JONATHAN ZUCK:	Good morning, folks. Good afternoon, good evening, wherever you are. Thanks for joining us on the 30th Plenary call for the CCT Review. I'm your host, Jonathan Zuck. Welcome to Fantasy Island. It's an old reference.

In any case, we're going to talk about some of the existing papers. We're driving toward a release of this by the end of the month here, so we're in our final stages of delivering a document for public comment. Today we're going to focus on the Application Evaluation Process papers and the Safeguards papers.

Before we get started, is there anyone that's on the phone that is not in Adobe Connect?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Yes, Jonathan. This is Carlos. I'm on the phone driving.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. I actually see you in the Adobe Connect. But thank you for speaking up. I see we're missing the new Head of Compliance at ICANN. We'll have to speak to him about his non-compliance.

Is there anyone who has an updated Statement of Interest? I'll actually have one before too long here, but not quite yet.

I hope that everyone's doing well. I guess we should just launch in here. Jean-Baptiste, if you can bring up the Global South paper that you circulated this morning.

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.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure. Will do it now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. On the most recent Leadership call we came up with a kind of a template for recommendations and also for references. I still need to go back and find page numbers and things like that for all the citations in this paper. I'm the one who holds the pen on this particular paper. I received comments from Stan. I'm unaware of comments from anyone else. If I missed them, please raise your hand and let me know if you have particular feedback on this document. Otherwise, we will race ahead to the recommendations in the document.

Is there anybody that read this and made comments that I missed because, as I said, all I'm aware of are Stan's.

Okay. Thank you.

Jean-Baptiste, I don't have scroll control, but if you do if you could just scroll down to the bottom to where the recommendations begin, I think that's the meat of our discussion.

Now I have it. Does everybody have it or am I able to scroll on your behalf?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Everyone has it now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. So if folks would, if you scroll down basically to the bottom of – oh, they're not numbered – bottom of page six I believe where it says Recommendations. I hear people's mouse wheels going. You should see Recommendations in blue and then the first recommendation.

Okay, so this might be the most controversial one and so I wanted to definitely have a discussion about this. I've also expanded on the template for recommendations a little bit and I don't know that it's necessary that everyone do that in time for this particular draft release for public comment. But some of the commitments we made at the outset included measures for success, and so I've added that to the template as well so I'm interested in people's feedback on that formulation and things like that as we go forward because mine right now is the only one I think that's formatted that way.

So the very first recommendation I have is actually to set objectives for applications from the Global South. If you recall, many of the conversations that took place at the last ICANN meeting was in review of the findings of the Applicant Survey from Nielsen and the Cohort Survey from AM Global. There was quite a bit of discussion about whether it is ICANN's objective or not to reach out to the Global South and whether or not expanding the application pool from the Global South is an organizational objective.

What I'm not sure of is whether or not this team has consensus about us making a recommendation on that particular fact. And so this particular recommendation – and Megan, I see you there. Just let me finish my thought before I lose it – what this particular recommendation is about in a sense creates the framework for the other ones. In other

words, many of the recommendations are only recommendations if it becomes a priority of the organization to reach out to the Global South. And so that's the phrasing of this and I put this in the hands of the GNSO.

Megan, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry, I had to unmute my mic. Thanks, Jonathan. I like the idea. I'm just a little bit concerned about the way it's referred to and the way it's set, because I'm a bit concerned that if we say set objectives for applications, there will be some number that is established and then if that number is not met, people will say that the whole business can't go forward or we don't have enough applications from, I don't know, Africa or Latin America or wherever it needed.

I wonder if it wouldn't be better – and I'm not fussy about the words exactly – to state that "goals for increasing applications" or something like that. That's my only concern with the word "objectives." Otherwise, I like the idea.

And then I have another [fussy] complaint, and I know Göran wants to call ICANN – which is a corporation – he wants to call it an organization and wants to separate it from [inaudible] but please let's not in this text which is supposed to be legally correct, when we want to make a recommendation to ICANN it's not ICANN organization. Göran can call ICANN whatever he likes, but legally it's a corporation. So if it should [say] to ICANN, it means ICANN the corporation. So let's just say "to ICANN."

I've said this a couple of times and I know staff probably is supposed to call ICANN an organization. You're welcome to, of course. But in our context I think we should just say "ICANN" or "ICANN Board" or "ICANN staff" or whatever it is we're referring to. Or a specific [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to change it to ICANN. The times that I've made reference to it were times when I guess I meant "staff" probably because it seemed more like an implementation oriented recommendation. People should feel free to disagree with my designation as well. But as far as how it's worded, "ICANN" is fine or "ICANN staff" is fine. I was just drawing a distinction between ICANN the organization and ICANN the community, but I'm used to calling what I run an "organization" even though it is technically a corporation because it's a non-profit as is ICANN. That might just be an Americanism, Megan. But we can certainly switch it to say just "ICANN" or something.

Back up to the top, I guess I'd like to open this up for some conversation. My recommendation was, in fact, to set numeric objectives. That does not necessarily mean that the program needs to be held up or anything like that, and we can be specific about that, but the idea simply being that we want to set some benchmark to judge the success of these efforts at expanded outreach. So the idea is that, "Hey, we got X number of applications from the Global South in the initial round here, and in subsequent procedures we're going to set objectives," and I don't have a way to do that because we don't actually know what the structure of subsequent procedures are going to look like. That's why I was partly punting that to them. But I think having a

numeric, measurable, objective is a good one and it doesn't need to say the whole program was a failure but it could suggest that more or enough has been done in outreach efforts. That's why I worded it that way. But I welcome more discussion on this notion about whether to set a numeric objective. That's my inclination.

Calvin, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Just one second. Two things are interject. My only concern, as I said, I like the idea of objectives or goals or [whatever]. My concern really relates to where it says, "must be completed prior to subsequent rounds." Yes. So it's setting the objectives that have to be [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. It's setting the objectives that need to be completed prior to subsequent rounds.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Not achieving the objectives.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Correct. That's exactly right. So the recommendation doesn't set objectives. That's right.

MEGAN RICHARDS: But we don't have to achieve the objectives in the subsequent rounds.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not at all. In fact, this decision is about whether to implement the other recommendations which are attempts to address this issue if a commitment comes out of the organization to do so.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. Clear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes. I think the question in my mind is what constitutes an application from the Global South because an application can be made up of various components. So you could have the registry operator coming from the Global South and a European applicant. Does that count as a Global South application?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We know what an applicant is, right? And so I think the idea here is that it's about applicants from the Global South. How they're handling their backend services, etc. is not the issue so much as the applicant itself as an organization from the Global South.

CALVIN BROWNE: So is it okay to have a whole bunch – I don't know, let's say 50 – applicants from Global South or any non-foreign technology or Global North infrastructure?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not the one to give the answer, and obviously that has to be [part of the exercise]. But in my mind, I think leveraging infrastructure that's available [if] from the Global North is not the end of the world. We can also suggest we can either break this up or add more detail to this recommendation that includes the question that you're asking. What I don't know is whether or not we have a well-defined opinion about that ourselves or if in fact we're encouraging the organization set objectives. In some ways that's left vague because if it's not rounds anymore, then having a round based figure for how many new applications there should be would be problematic.

The question you asked is a good one, but again, are we being asked to make a decision about whether or not infrastructure is required for competition from the Global South as [inaudible].

CALVIN BROWNE: I asked I know because in my experience often it's seen as if there isn't a skills transfer to local organizations, it's seen as a recolonization type issue, particularly in the political arena. I don't see it so much in the technology field but within the political arena it definitely tends to be viewed as a recolonization type thing.

Are we trying to make political points here? Anyway, it's a difficult topic I think.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I would like to [make a comment, Jonathan].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Carlos. Sorry. I'll call on you next. Just to react to what you're saying, Calvin, I think that's something about which to be concerned. But it's very difficult for me to imagine that reforms to the application and evaluation process would have objectives related to non-applicant activity – so back en registry service providers, etc. or resellers. Instead, I think the place to begin is whether or not the entrepreneur themselves that's trying to create a business model in the Global South is making use of whatever resources are available because even those numbers were almost non-existent in the initial round.

