JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, folks. Welcome to the CCT Plenary. This is Jonathan and I am in a car in Iceland, so I'm not in front of Adobe Connect. I think that we're going to focus this conversation today on prioritization exercise around our recommendations.

If you recall, we had a conversation about the fact that we were stuck with a binary representation of whether or not something was a prerequisite or not to Subsequent Procedures. We've modified that to come up with more of a priority system rather than a yes/no type of designation.

The prioritization system still has "Prerequisite" as one of its options. In other words, a recommendation is recommended to be implemented prior to any subsequent procedures. And then beyond that, the low, medium, and high is a reference to the time frame for implementation.

And so, if we look at a high priority, it's something that should get done in the next 18 months or something like that so as to hopefully be done prior to any subsequent procedures and be higher on the list. And then the low priorities need to be done prior to the next CCT Review. And the medium are somewhere in the middle between those two.

That was the matrix that we came up with for prioritization of the recommendations so that low priorities aren't just left to be implemented whenever people got around to it. They still had a deadline associated with them, but it's just a little further out. It's more like a four-year deadline as opposed to an 18-month deadline that's in the high category in terms of these recommendations.

I guess before we get started, I should ask if there's anyone besides me that's not in the Adobe Connect. Make yourself heard so that you can be called into attendance. Is anybody else just on the phone?

Has there been any update to anyone's Statement of Interest?

Okay. Given that prioritization scheme, does anybody have questions about that or comments on that categorization scheme that we came up with for the recommendations? Does anybody have any questions about that?

Somebody needs to tell me if someone has raised their hand.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Waudo has raised his hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Waudo. Go ahead, please.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello, Jonathan. Hello, everybody. I wanted to find out when we say completed in the next 18 months, that's from when? It's not clear to me because what we are doing is ongoing. Is the next 18 months from the time we [inaudible] hand over the report to the Board or when?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. That's a very good question, Waudo, and I think it's from the time of our final report. So, that's probably 18 months from July.

Any other questions?

I think we believe, given the timeline of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, that 18 months – barring anything unforeseen – is a sufficient amount of time to get a recommendation. It depends on the recommendation, but it should be enough time to get a recommendation done prior to the Subsequent Procedures. But it doesn't hold up subsequent Procedures if it's close to being done or something like that.

The notion about "high" is that we want it to be done before there are subsequent procedures, but we're not holding up further expansion of the DNS for that recommendation – unlike a prerequisite that says, "You shouldn't move forward at all until this recommendation is implemented."

WAUDO SIGANGA: [Thank you.]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, there is a question from Megan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Megan, go ahead please.

                          You might be on mute, Megan.

                          Very faintly.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'll try like this. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

MEGAN RICHARDS: The point I wanted to make was that the idea of low, high, etc., I think, is good, but I'm just a bit concerned that we say that timing is only the thing that relates to priority. For me, a priority could be high priority but it doesn't necessarily have to be done immediately. We have things, for example, that have to be done, but they could be done over a longer period of time.

My point is not to stop the whole discussion, but there may be some things that are high priority but could be done over a longer time scale. So, I just think we should be a little bit more flexible about the timing, that's all. I don't mind if you use this as a baseline for determining what's high, low, and medium, but I think in some cases you'll have some issues that are, let's say, low priority but should be done quicker, or high priority but could be done slower.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good question, Megan. I guess we're using "Priority" as a measurement of time, not importance. What we're asked to do in the new Bylaws as a result of the Accountability Framework [is specify]

whether or not a recommendation needs to be implemented prior to any subsequent procedures.

What we're doing is expanding that binary choice to include different amounts of time. And so, these are not in any way measures of importance. So when we say low, medium, and high priority, it's not like we care about one more than another. It's more about whether or not we think it should be critical [pathed] or something that could happen over time.

I think we believe that all the recommendations should be implemented. It's more a question of timeline and whether it's critical path to any subsequent procedures. Does that make sense?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah. I understand what you're saying, but then it's not a priority. It's timing rather than priority.

Anyway, I don't want to belabor the point. I understand why it's been done. I think it makes sense [to put a] timeline. No problem.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, if we come up with a better term, we'll change it. The exercise we're going through today is about timing and we're making the assumption that every one of the recommendations, from an importance standpoint, is a high priority. We're not making a distinction about importance, only timeline.

Any other questions about the taxonomy?

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible] a low priority [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jean-Baptiste, does anybody else have their hand up?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, there is a hand up from Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn, go ahead, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan, I mostly want to react or build on something Waudo said and then maybe give my own reaction to Megan. And I'll maybe do that in the opposite order.

I started off with a similar reaction to Megan that the notion of "Priority" wasn't necessarily aligned with timing. But as I've been trying to think about it and take a look, I think that, in probably 95% of cases, they're basically the same. We're using prioritization to signal the sequence in which we would want things done.

And so, to that extent, I think they largely align in any case – and this is an easier shorthand. And I think, importantly, because even the low priority has a time bound on it. It gives us more confidence that we can put things in the low priority bucket and still feel like they're actually

going to be done, as opposed to [being] ignored by ICANN because there's still a time bound on it.

I do think Waudo raises a good concern, which is when does the 18-month clock start ticking? I fear, just knowing how the organization and the community work, that it will be very easy for that 18 months to be considered to start at the start of 2020 or something like that. So, I would suggest we actually consider putting hard dates in instead. For example, I think the high priority stuff – we should just say it should be complete by the end of 2018; and the medium priority stuff, we could say by mid-2019 or something or even the end of 2020 if we want to give 40 months instead of 36. But I think hard dates might serve us better than [inaudible] because they're less subject to manipulation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Let's make a note to change that and to add that to the cataloguing description.

Any other questions?

Laureen, do you want to start? You have the most substantive, I think, recommendations. Do you want to start this conversation of going through them or we could do them in order? I don't remember how they're ordered, but if we want to start with the ones from Laureen's group, then Laureen could lead that conversation. We could just get started and we'll start to feel this out in practice. Does that make sense to folks?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Did we want to use Eleeza's Excel spreadsheet to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so. Yeah, definitely.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That struck me as a logical way to do this with the group. Can we get that on the screen?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Remember to mute your PC if you're not speaking. There's some background noise.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Then let's see if we can get this great spreadsheet a little bigger so we can actually read it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You have the right to change the [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. So I am…I've now made it too big. Okay, I think that's a little easier to read, and let me see if I can scroll to get this a little more centered. The problem is, it's hard to try to get all the fields on the screen in a way that we can read them.

I'm wondering if we…even though we certainly have recommendations based on impact of safeguards, but I'm wondering if it makes sense to start with Data Analysis first because those are more of our overarching, big bucket recommendations. Do you have [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does that make sense for Jordyn, then, to lead that discussion? Like I said, I can't see the screen or anything. Jordyn, do you want to go through some of those?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, it's both, but the first couple absolutely deal with Jordyn's issues more than mine.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I'm happy to run through that conversation. Also, I guess, for framing purposes – and I'm not going to talk with my leading-the-conversation-hat here, but just an interjection as a personal opinion – I think one way that it might be helpful to think about the prioritization would be whether there's some urgency around knowing the answer to the question and whether it's likely to affect behavior and changes prior to the next CCT Review.

I'm going to surmise, for example, as we talk about this that most of the competition-related data points are actually probably not going to be consumed prior to the next CCT Review, and so therefore they could easily be pushed into that low priority bucket. We want to make sure that data's available for a subsequent review.

