I guess I'll just open it up to any feedback on the parking discussion, recognizing that most of the folks who usually talk about it aren't here. So I will encourage them to read the transcript, and also to respond to Carlton's comments in the doc. And then Jamie, I saw that I think yesterday you sent a response to Stan. Any highlights from your response to the competition paper that you want to highlight for discussion today while we're on the call?

JAMIE HEDLUND:

My comments were pretty self explanatory. I completely agree with you that without reference to parking and legacy, that we shouldn't have any discussion of it, and it would, if you just say parking, and

nothing more, without describing the potential reasons that people either park domains or early movers in markets and speculate, and how that can bad and lead to bubbles, but it can also be helpful, and nothing wrong with someone getting first mover advantage. Just looking at parking a little more objectively, rather than based on assumptions that may not be fair about speculation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, thanks Jamie. Okay, so we'll wait for Stan to take a look through your comments and maybe on next week's call there can be discussion if there are any outstanding items there. Alright, as I promised, there were not a lot of outstanding issues on the competition consumer choice docs, so I think we've gotten through all the outstanding ones at the moment, so I'm just going to hand the mic back to you for any end items for the agenda.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Okay, thanks Jordyn. I know that we're still processing comments on several of the other papers, so I think we're going to hold those until the next phone call, unless, Drew, there are any sort of high level issues you want to discuss.

DREW BAGLEY:

No, not at this time.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, that's fine. Then, are there any issues that staff wants to add to the discussion at this point? Reminders? Encouragement? Keep in mind, I will point out, just for the review team, that our wonderful ICANN staff is well deserving of vacation time, and in fact ICANN is closed the week between Christmas and New Years, so please don't forward them information or requests during that time with an expectation that they are going to be responding, because they will be out of the office engaging in what I hope is well taken vacation and R&R.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Lauren, may I jump in? It's Eleeza.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And thank you, I hope you all get some time off, too, it is the end of the year. So a couple of points I wanted to bring up. One is the executive summary. We took a crack at drafting one, which is now linked in the master document. I don't know if you have received a Word document about it, if not, I'll make sure that it's sent to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I have received it, I will get back to you on that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay, well, I wanted to just read a couple points on it. I was the primary author and I was trying to capture as many points in there as possible and highlight all the key findings and key recommendations, certainly things may have been missed, so definitely feedback as well, but I'm also wondering if perhaps one of the review team members would like to take on further refining it. I think in particular the recommendations could use some more work in terms of either how to characterize or organize, there is some overlap.

There are multiple recommendations that have to do with surveys, for example, so maybe that's something we can give some thought to and discuss more on next week's call, what the next step should be with that document or if you want us to continue working on that, based on your direction, it's up to you. But that was one point I wanted to raise.

Another point that is related to the recommendations is in the global domains division, we're starting our planning process for FY18, so we're looking to your recommendation to start thinking about what exactly we need to plan and budget for in the coming year, and we can certainly make some estimates for further review and for future program implementation, but we also have some feedback for you on the recommendations and we're happy to provide that if and when it is appropriate. I have tried to provide some feedback and commentary in some places in the report, but I just wanted to offer that as well.

I'm not sure what the best way is to provide that or how we can best engage with the penholders on that, or if it's just the review team members as a whole, but that's just something I wanted to provide for

you, as well, to think about, implementability, and if you have questions about that, we're happy to provide our feedback to you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Eleeza. For your first point with the executive summary, I would say things are still a little bit in flux. Certainly you can tell from the conversation today, at least the consumer trust document, that those recommendations are going to be evolving, so I don't know if it makes sense right now to start putting things in stone in the executive summary. My sense is actually that it is probably going to want to be one of the last things that gets finalized, because things are still a moving target.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Of course, that makes sense.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

In terms of feedback, if your feedback on feasibility of implantation, you think it's going to significantly influence the way a recommendation is worded, I would say you should give that feedback now directly to the penholders, so they can take that into account, and then circulate that through their relevant sub-teams.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay, I think a lot of it has already come out in the comments that we've provided, and the comments Jamie has provided, but I just wanted that point to be made, that we're looking to these

recommendations as well, in terms of how they might impact our work. So as you're thinking about recommendations or changing them, we're happy to talk through them, as well, in addition to providing feedback as you're writing.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Great. Any other comments, concerns, feedback? Any other business? Okay. First of all I want to thank everyone, I thought this was a very thoughtful, useful discussion, so thanks everyone for the work you did preparing for this and on the call.

And again, I'll remind people to be on the lookout for revised drafts and if there are papers that you care about, that you haven't had an opportunity to weigh in on, there are still some opportunities, so I'll remind people that we our schedule, we now have a little bit of extra time and encourage folks to use the time well.

Make sure if you are working on a Google doc or a consolidated Word doc, just make sure that you identify yourself, so that we know who to look back with in terms of comments, if further discussion is needed, and also make sure if you're communicating to a penholder with certain comments, that you CC the review team on those comments, if it's via a Word document, so that it makes it to the consolidated version.

And with that, I will thank people once again, especially our ever supportive staff, and we will gather again next week at the same time. Thanks so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]