Again, I open it up for discussion but I think having the person driving the application deep in the Global South feels like progress to me.

Carlos, please go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Jonathan. This is an interesting discussion. I would prefer that we remain focused on general objectives and the welfare of the users. I know it's very difficult to come to grips because we can easily end up in the same discussion we had with the community applications that cannot be solved because the objectives are so difficult to define.

I think we should avoid remaining at the applicant level and at the very technical level, and if we ask the question as it was suggested before if the corporation or if the community sets objectives for underserved areas, they should be careful to define very, very, clearly what the measurement or the conditions should be for the welfare of the users in underserved areas, period. Very general, but specific.

If you are going to jump into that area, be careful to set very clear targets so as to avoid this [confusional] thinking of the community applications. It would be nice if this community gets together, but in the end they never get together. I don't know if my point was clear, but thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So let me ask this question- if we expand the details to include those questions that should be asked by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, does that meet your objectives or do folks on this call believe that we need to answer those questions?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: No, we should just make the warning that if the community decides to go into these questions they should be very clear and not get muddled through like it happened at the last round – not only for the Global South but for community applications. I see a big danger there that we express wishful thinking but we never get to [terms] and we should learn both from the failure of the Global South applicants but also for the failure of the community applications and remain at the level of consumer welfare and not get too technical.

If we can draft something like that, I would support like put in the warning because we have to recognize the fact that there weren't enough applications of the Global South and the process was not clear enough for community applications. We should keep that in mind.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So if I have a details section that is the next section down, if we could see, which is another section I added to the template where I think I could put information, a little bit more detail about those questions. I will make a note or hopefully staff is making a note and will remind me to expand the details section of this recommendation and to include addressing the questions that you raised. Does that make sense?

Waudo, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: It makes sense to me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudo, I can't hear you. You might be on mute. Waudo? We can't hear you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes. There you are.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	You can?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	I can hear you now.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	Okay. I wanted to suggest a [different] addition to one of your detailed recommendations. This one on outreach I think is the second one – "Outreach to the Global South requires a more comprehensive program of [inaudible] participation, etc." I [would suggest] that we have another activity added there to be identification of specific potential applicants. If you recall when AM were doing the survey they actually had an activity of identifying specific potential applicants who matched what kind of applicants that we have from the Global North. So I would have suggested that we also have such an exercise so that this outreach can be added, also targeted, it would be part of the outreach program to at least identify some highly potential applicants [that] then they can be targeted specifically rather than just having an outreach program which is general. So I wanted to add that there.
	Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Waudo. I've muted myself because I was blowing my nose.

Thank you. Does anybody else have an opinion on that recommendation? Obviously, such a recommendation has the beginnings of an implementation from the top part of the AM Global report where they've identified the cohorts throughout the Global South. They didn't reach out to all of them but they did identify a list so there is at least the beginning of that effort.

Do other folks have an opinion one way or another on that portion of the recommendation?

Eleeza, I see your hand up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jonathan. Thanks. I actually don't have an opinion on that. I wanted to raise something that had to do with the mechanics of the recommendations, but I wanted to wait until… I can wait until this conversation is complete.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Eleeza. Obviously I've messed up [this] template a little bit.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's what I was going to raise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Anyone have thoughts on Waudo's recommendation? Maybe if you're in Adobe Connect and you agree with Waudo's

recommendations, you can put in a green check mark. How's that? Does everybody know how to do that?

Alright. Is everybody finding where to do that? I want to make sure that you're… Is there anyone with strong objection to incorporating that into the recommendation?

Megan, does your note imply that you didn't hear Waudo's suggestion?

Alright, just for Megan's benefit – Waudo's suggestion here in Recommendation #2 was to, in the Details section of this expansion of the Outreach Program, it would include a specifically compiling list of likely applicants based on the kind of cohort strategy that AM Global employed and making sure that they are part of the outreach efforts.

Okay, excellent.

Alright. So staff, please make a note that I'll incorporate that into the recommendation.

And then now Eleeza and [now] you've had a chance to see me go through two of these, did you want to bring up your template issue?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. I just wanted to raise that if we wanted to change the template for the recommendations that we should make a note to all of the temp holders to do that to their papers because we're starting this week to format the papers and citations, and we've asked our in-house designer to come up with a graphical way to represent each of these recommendations. We'd like to have them all be in a consistent

[standard] format. So if everyone is on board with Jonathan's changes then I just wanted to point that out and ask the template holders who are on this call to adopt this new format in their papers.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's in fact a question. How are people feeling about the template as I have it presented? What I've found is that recommendation as a bullet point wasn't enough to provide enough guidance for implementation, and I recall from our Charter that we were trying to include measures for success.

So do people feel good about adding the Details section and the Success Measures section to their recommendations?

[CALVIN BROWNE]: Calvin Supports it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I guess you can remove your green tick if you don't agree with it and add one if you do and we'll see if you're comfortable with the template as I've modified it. It's one of those things that it made sense when we were laying it out but as I was trying to fill it out, it felt like it needed more.

Anybody have any questions about the format or concerns about it?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Megan. Go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Could I come in for a second?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome aboard.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Thanks. I don't have any concerns about the format per se. I'm just concerned that it's a complete waste of our time and quite frankly I'm not sure if ever I'll be able to rewrite all of this again in this perfect format. I suggest that it's done by a single editor – someone take the pen and just stuff it all into the standardized approach. I think all the information that we need is in all the documents that have been prepared, and we're just going to have to do another re-editing if each of us goes our own way again. I'm sure there's some positive elements in having [in] right order by each of us and then redoing it again later. In the interest of time I think we would be much more efficient and faster to just take what we have now and have one single editor from ICANN staff [probably] to put it all into the right format. It would make the draft look much better as well, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, thank you. You mentioned that on the e-mail. I guess my concern there is I think there's a distinction between straight up formatting and the checklist of things that need to be covered. And so if somebody's deriving the details of a recommendation from the paper, they may not be in a way that you agree with. That's the only hesitation is that this is probably the most important part of the document in many respects, and I think that there's a strong feeling by just about everybody that that should not come from staff per se. So the question then becomes where to draw that line.

I think the key is, Megan, is just to make sure you have enough detail in your recommendations so that in fact they could be implemented. And if you do, they can be reorganized by staff into whatever format makes sense. But I think the issue is to make sure that there's a rationale for the recommendation, that there's the notion of whether or not it needs to be completed before there are subsequent procedures, and enough implementation detail and measures of success.

It's a structure on one hand, but it's really a set of requirements for a recommendation, if that makes sense. And I think that at its core, that data needs to come, that content needs to come from the team. Does that make sense?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense. In that case, I will [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you just write a paragraph that has all of this information in it, I'm happy to ask staff to put it into the standardized format. We just need to make sure the data is there.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah. What I was going to suggest [inaudible] if someone from staff will send me most recent versions of the documents that I have done – because I must say I'm completely lost in all these iterations and revisions of Google documents and God knows what – in a Word version so that I can redo it and add and review them properly. I'm happy to make any minor adjustments that are necessary to make it fit into this additional requirement.

That I don't mind doing. I'm just not ready to spend the time or energy to redo it in a completely new [inaudible] version. That's all I'm saying. I think along with some others that are getting CCT fatigue in the sense that I think almost everyone has other full-time jobs that we do, and so–

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. We all do. Exactly.