And, to a certain extent, maybe there's some baselining value in getting some of the data sooner rather than later; but to the extent that ICANN could be confident it could capture the data points, it may not be that important to necessarily have it available to the community prior to the next review; whereas, I think, some of the things in the Safeguard papers that Laureen has identified – for example, is there a bunch of illegal activity happening in the highly-regulated strings that we just haven't been able to identify yet?

I think it would be of importance to the community to understand whether that is happening or not because I think many of the competition questions were basically saying, "We think that there's signs of competition. We just can't quantify it," which is different from saying, "There's a possibility that something bad is happening and we just can't find it."

In any case, I think that's how I'm trying to frame it just so we can find things to put into the low or medium buckets because, I think, so far that we've had a tendency to try to put everything into the high priority buckets.

So running through, the first 12 recommendations on this giant spreadsheet, as folks will see – I know it's a little hard to read because there are a lot of them – all relate to data collection.

I think the first of these is to "formalize and promote ongoing data collection." So, this is essentially to create a data collection function within ICANN. I think Eleeza has expressed that, to a certain extent, her group already does this. So, it may be just creating community

awareness or creating a structure that people understand, but this may largely be already complete. We have this marked, actually, as a prerequisite right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is this the overall one, Jordyn, that you're talking about?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, this is a high level like "We need the function to exist," basically.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess we should talk more before we just say that it already happened because I think we want to make sure that it becomes a more engrained thing, as opposed to a reactive thing that I think it is now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So, you're saying that it's not just that they're taking specific data elements requested by the community and collecting them, which is what happens today. But there should be some Chief of Data who, on their own, figures out [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: – with the community or with working groups, etc., but somebody whose job it is to drive the identification of the right data [to] track an issue and to measure the success of a reform. That's kind of what we're getting at there. I back away from creating this Chief Data Officer role, necessarily, but it's about having this become a proactive part of the

organization. That's what I was trying to make that recommendation suggest.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that makes sense. Like I said, I was mostly alluding to the fact that that capability may exist to a certain degree. I wasn't trying to say that we shouldn't include the recommendation. And in fact, we have this marked as a prerequisite in terms of our prioritization scheme.

I guess I'll open that up for…I'm trying to figure out the best way to get the sentiment of the group. What I might ask people to do – and I see that Carlton has his hand raised. I'll get to you in just a second, Carlton – what I might ask people to do is, we have these awesome… In Adobe Connect there's these little voting buttons – Agree/Disagree. We might be able to use that to signal levels of support for each of these.

But before we get to that, let me ask Carlton to speak since he's got his hand raised.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Jordyn. I hope you can hear me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: For the first one, I quite agree that it's a high priority for me. But I would want to ensure that – it's along the lines of what Jonathan says – there

has to be a whole new ball game with data collection than assessment and so on. We want an institutionalization of it. So, you want processes and people and [story] and all of these things defined. I am also interested in ensuring that the classes of data that we're asking for to make meaningful analysis is also understood.

So, as part of this recommendation, I would expect to see it come up from the other papers to show what classes of data as part of their advisory. I am very keen to see that we just don't say, "Well, this is [this here]." We know some classes of data that are missing right now, and I would want to see that as part of their advisory that we actually name them and we can pick up those in the paper.

That's my feeling about this one. We need to get a little bit more in the weeds on this one and put a framework around it. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Carlton. You'll see the next 11 recommendations all actually relate to specific data collection efforts. So, I think we're certainly going to include quite a bit of detail beyond just saying that we need the function to exist.

Carlos.

Carlos, we don't hear you. You might be on mute.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Hello. Can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There we go. Go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I am very interested in this recommendation and I fully agree we shouldn't get involved in too many details of the organization. My suggestion is that we add some qualities that we expect from this data, and there are many. I have a very short list. Going back to the discussions, the data should not enable anybody to track back to any single agent of the market.

Second, it should be clearly segmented. And third, it should be consistent over time. And fourth – for me, the most important – it should be the [inaudible] source of data. It should be the first round of data collection, and then it shouldn't be a second-hand data collection from a survey through an outside consultant and then presented to the community. Those for me, it could be handled quickly with these characteristics instead of going into the discussion we have already had before. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn, if I might – two things. One is, I think that a lot of that will depend on a case-by-case basis, so what we need to say is this: "This function needs to determine whether or not data needs to be anonymized or made confidential in some form" because that may not always be the case; it'll vary.

But more importantly, if we dissect each of these recommendations this way in the wording of them, we won't get through this prioritization exercise. We're going to have plenty of time, after we get public comments back, to go through and really refine how these things are written up, and we're going to have the opportunity to participate in the implementation process after our final report is delivered and the Board accepts or rejects one or more of our recommendations.

So for this call, we want to just summarize the recommendation and then just very quickly have a conversation about what the time frame is we think it needs to happen in. That's really the conversation for today. Is it a low, medium, high priority or is it, in fact, a prerequisite? Should implementation of that recommendation prevent those [inaudible] procedures from happening until that implementation is complete?

That's the discussion we need to have today about all of these recommendations. We can't have a deep dive into each one and only get a third of the way through.

So, let's drive the conversation toward prioritization in terms of timing for each of the recommendations.

Sorry, Jordyn. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Jonathan. I was going to make that second point as well, which is to the extent people have feedback on the substance of the recommendations, unless they think that they substantially affect the prioritization for some reason, I suggest just looping back in touch with

the recommendation owner to see if it still makes sense to tweak anything at this late date. I think in a lot of cases, as Jonathan alludes to, we'll just have to consider these relatively baked and revisit after the initial public comment period.

So, I think the real question that we want to answer here is, currently we have this flagged as a prerequisite in terms of priority, so this has to be done prior to the release of additional gTLDs. And I think, given the scope of Data Analysis as one of our key principles for future work, that makes sense to me, at least.

But let me ask if there's other feedback. Does anyone disagree that this item should be a prerequisite, which is implicitly our highest categorization bucket?

Maybe I will ask people to – I see Waudo's hand is up, so let me get to Waudo first – Carlos is doing it already. For those of you that agree that this should be a prerequisite, please use the little "Agree" symbol in Adobe Connect. Jonathan doesn't get to vote, but we'll have to go with the group unless he has a strong sense of it otherwise.

But while people are voting, Waudo, go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thanks, Jordyn. I actually agree that it should be a prerequisite. But my question was, in terms of the ongoing [data] collection, some of it is outside ICANN. It happens outside ICANN in that it's useful for the CCT. So, I'm just wondering how can we incorporate that aspect in this

documentation that some of the data collection that we want to be promoted is outside ICANN. It's not within ICANN.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Waudo, I think once again, that's going to get back to the implementation of the recommendation. I think the idea here, though, is just to have a capability within ICANN to go and gather that data. Obviously, what we're not saying here by making this a prerequisite is that all of the data listed below has to be gathered as a prerequisite; just that ICANN has to have the capability to go and get it and to organize it and [inaudible].

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Thanks, Waudo. I see only green check marks. I'm going to take that as we agree that this should be a prerequisite, and I'm going to hope that we're going to move through the following items a lot more quickly since we have 54 of them. That gives us a little over one minute per item for the rest of the call.

The second Data Analysis item is the "collection of wholesale prices for legacy gTLDs." This item is not marked as a prerequisite. I would propose that this item – once again, this is purely for eventual comparative purposes and there's some implementation issues because there's no way to actually compel the legacy gTLDs to do this.

So, I would suggest that this is actually a low priority item, even though, ultimately, it would be important for the next review. But I'm open to other suggestions.

Megan has her hand up, so I'll go to Megan first before we ask for a vote. And anyone else who wants to discuss, please feel free to raise your hand. Megan?

Megan, so far we don't hear you.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry, I was talking to the hand and not to the microphone.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. There we go. [laughing]

MEGAN RICHARDS: [Can you hear me] now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, barely.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I was looking at the little hand instead of the microphone.

My question is about to whom the recommendation is addressed. It says, "ICANN Board" for all these Data Analysis and Collection issues.

EN

I'm just wondering if that's really the right addressee. I think we should think about that as well. For the rest, I agree.

I thought there was a way of getting wholesale pricing, but if you say it's not possible then I guess it has to be not [approachable].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Megan. Two points. The fiirst is that with regards to who it's addressed to, I think what we heard in our last week's discussion was that if we think that it's actually for the staff to implement, that the general way to recommend this is to recommend it to the Board and then the Board instructs the CEO or the staff to do the implementation.

So, in general I think what we really mean by these things is that the staff would be the implementer, but the recommendation is being made to the Board in order to instruct the staff to do so. So, I think that would be true throughout these Data Analysis instructions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And to be clear, all of these recommendations go to the Board, and so then it's going to be staff or the Subsequent Procedures Working Group that are likely to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right. Megan, is that a new hand?

Okay. I'm going to assume no, or maybe Megan's just on mute, still, again.

EN

MEGAN RICHARDS: Again. No, I tried raising the volume. Can you hear me better now?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Anyway, my point is that the whole result will go to the Board, obviously, but there seem to be some inconsistencies in the list. Some say they're addressed to the Board; some say they're addressed to ICANN organization, etc. I'm just asking that we're consistent.

If everything goes to the Board anyway, then you can take that column out. But some say – and we've done this in our recommendations as well – sometimes we say "ICANN staff." Sometimes we've said "Board." Sometimes we've said "the PDP," etc. So, I'm just pleading for some consistency on this. That's all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Same thing. I think this category just means that we expect the staff to implement. We'll just have to figure out a way to represent that a little differently from the ones that, for some reason, we think is really just a Board issue without a specific implementer here.

In any case, I think that the – in chat I've seen Carlton suggests that this is medium priority, not to be considered as a deal breaker; whereas, Gao has suggested this should be a prerequisite, I think.

In general, Gao, I think in the discussion that we've had again in the past, if we're just curious about something and don't think that we're actually trying to correct an identified harm, that we're tending to not make these things prerequisites. And I think this definitely falls into the, "We're just curious about something" category because it's just purely to make a comparison between…

We actually think there's a very low probability this particular data is useful because the only thing we're trying to figure out is whether the legacy gTLDs are charging at the cap or potentially below the cap in their wholesale pricing. We know what cap they're allowed to charge, but we don't know whether they're actually charging that information.

Our theory is that it is very likely that all of the legacy gTLDs are constrained by their pricing cap, and so actually all we're going to find is that everyone's charging the cap. So once again, that's why I think this is actually pretty low priority, because the benefit of getting the data is low and it's only going to be consumed by a future team.

Carlton, did you want to speak to why you think this is medium priority as opposed to low?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, Jordyn. I agree with you. It's largely for the next team, but there are other things ongoing that it might be useful. For example, if you look at the pricing structure of the new gTLD domain names, an ongoing analysis of the movements of prices and whether the market is open as we think it is would include us having some reference point. And

wholesale prices would certainly be one point that we would consider. That's why I thought it should be medium priority.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, and I think, Carlton, that normally would make sense except for the fact that all of the legacy gTLDs have price caps. So, that's likely to be controlling here.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. I do understand that, but the legacy ones who at least [come in] next – they have price caps on them. But I think you understand the general principle of what I'm trying to get at.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess part of my goal in this exercise is to find some things that we can say are low priority because it's actually, I think, not a very helpful prioritization exercise if everything ends up in the "high" buckets. I guess this feels to me like if anything is going to be low priority, this is one of them because we think it's not the highest value data and it's probably less likely to be consumed prior to the next review than some of these other things as well.

Let me just get a sentiment of the group. Carlton's arguing that maybe this should be higher priority, but if folks agree with me that this can be marked low priority, please use your green vote button.

If you think it should be a higher priority, feel free to use the red vote button.

So far, only Carlos dares to vote. If only Carlos votes, then he wins.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, you win.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jordyn, I'm thinking I don't quite understand the reasoning behind this and the timing. Perhaps other people may not either, which is why you're not seeing a lot of votes. I know, at least for me, I'm not quite grasping the reasoning and I'm wondering if you can explain both the issue driving the collection of data as it relates to competition and then your reasoning as to timing. Then I would be able to give you a better vote.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. The reason we want this one is mostly a theoretical one. What we know today is what price the new gTLDs actually charge as a wholesale price, and we know what price the legacy gTLDs have as a price cap. What we don't know is what price the legacy gTLDs actually charge as a wholesale price. In theory, they could charge below the price cap.

We don't think that's very likely that that's happening, but it's a theoretical possibility. And just to be relatively more confident about our pricing analysis, we would like to know whether or not they're actually charging below their price cap. Because if they were charging below their price cap and the price went down or if they were charging at the price cap previously and the price went down, then we would

know that there was some downward effect on pricing as a result of the introduction of new gTLDs.

In general, I think Stan's opinion – and mine is likely to be as well – is that because the prices are all artificially low due to the price cap, it's actually very unlikely we're going to see any change in prices because everyone wants to charge more than the price cap today.

Let's say if someone wanted to charge $20 and their price cap was $8, even if they wanted to charge only $10 as a result of new gTLDs but the price cap was still $8, they would still only be able to charge $8.

And so, because the price cap is keeping prices artificially low, that's actually a much bigger confounding factor in our competition analysis than knowing the actual prices. That's why I think this is more checking a box to make sure we're being thorough than because we think we're actually going to glean significant insight from this particular set of data.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. That's helpful. So basically, in terms of your new gTLD analysis, what I'm hearing you (and you channeling Stan) say, it would be nice to have this information, but you don't think it's actually having a significant impact on your reasoning right now – nor might it in the future.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. Until we believe that it's likely that most of the legacy gTLDs are – the price has been pushed so low that they're likely to be

under the price caps, then this is probably just going to tell us that they're charging the price cap.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. That's very helpful. I'm going to add my [tick].

JONATHAN ZUCK: In fairness, we didn't get all the wholesale price data we wanted, even from the new gTLDs – but we got most of it, I guess. Right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, we didn't get transactional data. We did get baseline price data from the new gTLDs. We didn't get, "What fraction of your domains were discounted below the base price?" or "What fraction were premiums?" etc. But we got the base pricing for all of the legacy gTLDs or all the ones that Analysis Group surveyed.

Alright. I saw only green votes. Laureen changed hers to…

I think we got up to three green votes. So, we're going to go with keeping this low priority. I didn't see any red votes. Fabro's back to voting green. Okay.

Let's move on to number three. This is the collection of transactional pricing for the gTLD Marketplace which is what Jonathan just alluded to. Just as a reminder to everyone, what we got from the gTLDs as part of this last round is base wholesale prices. But if a gTLD ran a promotion or if they've sold some fraction of their domains at premium prices, we

don't know what that mix looked like and we can't look at a specific name and say it was priced at a specific price.

We think it would be helpful to have a more granular insight into pricing. This data will be a little bit complicated to work with in that it'll be, I think, a lot more sensitive for the registries to provide. It will be more burdensome to provide and it'll be more burdensome to consume. So, likely this will have to be done through an even smaller sample of some sort.