MEGAN RICHARDS: [Inaudible] of course, but I think in a most efficient and effective means. So as I said, if someone can give me the most recent version in a Word document, I'm happy to update and make any minor additions that are necessary to put it into those additional aspects that you've mentioned.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Excellent. Yeah, it's the aspects. It's the content that matters, Megan. We can work on the formatting. Staff can work on the formatting. But it's the content that really matters.
	Someone from staff hopefully is taking this as an action item – probably Jean-Baptiste – to get the most recent version of Megan's documents back to her in Word format for editing of the recommendations.
	Okay. Is it fair to say that we have consensus on Recommendation #2 here? Excellent.
	So Recommendation #3 has to do with a program that I only discovered when I got very serious about drafting, which was a pro bono assistance program that was part of the applicant support program as well. ICANN compiled a list of volunteer consultants and a list of applicants for that pro bono consulting. And that's it. So those lists exist but we have no understanding of what the interaction was between them – whether or not anybody actually received any pro bono assistance or how it went or anything like that.
	Given that there was feedback in the AM Global report with respect to getting help [and] consulting, that appears to remain an important function for the Application Evaluation Process. And so the recommendation I put here is basically having ICANN manage the pro bono assistance program. And my rationale is, "Despite the registration of both volunteers and applicants, there's no evidence of interaction." And that's a Footnote 1 for some reason.
	This recommendation goes to ICANN staff and it should be completed prior to subsequent round – in other words, the construct of this pro

bono program. And the idea is that, "The ICANN staff would manage this program to ensure communication [and successfully joining] the volunteers to the applicants. Both the volunteers and applicants should be surveyed by ICANN in real time on the success of the interaction so that future reforms could be based on feedback."

One of the things we did was reach out to every one of the volunteers and every one of the applicants for help and we got zero responses from anybody. The program makes a lot of sense, but we literally have zero data about its success. This is about it being more than just a web page and being an actual managed match making program complete with some kind of review in real time of how it's going. So I welcome feedback on that.

Jamie, go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks, Jonathan. Sorry, I was having trouble getting off mute. On this recommendation I think it would be helpful at least for staff to have a little bit more clarity around what "manage" means.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah. I don't have a great answer but I'll try and flesh that out more. It probably means that initial communication comes through ICANN staff and that staff gets back to both the volunteer and the applicant to see whether or not successful communication took place.

JAMIE HEDLUND:	Maybe it's more of a coordination role, because "manage" implies a more active management of resources and activities and ICANN can't really force people into – much as we try – we can't really force people into doing things. That was a joke.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So maybe a more active coordination role and reporting role. We'll change "manage" to "coordination." I think I'm comfortable with that. Calvin?
CALVIN BROWNE:	Yeah, I find this interesting because this is really the first I have heard of this process or these resources. Maybe some more salesmanship or going to the [inaudible] is necessary.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	That's right, Calvin. Presumably this program would be part of the expanded outreach program that's created by staff, but ironically there were some 20 volunteers and some 30 applicants for help. It's an amazingly larger number than there were applicants. It's a very interesting part of the Applicant Support Program that I wasn't even aware of and that [as near] as I can tell didn't go anywhere but again, that could be that communication… some greater coordination [of] communications. In other words, there wasn't a complete lack of awareness of this service, of these volunteers, but there seems to have been a lack of execution within that program.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. Interesting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudo. Waudo, I think you're on mute.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, now you can hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes I can.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can hear you now.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, this program that you mentioned, the pro bono program, you say this it's not much what [inaudible]. We did not [inaudible] some recommend some checking box to find out exactly what happened about this program.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Unfortunately, Waudo, no one knows. The number of people that were surprised by the existence of this program is greater than it should have been. But as far as we know there was just a form that you filled out to put your name on a list of volunteers and a form that you filled out to put your name on a list of people desiring support. That was the extent of the program.

Even so, there were 20 of each or something like that – I would have to go back and look at it – but there was no follow-up or coordination of that program and so there's no one inside the ICANN organization that has any further details about what happened here. And we, in fact, tried to reach all of the volunteers and all of the applicants for support and got no response. So those e-mails may be old at this point. People may have moved on. So I guess at the core of this is a reporting function to better understand how the system is working so that any future reforms of it could be data-based which they cannot be now because we literally have zero data other than the fact that there was interest. And I think that that's significant in and of itself and that interest seems bigger than the number of people that ultimately applied from the Global South.

I feel like it's a positive thing that there was interest, but unfortunately there's absolutely no evidence of success or failure of this program.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Why don't we recommend a study or a check to find out really what happened – a report can be [developed] about what happened about this program because we are recommending something to [proceed from here] but we don't know what happened.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. No one knows. I think we're starting over with trying to put ICANN staff into a more proactive coordination role so that we can make reforms along the way. There's as far as I know literally no one except maybe David Taylor who has his hand up who has any sense of what transpired with respect to this program.

David, do you have some experience?

DAVID TAYLOR: [Inaudible] can you hear me okay, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Very, Very, faint. Is there any way to increase the volume on your microphone?

DAVID TAYLOR: [Inaudible] had this problem before [inaudible]. Is that better?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not really.

DAVID TAYLOR: Any better?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not really. I can hear my echo louder than I can hear your voice.

DAVID TAYLOR: Is that better?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Much better. Thank you.

DAVID TAYLOR: Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: I can't remember what I was going to say. I actually do remember this program coming up because we – and I'm trying to remember. I'll try and find some of the correspondence on it – because we did quite a bit of pro bono work as a [firm], we considered putting ourselves forward for it. So I did have a little think about that, and then I suddenly thought if we're not careful, we will be inundated because I wasn't quite sure how it would work. And so we didn't, and there were so many things going on with applications, etc., that we didn't.

I was just going to say, just to add to that, I agree with your recommendation as it is, actually. I think that's exactly the way we should be saying this, because it's something which given the number of

people who are there and had sort of volunteered to assist, it's surprising it didn't get more traction at the end of the day.

So, I think your success measuring details there you've got in the recommendation makes complete sense. And because Calvin was talking about this, I just wondered whether he knew there's a South African one there, Mynext Mail (Pty) Ltd. You can find them on there, and they're offering technical help, consulting, etc. for writing applications. So I just wondered whether Calvin knew of them, and if we've got an issue with their e-mail being down, it might be something he could just reach out and we could get some at least anecdotal evidence of that, which might help guide us a little bit more to what to do next time.

CALVIN BROWNE: I'm having a look right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Calvin, [inaudible]. Sorry, what were you saying?

CALVIN BROWNE: I'm having a look right now, [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thank you. Jamie, is that an old hand?

JAMIE HEDLUND:	Yes, it is, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Alright. Waudo, go ahead. I think you're back on mute, Waudo. Waudo, we still can't hear you.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	Success measure. [inaudible] recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Please start over again, Waudo. We can hear you now.

WAUDO SIGANGA:	Yes, I'm asking [inaudible] measures. It's actually answering what I was asking about. Should that not be the recommendation rather than the success measures? Do you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes, I hear you. Thank you, Waudo. I debated that myself, and as I wrote it in details, it sounded like it was a mechanism for measuring success, so I put it there. I don't know that it's a material where it lands, but I can move it up into details and then try to define some more objective measure of success ourselves. But thank you. Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE:	Just a quick answer to David's query. The Mynext Mail guys are actually looking for or seeking support, not offering support. So it looks like

they're in the seeking support section. But yes, it's an interesting business that I'm not aware of. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Calvin, if you know of any way to reach out to them, I'd still be interested to hear from people seeking support, because we wrote to all of the e-mail addresses of both groups and we didn't get a response from any of them.

CALVIN BROWNE: I'll definitely try to reach and reach out then.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Any other questions about this recommendation? We have consensus from the team to go forward with it. Excellent. Final recommendation is about the Applicant Financial Support Program. There are only three applicants for support. I think that this is aimed at the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

Again, I have it the completion [inaudible] subsequent rounds depends based on the very first recommendation about setting objectives, and what I've put here is that the total cost of applying for the string exceeded the application fee.

There are efforts underway to reduce the application fee for all applicants, which will have oversized implications for the Global South, but beyond that, we should be looking at efforts to reduce the overall

cost of application, including additional subsidies and dedicated support for underserved communities.

I welcome enhancements to how that's described or what that recommendation should look like. Calvin, is that a new hand?