But we can leave it to the future staff implementation or third party implementation to figure out exactly how it would be done. But the idea here is that we will at least try to get some amount of transactional data for wholesale gTLDs. [inaudible] like Carlton's point around the penny domains – what fraction of the total stream are represented here?

I think this data actually would significantly change people's understanding of the marketplace, and so I'd say this might be a medium priority as opposed to a low priority. Once again, this is unlikely to change anything that anyone does in terms of policy over the short term, but it will be helpful I think for community understanding.

So, I would propose a medium priority here, but I'd like to open it up to a discussion if anyone has other opinions. Otherwise, we can vote on that.

Alright. I don't see any discussion. Carlton also agreed with medium. Why don't we use our green and red things? If you think it should be medium, would you please choose the green check mark. If you don't agree, then use the red check mark.

EN

Alright. I see lots of green check marks. No red check marks. Alright, so let's consider that to be a medium priority.

Number four is the "collection of retail prices for domain marketplaces." This is prices charged to registrants instead of the prices that the registries are charging to registrars. We started to get some of this data in this review, and I think that there are already third party sources for this data that we ended up using. I think Analysis Group did get some of this data as well.

This data is – I would say, unlike some of the other data elements we have here, there are already ways to get at this. They're just somewhat manual and tedious. Although, as we've discovered additional sources, I think that's become less and less true.

So, as a result of the fact that we actually do have ways to get to this data, I would also suggest that this should be a low priority because there's ways to substitute in for it if ICANN doesn't collect it directly.

Once again, that would be my suggestion. I'll open it up for discussion and then a vote depending on people's reaction. Megan says okay. Alright, so I don't see any discussion. Let's use our little green things again if you agree, and red if you don't. We're saying this is low priority.

Alright, green check marks. So, number four is low priority. We're starting to make good progress here, folks. You can stop hearing my voice if we keep this pace up.

Number five is "collection of parking data." Obviously, we've had extensive discussion around parking. I think we actually are starting to

get some of this parking data already, and so this may be something that can be done relatively quickly by just normalizing some of the things that are happening already.

But this would be data to better understand the phenomenon of parking. Given the interest in our review team on this topic and the fact that, to a certain degree, a lot of our discussion has hinged on the answer to this question, I would suggest this one probably is a high priority and so I would suggest that as a baseline.

Waudo has his hand up, though. And any other discussion, I think we can have before we vote.

Go ahead, Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I'm just wondering, when we were working on the parking data we actually had the two opposite ends of the parking data spectrum. We've got the new gTLD parking data and the legacy parking data. The problem we had was with the [legacy] parking data. That's the one that was not available at all. The new gTLD parking data is fairly easy to get on the market.

So I'm just wondering – this recommendation – whether there will be any value addition to perhaps break it in two or indicate that difference and difficulty in getting the data or do we just leave it the way it is?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Waudo. I think you're right. This would include both legacy and new gTLD parking data in a way that we could make meaningful comparisons across the two.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, so then we put it high priority.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Waudo also suggested a high priority, and Carlton as well. So, I'm going to suggest we vote on whether we agree this is high priority. So, use your green check marks now if you think "collection of parking data" is a high priority.

[WAUDO SIGANGA]:   Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, I see only agreement, so we will consider number five – the collection of parking data – to be a high priority.

Let's move on then to number six which is the "collection of TLD sales at a country by country level." This data is in order to better understand per market dynamics as opposed to looking just at global trends. This is already being done to a certain extent as part of, for example, the Latin America Review and perhaps part of the Middle East Review. And you might be able to expect this to happen in additional future ICANN Reviews.

This is, I think, relatively burdensome data to get at since you have to go look at Whois information, and there's Whois privacy and so on. Once again, this is data that I expect would not be consumed prior to a subsequent CCT Review.

So once again, I would probably suggest this is – between the cost of collecting it and the fact that it's probably not going to play a significant role in community discussions prior to the next round, I would suggest that it be lower priority but open to discussion.

Waudo has his hand up again. Go ahead, Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry. Hello, Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello. Sorry, that was an old hand. But maybe I can just take advantage of the opportunity just to mention that I'll have to leave the call in a couple of minutes. I have to attend another call. I wanted to suggest that when you reach number seven, maybe in addition to talking about country by country, you could also put that the regional – the entities that are collecting the data at the regional level. ICANN should establish relationships with them as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Waudo. I think you get regional–

WAUDO SIGANGA: When you get to number seven. [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Thanks, Waudo. I think you get –

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That makes sense. Thanks.

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] say about country and regional as part of number seven. Carlton's agreed on –

WAUDO SIGANGA: Alright. I'll have to leave the call, unfortunately, for another one so I'll catch up later.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Thanks, Waudo.

Carlton's agreed that number six can probably be considered low priority. I'm looking to see if there's any other feedback otherwise we'll just vote.

And Megan's right that certainly, for number six, you could get regional for free once you have country by country. Number seven's about establishing relationships, and so I think the idea there is you're talking about CENTR and so on.

Eleeza has raised her hand. Go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks, Jordyn. I just had a question just to make sure we're capturing this right. If something is listed as a prerequisite, then it's prerequisite; otherwise, it's high, medium, or low priority. Is that right? If you say something is a high priority, it's not a prerequisite.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. I just want to be sure we got that right before we got too far down the road. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. You can think of a prerequisite as just being the highest of the priorities.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Got it. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks. Let's go ahead and vote on the priority for number six. I'm proposing that this is low priority again. So, use your green voter if you agree with that and otherwise, say red, if you don't agree and then we'll make you explain why.

I see three green votes. [inaudible] Carlton [inaudible] two more.

Megan has made a red vote. Megan, do you disagree with making this a low priority?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, I'm sorry. I thought this was one of the important things that went also with the issue relating to the Global South because in order to be able to see whether the new gTLDs were competitive and were being used and rolled out –

I would have thought it would be a higher priority than just low. I understand we have to make some low priorities, but the "country type by country," for me, is rather important.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think this gets back to the question of importance of the [inaudible] and I guess my take is I think this is very unlikely to be consumed by any works other than a future CCT, so low priority just means that we make sure it gets done by then. If you think that there's another track of work that would happen sooner that it would be useful for, I think it would be probably good to understand that, and then it may make sense to raise the priority.

Open to other thoughts, though. Anyone else have feedback on this? Carlton's got his hand raised. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, Jordyn. That is a reasoning. I'm sharing that reasoning you just talk about with you. This is important to any new round, but to my mind if it comes at some point before that, then that's okay.

The next one, to make the relationship, I think that would be medium priority because you want to be able to have the relationship in place before you start doing the connection and the analysis. That's my thinking, too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think that makes sense, Carlton. I'm going to take Megan's "Okay, but…" as a mostly okay and leave this at low unless anyone else has objections or thoughts.

Okay, so we'll make this low and then segue into number seven which is, "establish relationships with entities involved with collection of TLD sales at a country by country." And as Waudo says, we can amend this

to also be regional – so entities like CENTR would be in scope. We have lots of…

Carlton's proposed medium. That seems reasonable since this sets up number six. I think Eleeza and Megan's hands are probably both old, but if either of you want to speak to that, feel free. No, it looks like those are indeed old hands.

So, we're proposing medium priority here for this recommendation number seven. Does anyone disagree with that? Then let's vote on the green – say, green if you agree and we'll go with that.

Alright, I see green so we'll make this one medium priority, number seven.

I'm going to bundle eight and nine together in the interest of efficiency. These make the periodic surveys – the surveys that Nielsen did in Phase One and Phase Two – not necessarily by Nielsen, but similar surveys on an ongoing basis. It makes them happen regularly, as opposed to just the one-offs for this review. I think that will be helpful in terms of capturing trend information.

I would also suggest that these are both high priority since, in order to keep the regularity consistency with the last rounds of surveys, we'd want them to happen in the relatively near future. So, I would propose these two are high priority just to make sure that we keep the cadence up.

And open up for discussion. Anyone have thoughts on numbers eight and nine – continuing the surveys?

Carlton says, "High priority makes sense." Yeah. So, Megan, everything that we have here, anything that we give as a recommendation, will have a completion date prior to the next CCT. So, agreed that they need to be done prior to the next CCT but not the next round or release.

Okay, so it seems like there's generally support, but let's go ahead and have people use their icons – say, green if you support keeping these high priority or red if you disagree.

I see some green…more green… Alright, that's enough green. So, we'll consider these to be high priority.

Number ten is actually quite similar, but a different Work Stream which is "continuing to do periodic DNS Abuse Studies." Once again, I think this one also makes sense to leave as high priority for the same reason of keeping the cadence up, and probably even more so because while the others give us a good baseline of effects on the marketplace – which is also important – these help get to ICANN's core mission of security and stability and should be [inaudible] on a regular basis. Seems like it would be a high priority.

Let's see if there's any discussion on that. Not seeing any, so let's go ahead and vote. The recommendation is that number 10 is also high priority. If you agree, make a green check; disagree, the red X.

I see mostly green checks, so let's go ahead and consider that to be high priority.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just listening and as the conversation's going on, we can address Megan's concern and maybe make the conversation easier if we just call it "timing" instead of "priority." So then it's Prerequisites and then Near, Medium, and Long-term – is what we can call them. We can make this change [inaudible] minute, but if we do it that way it might make the conversation clearer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. That makes sense. And even the long-term one, once again, we expect should be completed by the inception of the next CCT.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. We agree to that. Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so we'll use Near, Medium, and Long-term as substitutes for High, Medium, and Low. But in any case, this last one is high priority/near term. Same thing.

We're moving on to number 11 which is to track the costs of the safeguard implementation. Laureen, can I maybe ask you to speak to exactly what we mean here?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes. On a lot of our Safeguards papers, we were really trying to not just look at what impact the safeguards have had on meeting their intended goal, which was most often mitigating DNS abuse or enabling better identification of bad actors, but also the counterweight to that is what has been the costs associated with the actors that have to actually implement these safeguards?

That is not something we actually had any data on, so this broad recommendation is to get more information on what are the costs of implementing these safeguards? If we're truly going to do a cost-benefit analysis, we need to get a sense of the costs and we do not have that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Laureen. That's helpful. And do you have a sense of where you would recommend the priority for that to be?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I would recommend it to be a medium priority; not a bar to the next round but something that should happen certainly before the next CCT Review. I wouldn't put it as a low priority because I think if this effort does not get started, then it won't even be useful for the next CCT Review Team. That's my thinking, but I'm certainly happy to hear other thoughts on that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Thanks, Laureen. Medium was my mental intuition as well, so I'm certainly supportive of that. Anyone else want to jump in with thoughts on the prioritization of this item?

Carlton, Megan, and everyone in the chat is agreeing that it should be medium, so why don't we just go ahead and use our check marks. If anyone disagrees, please use the red check mark. Otherwise, if you want to further indicate support, use the green one. But since we generally have support in chat, I feel like this is good at medium priority. So, thanks, everyone. We'll lock in number 11 as medium.

The last of the Data Analysis items is number 12, which is "more granular data collection by ICANN Compliance." I think this is just to get better bucketing. There's been extensive discussion of this throughout. I think the safeguards discussion, just to better understand types of complaints and other elements of data. I know this is something that – I do get the sense that, depending on the answer, it may be actionable by other review teams, for example, that are underway right now or in the near future, or PDPs. So, I would think that this is probably a high priority item or possibly even a prerequisite.

Laureen, based on our previous discussion, have we given this a tentative priority?

LAUREEN KAPIN:	It certainly would be a high priority. I'm looking at my notes to see whether we spoke about this in terms of a prerequisite or not, so give me a moment. [(Safety and handling complaint.)]
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Laureen, if I may – I recall the conversation. We had it as a prerequisite and Jamie pushed back on that because there's an IT component to it.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Right.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	And so, that's part of where this conversation of coming up with these different time frames came up. I think it's, at the very least, a high because we want to start tracking the data to assess how the safeguards are doing it sooner rather than later. So, these would be a high or a prerequisite. It's possible that highs will get done sooner than prerequisites, depending on how the subsequent procedures process goes. That was the conversation that took place before.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Thanks, Jonathan. I think Jamie's got his hand raised, so I'm going to move to him in just a moment. But I was just going to observe. If we think things are prerequisites and we think, legitimately, that there just shouldn't be any more gTLDs until we have addressed this issue, it actually doesn't matter how long it takes.

The fact that there's an IT component just means that ICANN has to finish that IT work before we can release additional gTLDs; whereas, it might be totally reasonable for Jamie to push back and say that it's impossible to get this done in 18 months, so please don't make this a high priority. Whereas, if we make it a prerequisite, we just say, "It doesn't really matter how long it takes. It has to be done before there can be additional gTLDs."

Obviously, that puts a lot of pressure on ICANN to get it done sooner rather than later and I don't think we should make things prerequisites just to put pressure on ICANN, but from that perspective I think I would argue against considering what the implementation looks like to make it a prerequisite or not.

Jamie's got his hand raised. Go ahead, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes, there is an unknown IT component associated with this, but the bigger issue is there's no granularity in terms of what – not "no," but it's unclear what the data set is and what the requirements for revealing those would be. So, it's a little like you've got to go to the moon by next year, but we have no idea what kind of rocket we need. I'm obviously exaggerating for a point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we did it, too. That's a great example, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND:	Well, it took a little longer than [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We put a man on the moon – not because it was easy but because it was hard. My vote is to make it a prerequisite because I think that – and Jamie will back me up on this – I think Compliance is the most important department of ICANN, and for us to really have an understanding of the effectiveness of all the work that we've put into safeguards and other types of Rights Protection Mechanisms, etc., that we've been adding, the only way to really understand their effectiveness is to track it and capture it.

And we'll be around to help you define that data set very early in the Fall so that there's plenty of time to get it implemented. Right now, the entire complaint is in a memo [sealed in Salesforce], and I think that needs to change prior to there being any more new gTLDs. That's my opinion. That's my vote.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Jonathan.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, maybe a better analogy is we have to go to space, but we're not really sure where we want to go. So, if it's the moon, yeah, that's realistic. If it's Mars, it's going to take longer and then it's going to have consequences. I'm not resistant to it making the data available. I just would feel a whole lot more comfortable about it if there was agreement and understanding about what data it is that folks are

looking for and how it's to be presented before committing to timing. If you all think that it's…

Anyway, that's…

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's do-able, Jamie, and we will certainly spend the next [weeks/] months getting it more granular.

JAMIE HEDLUND: You can't it's doable because you don't know what it is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We don't have to have this figured out for the public comments period is all I'm saying.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. We [would then] all sit down and talk about it, and I think we still should just so staff can come back and say, "This is the level of effort. This is how long it's going to take. This is how much it's going to cost based on available resources."