CALVIN BROWNE: Old hand, I'll take it down now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, I guess my finding here in the document is twofold, that not enough people knew about the program itself, not enough people knew about the Applicant Support Program, and there was not enough of an understand of the actual cost associated with being an applicant.

So, most of the indictments of the Applicant Support Program seem to have to do with outreach more so than the support program itself. But if people have specific recommendations for the support program itself, then now is the time to bring them up. But basically, it's a recommendation to revamp this program and look at the broader spectrum of costs associated with being an applicant.

Waudo, go ahead. Waudo, we can't hear you yet. Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Is that correct, it's applied only to the community applicants?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. It's not applied only to community applicants.

WAUDO SIGANGA: So it applies to all applicants from the Global South?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is it confusing that I put underserved communities?

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, I was thinking that it only applied to community applicants.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think so.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay. As far as I understood, there weren't any successful applicants for support, so the three that did apply were all unsuccessful if I remember correctly, which might [inaudible] even more of [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I thought one was successful.

CALVIN BROWNE: I beg your pardon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I thought one was successful.

CALVIN BROWNE: Interesting, I'm not sure. I'd be curious to [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I thought there was [inaudible] successful.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay, I stand corrected.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But we can – are you – what you're getting at is the idea that we need to revisit the evaluation portion of that program to make sure that it's not unfairly excluding applicants?

CALVIN BROWNE: That might be an idea. I remember I think we looked at it very briefly and decided that it was for us a complete waste of time when you were doing our [job at Dublin] Cape Town and .africa applications. But then I

wasn't involved in the decision making process on that, but I do remember something like it would have just wouldn't be successful concentration of efforts.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. I would love greater specificity about that if there's anyone you can reach out to about that so that we can make a more specific recommendation.

CALVIN BROWNE: I can maybe speak to the guys in our team. They came back in the next hour or two. He would have handled that section, and I'll see if I can give you input on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thank you, Calvin. Megan, please go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, thanks, Jonathan. Well, I just wondered if it's useful in being even a bit more specific in the details.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Always.

MEGAN RICHARDS: No, I'm putting you [inaudible]. Because there has been a lot of discussion about for example – now Jamie will probably jump out of his

seat when I say this, but – using new gTLD auction proceeds and supporting the Global South with that, etc.

But I wonder, in that context, is it not better to do what you said? You say the total cost far exceeds $185,000 application fee, and then you say efforts to reduce the application fee. Shouldn't the recommendation really be even more detailed in the sense of analyzing whether that application fee was necessary, how far it offset costs, and then have a gradation of costs that relate to – I don't know, not the GDP of the country the person's from, but the financial situation of the company that's involved. There are ways and means of doing this. Obviously, you don't want to go into all the details here, but someone should do a proper, thorough assessment of how could the financial support program work better and be more effective.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I think I've tried to put that in the hands of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay, that's what it says, "Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds?" It depends.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, the reason I have it as depends is, again, I think it's linked to whether or not it's a community objective to increase the number of applications from the Global South.

MEGAN RICHARDS: But you've already said that, so that's our recommendation. Oh, you're presuming that they have to agree on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. That's all depends means. So again, I welcome any feedback if you think that's – maybe I should put depends on recommendation one or something like that, which I could do. That was sort of what I was basing that on, is that these were all given the notion that we want to increase the number of applications from the Global South, and that is an organizational goal or a community goal, here are some recommendations for doing it.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Why don't you just then put it subject to adoption and agreement by the community of recommendation 1?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's also possible that the subsequent procedures folks will want to determine that it's an ongoing effort, as opposed to something that is a prerequisite to subsequent procedures. In other words, it's something that could be happening in parallel with subsequent procedures, as opposed to completely frontloading it.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Indeed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Then you don't run out of time the way you did before and things like that. So, I don't know if people have a strong opinion about that, but I think the argument could be made that an overall objective increasing applications from the Global South could be happening in parallel to subsequent procedures.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Absolutely. But I think – yes, that's a question of how you phrase it, I think, more than anything else.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, I'll revisit depends. Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes, it's kind of coming back to me now on that subsidy issue. I'll still check with the rest of the team and just confirm. Basically, you get points for how financially secure you are or your application is, and I think it might have been that basically, it's counter-intuitive.

So if you are trying to collect as many points as necessary by supplying all these guarantees and so forth and then you go and apply for assistance, it kind of is self-defeating, if I remember correctly. But again, I will have a chat with the guys tomorrow and see [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Calvin. That's good feedback. Waudo, the reason that I added the word "financial" is because I've broken up the Applicant Support Program into pieces. So for example, the pro bono assistance program is also part of the Applicant Support Program. This recommendation simply has to do with the subsidy portion of the Applicant Support Program. Does that make sense? Thanks.
	Megan, that's an old hand? Okay.
	Alright, so I have some marching orders in terms of making some revisions to this document that hopefully staff have captured, so at this point I would like to hand over the phone to Megan to go through her recommendations from her documents, which were also part of the application evaluation process.
MEGAN RICHARDS:	Oh, my goodness. Okay, I'm happy to do that. Does someone have them in front of them to clip onto the screen? I sent them quite some time ago, I think in one of these horrible Google documents. And I see that Jean-Baptiste has [agreed to] send me back all my documents again, but–
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Sorry, Megan, can you confirm which documents you'd like to start with?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Of the ones that you just sent me. I think there's only one that's on application [inaudible] I think it must be called Simplifying the Process. I don't think I did Simplifying the Process, that's for sure. I did something on the [inaudible], let me just have a look.

Specific Communities, is that it? On Specific Communities, perhaps it's that one. Let me just have a look. I have a separate file [inaudible]. Sorry, it caught me off guard. I didn't realize I was supposed to be doing [inaudible]. Why don't you go on to something else in the interim while I quickly find what I had done in Application and...

Yes, it's things related to the application process. Yes, that's right. They all relate to what was originally called string contention, and then we changed that to call it something not entirely string contention, but objections to – let me see how we called it – Effectiveness of the String Contention Service. But I changed the title of that. And Preventing Delegations That Would Be Confusing or Harmful. I had changed the title of those. See, they're not the most recent versions, at least not the versions that were not in the Google Document.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's the one from the Google Doc.

MEGAN RICHARDS: There we are, Effectiveness of the Dispute Resolutions Process [inaudible]. That's it, that's the correct one. Thank you.

Okay, so a lot of the comments that have been put in here are no longer relevant. For example, this one that says need to define string

contention process, because this is no longer string contention. It's now Effectiveness of the Dispute Resolution Process for Formal String Objections.

I hope David – oh, David has left. Drat. Because this is something that David and I were supposed to do together, and I haven't really had a chance to have any comment, [contributions] from David, unfortunately. He's been doing a whole series of other things. So, I was hoping he'd have a look at this with us, but I think he's just dropped off the list.

So, everything – I think it was Stan who said we need to define string contention. That's not necessary anymore. And these other comments about why not describe them, those are all described below, so I don't think we need to pay attention to those.

And then the paragraph is confusingly written. Well, that's possible. I won't say it's not. Someone was confused, obviously. So, I'm happy to have someone rewrite it in a clearer way. So, I think aside from that, I don't think you'll be able to scroll up and down either. There we are, thank you.

So now I'm on the next page. So this is just a description of the different times of dispute resolution processes that were for formal string objection. I changed that so that it fits exactly the vocabulary that's used by the Evaluation and Application Guidebook.

And then I had this comment in yellow which said the ICDR [inaudible] and then someone has very usefully put the link in there of the objection cases, but I don't know if that means that we should just leave

that as a footnote. That's probably the best thing instead of an entire listing.

So, I'm not quite sure what else we need to do here except for cleaning it up and, of course, putting in the additional aspects that Jonathan has asked for, and changing the recommendations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, do you have the recommendations separated out someplace so that you could just go through them and make sure we have some grip on them?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Those are in bold. The recommendation is in bold on page two. I think it's the second or third page, let me just have a look. On the third page is the recommendation in bold. The problem was that there was inconsistency of outcomes in a number of string confusion objections.

And the argument that this could be avoided n future by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings were examined by the same expert panel, or by determining that strings could not be delegated for singular [inaudible] and that all such similar applications would be resolved either by negotiation between parties or by ICANN [inaudible].

Whatever the options chosen should be made clear in the Application Evaluation Guidebook [inaudible]. So, that's effectively the recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that's just the one recommendation for this document.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Well, if you'd like, I can cut it out into more, because the other one says future gTLD launches should ensure that this aspect is [inaudible] established, consistently closed. Those are, if you like, [inaudible] recommendations in the sense that for me it's speeding [inaudible] but it's clear that they could be transformed into a recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's just open a discussion here. Do we think that there's sufficient detail in this recommendation that it could be implemented? And who is the target of this recommendation? Megan, do you have a target in mind for the recommendation, who this recommendation is to?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Well, someone parts are obviously – yes, I do. I was waiting for the others to chime in. Well, certain parts could be done by ICANN staff, obviously, and that relates to the Application and Evaluation Guidebook. And the reason things changed and [overhauled] later was obviously because with the new process, things were done along the way.

I think now, things are much clearer, and those can be clarified and improved and revised in the Application Evaluation Guidebook. So, those aspects could be done by ICANN staff. Some aspects have to be

done by the PDP group in determining the terms and conditions of the new gTLD process. Notice I didn't use the bad word.

So, that could be clarified a bit more in a new version of the recommendations.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Comments from the rest of the team? Are there any objections to this recommendation? Do we have consensus about it? Okay, so we'll assume this is good going forward. Megan, you're going to just –

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'm going to transform it into your preferred approach and clarify a little bit to whom the recommendations are addressed, and separate them clearly what recommendation and what needs to happen [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. Hi, Megan. I had a question. Is there another version of this paper? Because there's a number of comments in here, some that came from my colleagues and some myself regarding how some of these objections and contentions are characterized. Have you been able to address those?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Well, I changed the terminology, rightly so, because no longer string contention. It's now effectiveness of the dispute resolution process, and not string contention per se. So, those are addressed, and then there is a whole series of other comments that were made. But I'm not sure if those are intended to be put in as footnotes.

For example, here's one. Comment eight: "Maybe worth noting. AGB provided standards for string similarity panel. The standards of review of the string confusion did not require the same standards the String Similarity Panel had to use, leading to differing results."

But I don't see that that's inconsistent with the recommendation, which is that the Evaluation and Application Guidebook should be improved, clarified, etc.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The comments are really just to provide more context to [inaudible] it's not necessarily to sway your recommendation one way or another. Although if you want to make a recommendation [inaudible] Applicant Guidebook, I think that is important to note what was included in the Applicant Guidebook, and if you feel that there were some things missing, this would be the place to raise that.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. I didn't say that things were missing, I said it should be clarified. What did I say exactly?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Or clarified.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I can't see it now, but it's in there somewhere. And then the other question, Eleeza, that was raised is string similarity review is based on visual similarity, and string confusion objection is not bound to visual similarity. That's a comment that someone put in, maybe you or one of your colleagues.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, they came from one of my colleagues. So the point there was that the objections were not only evaluated based on the question of visual similarity, but on other issues. So, it was trying to differentiate that.

MEGAN RICHARDS: But I don't think I referred specifically to visual similarity. I used one specific case of plural versus singular, where there were clear misunderstandings – not misunderstandings. There were clear differences of approach, let me put it that way. Clear differences of approach in very similar circumstances, let's put it that way.

That was the one area where there was… Let me put it this way: if you were to take all the same cases of plural and [singular] and put them together, you would expect to have a consistent and similar resolution of similar problems. And that wasn't the case.

For all the others, I think they were relatively clear. My point of those was that the Application and Evaluation Guidebook should perhaps

clarify now in a new version where issues have arisen, how they could be resolved and what to avoid in the future.

So, perhaps that's a way of making that recommendation a little bit punchier so that it divides more clearly the [key cases] or plurals and singulars and all others, let me put it that way.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right, so I think that that's a fine recommendation. I think that would be a policy recommendation. I think the point was just to try to differentiate between the initial evaluation and then the objection process, because there were different standards there, and I thought it might be [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. But I did say that this addresses only the post-ICANN evaluation dispute resolution. It says somewhere at the beginning that – anyway, it says somewhere at the beginning of the text that this is only dispute resolution carried out after the initial assessment done by ICANN staff, because there was an initial assessment done by ICANN staff, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's correct, yes.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Exactly, so this is only those post-internal assessment, or pre-assessment, let's put it that way. So I thought that was clear in here, but

I'll try to change that as well. Okay, so clarify post-ICANN evaluation, and I'll divide the recommendation into plural and singular and all others.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And I'm happy to discuss with you offline, Megan, so that we don't take up everyone's time on this one issue. I just thought it might be helpful to go through a couple of the comments.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan, I don't know if you have comments from anyone else.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not on this document, I don't think. Do you have any other documents related to the application evaluation process?

MEGAN RICHARDS: There was also the one on GAC early warning advice and GAC advice, so maybe – I don't know who's messaging me. Yesim.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] I believe.

MEGAN RICHARDS: That's part of the application [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Is it possible to make that a little bit bigger? Because I have my glasses on, but they're obviously not good enough to read that as well. That's better, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, do you want to tell us where to go to jump ahead to the recommendations?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Good question. Where is the recommendation? Here I didn't put it in bold, unfortunately, but I think it's in this part that's in this blue at the end. That's effectively where the recommendation was. So, the point was that the early warning from GAC helped the applicants improve their application's chances of success, either by ensuring that potential conflicts with public policy or public interest were avoided. The contentious case is to be withdrawn and there with reimbursement of 80% of the application cost to the applicant or that PICs were included to increase likelihood of consumer protection.

So, the conclusion was that clear and timely early warning advice from GAC helped applicants to avoid potential public policy problems, correct national or legal problems, or allow withdrawal of an application and therefore recuperation of a significant portion of the application fee, and the avoidance of any future costs. And it also helped to improve the acceptability and viability of the – someone has changed that to future applications. It's not future applications, it's the TLD itself.

So, I take just the example of .gmbh for which there were about six different applicants, and Germany made an early warning GAC advice saying .gmbh has to meet certain legal criteria. So, anyone using .gmbh should ensure that their registrants are legally eligible to use this legal notion. It's like LLC, for example, in the United States. So, if you wanted to use LLC, we'd want to make sure that something that's calling itself an LLC really did have the legal ability and requirement to do that.

So, that was the kind of thing that was made in the early warning and helped the applicants ensure that its registrants met certain criteria. It didn't have anything to do with whether the application went through or not, or whether one particular applicant was successful or not. But it's clear that it has helped to improve the quality of the TLD once it was delegated.

So, to that extent, the recommendation is that in any future expansion of gTLDs, GAC early warning advice should provide clear, actionable and timely advanced warning to potential applicants or advance advice, I guess. And then someone said they didn't like that, because they didn't see why we should include that because this was a recommendation to GAC. But it is a recommendation for GAC, but it's also a

recommendation to a future PDP group to make sure that in developing any new version of the gTLDs, they ensure that either GAC early warning advice as it is is done even better and with learning all the errors of the past, or it's done in a slightly different way. I don't care how it's done, but it's clear that it's necessary, useful, and avoids problems for potential applicants and for potential TLDs, particularly with respect to consumer protection. So, that's really what the very last paragraph is, [inaudible] I guess really the recommendation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are your findings, it seems, as opposed to recommendations. Or was it your finding is that the program largely worked?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. And the recommendation is that it continues, and that the errors or problems that arose in the past be clarified in the Applicant Guidebook, and go forward. So, to be clear –

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay, Calvin, do you have any – oh, go ahead. Maggie, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Okay, [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, yes, go ahead, Calvin.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, if Calvin wants, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes. What I find interesting is between the geosphere and that's based on personal experience if you guys might know about the whole [inaudible] so forth. There doesn't seem to be any place for governments to object formally to an application.