I know that sounds like throwing up bureaucratic nonsense, but from what I understand it is not going to be an insignificant amount of work to start capturing this info and data and revealing it. And if everyone's comfortable with that, if that takes however long, if that takes – I'm exaggerating – but if that takes five years and it means that the new

gTLD program doesn't start for five years because of the lack of granular data in complaints, that's the community's decision.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Jamie. I have my own thoughts that I'll jump in with, unless anyone else wants to comment.

My opinion is that it's entirely plausible to me that this should be a prerequisite, but I guess I don't have a good enough sense of where we think the lack of data, or the granularity of the data is preventing us from…

It is true that we only see broad buckets. For example, Laureen gave the example of, in Whois, we don't know whether the complaints are accuracy related or related to the identity of the registrant or not. And I think this, obviously, would be very helpful to, for example, the Whois Review work or the NextGen RDS to have that information.

I'm not sure it implicates the release of additional gTLDs, so I guess it would be helpful for me to at least understand what are the specific types of data elements that we think are blocking? Because I think there's probably some amount of data elements that it would be nice to have and some that we think are really critical, and at the very least being able to separate those out might be useful in terms of deciding if this is a prerequisite.

I see Carlton and Laureen have raised their hands, so I'll go to Carlton first.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Put me in the queue, too, Jordyn. Thanks.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS:	Thank you, Jordyn. I don't think there's any argument that could be successful. That tells you that we know certain things or we hear certain things. We have all of these classifications. If you look at the classifications that are in the Compliance oversight – phishing, whatever, whatever, all of those – I don't think there's any argument we don't know enough about which abuse is occurring in each bucket.

And perhaps, if we go [inaudible] it is a good thing to have more and [better regular] data. I don't think there's any [inaudible] contradiction to that argument. That we do not [know everything] or we do not know exactly every piece of data that will make up an indicator – that's true, too. But it's nonsequetor to say that because we don't know enough about the data but we know [distinctly] how much it will cost to get that data… Those two things don't fit together.

If the argument is that we have to be absolutely sure 100% on every single data item that we need to collect in the granularity before we can move, that is not an argument that can be sustained. That's how I feel about it. I truly believe it's a prerequisite and we will learn as much as we can learn as we go along. And what we have do is to commit to working together to work out all those details.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Thanks, Carlton. Laureen?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn, and everyone else's thoughtful comments. Not surprisingly, I also would weigh in on this being a prerequisite. Although I do take Jamie's point to heart in that I think if we're going to be effective in our work and provide something that can be implemented, we need to give further guidance about what further categories we want information on; how we want this data to be granular and, ideally, a sequencing if we have sub-priorities.

But that said, the reason why I think it should be a prerequisite is because right now the buckets that are reported by ICANN Compliance are so big and are so opaque. So, we have this big "abuse" category, but we don't know if this is phishing or pharming; we don't know if this is loss of money or loss of information leading to identity theft; we don't know if – for the Whois accuracy – if it's just a syntax problem or it's an identity problem.

And perhaps most importantly, with the gTLDs that have been designated as the most sensitive of all, we don't know if the safeguards that are in place are working, and we don't know the extent of the types of problems that these gTLDs may be facing because we don't have this transparency and granularity.

Therefore, there may be a supposed assumption that everything is fine and these safeguards are adequate. And, like the cost issue, we have no insight into whether, in fact, things are working or not. And so, I think that without that information, the next gTLD round really can't proceed

on a sound basis because we don't have adequate information to figure out if things need to be adjusted or if things are fine.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Laureen. I guess my opinion is, we should – if we're going to make this a prerequisite – and I'm not, like I said, I'm not trying to say I'm necessarily opposed to it. I think there's a lot of granularity that ICANN could [do] that probably isn't a prerequisite, and there's probably some amount of granularity that ICANN could add that probably is.

I think we probably just need – and we don't need to get it right before this draft report comes out, but certainly before the final report comes out – we need to be, I think, a little bit crisper about identifying which particular sets of data need to be unearthed prior to making this a prerequisite.

I would suggest it's fine to leave this as a prerequisite for the moment, but we should probably add a comment into the report that we expect to identify specific data that we expect to be made granular prior to the next round and only those items will be gating; whereas, I'm sure there's a lot of additional work that we would like for the Compliance Team to do in terms of making more granular data that might not be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn?

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Go ahead, Jonathan. Sorry, Jonathan. I'm terrible at [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem. I agree with everything we said and I think we can make those determinations. The beauty of it is that once we say something like have a field like "category of abuse," there'll be a pick list and adding an item to that pick list will be nothing from an IT perspective compared to setting up a system to have a pick list in the first place.

And so, I think that if we get these broad categories, we'll be able to solve the IT problem and then, in terms of the data issue going forward, that is trivial. Again, we won't have to predict the future of everything we'll ever want if we can [inaudible]. But beyond that, I agree with everything that was said.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks. I agree with that sentiment as well. I certainly hope it's the case that adding fields to the pick list don't add a lot of future implementation costs.

It sounds like we're converging on making this a prerequisite with the caveat that before this becomes final, we need to identify a clear set of data that we consider to be blocking and that will be in the final report.

Alright, starting the voting already. Carlton has voted yes. Everyone else, use their green button if you think that this is a prerequisite and that we also are making a commitment to clearly identify which data elements are prerequisites in the final report.

Alright. I see lots of green boxes. The good news is we're done with the Data Analysis section, which is the first 12 of our 54 items here. The bad news is I'm going to give the mic back to Laureen with 34 minutes to get through the remaining 42 items. Good luck, Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks, Jordyn. The good news is I'm going to be passing the mic back to you just before we get to the end.

So, Impact of Safeguards – and I'm hoping, actually, we can go through these quickly since we've spent the last couple of Plenary calls on some of these issues.

The first one is "assessing the percentage of Whois complaints related to data accuracy." This is not a prerequisite and during the last call we had designated this as a medium priority. So, I'll ask for any questions or comments on that before we proceed to a vote.

Okay. I'm not hearing anyone and I'm also not seeing any hands, so I'll ask people to vote on this. Again, not a prerequisite – medium priority.

I'm seeing the check marks, so we will move right along. That's going to be medium priority for the Whois complaints related to identity.

The next is to compare rates of –

I'm sorry. Megan, did you have a comment? Did I hear someone? Okay, I must have misheard.

The next one is to "compare rates of abuse in domains operating under the new RA and RAA with the legacy rates." So, this is a straightforward comparison. This relates to the mitigating abusive activity safeguard. This recommendation really relates to some of the language – [this is] actually a little different from the recommendation in the paper, but this relates to making sure that our data gathering exercise with the DNS Abuse Study is repeated.

And it's repeated so we get a comparison of what's happening under the new Registry and Registrar Agreements between the new gTLDs and the legacy gTLDs.

So, this has been identified as a high priority, but not a prerequisite. But again, it's to continue the DNS Abuse Study. So, this will be similar to the continuation of the Registrant and Consumer End User studies in terms of the timing. It would be a high priority so that it can be sustained.

Questions or comments on that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Laureen, I just noted in the chat that this actually seems like the same thing as number 10, so we should just probably bundle those together. But we already said number 10 was high priority, so I agree that this should be as well.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. Just in terms of organization, the Data Analysis we had identified as our big bucket and this is repeated in the paper, and that's why it's a

separate line item. But yes, when we're organizing this in other ways, I agree that it's related.

Again, this is a high priority. Any questions or comments before we move to a vote there? Okay.

I'm already seeing the green votes. Any disagreement here? If you can vote with your buttons – your agreement or disagreement. I'm only seeing green, so this is going to be a high priority. And we should note a link with the number 10. But it will, as I had noted and as Carlton echoes, it will also appear in the paper.