At least in the current process, I'm not sure where that would take place. One would think that GAC advice might – a GAC early warning would be construed as such, but is there any formal way for a government to actually object to a geo application as per the guidebook?

MEGAN RICHARDS: So, there's a whole section in the guidebook on geo applications, and I've forgotten how exactly what it said, but again, I can use a specific example of .swiss which was applied for by Swiss Airlines, and the Swiss Confederation made an application under GAC early warning – not an application, they provided GAC early warning advice saying, "Sorry, .swiss is not limited to the Swiss Airlines company, this is a reference to the Swiss Confederation, and please don't do it," and therefore .swiss withdrew.

I've forgotten the exact details. Did I not put it down in one of the examples? I'm assuming I did. Maybe I didn't put it in the examples. I have it probably in my old notes. But that was also a good example. Oh,

yes, here it is. There it is. It's on – I don't know what page this is. It's the penultimate page. it's the penultimate paragraph in that page, on the .swiss page.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible]

CALVIN BROWNE: There you go, yes. Yes, I've got it.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay, so that was a specific geographic case, and the one was withdrawn following that GAC early warning advice from the Swiss Confederation.

CALVIN BROWNE: Sure. Now, if they hadn't withdrawn it and they had continued with it, where would the Swiss Federation have issues the objection, the formal objection to the application?

MEGAN RICHARDS: I think they would have had to go through dispute resolution under legal lanes, because if the Swiss Confederation owns .swiss as a

trademark or a legally binding means, then I suppose they would have had to go through that process, through the dispute resolution process.

Because there was a process for legal rights as well. I didn't talk about those, because for me, those were relatively clear and straightforward. If you have a legal right, it's a purely legal case. It wasn't so much related to the name, the way in which the [inaudible] was propose, etc.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yes. You see, in the [inaudible] but that they shouldn't have to move objections I think it is. I'm not sure the exact language, but something like that. So, how do those objections get lodged?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Folks, I feel like we're getting into very specific weeds unfortunately in the document, and that's what needed to happen prior to this call. So, I'm hoping Megan, you could take these comments in the margins, etc., and incorporate them into your new draft and pull the recommendations out separately.

MEGAN RICHARDS: No, I'm not [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: And if it's back in front of – give this back in front of Calvin for him to see if his questions are answered. I think part of the challenge now is

that the document is so marked up with things. Because we need to move on to the safeguards recommendations.

MEGAN RICHARDS: No, indeed, but on Calvin's question I think the staff has to ask after the session. I don't know… I'm not all an expert in all these details. I just need specific cases to try to get an idea of how the [inaudible]. So to go back and look at the individual cases of how many times the objections were allowed – I don't know. I think Eleeza [inaudible] or some of her colleagues [inaudible] that in much more detail. That might be the way to [resolve] on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Calvin, can you reach out to Eleeza and Jean-Baptiste offline for the answer to that specific question? We'll assume that Megan's going to turn this document around and clean [inaudible] relatively soon. Then you can see if the other questions you have still raise to the top.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. I'll wait for the clean document.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Megan.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Drew and Laureen, do you want to dive into the recommendations of the Safeguards document or any questions that were raised in the findings? Thanks.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. Yes. Happy New Year, everyone. Given our short amount time – we have about a half-hour left – I'm going to first dive right into the impact of Safeguards document and the recommendations in there because we have not yet, as a group on a call, gone over these. With the remaining time, I'll give you a brief update on the modification to the recommendations in the Voluntary PICs document.

Just a quick FYI in case you don't get there, those are just my best efforts to encapsulate the consensus areas that were reached in our last phone call – and to put them in the new format so you can look at those on your own and provide feedback; worst case if we don't get there.

Very briefly, before I jump into the impact of Safeguards document, I just wanted to point out that Jean-Baptiste has added our new DNS Abuse chapter to the master document. He did that earlier this week. So that is also there for you to read over. That is a placeholder because we do not have the DNS Abuse study data yet, so therefore, at this time, the document does not include recommendations. In case you have any feedback on what's factually stated there or the formatting or anything else, definitely provide that over e-mail.

For the impact of Safeguards document, which is, yes, the one that is highlighted – sorry. I'm looking at the wrong screen. Yes. Here we are. Okay. So for this, this document focused on the safeguards that were implemented that were specific to the New gTLD Program. It does not include all of them. Some will be included in the DNS Abuse chapter, which has specific technical safeguards. Between those two chapters, this will include everything – all the safeguards that's somehow tied to the New gTLD Program.

Going through these, there are recommendations at the end of each section based on our findings thus far. These recommendations need to be put into the new format, which will be helpful in helping us determine which parties should be responsible for implementing it and goals for success and whatnot.

I'll bring your attention to the first two recommendations that are listed under the section that discusses WHOIS verification. The first recommendations is, given our findings about the relatively large numbers of WHOS-related complaints received by ICANN Contract Compliance – shout-out to Jamie now – that the ICANN organization analyze complaints to identify the subject matter of the complaint. This means whether the subject matter was about syntax, operability, or identity.

We also state that they should identify other potential data sources of WHOIS complaints dealing with registrars, registries, ISPs, etc. in attempt to attain anonymized data from these sources. If identity is a significant percentage of complaints, then consult with stakeholders to explore in proceeding with the identity phase of the ARS project

because, as a community, we have not yet reached the identity phase of the ARS project. So that's Finding 1.

Let me see if I have any hands with regards to that one. Does anybody have any feedback or anything they want to type about that?

Okay. Can we use the voting method to just see if we agree with that? It will of course be put in the new format. Could you please you the checkboxes so that we can determine consensus?

Okay. Laureen, I'm going to assume you agree. Okay. Yeah. You now have voted.

Still waiting for votes from Dejan, Waudo, Kaili, and Calvin. If you don't agree, then do the disagree X. Oh, Waudo says, "I'm not sure what ARS is."

The ARS project is detailed in part in this section as well as in the DNS abuse placeholder. That project is what has been looking at WHOIS accuracy. There are different aspects to the project, looking at, for example, "Is WHOIS syntax proper and being complied with?" So it's sampling WHOIS records to determine whether or not a phone number is the correct number of digits and whether addresses are in the correct format, etc., as well as operability so far to ensure that, when you're querying WHOIS information about domain name, you're able to actually receive a response, and so therefore you're ensuring that registry operators are not blocking all WHOIS queries or whatnot or that registrars, as they're collecting the information from registrants, are failing to even scrutinize the syntax of the information being provided to them, etc.

What has been proposed in the past but what has not been done yet by the accuracy reporting system is getting to the point of actually determining whether identifies are valid in any way. There are different ways you can go about that, different layers of it, but essentially, today, as long as the syntax is correct, you could put a fake name/fake phone number – maybe the country code has to be a real country code and things like that, but it might not be your real phone number – and there wouldn't be anything done to verify that that is the actual identity of the registrant.

Laureen just paste a great link to the WHOIS ARS. So that's that. Waudo, feel free to provide any feedback after looking over that. So that's essentially that. We're saying that we actually propose there being a little more data collected before moving on and assessing whether or not they should proceed with the identity project.

Recommendation 2 here is, given the existing efforts on WHOIS accuracy, to determine whether the ARS team could assess whether WHOIS syntax and operability accuracy has increased under the 2103 RAA. This is because the obligations under the 2013 RAA were actually imposed obligations on operators to verify this. So we're giving this recommendation to see if it actually did in fact have that effect of increasing such accuracy for those two things.

Does anybody have any feedback on that?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Drew, [this is] Jamie. I've had my hand up. I don't know if you've seen it.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh, I apologize. All the green checkboxes. It wasn't just because you're Compliance that I was ignoring you, I can assure you. Congratulations, by the way. Yes, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you. On the first one, it seems like it might be a little unclear about what you mean by other potential sources of WHOIS complaints. Registrars and registries are responsible for resolving complaints. So it's not clear. Are you suggesting that they would also offer complaints?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes. I'm going to invite Laureen to chime in after I speak on this because she was the penholder for this chapter. So yes, because, potentially, complaints, particularly those dealing with operability or something, could come from any type of source. So that is what we're aiming for in that.

As I mentioned, we'll definitely work this into the new format for recommendations. I think that will provide clarity. Laureen, would you like to chime in about that?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Can everyone hear me? Yes?

DREW BAGLEY: Yes.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Good. Jamie, I want to make sure I understood your question because the reference here was to consider other data sources, and then there was a specification that registrars and registries and perhaps ISPs – and potentially I would think law enforcement and members of the public may also have, but this would be an identification of other potential data sources that might be rich sources of WHOIS complaints.

So even though I'm making this long list that might include more granular entities like individuals, I think the real task would be: "What are going to be rich data sources of WHOIS complaints? Where are the places where a lot of this information lives?" Registrars and registries seem to be some of the sources where one would expect to find this information.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you. That's helpful. I'm still a little confused though because if it's a WHOIS complaint, it goes to ICANN.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, I understand that, the WHOIS complaint goes to ICANN. That's the place it's supposed to go. But my sense is it's not the only place that folks receive these complaints. There could be other potential data sources. In fact, my sense is that, although people within the ICANN ecosystem are very well-versed in where these complaints should go, a lot of the rest of the world doesn't know the right place to complain to.

In fact, we see that in our Nielsen survey; that people often complain to law enforcement or they complain to other sources.

This recommendation is trying to account for not this sort of should-be world – i.e., these complaints should all go to one place; they should go to ICANN – but more of the reality that, in fact, these complaints may be going to disparate sources. It would be useful to identify what the richest of these disparate sources might be so that information could be taken into account.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. Maybe I'm just being thick. I understand what you're getting at in it. A WHOIS complaint is something that by its terms, goes to ICANN, or at least many may see it that way. What I think you're talking about is claims of WHOIS inaccuracy that don't go to ICANN. I don't have any objection to the recommendation, but it might be worth clarifying what it is you mean because people may not understand you're talking about claims of inaccuracy that don't become WHOIS complaints to ICANN, if that makes sense.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. Okay. I think I hear what you're saying: because there is a structure set up where complaints should go and this is basically acknowledging that they may not necessarily go to the place we want them to, we should clarify that there's this existing mechanism so that we don't inadvertently create confusion. Am I understanding it right?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah. That's it. Also what will help clarify that is suggesting ways in which the identification of these sources could be made. Is it reaching out to individuals? Is it the survey? How is it done?

LAUREEN KAPIN: That makes sense.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Drew, under Number 2, the only question I have is about "approved under the 2013 RAA." Over what?

DREW BAGLEY: Over pre-2013 RAA. So those not under the 2013 RAA.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. It might be helpful to clarify that.

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah. Absolutely. [inaudible]

JAMIE HEDLUND: [inaudible] "all prior [inaudible] the 2009" or whatever.

DREW BAGLEY: Right. Yeah. Okay. Good point. We can do the most recent to the 2009 RAA.

Okay. Does anybody else have any more feedback before we move on to the next couple of recommendations?

Does anybody oppose either of these recommendations? Looks like we have consensus for both, with the modifications – to clarify them both.

Okay. David, that's an old hand. Correct?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes it is. Sorry.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. No problem.

Okay. Moving on, here's a safeguard of mitigating abuse activity which place requirements on the operators to actually, in not a completely specific way, do something; to investigate and respond appropriately to any reports of abuse.

From this, we came up with three recommendations, the first of which is: In light of the important goals of these safeguards to mitigate abusive activity, continue to gather data, comparing rates of abuse in domains under the new registry agreement and new registrar agreements to legacy gTLDs. That's something where we're going to have a bit more insight once we get the DNS abuse data for that.

I'll read through all three of them and then we can discuss them.

Number 2: Determine whether it's possible to draw any conclusions about the impact of individual safeguards on rates of abuse. This is,

once again, where we're going to be looking at what correlations we may or may not be able to draw and whether we can go further than a correlation once we have that DNS abuse data.

Three: Survey registrars to find out whether the safeguard has made a difference in the way they approach combating abuse and find out how registrars interpret their obligation to take reasonable and prompt steps to respond appropriately to reports of abuse.

There are some comments already in the document about some of these parts. Going back to the first recommendation that's focused on comparing the rates of abuse amongst TLDs and registrars under these new policies versus those under the old policies, does anybody have any feedback on that one?

Brian, I see your hand.

Brian, we can't hear you if you're talking – oh. Hey.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Hello. Thanks, Drew. Just a minor suggestion to maybe strengthen the language of it on 2. Rather than saying, "Determine whether it's possible to draw any conclusions about impacts…" maybe just say, "Assess impact of individual safeguards…" Something like that. Or "Study impact." Something like that. That's my suggestion.

DREW BAGLEY: Thanks, Brian. That sounds good to me. Okay. So that was for 2. All right. It seems like no one had anything so far on 1, but you can definitely chime in while we're talking about the other things.

On 2, does anyone have any other feedback other that Brian's about tweaking the language? Of course, all three of these will go into the new format, and the language will be tweaked accordingly for that. Does anybody disagree or strongly agree or have any other feedback on these recommendations, for 1, 2, or 3 now?

Brian, is that an old hand?

I guess it's an old hand. Okay –

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah. Sorry.

DREW BAGLEY: Oh. Yeah, no problem.

For the third one, I believe it was Eleeza, maybe, who, in the document, had a comment to the point of "And to find out how registrars interpret the obligations to take reasonable steps." So her comment…I don't know if I'm seeing the comment I'm thinking of. I think she had a comment…yes. Okay, I found it. She said, "It's unclear what value this data would provide to registrars providing answers to this question. What would the action based upon their responses?"

The data that could come out of this would be seeing if there truly are disparate interpretations of this to the point that maybe it's not accomplishing the goal of enhancing abuse mitigation, which would then lead to community discussions that could strengthen the language or just make a language specific in a way.

Or it could be that we find out that, maybe in a good way, there's diversity of interpretation that actually leads to different approaches that are all focused on mitigating abuse and that really would fit into a category of reasonable and prompt steps.

Anyway, it's to peel back the onion little and actually get some more data about what that means in practice versus just what it means on the paper.

I'm wondering if anyone has any feedback on that. After I hear any feedback on that, then I'll read Jamie's comment from the chat. Does anybody have any feedback on this one? Is everyone still okay with it and does everyone understand that explanation to the feedback provided? Like I said, we will put this in the new format, and then it'll become "more specific wording on our part" as a recommendation.

Okay. Well, moving onto Jamie's point, which is actually relevant to this one, even though it's also relevant to others, Jamie is pointing that, of course, the contracted parties are now required to report information such as this or the type of information – and they refuse to do so – and getting this type varies depending on the willingness of the party with the data.

That's definitely a good point. That doesn't mean that the community shouldn't try, but to Jamie's point, perhaps, if anyone has any other recommendations of other data sources we could add in addition to attempts to get this type of data – because we can't assume that we're going to get this data, as we learned from this past year with all kinds of data we've wanted – feel free to chime in.

Jamie, while you are typing to provide further feedback on that, I'm going to check one last time with the group if anybody opposes these three recommendations in general. Otherwise, I'm going to assume we have consensus and then move onto the next recommendations because we only have a few minutes left.

Okay. Thanks, Jamie. Okay. For the next section, we have one recommendation with regard to the security checks, and it's that, once completed, ICANN and community stakeholders should review the proposed registry operator framework and assess whether the framework is efficiently clear and effective and an enforceable mechanism to mitigate abuse by providing four specific actions in response to security threats.