Moving right along in task, we're on 15 now. This is a "review of the registry operator framework in mitigating abuse," and more specifically – and maybe we can make a note to put this in as an edit – if we can add a reference to security checks there because that's what it relates to. So, if we can edit number 15 to "review registry operator frameworks for effectiveness in mitigating abuse," and just put in parentheses "security checks." That's what it relates to most specifically.

This we had identified as a medium priority and not a prerequisite. In terms of the timing here, this is something that's actually currently undergoing discussions within the multistakeholder community, and we anticipate that something is going to actually emerge on this, hopefully sooner rather than later. So, it's not a prerequisite, but it would be something that should be dealt with in terms of the next 36 months. So, we definitely need this as a medium priority.

"Not meant to be shared –" Thanks, Eleeza. That's helpful. Still, if we can put "security checks" that would actually make it more meaningful to me also.

Questions or comments on this priority for the security framework? "Medium sounds right to me." That's from Jordyn. Do we have questions or comments? If not [inaudible] goes to a vote. So, if people can vote on making this a medium priority, now would be the time to do that.

I'm seeing green check marks. Okay. And Jamie, I see you're switching to phone, only so I'll count on you to speak up when you want to be in the queue.

Okay, so we have this as medium then.

Moving on to 16. Sixteen is, to "assess the effective mechanisms to report and handle complaints on abuse." Let me get a little more granular for this because this recommendation – I'm using the word the overused word "granular." Let me get a little more specific. This recommendation – although it might sound like it's aimed at ICANN Compliance, actually it isn't.

These are recommendations relating to the safeguards on making and handling complaints and it's taking a look at whether the mechanisms in terms of the safeguards have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse. So, the recommendation is to determine the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD – that was one of the requirements of the contract – and also the volume of inquiries

that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD and what actions they take to respond to it.

This is really trying to gather information for future review teams. And also, another issue here with whether more efforts are needed to publicize where complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within the TLD should be directed because one of the safeguards here was to make sure that the TLD had a contact point listed for reports of such abuse.

Those are the specific recommendations that relate to this safeguard, and this has been designated as medium priority.

Questions or comments on this? I see, Megan, [you're] saying that this is a higher priority for you. Does that mean you would bump it beyond medium or just if you were sequencing, you'd put it ahead? Okay, and Jordyn is saying maybe higher than 15 but still medium.

Other questions or thoughts on the priorities for these recommendations that are really aimed at assessing the safeguards on making and handling complaints? How are these safeguards working? Is there room for improvement? That's really what these recommendations are trying to suss out. "Medium high." I think we're going to have to stick with our buckets here.

Not seeing more comments, I'm going to keep this at medium for now – unless we somehow go to more gradations here – and ask people to vote on keeping this a medium priority. If you can vote with your voting buttons. If you disagree, note that also.

Okay, this still has more green votes and no negative votes, but an inclination that this would go ahead of 15.

Moving on to 17. Seventeen is "assessing if more efforts are needed to publicize where abuse complaints should go." I realize I scooped that up into the other one, but this, too, would be medium – assessing whether there's a need to further publicize where abuse complaints should go. This would be medium.

Questions or comments on this? I'm not seeing any, so I would ask then to go to a vote on this one for 17 – publicizing where complaints should go. That's going to be medium. People can note their agreement or disagreement. I see two green voting buttons. Okay, now more. Okay, so we will keep that as medium and move on to 18.

Eighteen is the safeguard that we have now talked about extensively, which is "more granular information on the subject matter of complaints in compliance reports." So, we should link these and, consistent with our prior discussion, we should have this as a prerequisite.

But since we've talked about it already, I'm going to ask people to indicate their agreement with our prior decision that this is a prerequisite. If anyone disagrees or wants to discuss this further, now's the time.

I'm seeing green voting buttons. Jordyn, noting your agreement with the same caveat. Okay, "What is meant by linking?" Yes, I do intend them to also be in the safeguards paper, but they'll also be in the Data Analysis. In fact, in my safeguards paper I have a note to reference the

Data Analysis recommendation also. This is more of a, "Yes, we know we're putting this in two places and we're doing that deliberately."

I'm assuming that we're in agreement on this for 18 to be a prerequisite and I'm going to move on to 19 now so people can clear their buttons.

Nineteen – we've moved on to the safeguards in the highly regulated strings now, and these particular recommendations really go to "assessing the security measures for the TLDs gathering sensitive health and financial information."

And if you recall, this relates to gathering information on whether there are complaints in these areas, comparing rates of abuse between highly regulated TLDs that have agreed to verify and validate credentials with those highly regulated gTLDs that haven't.

I'm actually getting confused here. We're not there yet, so apologies. I'm having to track these to the safeguards in the paper which, of course, are not similarly numbered.

Apologies. This relates to the safeguard that is in the regulated strings and calls for them to implement measures that basically ensure if they're going to be collecting sensitive health information or sensitive financial information, that they are implementing measures to do that. And so, this is really trying to get at assessing those measures.

So, this is 19, and we had designated this as a high priority given the sensitivity of the information.

In 19, that is a high priority, and I'll take questions or comments on that recommendation of 19 being a high priority. Questions or comments?

Okay, then I'll ask people to vote on that on 19, "assessing the security measures for TLDs gathering sensitive health and financial information." I'm seeing the green checks.

Okay, so 19 – sensitive health security, high priority.

Moving on to 20. This relates to a very specific safeguard. Again, we're dealing with the regulated and highly regulated gTLDs. Now we're in the highly regulated gTLD category and the first safeguard was, "requiring registry operators to take steps to establish relationships with government or industry bodies."

And this recommendation really is figuring out what steps have been taken to do that. These were all treated as a bucket in the safeguards paper. There were actually five safeguards that relate to the highly regulated gTLDs and we had put all these safeguards as a high priority.

It strikes me, when we are talking about this, that if we were going to separate them out, perhaps this one would be a more medium priority as compared to the others. But I'm happy to reconsider that.

And I'm looking at the comments from Jordyn, "I'm okay putting all these together in a study on restricted and highly regulated gTLDs and make them high priority." That's probably simpler, so let me adopt Jordyn's reasoning here and we can take these as a group because 19, 20 – 19 relates to the highly regulated…

These are out of order. That's what's also confusing me. Okay, so 20 would continue to be a high priority.

Twenty-one actually doesn't deal with registries that are highly regulated.

Well, let me get a vote on 20. That is designated as a high priority because it relates to the highly regulated gTLDs. So, can we get a vote on that?

Carlton, I see your hand is up. Go ahead. Oh, hand is down now. Okay. And I see your comment in the chat.

So, high priority for this one. And I'll note that all our votes are in favor of that.

For 21, here we are out of the highly regulated gTLDs and we're in these stand-alone safeguards that have to do with cyberbullying and government function safeguards. These we had designated as a low priority, and I think part of the reasoning there was that first of all, these impact very few gTLDs and we have no information here. So, there isn't a recognition that there's a problem; although, depending on the data received, that might become a higher priority in future reviews. But right now, we had designated this as a low priority.

Questions or comments on that designation? Okay, so I'm going to ask people to vote on making this a low priority. We're on 21, and this is really looking at "complaints for registries' failure to comply with the cyberbullying/government functions safeguard."

I'm seeing green buttons there agreeing with that priority. Okay, so that's going to be a low for 21 – government functions and cyberbullying.

We're going to go to 22. Twenty-two – this is related to the same safeguard – determining how they enforce these safeguards. So, this would have the same low priority, so I'm going to just ask people to do a straight vote on that. This would have the same low priority, if people can vote on 22 as well. Okay, and I'm seeing a consistent vote on that in favor of the low priority.