This is one where, as we tweak this recommendation, we can define it a bit better as to what we mean by "enforceable" because it is a framework. We can change that language a bit to reflect the fact that is a framework. We can still put in place how the framework is implemented as a mechanism for which you can ensure that it is implemented. So what this focuses on is, of course, registry operators' obligation to conduct periodic security checks so that we can make sure

they are doing those periodic security checks and find out more about that.

Does anybody have any feedback on that one? I see a couple typing for this one. I don't see any hands right now, but feel free to chime in if anyone wants to speak as well. Otherwise, I will see what people are tying for that one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Drew, it's Eleeza.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Laureen – whoops.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. I'm going to put myself on mute. Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm in the car, so I can't raise my hand. Laureen, you can go ahead if you were first.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, you go ahead first, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. I had a question about this, and I'm not sure it made it into the draft that's on the screen now since I'm not in front of the screen. I

was wondering, specifically in terms of the word "enforceable" – this is the voluntary framework recommendation, I think, that we're talking about. It's voluntary. Is "enforceable" meant to be for ICANN to enforce, or is that referring to the registries' ability to enforce its framework? That was my question. Thanks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Eleeza, this is Laureen. I actually think this is a very well-founded comment. It is a voluntary framework, and enforcement is – on reflection, this is a very apt comment. That is the wrong word, and we probably should take out the word "enforceable" and, I think, keep "clear an effective" because I think that's the key: any proposed framework going to the – has sufficient clarity and specificity so that it actually can be implemented. I think "enforceable" probably would raise a lot of red flags when the whole intent is for this to be a voluntary framework.

That said, if it lacks specificity and if it lacks clarity, then it will have limited usefulness. So I think those are the concepts we should focus on.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks. That makes sense.

DREW BAGLEY: Okay. So we will adjust that. Both Megan and Jamie have feedback. Okay. Yes. To Megan's point, this is part of what I'm alluding to as you put things in the format. We'll definitely be more specific with who we are directing the recommendations to. I'll just say ICANN as some

general big thing. Thank you for reiterating that because that's very, very important, of course, for making these recommendations meaningful. However well-intended they may be, if we aren't specific, then they will likely not go anywhere.

[Terri] and then Jamie's point echoes what was just said about our need to focus on what's actually enforceable versus what is not enforceable and to change our language accordingly with that recommendation dealing with the registry operator framework. So that is duly noted.

All right. People are starting to drop, and we're out of time. For those willing to stay on, I will go over the rest of the recommendations, at least in this document. For voluntary PICs, I urge you to read those on your own and tell me if we should change anything before that becomes part of our first draft report.

Let's see. Moving on, we have two recommendation in this section that details making and handling complaints, focusing on the base registry agreement for new gTLDs.

The first recommendation is to survey registries to find out the volume of complaints they receive, both from the public and from government agencies. Number 2 is to assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by surveying registries to find out what actions they take in response to complaints.

To the first one, of course, a criticism will be, "What if they don't respond? They don't have to respond," and whatnot. I still think it's a worthwhile exercise, especially having had experience of actually

surveying registries and registrars from my own organization about abuse complaints and what they do. So I still think it's a worthwhile effort to do this in an anonymous way and to better understand this volume of complaints because this, of course, helps inform decision-making about abuse policies and whether or not they are effective.

Does anybody have any feedback about that? Once again, that needs to be more specific as to who it's directed at and whatnot. This is in response to the requirements in the base registry agreement, coupled with the data that we go from our own surveys about many people not being aware as to who to go to for complaints. Of course, we always hear in the community with regard to abuse that abuse reporting often can be misdirected and that some of those that should go to a content provider do not and vice versa. And things that should go to ICANN might not always land there.

Does anybody disagree with the first recommendation? Or feedback? I don't think we have quorum to judge whether we have consensus, so that will have to be done via e-mail. For Recommendation 2 – assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by undertaking a survey – does anybody have any feedback on that?

Okay. Well, we'll go to e-mail to ultimately see if we have consensus on those after we've reworded those in the new format.

For those still on the line, continuing on with the document, I'm going to go through the next three recommendations. These recommendations are under the safeguards for sensitive and regulated string section.

We're losing ICANN Compliance, which means that everything we say about ICANN Compliance will no longer have opposition. So now that should get some feedback from the remaining people.

These three recommendations are: Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN-publicly-available complaint reports. This is something I would definitely want Jamie's feedback on, of course. Maybe, once again, this will be something better-suited for e-mail because I think that would be really helpful; to get the Compliance take on that.

This is something that, I think, for us not only doing the review but just from our findings, seems like it could be a lot more helpful to the extent that Compliance could be more specific on the subject matter. I think that would be helpful for the community: understanding where the problems really are, rather than them being lumps of generally – in scope. So that's how we came up with this recommendation; we would like to know what these complaints look at. Is there a specific law that someone is alleging is being violated? Do these complaints relate to any of these newer things, such as these obligations for the protection of sensitive health and financial information? All of that would really help reflect the reality of the new safeguards and the Compliance obligations that have arisen with that.

Number 2 in this section is a recommendation that survey registrars determine whether they're complying with obligation to provide appropriate security measures for this sensitive health and financial information. 3 is to follow up any survey that's conducted with an audit

to assess whether registrars are sufficiently protecting users' sensitive information; once again, going with these new obligations.

Does anybody have any feedback on that?

Okay. Once again, that'll just be done via e-mail. I'm thinking we'll just have to end the call soon because we're getting fewer and fewer people. For those of you still on the line, though, as far as review team members – Calvin, Jonathan, Kaili, Waudo, Dejan, and Jamie – it looks like you're still hanging on. There are a few more substantive recommendations.

Since we are now almost ten minutes over, I guess we could go ahead and take this offline. This is dealing once again with more surveys to registries and registrants and whatnot and focused on complaints and getting to the heart of learning more about complaints.

Laureen and I will go ahead and put these in the new format and then shoot these back out to the group so that that way we can get broader feedback on them. For those of you still on the line, I urge you to go through and read these and provide any feedback, even on the spirit of them, before we go through and put them in the new format, to see if you flat-out disagree or have feedback as to how they can be better as we put them in the new format.

I'm just going to go ahead and close there since we're so far over. There's still a few minutes left, so I'll yield it to you, Jonathan and anyone who can chime in the chat, or to you and your closing remarks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Drew. Sorry we pushed so far for the end there. Folks, make an effort, when these links are recirculated in Google Doc format, to take a look and make comments in line so that we talk about them as efficiently as possible on the next call. Let's try to raise the surface issues that might be controversial and make sure to have a targeted discussion of these when they're next raised because we are coming up against our deadlines, which are the next topic of the agenda.

At this point, we have some people. I don't know if it makes sense to go over them, unless, Jean-Baptiste, you wanted to take 30 seconds here and remind us of some of the deadlines that we've set for ourselves in terms of release of this to the public so that people are aware of the urgency.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Jonathan, I think we are running out of time. What I wanted to remind everyone of is to send their comments by the end of this week because if we still plan on publishing the draft report for public comment on the 23rd, we need to [inaudible] internally to format the report. So please send your comments by the end of this week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, JB. In case people didn't hear, the end of the week here is the deadline for your comments. Remember that we'll be releasing this for public comment and you will all be part of the process of defending the document in the environment of public commenting. So please do take another round of looks at the documents and get your comments in by the end of the week.

Beyond that, we'll get out the agenda for the next plenary call, which will include the executive summary, as well as the data-based summary.

Laureen and Drew, I'm looking forward to you to supplement the draft that Stan prepared on the competition side with things that you want to add in terms of the data requests, at which point I will try to take the pen and formulate that into something cogent. So please do take a look at the documents that Stan circulated and supplement with data requests that would come out of Compliance.

All right, folks. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Jonathan, maybe we can talk offline because I'm not sure I have full clarity on what the ask is here. So maybe you and I and Drew can chat about that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Definitely. Let's set up a call to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, folks. Thanks a lot.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]