For 23, it would be to "compare the trustworthiness of the new gTLDs with registration restrictions to those without restrictions." This relates to the Category [2] safeguard advice which related to safeguards on restricted registration policies.

I will note, Eleeza, that we seem to have skipped a number of safeguards in the highly regulated category and collapsed that into just establishing a relationship with government or industry bodies. But there are actually several more.

I'll just say as an aside that when we had discussed those, they were all high priorities, and I'm going to assume that the rest of the recommendations in the highly regulated area which, in the safeguards paper, fall on page 16. There are actually six recommendations here, but only one seems to have made it to this list. Those were all designated as a high priority and I'm assuming that we're keeping that based on our past discussion and also the comments in the chat.

But that probably means that this chart should be adjusted and when we note this, those will all be a high priority. So, what I'm asking for is to add those specific safeguards in the highly regulated category to this chart and note a high priority for those as well. They all fall under the

same bucket as "establishing a relationship with enforcement authorities."

That's my aside, and I see…okay…

But let me move into the restricted registration policies and note that in our prior discussion, we had noted this as a high priority. And this was really to get at this issue of getting information about the impact of these registry restrictions on trustworthiness.

Questions or comments on designating this as a high priority? This is for Impact of Safeguards 23. Questions or comments?

Then I'll ask people to vote on making this a high priority. And I'm seeing the green check marks, so this would be a high priority.

Twenty-four, again we're on the same safeguards which really have to do with restricted registration policies, and this relates to abuse rates.

And as an aside, this is probably information that the DNS abuse Study would go to, but it again, in prior discussions this has been identified as a high priority.

Questions or comments on this? Okay, then I'll ask people to vote on prioritization here as a high priority. I'll note that there's consensus that this is a high priority for 24.

On 25, this would call for an assessment of the costs and benefits. For example, what's the impact on compliance costs and costs for the registries in implementing these restrictions? This is still regarding the

same safeguards related to the GAC Category 2 designation – Restricted Registration Policies. Again, we had designated this as a high priority.

Questions or comments on that? Okay, not seeing any, I'll ask people to vote on identifying this as a high priority.

I'm seeing the green check marks, so we have consensus on that.

Finally – and even though it's safeguards, because this also, by the terms of the –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm sorry, Jonathan. Did you want to…

Okay, you're on mute now. I wasn't sure whether you wanted to speak.

This was a recommendation related to gathering public comments on the impact of these registration restrictions on competition, and this was noting that there was a lot of concern that the implementation of the safeguards may have led to competition issues.

There was an ongoing back and forth on the implementation of safeguards between the GAC and the ICANN Board, but there really isn't information on whether these concerns – how they played out. So, this is a recommendation dealing with gathering that.

And again, these were all designated as a high priority, so I'll ask folks for questions or comments on that.

Okay, so I'll ask people to vote on designating that as a high priority. Okay. I will note, then, we have consensus on that.

I see that we are approaching the end of our time, so rather than moving to pass the baton to Drew for a discussion of the PICs, what I'll suggest is that we pick this up on our next call; but ask people to take a look at this so that they're ready to dive right in.

I'll also ask a quick question, totally changing topics for the staff. I'm dealing with travel. I note that I, and probably other people, got a message from ICANN Travel about travel arrangements, but it didn't identify a hotel. And, also, it was a pretty large date range, but I was unclear about when our CCT face-to-face meeting was going to be. I wondered if there was any quick information on both those issues that you could share with us. Fabro wondered about that, too.

Does anyone on staff who's on the call have any insight into those issues?

PAMELA SMITH: Sorry, Laureen. I couldn't get myself off mute. The actual face-to-face has been approved by the Board to happen the 10th and 11th. Then we have a Public Engagement session on the 12th and we have a wrap-up on the 13th. And then the date ranges were based upon those events.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Got you. And are we going to –
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Pamela, when does the meeting begin? When does the ICANN meeting begin?
LAUREEN KAPIN:	The 11th, I think.
PAMELA SMITH:	Officially on the 11th, and the opening ceremony is on the 13th.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. And we're on the 10th and 11th?
PAMELA SMITH:	Yes, sir.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Alright, thanks.
PAMELA SMITH:	And so, you're being approved to arrive on the 9th so you're not beat down and drug out for the next day. And then the departures are arranged accordingly with the schedule, and to give you all a little leeway to perhaps do some other things.

As far as hotels, none of us know yet which hotels we're in, and so we're just waiting to hear back from Laura Ramirez as to where we are going to be stationed. As far as that's concerned, look for that to be coming. They haven't forgotten. It's just I believe Joseph De Jesus is trying to make a preemptive strike and have Constituency Travel get you all flown to where you need to be, and then there will be places to stay.

There are – I think it's four or five hotels listed on the ICANN58 website. It will likely be one of those. My understanding is that this is not nearly as spread out a situation as Hyderabad was, so these hotels should be much closer to the venue.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And do you know, are there going to be shuttles and things? Because actually, the venue is not downtown.

PAMELA SMITH: Right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And the hotels aren't so close.

PAMELA SMITH: Okay. Also, the average mean temperature is going to be 37 degrees Fahrenheit, just for those of you who wondered – according to what my husband looked up for me for the month of March. I don't have that answer yet, either.

We haven't gotten that information from the Meetings Team, but I will be pressing for that today because not only are you asking, but the rest of the MSSI staff is asking the same question as well. So, I hope to be able to get something to you by close of business tomorrow as far as those details are concerned.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you, Pam.

PAMELA SMITH: You're welcome, Laureen. My pleasure.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jonathan, did you have any closing remarks?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I guess what we should do – and then I'm going to make remarks – so sorry. Maybe we can make this spreadsheet available to the whole team so that people can go look at the prioritizations that were set by default by the drafters. And then we can really streamline the next conversation about these timelines by looking for areas of dissent. Does that make sense?

LAUREEN KAPIN: It does. Although Jonathan, I would note that this chart was created before everyone added the prioritizations to their papers, so that field actually, other than the prerequisites, is not here yet because people

hadn't done that. So, what I would suggest is perhaps staff can add the priority that was identified in our revised papers and then publicize it to the team so they have that information to consider. That's why I was strumming through my paper while we were speaking, because I had to [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That makes sense. And then confer with us if it's not clear what the drafter intended.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, let's at least get straw men prioritization in there and then people can just raise issues with which they have disagreement for the next call.

And we're going to do one more round of edits in the Drafting Team of the Executive Summary, and then we'll circulate that in the next day or two for comments online. I think that's going to be less of a verbal discussion and more people providing written feedback.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Laureen, can I ask a question? You said you wanted us to add the prioritization from your papers into this? Is that right?

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Right. When we had done our papers the last round, we had actually – at least in my last round – I had designated low, medium, high.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Right. Would you want us to do that just for the papers we haven't talked about yet or do you want us to add that from the papers –

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Right. Only for the papers we hadn't talked about yet [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	We'll indicate that with a new column [inaudible] confuse everyone.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yeah, or a different color. However you want to do it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. We'll make it separate.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yeah. These people would know what it had been designated as, and the column that has priority now would reflect our current discussion that we just had today.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Okay. Will do. Thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Alright, everyone. Thanks. I know it took a little bit to get our minds around on the exercise, but everybody did get it once we got going. So thank you so much.
	Keep your eye on your inboxes for the Executive Summary and for a link to the spreadsheet, and we'll pick it up and finish this on the next call.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]